

**RIVERSTONE EAST SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS AND RESPONSES**

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
<b>AGENCIES</b>					
<b>Blacktown City Council</b>	127911	1, 2, 3	Not Supportive of Staged Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is no certainty for landowners in Stage 3.</li> <li>2. Unable to collect Section 94 contributions from development in Stage 3 to fund the acquisition of land required for a future public purpose.</li> <li>3. Creates inequity and uncertainty.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staged rezoning and infrastructure delivery.</li> <li>2. A Section 94 Contributions Plan will be prepared for the entire Precinct, and will be levied for development in Stage 3 once it is rezoned.</li> <li>3. Landowners have been informed of the coordination of rezoning with infrastructure delivery and will be kept informed of the rezoning timeframe.</li> </ol>
			Open Space	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Proposed playing fields will not fit into allocated spaces.</li> <li>5. Provision of passive open space is not equitable.</li> <li>6. Gap in the provision of open space between Clarke St, Guntawong Rd, Tallawong Rd and Riverstone Rd.</li> <li>7. Open space area between Cudgegong Rd and the transmission easement in the Area 20 Precinct serves no useable function.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Further work has been done with Council and the masterplanners to demonstrate the playing fields within Stages 1 and 2 will be able to fit in the allocated areas.</li> <li>5. See Section 4.5 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion on open space.</li> <li>6. See comment (5) above. An additional pocket park is proposed within Stage 2.</li> <li>7. See Section 4.10 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion on the five lot rezoning within the Cudgegong Road Station Precinct and the open space.</li> </ol>
			General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Various land uses within the precinct could cause noise, odour, impact on water quality and cause contamination of land.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Land uses currently operating in the Precinct that could cause environmental impacts will likely move out of the Precinct progressively as the Precinct is developed.</li> </ol>
			Heritage – Indigenous and/or Non Indigenous	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. General support for the heritage outcomes, including heritage controls outlined in the DCP for development around Nu Welwyn.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. See Section 4.9 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion on non-indigenous heritage.</li> </ol>
			Open Space/ENV	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. The proposed medium density residential land between First Ponds Creek, Clarke St, Riverstone Rd and Cranbourne St is very close to the riparian corridor. This area contains groundwater dependent ecosystem vegetation communities that are assessed as having high conservation significance. The setback in this area is not sufficient to allow for the riparian zone, vegetation protection and an associated asset protection zone and perimeter road. This area should form part of an open space riparian corridor.</li> <li>11. Consideration should be given to realigning the Clarke St extension between Guntawong Rd and Oak Street towards First Ponds Creek, to increase the amount of developable land on the eastern side of the road.</li> <li>12. Further consideration should be given to land in the vicinity of Oak St between the existing Nature Conservation Trust lot containing ENV, Clarke St and the proposed native vegetation retention area on certified land adjoining the train stabling yards.</li> <li>13. Presence of Shale Sandstone Transition Forest (SSTF) within the Stage 3 of the Precinct needs to be recognised for its importance regionally.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. The medium density development (perimeter road) will slightly encroach the groundwater development ecosystem vegetation, however this vegetation is not specifically being mapped on the NVP map and is therefore not protected. The ILP will allow for the required riparian corridor plus a 15m APZ, which will be partially accommodated in the perimeter road.</li> <li>11. Clarke Street plus its extension will have a width of 26m. It was exhibited at 35m. Therefore along the alignment various properties will benefit from the reduced width.</li> <li>12. 8.1ha of ENV is bring protected across Stages 1 and 2. This is 0.6ha more than required under the Biodiversity Conservation Order.</li> <li>13. Shale Sandstone Transition Forest within Stage 3 will be considered when that stage is rezoned.</li> </ol>
Infrastructure Provision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14. Water cycle management – previous concerns with Issue B and C of the draft water cycle management report and stormwater management concept have not been addressed In the exhibited draft report.</li> <li>15. Boundaries of train stabling yard are incorrectly shown on ILP. This needs to be corrected. This will have a major impact on Basin 1 and bio-retention basins M5-A and M5-B.</li> <li>16. The flood extent shown on the draft SEPP Development Control Map (DVC Flood Prone and Major Creeks Land map) in the vicinity of Oak Street is questioned and needs to be checked against the modelling by Mott MacDonald.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14. A drainage review has been completed by the consultants, Mott MacDonald in consultation with Council. See Section 4.3 of the Finalisation Report.</li> <li>15. The stabling yard boundary has been corrected.</li> <li>16. The flood mapping shows the flood extent currently, ie prior to development. There are some areas, eg R3 zoned land east of Oak St, that are flood affected. As drainage infrastructure is installed</li> </ol>			

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
			Traffic and Transport	<p>17. Riverstone Road and Gordon Road are both shown as being closed at First Ponds Creek in the Riverstone Precinct and are being constructed as local roads. In the Riverstone East Precinct they are now shown as being opened and also having the status of collector roads. This conflict needs to be addressed.</p> <p>18. The proposed collector road between Tallawong Road and Cudgegong Road should have its alignment adjusted to meet Tallawong Road at the main entrance to the train stabling yard.</p> <p>19. The ILP needs to incorporate a roundabout at the intersection of Rouse Road and Cudgegong Road.</p> <p>20. The staggering of local roads in several places is not supported.</p> <p>21. Traffic controls are required at the following intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Realigned Clarke Street and Garfield Road East – traffic lights</li> <li>ii. Realigned Clarke Street and Tallawong Road Extension – roundabout</li> <li>iii. Realigned Clarke Street and Riverstone Road – roundabout</li> <li>iv. Clarke Street and Guntawong Road – roundabout</li> <li>v. Tallawong Road extension and Riverstone Road – roundabout</li> <li>vi. Tallawong Road extension and Guntawong Road – roundabout</li> <li>vii. Tallawong Road and Macquarie Road – roundabout</li> </ul> <p>22. Proposed road widths in DCP Schedule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Fig 4.3 Sub-arterial – the total road reserve width of 35m is wider than the width of sub-arterial roads in the DCP Schedule of other precincts. It should be consistent.</li> <li>ii. Fig 4.4 Collector Road (Bus Route) – 20m width is acceptable; however the gap between the property boundary and footpath should be a minimum of 0.9m.</li> <li>iii. Fig 4.5 Local Street – 16m width is acceptable, however the gap between the property boundary and footpath should be a minimum of 0.9m.</li> <li>iv. Fig 4.6 Local Street configuration along Riparian Corridors/Parks is not consistent with other precincts. This road will not be necessary as we do not support residential development between Clarke Street and First Ponds Creek. This road typology should be removed.</li> <li>v. Fig 4.8 Slip lane configuration is not acceptable as it leaves only a 4.0m width for 2 way traffic.</li> </ul> <p>23. The 2 local roads that have direct access to Garfield Road East are not acceptable. The one opposite Edmund Street should be closed as a cul-de-sac and the one between Edmund Street and Junction Road could be a left in-left out arrangement.</p> <p>24. Road widening for traffic signals and roundabouts must be shown on the Land Reservation Acquisition maps.</p> <p>25. Access to the proposed medium density residential land located between Clarke Street and First Ponds Creek will be constrained given that Clarke Street is an access denied sub-arterial road. The ILP does not propose slip roads along the entire western side of Clarke Street, but does propose local roads along the edge of the riparian corridor. This would result in an undesirable streetscape of back fences on Clarke Street. Development in this area is questioned.</p> <p>26. Consideration should be given to a pedestrian crossing across Clarke Street to allow residents to access the open space corridor along First Ponds Creek.</p>	<p>within the Precinct, some areas will no longer be flood affected and will be able to be developed for residential purposes.</p> <p>17. Riverstone Road and Gordon Road as they exist in the Riverstone Precinct and crossing over the creek into the Riverstone East Precinct will be local roads. Riverstone Road once it crosses Clarke Street and further east is proposed to be a collector road to accommodate buses.</p> <p>18. The ILP has been altered for a local road to align with the stabling yard entrance road.</p> <p>19. This has been corrected on the ILP and SEPP mapping.</p> <p>20. Noted. Amendments have been made in some instances to square off intersections.</p> <p>21. Intersection treatments are indicated on Figure 4-2 of the DCP. All intersections with the sub-arterial will be determined at the relevant time by the RMS. The DCP figure differs from Council's advice for the intersection of Tallawong and Guntawong. ARUP's report recommends a signalised intersection where Council recommends a roundabout.</p> <p>22. Refer below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Sub-arterial road width reduced to 26m.</li> <li>ii. Collector Road figure to be amended.</li> <li>iii. Now found in main body DCP.</li> <li>iv. Local Street along riparian corridors/ parks to remain.</li> <li>v. Slip lane figure to be amended.</li> </ul> <p>23. The existing intersection of Clarke Street and Garfield Road East (opposite Edmund St) is to become a cul-de-sac. The proposed local road intersecting with Garfield Rd East between Edmund St and Junction Rd is proposed to be left in – left out. Consultation in both instances has occurred with RMS.</p> <p>24. Widening as shown on the LRA map for intersections includes: Tallawong/Clarke, Guntawong/Clarke and the roundabout at Rouse/Tallawong.</p> <p>25. Development can be designed to address both frontages.</p> <p>26. A number of traffic signals are proposed along Clarke Street which will provide for controlled pedestrian crossing movements so residents may access the open space corridor along First Ponds Creek.</p>
Conolly, Kevin Riverstone East 35 Oak St, Schofields	127405	1, 2, 3	Naming	1. New names for localities will be required for this precinct, suggestions supplied.	1. Noted. The process for naming places is managed by the Geographic Names Board of NSW which welcomes applications from the community.
	127407		Zoning – Place of Worship	2. Proposed zoning of 35 Oak Street Schofields is inappropriate. Zoning the developed portion of the site RE 1 would render the current land use unviable in the future. A more appropriate zone should be identified which both would allow the ongoing use of the site at 35 Oak Street Schofields for religious purposes and contribute to the strategic intent of the exhibited plan to preserve and enhance the riparian corridor along First Ponds Creek.	<p>2. The zoning proposed for this site has been amended. It is proposed to zone it part E3 Environmental Management (to cover the creek corridor) and part E4 Environmental Living (to cover developable land).</p> <p>Places of public worship are permissible under the E4 zone and the existing structures on the site will benefit from 'existing use rights' provisions under the <i>Environmental Planning</i></p>

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
					<i>and Assessment Act 1979.</i>
<b>Department of Education</b> Riverstone East	128373	1, 2, 3	School Site	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Department acknowledges that no schools are proposed within Stage 1 due to capacity in existing nearby schools.</li> <li>The nominated indicative site on Riverstone Road (Stage 2) is generally in a suitable location and of appropriate size suitable for a primary school.</li> <li>The department is not in a position to purchase the land at this early stage however will continue to monitor enrolment demand as the precinct develops.</li> <li>The Department will have further discussions with DP&amp;E relating to the provision of land for education facilities for Stage 3.</li> </ol>	Noted.
<b>DPI Water</b> Riverstone East	130946	1, 2, 3	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General support for the draft Precinct Plan.</li> <li>No objection to the riparian corridor as presented and finds it in accordance with current guidelines.</li> </ol>	Noted.
<b>Endeavour Energy</b> Riverstone East	127704	1, 2, 3	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General support for the draft Precinct Plan.</li> <li>The method of supply in the early stages of development will be from the existing Schofields Zone Substation (ZS) located at Schofields Rd.</li> <li>Schofields Zone Substation has capacity for the proposed 1800 dwellings in Stage 1 of Riverstone East. The development of 11kV HV reticulation from Schofields ZS to Riverstone East precinct is contestable works and funded by developers in accordance with Endeavour Energy policies.</li> <li>The 1,400 dwellings in Stage 2 can be supplied by a combination of Riverstone ZS and Schofields ZS in 2018. This will be partly enabled by a proposed transfer of the existing Box Hill precinct load onto the 22kV supply from Mungerie Park ZS. If applications for Stage 2 are received prior to 2018, a method of supply is possible but is likely to be more onerous for developers.</li> <li>Capacity for Stage 3 development will require further network infrastructure investment which is not currently approved. The most likely option will be a ZS in Riverstone East which was not included in the Endeavour Energy 2014-19 Regulatory Submission to the Australian Energy Regulator. Therefore Endeavour Energy would recommend a delay in rezoning of Stage 3 to 2020 to enable funding to be included in the next regulatory period.</li> <li>Endeavour Energy formally reviews forecasts, available capacity and investment plans on an annual basis. If there are material changes to the available capacity for Stage 3 in the future, Endeavour Energy will inform DP&amp;E.</li> <li>Endeavour Energy currently owns a parcel of land at 120 Guntawong Road within Riverstone East Stage 3 area. This is currently being assessed for suitability for use as a future zone substation site.</li> </ol>	Noted. Stages 1 and 2 are to be rezoned concurrently due to the availability of services. It is noted that initial electricity capacity in Stage 2 is limited to 600 lots, as discussed with Endeavour Energy, and that additional supply will be provided through the proposed zone substation.
<b>Environment Protection Authority</b> Riverstone East	131733	1, 2, 3	Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In relation to the meat rendering plant operation, the potential odour impacts from all assessed operations may be compatible with industrial uses in the Precinct, but are not ideal for the immediate development of large commercial office use or urban residential use. It would be preferable to transition the development of commercial or residential land use over time.</li> <li>The proposed residential zonings in the vicinity of the stabling facility may be incompatible and require appropriate noise mitigation measures to avoid land use conflict.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the timeframe for full development of Stages 1 and 2 of the Precinct is 5 to 10 years, this should give adequate time for industrial uses to transition from the Precinct. See Section 6.2 of the Riverstone East DCP for advice.</li> <li>Additional noise mitigation measures are proposed for development east of the stabling yards. See Section 4.7 of the Finalisation Report.</li> </ol>
			General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is important that a process is documented as part of the precinct planning process that mitigates the potential risk for land use conflict due to noise.</li> <li>The EPA recommends that road traffic noise impacts associated with road traffic levels at (or below) 20,000 AADT should be assessed and appropriate noise mitigation measures identified including measures to protect external amenity.</li> <li>The EPA recommends that water quality and flow targets should be developed as part of the precinct planning process and secured in the DCP. These targets would then apply to any new development associated with the precinct.</li> <li>The development of the Riverstone East Precinct needs to carefully consider the capacity of the Sydney Water's Riverstone Waste Water Treatment Plant and system to cater for additional load.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> <li>The DCP addresses noise mitigation. See Section 6.2 of the Riverstone East DCP.</li> <li>The Precinct has an extensive water quality management strategy.</li> <li>Sydney Water has been consulted on the development of the Precinct.</li> </ol>
			Open Space	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EPA is unclear whether the proposed open space (that is, immediately north of the stabling facility) will provide adequate separation between noise making development and sensitive land use (the medium density residential development immediately east of the stabling facility).</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The open space north of the stabling yards will provide a noise buffer to residential development.</li> </ol>
			Contaminated Land, and	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In relation to Stages 1 and 2, additional site investigations can be undertaken at DA stage</li> <li>The rendering works site on the corner of Garfield and Windsor Roads (Stage 3) will require a detailed site investigation prior to rezoning.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> <li>Noted.</li> </ol>
			Salinity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Precinct contains widespread highly sodic soils which will require specific management techniques to reduce dispersion, erosion and to improve drainage. In addition, the soils are also moderately to very saline. Specific management techniques will need to be developed and applied during bulk earthworks and construction.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. The Blacktown Growth Centres Development Control Plan 2010 provides controls relating to the salinity management.</li> </ol>

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
			Waste Management	11. DCP should contain guidelines to reduce waste.	11. The main body DCP contains a section on waste management and development applications have to lodge a waste management plan in accordance with Blacktown's DCP 2006 Part O (Site Waste Management and Minimisation).
<b>Fire &amp; Rescue NSW</b> Riverstone East	127706	1, 2, 3	General	1. Will not be making a comment at this time but want to be informed of process on Precinct planning.	Noted.
<b>Health, Western Sydney Local Health District</b> Riverstone East	127732	1, 2, 3	Zoning	1. Creation of employment zones within proximity to the rail station and adjoining residential areas is supported. Limiting the number of fast food outlets and giving preference to healthier alternatives within the precinct is recommended.	Noted.
			General	2. Businesses should promote physical activity with on-site recreational facilities. 3. Should consider physical access by foot, bicycle and public transport to community facilities in other precincts.	
<b>NSW Police Force</b> Riverstone East	128111	1, 2, 3	General	1. General support for the draft Precinct Plan.	Noted.
<b>NSW RFS</b> Riverstone East	128106	1, 2, 3	Bushfire	1. Raises no objection to proposed rezoning of subject site on provision that any future development is appropriately designed to comply with <i>Planning for Bushfire Protection 2006</i> (PBP 06) and AS3959 – 2009 <i>Construction of buildings in bushfire prone areas</i> . 2. Subdivision should not occur if proposed lots do not offer building sites that can achieve a bush fire attack level of 29 kW per square metre (BAL 29) or less. 3. Perimeter roads should be provided to those parts of the proposed development that are adjacent to areas requiring Environmental Management such as riparian corridors. 4. Future residential and Special Fire Protection Purpose development that may occur within this site will be required to comply with ' <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i> ', including a provision of particular bush fire protection measures.	Noted. Asset protection zones are mapped in the Riverstone East DCP (Schedule 8).
<b>Office of Environment and Heritage</b> Riverstone East	127874	1, 2, 3	ENV	1. Entire precinct needs to protect 14.6ha. 8.3ha proposed to be protected across Stages 1 and 2. Concerned about the remaining 6.3ha needed for protection for the entire precinct to maintain parity in relation to the 2000ha target for the NWGC. Concerned at lack of validated ENV retained. 2. Field validations and mapping of protected ENV. 3. Protection of ENV and proposed zonings.	1. ENV to be protected in Stages 1 and 2 meets the requirements of the Biodiversity Conservation Order. A similar assessment will be undertaken when Stage 3 is rezoned to confirm the ENV quantum that will be protected against the requirements of the Biodiversity Conservation Order. 2. Areas of ENV that meet the definition of existing native vegetation under the in Stages 1 and 2 meets the requirements of the Biodiversity Conservation Order are confirmed on the Native Vegetation Protection map. Refer to the Biodiversity Consistency Report for further details. 3. Areas of ENV adjacent to roads have been allowed a 50m buffer as mapped on the Native Vegetation Protection Map, to allow for road construction impacts. The proposed RE1 zone will allow for public ownership of the land containing ENV, application of Section 94 Contributions toward land acquisition, and ongoing public benefit of the land.
			Riparian corridors	4. The RPA map does not provide a consistent corridor width for First Ponds Creek. As a 3 <sup>rd</sup> order watercourse the total riparian corridor should be 60m wide plus channel width.  5. Patches of potential ground dependent ecosystems along the creek recommended to be retained and appropriately integrated with the ILP and future urban development.  6. The Water Cycle Management Report includes detailed engineering plans for the basins but not details on planting or a plant schedule. Vegetation management plans for these areas will need to be prepared to the satisfaction of NOW/OEH.	

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
			Visual amenity from Rouse Hill House and Regional Park	7. Consider the visual amenity issues relating to the historic Rouse Hill House and its curtilage particularly building density and heights and retention of vegetation along ridgelines and high points in the landscape throughout the Precinct.	7. Significant viewlines have been retained to the rezoning of the small portion of the Cudgegong Rd Station Precinct (Area 20) and views to Stages 1 and 2 will be of predominantly low density housing. Pocket parks have been located on high points which will enable plantings in these locations. The planning for Stage 3 is not yet finalised and viewlines within Stage 3 will be reviewed when Stage 3 is rezoned.
			Bushfire	8. Revise the Bushfire Report to include references to the future revegetation of the Rouse Hill Regional Park including the need for asset protection to be outside the park boundaries and standard cross sections where land adjoins the park.	8. This issue will be considered at the time Stage 3 is rezoned.
			Traffic and Transport	9. Access to Rouse Hill Regional Park and its future expansion is not given due consideration in the traffic report. A major use that needs to be included in the planning is to provide for simple and safe pedestrian and cycle access from the train stations at Rouse Hill and Cudgegong Road to the park. 10. Revise the Transport Report to include an adequate consideration of the Guntawong Road crossing, including a connected land bridge across the roadway to provide an uninterrupted cycleway/ pedestrian access as well as a landscape linkage that will facilitate fauna movements.	9. More detailed planning will occur as part of the Stage 3 rezoning. However, there will be collector roads leading to the park and area that can accommodate shared paths. 10. As noted in the transport study, this section of Guntawong Road has been designed to minimise severance through Rouse Hill Regional Park while also providing for sufficient traffic capacity. Further consultation with relevant stakeholders, including Council, RMS and Office of Environment and Heritage will be required to confirm a suitable cross section for Guntawong Road.
			Climate Change and green cover	11. Greater opportunity for consideration of green cover as part of the precinct planning process to assist in climate change adaptation. Recommended changes to the Blacktown DCP including the preferred planting list.	11. To be considered as part of any future review of the main body DCP by the Department in consultation with Council
			Aboriginal Cultural Heritage	12. Previously advised test excavations should be done prior to rezoning, which have not occurred. 13. Area of high probability in the south west to be zoned IN1.	12. Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report states excavations should be done ideally before rezoning otherwise prior to development. Further assessment and approvals will be required for any land as indicated on DCP figure 3.5 – Aboriginal cultural heritage which shows land containing known Aboriginal Heritage sites and land with a high potential to have artefacts. 13. This area is part of the stabling yards and will not be mapped on the Riverstone East Precinct Aboriginal Heritage DCP figure as the stabling yard has undergone a separate approval process and is currently under construction.
			Flood Risk Management	14. Highlights it is prudent to consider the developed scenario for the upstream Alex Avenue Precinct for flood events larger than the design flood (ie the 100 year ARI) up to the PMF for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To adequately address the risk within the precinct, during flood events larger than the capacity of the proposed management measures/ basins within the upstream Alex Avenue Precinct.</li> <li>To appropriately identify flood prone land within the precinct (ie PMF extent). The PMF extent for the ultimate developed scenario along First Ponds Creek line provides an upper limit of flooding and associated consequences. It would inform emergency response planning to ensure safety of existing and future communities.</li> </ul>	14. Proposed flows from the Alex Avenue Precinct have been used in PMF event in accordance with Council requirements. This has been updated in the post exhibition modelling. Council is supportive of the approach taken to water management within the precinct. Council is currently considering water management on a greater scale, ie including modifications to Alex Avenue and will adjust regional models completed for precinct rezoning post exhibition.  PMF modelling has been undertaken to determine the 'worst case' scenario which also includes backwater flooding from the Hawkesbury River. A high level flood evacuation strategy has been provided within the post exhibition documentation to appropriately address emergency response planning in accordance with current regional Flood evacuation plans.

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
RMS Riverstone East	128108	1, 2, 3	Zoning	1. Must ensure that the integrity of all existing RMS reservations is identified on the land zoning map.	1. Agreed. Schofields Road, road widening to be mapped SP2.
			Infrastructure Contributions	2. This precinct forms part of the larger NWGC and once zoned will be subject to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Amendment (Special Contributions Area – Western Sydney Growth Areas) Order 2011. If zoned today it would be subject to the order and Special Infrastructure Contributions (SIC) would be applicable to development within the subject area. RMS concern that Infrastructure Contributions are based on a 'developable hectare area' and the NWGC structure plan was based on an average density of 15 lots/ha. Perusal of the current proposal suggests that densities of around 25 lots/ha for Stage 1 are likely. If this is carried through (in the future) to Stage 3 of the Precinct then a far greater population will be realised than what was previously planned for the Riverstone East Precinct. Therefore it is requested that consideration be given to this precinct being funded as follows: development up to 15 dwellings/ha to be covered by SIC, and development in excess of 15 dwellings/ha be covered via a planning agreement to provide contributions and/or works in kind. 3. Funding mechanisms to support the recommended road/transport based infrastructure are to be identified and entered into 'prior to the making of the plan' to ensure local and regional transport/road facilities are not compromised.	2. Noted.  3. State and local funding mechanisms will apply to the delivery of certain roads.
			Traffic and Transport	4. Recommends that TfNSW further discuss a cross section requirement and/or suitable crossing facility which satisfactorily address the functional capacity of Guntawong Rd whilst facilitating north-south connectivity of the Regional Park. 5. Recommends 20m wide corridor width for collector roads within the RE Precinct as this would be in line with best practice applied within the Blacktown LGA. 6. Table 3 of the Transport Study identifies the road carriageway for a Collector Road as being (12m or 13m if a bus route) which means that it is capable of providing four traffic lanes. Therefore, to ensure the functional capacity of Guntawong Road is not compromised through the Rouse Hill Regional Park it is recommended that TfNSW further discuss a cross section requirement and or suitable crossing facility which satisfactorily address the functional capacity of Guntawong Road whilst facilitating north-south connectivity of the Regional Park.	4. Guntawong Road is proposed as a collector road.  5. Collector roads are proposed to have a 20m wide corridor. 6. As noted in the transport study, this section of Guntawong Road has been designed to minimise severance through the Rouse Hill Regional Park while also providing for sufficient traffic capacity. Future year traffic modelling indicates the cross section identified will accommodate future traffic flows.
			Other	7. The installation of any new traffic signals within the precinct is dependent on the proponent satisfactorily demonstrating that general warrants in accordance with Roads and Maritime requirements for Traffic Signal Design – Section 2 warrants can be met.  8. With respect to the proposed Schofields Road access to the B6 – Enterprise Corridor land located next to the Sydney Metro Stabling yards, and subject to further detailed traffic analysis, and a safe/appropriate location being selected, RMS would not object to a left-in/left-out driveway access along the northern side of Schofields Road (between Hambledon Road and Tallawong Road).	7. The installation of traffic signals at each of the locations identified in the Riverstone East precinct will be staged based on the development of the precinct and following demonstration that traffic signal warrants may be met. This will be considered during detailed planning for the precinct as the land uses are more accurately defined.  8. Noted.
State Emergency Services (SES) Riverstone East	126780	1, 2, 3	General	1. Matters raised in correspondence have been referred to the Emergency Risk Management Branch of SES.	No further correspondence received from SES despite follow up by DP&E.
Sydney Water Riverstone East	127909	1, 2, 3	Supportive of Staged Rezoning  Drinking water Wastewater	1. In principle support for the approach of staged rezoning for the growth centre precincts that aligns to infrastructure investment. 2. Trunk drinking water mains completed in early 2015 and have capacity to service all stages of the precinct. Smaller lead-ins and reticulation drinking water mains will connect to these trunk mains, and shall be delivered by developers. 3. The First Ponds Creek carrier was built in early 2015 and has the capacity to service stages 1 and 2 of the precinct for wastewater. Developers will generally need to build lead-in and reticulation water mains. Developers encouraged to contact Sydney Water for requirements. 4. Trunk wastewater services are not currently available for all of the stage 3. Anticipate stage 3 would be serviced by the future Box Hill Chain of Ponds Carrier. Sydney Water currently planning this carrier as part of the North West Growth Centre Package 3 work and current delivery timeframe is late 2018.	1-4 Noted.
			Water Cycle Management Report	5. Does not support the proposed Water Cycle Management Report and recommends the Department critically review and revise the proposed strategy. 6. The flood impact assessments have been undertaken at a precinct consideration level only. The cumulative impacts of the broad development scenario envisaged for the South Creek catchment must be understood before strategic targets for precincts may be set. 7. 'Section 4.1.7 Lag Links and Model Calibration' of the report describes an unusual 'calibration' process with the application of results from one computer model (TUFLOW) to another computer model (RAFTS). Calibration	5. In general, the Water Cycle Management Report (WCMR) was prepared in close consultation with Blacktown City Council who supports the approach taken to water management across the precinct. 6. See above comment. The Riverstone East Model created considers the cumulative impacts of neighbouring developments such as Riverstone and

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
				<p>would normally involve the comparison of model outputs against observed rainfall and runoff data and adjustment of the model within appropriate bounds of confidence.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. 'Section 4.1.10 Proposed Development Assumptions' of the report considers sub catchment areas and the Alex Avenue precinct to be 'undeveloped' for modelling purposes. This will lead to a systematic underestimation of the total runoff volume in the design storm event(s).</li> <li>9. 'Section 5.2.3 Hydrologic Data' of the report presumes 'flows from developed scenarios should be attenuated back to existing scenario flow rates through proper implementation of water sensitive urban design and flood risk management principles' is optimistic at best, particularly given the strategic directions applied in the current planning. The previous exploration of the report is not considered to be satisfactory.</li> <li>10. 'Section 5.2.5.5 Existing Dam Structures' of the report discusses the incorporation of existing dams in the modelling and notes that 'the initial water level of existing dams has been applied'/ It's not clear from this discussion how much reliance has been placed on the attenuation of flood flows due to existing farm dams.</li> <li>11. 'Section 5.2.7.1 Creek Realignment' of the report generally proposes modification of existing flow paths realigned and channelized, and removed and replaced with formal structures to allow previously shallow flooded areas to be salvaged for development. This strategy will dramatically alter the catchment runoff response and based on the hydrologic modelling commentary the impacts of this strategy on downstream properties has not been fairly represented.</li> <li>12. 'Section 5.4 Climate Change' of the report has provided a cursory response to risks associated with climate change and further assessment of the urban design implications of this approach is warranted.</li> <li>13. 'Section 6.2.2.3 Employment Land, Medium and High Density Development' of the report notes that 'it has been assumed that the proposed water quality treatment devices will treat stormwater runoff from the new public roads only'. This assumption needs to be validated because to date Council has not applied 'at source' streetscape WSUD facilities generally in roads.</li> <li>14. Certain basin section drawings show significant excavation into the existing ground levels. This approach is likely to be problematic in achieving free drainage to any bio retention beds in the basin without likely requiring a chase of 'tail out' along the downstream watercourse reach. The practical constructability of the basins should be reviewed in detail. The basins and swales appear to be highly engineered structures with little consideration given to the integrated use of the facility for public access and recreation.</li> <li>15. There are multiple references to modification of waterways and flow paths within the document to gain maximisation of developable area. Meanwhile, there is a lack of frameworks being used to assess the expected outcomes for waterway ecological health, community use and recreation of the riparian areas. The basin strategy should be revised to ensure quality urban design and liveability outcomes are provided concurrently.</li> <li>16. Section 6.3.2 states that the water quality objectives have been achieved 'for the precinct'. Water quality should be achieved from a treatment train before discharge into the creek at each location of discharge. The modelled treatment (expressed as % reductions) for each discharge point to the waterways should be detailed. Considers the receiving environment to be the creek within the development, not just the waterways downstream of the development.</li> <li>17. The proposed strategy has not clearly demonstrated effective protection of the receiving creek systems through effective hydro modification metrics such as the Stream Erosion Index which is required within the Growth Centres DCP but is not referenced in the report. Calculations should be undertaken to assess this index and estimate the impact of hydro modification on downstream environments and minimisation actions developed.</li> <li>18. Encourages the consideration of waterway objectives to drive the water quality and flow objectives of the waterway and notes significant planned earth works in the channels. The positioning of on-line detention basins specifically Basins 1 and 2, is inconsistent with the current NSW riparian corridors guidance that does not allow structures on watercourses greater than 2<sup>nd</sup> order streams.</li> <li>19. Strongly recommend that greater consideration is given to an at source water management framework that allows for a protection and restoration philosophy to waterway corridor and geomorphology focused on ecological function. The attenuated hydrographs noted in Section 2.2.5.2 should be detailed for this purpose. In particular opportunities for stormwater harvesting to reduce flow volume to waterways should be integrated into the design with appropriate fit for purpose use in sports fields and other irrigation uses.</li> <li>20. Strongly recommend that a Water Balance is detailed for the precinct with the expected annual volumes of rainfall, evaporation, waterway flow, mains water supply, wastewater discharge. Harvesting and recycling options must be considered. In short, the precinct must demonstrate an integrated water approach, currently the streams of water are considered separately and potential efficiencies and benefits are not considered.</li> </ol>	<p>Alex Avenue. It should be noted that a further study is being undertaken for the Vineyard precinct which addresses impacts further downstream. The current modelling extents and approach have been discussed in consultation with Blacktown City Council. Tail water effects from the Hawkesbury Nepean River have been included. The work done within Riverstone East precinct builds upon the work already completed for the Riverstone and Alex Ave precincts.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. The terminology within the report has been changed. The lag link travel times were updated in an iterative process between TUFLOW and RAFTS. The models were separately also calibrated against other approved models in the area, as recorded observations were limited within the First Ponds Creek Catchment.</li> <li>8. Council is supportive of the approach taken to water management within the precinct. Council are currently considering water management on a greater scale, ie including modifications to Alex Avenue and will adjust regional models completed for precinct rezoning post exhibition.</li> <li>9. Council is supportive of the approach taken to water management within the precinct. Council will build post development models.</li> <li>10. The dams were modelled as full (having no attenuation effect) in TUFLOW and not considered in RAFTS and have therefore not been included as detention across the precinct. This allows removal for the future removal of the dams. This approach has been agreed with Council.</li> <li>11. The approach to creek realignment has been agreed with Council.</li> <li>12. The approach to climate change has been agreed with Council.</li> <li>13. This approach has been agreed with Council. Council prefers treatment devices to be larger and located regionally, not at the source. Any residual areas will be treated by raingardens.</li> <li>14. Council has agreed to the design of the basins. The approved locations from OEH regarding the basin locations along First Ponds Creek limit the number of alternative locations. The basin designs have since been altered with Council to consider public access along the fringes. A number of constraints exist including existing roads, community facilities, Aboriginal heritage and vegetation that have dictated the design of the basins. The basins have been design with internal falls and will have subsoil drainage in accordance with council's request.</li> <li>15. The WCMR along with the Biodiversity and Riparian Corridors Assessment has protected and optimised the riparian corridor and consequently water quality within the precinct. Masterplanning identifies, to a certain level how the community would use the riparian corridor but Council will be responsible for doing detailed design of the corridor.</li> <li>16. This is being done at Council's request. A number of raingardens have been put back into the model for</li> </ol>

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
					<p>water quality purposes to ensure water quality to the receiving creek.</p> <p>17. This has been done but it is not explicitly mentioned in the report. Erosion has been raised by Council and is addressed the revised post exhibition Water Cycle Management Report.</p> <p>18. Office of Water has provided specific consent for the basins to occur in these locations.</p> <p>19. Council has expressed the preference to manage larger regional basins rather than multiple smaller basins.</p> <p>20. The study is outside the scope of precinct planning and it is not required by Council or Office of Water.</p>
<p><b>Transport for NSW</b> Riverstone East</p>	<p>128070</p>	<p>1, 2, 3</p>	<p>ILP</p>	<p>1. The depiction of the North West Transport Corridor in the draft ILP is noted and has been confirmed as correctly located.</p> <p>2. Residential development close to the Metro Rail Facility requires noise mitigation measures.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noise mitigation measures have been inserted into the Riverstone East DCP. Also see Section 4.7 of the Finalisation Report.</p>
			<p>Mapping</p>	<p>3. The B6 zone is encouraged to achieve good integration of the rail facility transport and land use planning, with appropriate permissible uses.</p> <p>4. Flood prone land map includes a significant area along TfNSW land on Schofields Road adjacent to Metro Rail Facility, which will require filling to facilitate extension of Hambledon Road.</p> <p>5. The height of buildings map omits the B4 zoned sites on TfNSW land that are split across Area 20 adjacent to the Cudgegong Local Centre.</p>	<p>3. Food and drink premises, vehicle sales or hire premises, vehicle repair stations and wholesale supplies have been included as proposed uses.</p> <p>4. Finished road levels and associated earthworks required for the sub-arterial road will be considered during the design stage of the road.</p> <p>5. The Height of Buildings Map has been amended to apply a 26m height control to the proposed B4 area within the Riverstone East Precinct adjacent to the Cudgegong Road Station (Area 20) Precinct.</p>
			<p>Traffic and Transport</p>	<p>6. A standard collector road width of 20 metres in line with Blacktown City Council best practice is recommended to allow incorporation of wider shared paths, bus stops and transport infrastructure.</p> <p>7. The installation of any new traffic signals within the precinct including the proposed Tallawong Road signalised access point is dependent on the proponent satisfactorily demonstrating that general warrants in accordance with RMS requirements for Traffic Signal Design – Section 2 warrants can be met.</p> <p>8. The suggestion to narrow Guntawong Road to two lanes through the regional park is not supported. Due to the higher projected traffic flows it is important to maintain flexibility for future operations should the need arise.</p> <p>9. The finalisation report should note that the final access arrangements by the ultimate developer of the residual land will need to involve detailed discussion with Roads and Maritime Services to develop and agree an optimal arrangement.</p> <p>10. The provision of bus priority lanes at five intersections listed is supported. Some approaches the length of the priority lane is shorter than the predicted maximum peak period queue length. This makes the priority lane ineffective when it is most needed to ensure that on-time running is maintained, i.e. during peak periods. Based on the information provided in the SIDRA analysis (see also Table of bus priority lanes on following page) it appears:</p> <p>i. For the Windsor and Mt Carmel Road Intersection (Windsor Road North approach) the bus lane should be extended to 85 metres.</p> <p>ii. For the Windsor and Mt Carmel Road Intersection (Windsor Road South approach) the bus lane should be extended to 128 metres.</p> <p>iii. For the Windsor and Garfield Road (Windsor Road East approach) a bus lane length of 250 metres should be agreed.</p>	<p>6. All collectors proposed in the Precinct will have a width of 20m.</p> <p>7. The installation of traffic signals at each of the locations identified in the Riverstone East precinct will be staged based on the development of the precinct and following demonstration that traffic signal warrants may be met. This will be considered during detailed planning for the precinct (particularly following the preparation of development applications for individual sites) as the land uses are more accurately defined.</p> <p>8. As noted in the transport study, this section of Guntawong Road has been designed to minimise severance through the Rouse Hill Regional Park while also providing for sufficient traffic capacity. Future traffic modelling indicates the cross section identified will accommodate future traffic flows. Further consultation with relevant stakeholders, including Council, RMS and OEH will be required to confirm a suitable cross section for Guntawong Road.</p> <p>9. Noted in final ARUP Transport Study.</p> <p>10. The SIDRA movement summary outputs (from which the recommendations for bus lane lengths are relied upon) indicate maximum queue lengths in the <i>traffic</i> lanes, not the kerbside lane in which the bus would utilise. The SIDRA lane summary outputs indicate the bus lane length required are consistent with those noted in the report. It should be recognised that the transport study notes that the intersection configurations are indicative only. These layouts, including the preparation of detailed traffic signal plans, will be</p>

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
					further refined during the ongoing development of the precinct.
			Bus servicing	<p>11. Cudgegong Road should be extended north to connect with Riverstone Road to support north-south bus operation.</p> <p>12. Macquarie Road should be extended west to connect with Clarke St to support east-west bus operation or the proposed local road in this location between Clarke Street and Tallawong Road changed to Collector Road Status.</p> <p>13. All intersections of collector roads should be designed to support a 14.5m non-rear steer bus swept path.</p> <p>14. Appropriate pedestrian crossing facilities would need to be provided along the collector and sub-arterial roads to enable safe crossings for residents in the vicinity of bus stops. Intersection designs in the vicinity of the school and shops should carefully consider and facilitate pedestrian and bicycle crossings and pedestrian refuges. Further, any proposed traffic calming measures should be designed to minimise impacts on bus operations.</p> <p>15. The future Development Control Plan should ensure that bus stops are located at approximate 400m spacing and also adjacent to community facilities.</p>	<p>11. This issue applies to land in Stage 3 and will be addressed when Stage 3 is finalised for rezoning.</p> <p>12. The extension of Macquarie Road to Clarke Street does not align with the current land use plan for the precinct. The North West Sector Bus Servicing Plan does not envisage any bus services utilising this section of Cudgegong Road. Should bus services want to travel east-west via Macquarie Road, they may do so via Tallawong Road and Guntawong Road.</p> <p>13. Noted - to be considered during the ongoing development of the precinct.</p> <p>14. Noted - this is consistent with the objectives of the Transport report.</p> <p>15. Noted - this is consistent with the objectives of the Transport report.</p>
			Pedestrian and cycling network	<p>16. Section would benefit from more detail and discussion as it is confined to the pedestrian network as it relates to sub-arterial and collectors roads. There is little description of the pedestrian and cycling network along the local roads, open space or along the riparian corridor.</p> <p>17. A more complete description of pedestrian network facilities and amenities should also be included. Description of additional pedestrian and cyclist (priority) crossing at the village centre, schools, sports fields, mixed-use, high density residential areas, etc should be discussed.</p>	<p>16. The report has been updated to include discussion on design principles with regards to pedestrians and cyclists along local roads. This will be further refined during the ongoing development of the precinct.</p> <p>17. Commentary regarding appropriate facilities for cyclists in different environments is discussed within the report. Specific details on the facilities to be provided will be provided during the ongoing development of the precinct. The Riverstone East DCP contains a Bicycle and Pedestrian Network figure to assist in future planning.</p>
<b>PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS - RIVERSTONE EAST STAGES 1 &amp; 2</b>					
<b>Ae design partnership</b> Lot 2 DP 1208526	127654	1	Zoning/ Height	1. Property should be zoned R3 with a 12m height limit.	These concerns are addressed in Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.
<b>Arthur, Tanya</b> Riverstone East	127730	N/A	Density	<p>1. Medium density increases likelihood of flooding. Medium density should not be permitted in areas that are flood prone.</p> <p>2. Medium density under power lines will cause a slum (refer to power lines issue).</p>	<p>1. No medium density development is proposed where land will be flood liable in the future. Some land is currently flood liable but as drainage infrastructure is installed within the Precinct areas will no longer be flood affected and can be developed for residential purposes.</p> <p>2. The transmission line easement running east-west through Stage 2 has a 60m reserve. Within that reserve no substantial structures can be built. The land will most likely be used for parking, private open space and small structures such as garden sheds.</p> <p>3. The ILP does ensure as much as practicable that uses such as open space and community uses are designed for passive surveillance by residential dwellings.</p> <p>4. See Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.</p>
			Compatibility with Surrounding Areas	3. Historical premises, parks and community centres need to be protected from vandalism. Separate these areas and allow the housing adjacent to be security for them.	
			Zoning	4. Property in its entirety should be zoned R3 Medium Density Residential.	
<b>Barker Ryan Stewart, Corrine Manyweathers</b> 72 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	128006	1	Open Space	1. Width and length of site is not usable for playing fields, protected vegetation or drainage.	<p>1. Refer to Section 4.5.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses 72 Tallawong Road – proposed passive open space.</p> <p>2. Refer to Section 4.8 in the Finalisation Report which discusses the Community Centre relocation to the Local Centre.</p>
			Community Centre	2. Site is isolated from commercial, retail, or other services. Site does not meet criteria for locating a community hub.	
			Acquisition and Value of Land	3. Value of site will be severely diminished compared to neighbouring properties. Compensation should be provided if proposed zoning is not altered or justified.	

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
			Zoning	4. Believes R2 zoned land located along Clarke St should be rezoned for a higher residential density. Provides consistency with surrounding properties.	3. The land identified for public purposes will be acquired by Council at current market rates. 4. See Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.
<b>Bugeja, Sam</b> 22 Clarke St, Riverstone	127361	2	Density	1. Increase dwelling density of 15 dwellings per hectare to 25 to achieve a better mix of housing, reduce visual impact, promote affordable housing, provide more housing to those who rely on public transport and better access to services on sub arterial roads, and encourage affected landowners to consolidate and sell.	1. These concerns are addressed in Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density. 2. Building heights also relate to density controls – see Section 4.1.3 of the Finalisation Report. 3. The transmission line easement running east-west through Stage 2 (and the commercial centre) has a 60m reserve. Within that reserve no substantial structures can be built. The land will most likely be used for parking. 4. The commercial centre is placed on a collector road to enable safe vehicular access and a more appropriate pedestrian atmosphere. A centre could not have direct vehicular access off a sub-arterial road. 5. The zoning concerns are addressed in Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density. 6. A Transport Study supports the Precinct and the uses. 7. These concerns are addressed in Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.
			Height	2. Increase 9m maximum building height limit to 12m.	
			Local centre and power lines	3. Opposes shopping centres and 4 storey apartments under power lines on Guntawong Rd. 4. Should be placed on sub-arterial roads where accessibility is maximized by local residents.	
			Zoning	5. RE1 zoning should be reconsidered, and a R3 Medium Density Residential zone should be put in place due to development benefits and proximity to Cudgegong Road Station. 6. The location of RE1 will increase congestion on the road with users of the park relying on Tallawong Rd as a main access way. 7. Medium Density land use zoning at the subject site will assist in relieving traffic congestion as residents will be within walking distance to shops and the rail station.	
<b>Calibre Consulting, Peter Lee</b> 83 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127663	1	Playing fields	1. Objects to playing fields in this location.	Refer to Section 4.5.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses 67, 77, 83, and 87 Tallawong Road – proposed playing fields and passive open space.
<b>Carn, Stephen</b> 153 Guntawong Rd Rouse Hill	127133	1 & 3	Compatibility with Surrounding Areas	1. Construction surrounding the property will create noise and air pollution. Dust and other contaminants will affect water supply. Possible affects to business.	1. Development Application conditions of consent will require management and mitigation of construction impacts. 2. The site falls within Stages 1 and 3 of the Precinct. A school is proposed on the part of the site located in Stage 3 due to its accessibility and site suitability for a school. Landuses in Stage 3 will be reviewed and exhibited in the future. The timing of rezoning was split due to the school site not being required in the short term. 3. The ILP shows a local road that connects Guntawong Road through to the south to the new road network – required through links. The roadworks would not cut off water supply which will be available to all future properties. 4. There will be appropriate setbacks to the open space through the use of the surrounding roads and the open space is on a high point in the area.
			Acquisition & Value of Land	2. Will have to wait for council to acquire land while medium density residential is constructed. Unable to move or build due to the part stage 1 and part stage 3.	
			Traffic and Transport	3. There is a road placed through the centre of the property. Roadworks like this would cut residents from main water supply.	
			Open Space	4. The lower half of the property may need further infrastructure and services to be developed. Proposing that the RE1 section get moved to the lower area of the property as this RE1 area would need minimal services. Under current ILP the view from within the RE1 area would be blocked from all directions by 3 storey dwellings.	
<b>Carrapetta, Frank</b> 134 Cranbourne St, Riverstone	127584	2	Zoning	1. RE1 and SP2 zoning does not address intended subdivision layout, and adversely impacts on value of land.	The property is partly located in the Riverstone Precinct and partly in the Riverstone East Precinct. Within the Riverstone Precinct, it is zoned part SP2 Local Drainage, part RE1 Public Recreation and part R2 Low Density Residential. It is flood affected and has the riparian corridor running through the middle of the site. For these reasons the zoning proposed within the Riverstone East Precinct is SP2 Local Drainage and RE1 Public Recreation. The site is also affected by the

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
					electricity easement and is a known Aboriginal heritage site. The site is not suitable for any additional residential development.
<b>Castle Development Group, Aaron Gray</b> 95 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	128038	1	Traffic and Transport	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Suggests a re-position of road running along southern boundary of site so that its centreline coincides with the common boundary of the subject site and the land to the south.</li> <li>2. Road should be shifted 8m south as it is inequitable.</li> </ol>	Local roads shown are indicative only and final locations can be determined at subdivision or development application stage. The location of this road will be designed in consultation with Council and its design of the playing fields and space required for the fields, parking and amenities.
<b>Concato, Tony</b> 87 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127530	1	Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Property is more suitable to R3 Medium Density Residential rather than RE1 Public Recreation.</li> <li>2. The future use of Nos. 67, 77, 83 and 87 Tallawong Rd for medium density residential development and the relocation of the sports fields to an alternative site represents a better land use planning and environmental outcome.</li> </ol>	Refer to Section 4.5.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses 67, 77, 83, and 87 Tallawong Road – proposed playing fields and passive open space.
			Acquisition and Value of Land	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Landowners potentially affected by future acquisition have not been provided with sufficient information with regard to the acquisition process nor have these landowners been provided with a timeframe for future acquisition processes.</li> </ol>	
			Open Space	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The additional population would not warrant any additional major recreation infrastructure such as additional sporting fields, netball courts or the like. The additional passive open space could be accommodated with any of the proposed alternative open space sites noted in submission.</li> <li>5. The traffic generation and resulting impacts of placing sports fields at a site along Clarke St, rather than a potential 110 dwellings has been assessed. The substitution will result in an estimated net increase in peak hour vehicle trips from 55 to 114 trips. The impact of the additional trip generation has been assessed to have no impact on either Clarke St/ Guntawong Rd or Clarke St/ Schofields Rd intersection.</li> </ol>	
			Density	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. The net increase of 90 dwellings will result in an estimated 45 additional peak hour vehicle trips, which constitutes an increase of less than 1% in the total trips generated by the precinct and will therefore have no noticeable impact on the function of the road network.</li> </ol>	
			Traffic and Transport	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Estimated changes in traffic generation resulting from a change to the precinct layout will have no effect on the road network.</li> </ol>	
<b>Cremona, James</b> 20 Clarke St, Riverstone	127363	2	Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believes R2 zoned land located along Clarke St should be rezoned for a higher residential density. Provides consistency with surrounding properties.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. These concerns are addressed in Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density (and height).</li> <li>2. See comment 1.</li> <li>3. See comment 1.</li> <li>4. The transmission line easement running east-west through Stage 2 (and the commercial centre) has a 60m reserve. Within that reserve no substantial structures can be built. The land will most likely be used for parking.</li> <li>5. The commercial centre is placed on a collector road to enable safe vehicular access and a more appropriate pedestrian environment. A centre could not have direct vehicular access off a sub-arterial road.</li> </ol>
			Density	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Increase dwelling density of 15 dwellings per hectare to 25 to achieve a better mix of housing, reduce visual impact, promote affordable housing, provide more housing to those who rely on public transport and better access to services on sub arterial roads, and encourage affected landowners to consolidate and sell.</li> </ol>	
			Height	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Increase 9m maximum building height limit to 12m.</li> </ol>	
			Power Lines	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Oppose shopping centres and 4 storey apartments under power lines on Guntawong Rd.</li> <li>5. Should be placed on sub-arterial roads where accessibility is maximized by local residents.</li> </ol>	
<b>Dabrowski, Boguslaw</b> 144 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127518	1	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General support for the draft Precinct Plan.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. Local roads shown are indicative only. Final road layout can be determined at development application or subdivision stage.</li> </ol>
			Traffic and Transport	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Proposed road running through property should be relocated.</li> </ol>	
<b>Dennis, Georgia</b> 28 Clarke St, Riverstone	127367	2	Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recommends that the eastern sections of R2 land facing Clarke St on the eastern side to be reclassified as R3 zoning, 25 dwelling density target, 12m in height, rezone the residual of the blocks facing Clark St to R2 with a 20 dwelling density target. This would achieve a better mix of housing, reduce visual impact, promote more affordable housing, provide more housing to those who rely on public transport and better access to services on sub arterial roads, and encourage affected landowners to consolidate and sell for development.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.</li> <li>2. The transmission line easement running east-west through Stage 2 (and the commercial centre) has a 60m reserve. Within that reserve no substantial structures can be built. The land will most likely be used for parking.</li> <li>3. The commercial centre is placed on a collector road to enable safe vehicular access and a more appropriate pedestrian atmosphere. A centre could not have direct vehicular access off a sub-arterial road.</li> </ol>
			Power lines	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Oppose shopping centres and 4 storey apartments under power lines on Guntawong Rd.</li> <li>3. Should be placed on sub-arterial roads where accessibility is maximized by local residents.</li> </ol>	

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
DFP Planning, Warwick Gosling 163 Tallawong Rd Rouse Hill	127678	1	Zoning	1. Property should be zoned R3 Medium Density Residential to provide a suitable transition between adjoining land uses and ensure that building line along Tallawong Road forms a continuous stepped increase in density when approaching Guntawong Road from the south.	These concerns are addressed in Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density (and height).
			Height	2. Increase 9m maximum building height limit to 12m.	
			Density	3. Increase dwelling density of 15 dwellings per hectare to 25.	
DFP Planning, Warwick Gosling 114 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127680	1	Traffic and Transport	1. Realign road to provide a safer intersection and provide opportunity for residential allotments, without alienating parcels of land.	Local roads shown are indicative only. Final road layout can be determined at development application or subdivision stage.
DFP Planning, Warwick Gosling 114 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	142854	1	Zoning and road layout	1. Move the local road north and rezone land up to road boundary as R3. Square off intersection.	Local roads are not fixed and alternative layouts can be proposed at DA or subdivision stage. The zoning is not being amended however the intersection has been squared off as shown on the ILP.
Dhanju, Sham – Sikh Grammar School 151 and 161 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127871	1	Traffic and Transport	1. Road layout causes safety and security concerns.	1. The indicative road layout has been altered to accommodate the school's masterplan for the two sites. 2. The flood mapping for precinct planning is the most up-to-date flood data and has been prepared on a broader scale taking into account predicted post-development flows from upstream areas. It will replace flood mapping held by Council. 3. As the Precinct is developed and public transport routes are refined or introduced, the location of public transport stops can be tailored to the requirements of an area.
			Drainage/ Flooding	2. S194 Certificates obtained for property identifies land as not within flood zone, but the draft Flood Prone Land map for RE presented by the DPE indicates that it is.	
			Compatibility with Surrounding Areas	3. Clause 6.2 of Appendix 12 of the GC SEPP means the site requires a public transport stop within 90m of the site.	
Doug Sneddon Planning Pty Ltd, 154 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127605	1	Traffic and Transport	1. Proposed local streets can possibly prevent development due to lack of information provided.	Roads shown are indicative only. Final road layout can be determined at development application or subdivision stage.
Elton Consulting, Vasiliki Andrews 162 Guntawong Rd Riverstone	127673	2	Zoning – Village Centre	1. Village Centre be rezoned and progressed in Stage 1 to ensure coordination of shopping and other facilities in line with demand.	An Economic and Employment Study for the Riverstone East Precinct has been undertaken by SGS Economics & Planning, which recommends the development of the retail centre once the population of the precinct reaches around 2500 dwellings. Notwithstanding this, Stages 1 and 2 will be rezoned at the same time and the landowner/developer of the village centre can develop the site when considered appropriate.
Ewers, Scott 74 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127482	1	General	1. Does not support the draft Precinct Plan.	1. Noted. 2. Refer to Section 4.8 in the Finalisation Report which discusses the Community Centre relocation to the Local Centre. 3. See above comment. 4. This site will now be zoned all R3 Medium Density Residential.
			Community Centre	2. Proposed community centre should be relocated to an area that would not affect existing households, as it will be inconvenient and no acquisition time has been given. 3. Community Centre should be repositioned within Area 20 due to it being near a shopping centre, public transport, and open space.	
			Zoning	4. Zone property R3 once community centre has been relocated to provide dwellings that achieve the dwelling density target and housing mix.	
Glendinning Minto & Associates P/L, Andrew Minto 72 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127973	1	Zoning	1. SP2 – Infrastructure zoning should be zoned R3 Medium Density Residential to maximise benefits of land. 2. RE1 zoning should be zoned R3 Medium Density Residential as there is a more appropriate site south east to create a connection between ENV.	1. Refer to Section 4.8 in the Finalisation Report which discusses the Community Centre relocation to the Local Centre. 2. Refer to Section 4.5.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses 72 Tallawong Road. 3. Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density. 4. See comment 3. 5. See comment 3.
			Community Centre	3. Community centre is not an appropriate use for the land as it is not close to other facilities that generate activity and where people already have cause to congregate.	
			Density	4. Increase dwelling density of 25 dwellings per hectare to 45 due to proximity to public transport.	
			Height	5. Increase 12m maximum building height to 16m due to proximity to public transport.	

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
<b>Hamptons Property Services, Melissa MacGregor</b> 175 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127563	1	Zoning	1. The property in its entirety should be zoned R3 to maximise benefits of land.	Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.
<b>Hanna, Vince</b> 194 Guntawong Rd, Rouse Hill	128083	2	General	1. Zoning under power lines should be R3 Medium Density Residential to better achieve objectives of DCP.	1. The transmission line easement running east-west through Stage 2 has a 60m reserve. Within that reserve no substantial structures can be built. The land will most likely be used for parking, private open space and small structures such as garden sheds. 2. Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density. 3. The local centre is located off Guntawong Road to enable safe vehicular access.
			Zoning	2. Believes property in its entirety should be zoned R3 due to proximity to community facilities and keeping in character of the lower side of the proposed Clarke St zoning. 3. Corner of Guntawong Rd and Clarke St would be suitable for zoning allowing retail services.	
<b>Heazlewood, Christina</b> 150 Guntawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127255	2	General	1. General support for the draft Precinct Plan.	1. Noted. 2. Stages 1 and 2 will be rezoned at the same time. Refer to Section 4.2 of the report that discusses infrastructure delivery.
			Infrastructure Provision	2. Acceleration of electricity services to stage 2 can possibly benefit the development of the area.	
<b>Heritage 21, Kaylie Beasley</b> 4 Clarke St, Riverstone	127979	2	Heritage - Indigenous and/or Non	1. Objects to proposed listing of whole property as a heritage item. An appropriate curtilage should be established.	Refer to Section 4.9 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Non-Indigenous Heritage.
			Acquisition and Value of Land	2. Appropriate curtilage would prevent the land from becoming sterilised in the housing market.	
<b>Hong, John</b> 6 Oak St, Schofields	127700 128385 127667 (Anne Clements & Associates) 127659 128387 (JBA)	1	Zoning	1. RE1 zone should be reconsidered due to lack of constraints, and that the park proposed on site is not required to complete green corridor between First Ponds Creek and Second Ponds Creek. R3 Medium Density Residential is more suited. 2. R3 Medium Density Residential is more suitable to the property than RE1 based on ecologist studies. 3. RE1 zone should be reconsidered due to lack of constraints, and that the park proposed on site is not required to complete green corridor between First Ponds Creek and Second Ponds Creek. R3 Medium Density Residential is more suited.	Refer to Section 4.5.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses 6 Oak Street.
			Open Space	4. RE1 zoned land is not consistent with planning criteria. This is in respect of advice from an ecologist, and examination and recommendation from planning consultants.	
<b>Invoke Property, Rick Alloggia</b> 140 Guntawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127708	2	Zoning	1. The property in its entirety should be zoned R3 to maximise benefits of land.	These concerns are addressed in Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.
			Height	2. Increase portion of 9m maximum building height to 12m to maximise opportunity for development.	
			Density	3. Increase portion of 15 dwellings per hectare to 25 to maximise benefits of land.	
<b>Invoke Property, Rick Alloggia</b> 131 & 135 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127710	1	Open Space	1. Objects to Local Park on properties. Should be located in stage 3 addressing open space voids in the northern half of precinct. Oversupply of open space.	1. Refer to Section 4.5 in the Finalisation Report which discusses the provision of open space. The land zoned RE1 Public Recreation within these properties are planned to service the surrounding catchment with passive open space. 2. Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.
			Zoning	2. The properties in their entirety should be zoned R2 to maximise opportunity for development.	
<b>Invoke Property, Rick Alloggia</b> 25 Macquarie Rd, Rouse Hill	127712	1	Height	1. Increase 12m maximum building height to 14m to maximise opportunity for development.	Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.
<b>JBA, Metro Award</b> 34-42 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	128011	1	Height	1. Increase 16m maximum building height to 26m to proximity to Cudgegong Road Station and community facilities, size of site (4ha), and it is consistent with the height limit in Area 20 around sites immediately east to the subject site.	Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.
<b>Kavallaris, John</b> 9 Clarke St, Riverstone	127833	2	Zoning	1. Objects to extensive area of land proposed to be zoned RE1. 2. The extent of RE2 zoned land on the subject site should be limited to that portion that is affected by the 1 in 100 year flood and should not extend beyond that point. The remainder of that site should be zoned R3.	The proposed open space will contribute to the total provision of open space across the Precinct, thereby allowing for equitable access to both passive and open space areas by future residents. The proposed open space is not considered to be isolated and will form part
			Open Space	3. No justification provided as to why such a significant quantum of open space is required. 4. The concentration of public open space along the creek line appears to be more of a matter of 'convenience'	

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
				rather than 'good planning'.	of the open space corridor along First Ponds Creek. The extent of proposed open space not affected by flooding is constrained particularly by the need for road access to support residential development which is considered to be too close to Riverstone Road. The proposed open space allows for a regular configuration for passive open space uses, whilst allowing for medium density residential development on the balance, unconstrained part of the site. No zoning changes are therefore proposed to this site.
			Traffic and Transport	5. The two major roads of Clarke Street and Riverstone Road isolate the proposed open space from the higher density residential housing precincts. 6. Any proposed road reservation should be located wholly within the RE2 zoned land rather than within or partially within the R3 zoned portion of the site.	
			Drainage/Flooding	7. While part of site is flood affected, it is evident that the proposed RE2 zone extends beyond the area of flooding.	
<b>Liao, Wen Ming</b> 26 Clarke St, Riverstone	127357	2	Zoning	1. Recommends that the eastern sections of R2 land facing Clarke St on the eastern side to be reclassified as R3 zoning, 25 dwelling density target, 12m in height, rezone the residual of the blocks facing Clark St to R2 with a 20 dwelling density target.	1. Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density. 2. The transmission line easement running east-west through Stage 2 (and the commercial centre) has a 60m reserve. Within that reserve no substantial structures can be built. The land will most likely be used for parking, 3. The commercial centre is placed on a collector road to enable safe vehicular access and a more appropriate pedestrian atmosphere. A centre could not have direct vehicular access off a sub-arterial road.
			Power Lines	2. Oppose shopping centres and 4 storey apartments under power lines on Guntawong Rd. Should be placed on sub-arterial roads where accessibility is maximized by local residents.	
			Minimum Lot Size	3. Two land owners have a minimum lot size of 2000m <sup>2</sup> in an R3 zone. Asking for amendment to those lot sizes.	
<b>Mansfield, Rick</b> 74 Tallawong Rd Rouse Hill	127528	1	Zoning	1. SP2 zone (Community Centre) should be rezoned to R3 Medium Density Residential in order to retain current dwellings.	Refer to Section 4.8 in the Finalisation Report which discusses the Community Centre relocation to the Local Centre.
			Community Centre	2. Relocate community centre.	
<b>Mecone, Joseph Bell</b> 95 & 103 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	128046	1	Traffic and Transport	1. Suggests removal of the two local streets from the sites. The north-south roads would not provide through traffic functions that aren't able to be appropriately provided by Tallawong Rd or the western perimeter road. 2. Move the southern perimeter road 8m south.	1. Local roads shown are indicative only and final locations can be determined at subdivision or development application stage. Any removal of local roads at this stage would limit flexibility of the block to accommodate new traffic movements should an alternate design be proposed. 2. Any alteration of the southern perimeter road would have to be done in consultation with Council as it designs the playing fields and space required for the fields, parking and amenities. 3. Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density (and height).
			Height	3. Increase 12m maximum building height to 14m due to close proximity to public transport and community facilities. It would also provide a better design outcome, not necessarily an extra storey.	
<b>Mercieca, Joseph</b> 18 Oak St, Schofields	127324	1	General	1. General support for the draft Precinct Plan.	Noted.
<b>Mookhy, Avinash</b> 166 Guntawong Rd, Rouse Hill	126843	2	General	1. General support for the draft Precinct Plan.	1. Noted. 2. Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
			Timing of Development	2. Wants to know an indicative time frame for the rezoning of part of stage 3, north of stage 2.	
<b>Moylan, Paul</b> Riverstone East	126494	N/A	Zoning	1. Suggested all properties along Cudgegong Rd should be zoned at least R3 Medium Density Residential to fix Sydney's housing crisis.	Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.
<b>Planninglink Pty Ltd, Linc Robert</b> 124 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127613	1	Traffic and Transport	1. Road layout will create irregular shaped lots and residual lots, causing difficulty for development.	Local roads shown are indicative only. Final road layout can be determined at development application or subdivision stage.
<b>Planninglink Pty Ltd, Linc Roberts</b> 50 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127650	1	Height	1. Increase 16m maximum building height to 25m to provide additional housing.	Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
<b>Prager, Valoha</b> 26 Oak St, Schofields	127331	1	Open Space/ENV	1. Believes that the wildlife corridor could be extended to land adjoining to the north east. The landowner has a covenant on property and believes it is ideally situated to join with neighbouring properties to form an extended wildlife corridor that connects with Cudgegong Road Reserve via a waterway with the addition of a 50m corridor that also drains from the reserve.	1. Portions of ENV south and east of the conservation property will be protected from clearing and incorporated into public open space. 2. An approximate 6m wide strip needs to be acquired for the sub-arterial road. The road has been narrowed from 35m to 26m since exhibition.
			Acquisition and Value of Land	2. Due to covenant on property, no part of it is available for acquisition.	
<b>Re, Edward</b> Riverstone East	124982	N/A	General	1. Does not support the draft Precinct Plan. Releasing more land and creating sprawl will create a problem for Sydney.	Noted. The Department is working with Council, agencies and communities to help provide new homes in the North West of Sydney that are close to jobs, parks, schools and services.
<b>Ridgeway, Peter</b> Riverstone East	127656	1, 2, 3	Open Space/ENV	1. Supports retention of vegetated riparian corridors. 2. Exhibited link from Cudgegong Reserve to Tallawong Rd poor. Property to the south should be used as it contains more trees. 3. Consultation needs to occur with property owner at 26 Oak St plus the Nature Conservation Trust of NSW re the Conservation Covenant registered on the property and the impact of road widening and land acquisition. 4. Land northwest of the conservation land should be added to ENV targets. 5. Maintenance of a water flow through the conservation land needs to be determined. 6. Land required for water management north of the conservation land would be ideal for creating a water management wetland suitable for native biodiversity.	1. Noted. 2. An additional area of ENV is to be retained on property to south plus a tree link to Tallawong Road is proposed along the collector road (Rouse Rd extension). 3. Road widening needs to occur in this location and is constrained due to the creek. The exhibited road width has been reduced from 35m to 26m. The acquisition impacts on the property are noted. 4. There are multiple areas of ENV throughout the Precinct that could have been retained but only the target amount needs to be retained and balanced with a development outcome for the Precinct. 5. Environmental flows will be retained through the conservation land with an appropriate zoning and riparian corridor overlay on the maps. 6. The area required for water management has actually been reduced on this land. The area is not proposed for wetland suitable for native biodiversity.
<b>Rossi, Dominic</b> 141 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	126541	1	General	1. General support for the draft Precinct Plan.	Noted.
<b>Rouse Hill Heights Action Group Inc (RHHAG)</b> Riverstone East	127576	1, 2, 3	Open Space	1. Believes that the number of playing fields should be significantly reduced, and the space given over to housing.	1. Refer to Section 4.5.1 in the Finalisation Report which discusses population and dwelling projections and open space provision. 2. The 12m height limit for the majority of the R3 zoned land is to only allow three storey buildings plus a pitched roof. A further height increase would allow a four storey building which is not supported. 3. Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density. 4. See Section 4.9 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion of the E4 land and non-indigenous heritage. 5. Noted. 6. See Section 4.11 which discusses electricity provision for Stage 3. 7. See comment 6.
			Height	2. Believes that the height of medium density should be increased to 14m – not allow another storey, but to allow for a pitched roof and more flexibility in parking – should be considered.	
			Zoning	3. Medium density should be able to be extended beyond the current suggested zones. 4. E4 zone quarantines valuable housing land next to two major roads, Garfield Rd and Clarke St, for a vague benefit for a historic home which really no longer exists. Doesn't need to have an artificial curtilage around it to preserve any value it may have.	
			Acquisition and Value of Land	5. Opposes the fact that land along Schofields Road which was compulsorily acquired for the stabling yard and is now not needed, has been zoned as industrial, but previous landowners have not been able to benefit from this rezoning. Previous owners should be offered the change to buy the surplus land back from TfNSW at the same price they were paid several years ago.	
			Infrastructure Provision	6. Encourages the DoP to ensure that Endeavour Energy builds the new substation as soon as possible. Believes that there are many blocks in stage 3, especially in the north of the precinct which could be included in stage 2.	
			Timing of Development	7. There are many blocks in stage 3 that should have been included in stage 2 as they are only lacking electricity.	

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
RPS, Liz Coker 172 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127399	1 & 3	Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ridgeline indicated as a site constraint on the subject lot does not exist in reality.</li> <li>The sliver of R2 land should be zoned R3.</li> <li>The partial urban zoning will force the landholder to subdivide the lot before it can be sold for redevelopment, as a developer will have no interest in the unknown future of the rear half of the lot. The landholder is then left with the residue lot with no frontage and unfairly limited land use opportunities.</li> <li>Either zone the entire site R3 or identify the school site for acquisition now or relocate the indicative school site to another location within Stage 3.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site falls within Stages 1 and 3 of the Precinct. The Stage 3 portion will eventually have a school located on it. The timing of rezoning was split due to the school site not being required in the short term.</li> <li>The R2 sliver has been amended and is now proposed to be zoned R3.</li> <li>The site could be developed as rezoned or it could be developed once the whole site is rezoned. Generally land must be reserved for school sites and cannot be zoned for acquisition way ahead of when it is required because the Department of Education does not have the funds to acquire the land currently.</li> <li>See comment 3.</li> </ol>
			Acquisition	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lot is not identified for acquisition on the Land Reservation Acquisition Map however the school site is indicated on the public constraints map. This will sterilise the resale value of the site.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See comment 3.</li> </ol>
RPS, Liz Coker 28 Clarke St, Riverstone	127401	1	Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believes the site should be zoned R2 Low Density Residential entirely, and reposition the local drainage channel (SP2 zone) slightly to the south across 194 and 184 Guntawong Road, along the rear boundary of the lots. This is due to the fact that should the drainage channel be compulsory acquired on the site, the existing dwelling will be unreasonably impacted and the remaining area on the lot will be an irregular shape. The site will form a U-shape with a sliver of land along the south boundary and this could be problematic for the future subdivision of the site for the landowner and will highly depend on cooperation with developers or landowners on the adjoining site.</li> </ol>	The drainage channel has now been placed within the proposed local road. See Section 4.3 of the Finalisation Report for a detailed discussion of the changes to the Water Cycle Management Plan across the Precinct.
Saliba, Carmen 18 Clarke St, Riverstone	127365	2	Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommends that the eastern sections of R2 land facing Clarke St on the eastern side to be reclassified as R3 zoning, 25 dwelling density target, 12m in height, rezone the residual of the blocks facing Clark St to R2 with a 20 dwelling density target. This would achieve a better mix of housing, allow for consistency in planning on sub-arterial roads, reduce visual impact, promote more affordable housing, provide more housing to those who rely on public transport and better access to services on sub arterial roads, and encourage affected landowners to consolidate and sell for development.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.</li> <li>The transmission line easement running east-west through Stage 2 (and the commercial centre) has a 60m reserve. Within that reserve no substantial structures can be built. The land will most likely be used for parking,</li> <li>The commercial centre is placed on a collector road to enable safe vehicular access and a more appropriate pedestrian atmosphere. A centre could not have direct vehicular access off a sub-arterial road.</li> </ol>
			Power Lines	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oppose shopping centres and 4 storey apartments under power lines on Guntawong Rd.</li> <li>Should be placed on sub-arterial roads where accessibility is maximized by local residents.</li> </ol>	
The Sri Lankan Buddhist Vihara Association of Sydney Inc 35 Oak Street Schofields	128118, 128120, 128122, 128124	1	Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land has been drafted as part RE1 Public Recreation and part SP2 Public Infrastructure. It is identified on the Land Acquisition Reservation map. This could possibly lead to the removal of the SLBT.</li> <li>This place of worship provides the Buddhist Community a tremendous service, and it has significant religious, historical, cultural, social, architectural, and aesthetic values.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The zoning proposed for this site has been amended. It is proposed to zone it part E3 Environmental Management (to cover the creek corridor) and part E4 Environmental Living (to cover the existing structures).</li> <li>Places of public worship are permissible under the E4 zone and the existing structures on site will benefit from 'existing use rights' provisions under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>.</li> </ol>
Tolj, Marija 72 Tallawong Rd Rouse Hill	127623	1	Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The property in its entirety should be zoned R3 Medium Density Residential due to proximity to amenity and services.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to Section 4.5.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses 72 Tallawong Road – proposed passive open space.</li> <li>Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.</li> </ol>
			Height	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase 12m maximum building height to 16m to be consistent with surrounding Area 20 development.</li> </ol>	
Tolj, Mario 72 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127627	1	Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land should be zoned R3 Medium Density Residential due to lack of constraints on land and proximity to public transport.</li> </ol>	Refer to Section 4.5.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses 72 Tallawong Road – proposed passive open space and refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.
Urban City Planning, Greg Hall 77 Tallawong Rd,	127491	1	Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RE1 zone should be relocated. R3 would be more appropriate.</li> </ol>	Refer to Section 4.5.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses 67, 77, 83, and 87 Tallawong Road – proposed playing fields and passive open space.

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
Rouse Hill					
<b>Urban City Planning, Greg Hall</b> 67 Tallawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127969	1	Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RE1 zone should be relocated. R3 would be more appropriate.</li> <li>The subject land is suitable for residential purposes from an acoustic perspective and is not required as a noise buffer for the future residential development further to the north of the RTRF site.</li> </ol>	Refer to Section 4.5.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses 67, 77, 83, and 87 Tallawong Road – proposed playing fields and passive open space and refer to Section 4.3 Water Cycle Management which discusses drainage changes on the site.
			Open Space/ENV	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed re-construction and channelization of the watercourse offers limited aesthetic and recreation benefit.</li> <li>Location of major open space and local sports fields adjoining the stabling yard facility reduces the potential catchment of the park.</li> </ol>	
			Drainage/ Flooding	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies that while the watercourse is to continue upstream to the subject land, it is considered that this stretch of the depression is not a suitable section to rehabilitate with an engineered creek system.</li> <li>Any new watercourse within the subject land will be comprised of a new engineered channel which will require a significant amount of disturbance to the landform and construction works, including the removal of a number of trees. Suggests shortening or realigning watercourse.</li> </ol>	
<b>Urban Taskforce</b> Riverstone East	128064	1, 2, 3	General	1. A mismatch between proposed height and FSR controls on some of the sites within the Riverstone East precinct.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For residential development, the precinct does not propose FSR controls but rather height and density controls.</li> <li>Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.</li> <li>Noted.</li> </ol>
			Density	2. High density residential development should be permitted in close proximity to railway station.	
			Infrastructure Provision	3. Reliance on developer contributions and voluntary planning agreements to fund infrastructure should be reviewed.	
<b>Votano, Dominic</b> 256 Garfield Rd Riverstone	124931	2	Drainage/ Flooding	1. All land west of the existing Clarke Road should be environmental living. No medium density should be permitted here as this property is currently subject to regular floods. Increasing housing density increases the amount of flooding.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not all land west of the existing Clarke Street is flood liable. Those areas not flood liable are proposed to be zoned R3.</li> <li>The transmission line easements running east-west and north-south through the Precinct have 60m and 30m wide reserves respectively. Within those reserves no substantial structures can be built. The land will most likely be used for parking, private open space and small structures such as garden sheds.</li> <li>See Section 4.9 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion on non-indigenous heritage. The land north and east of Nu Welwyn is proposed to be zoned R2.</li> <li>See comment 3.</li> </ol>
			Power Lines	2. Power lines deem land uninhabitable. Hence the zoning underneath these lines should be reconsidered.	
			Heritage	3. Does not support outcome for Nu Welwyn – property should be incorporated into development for passive surveillance. Does not support E4 zoning – does not contribute to heritage item.	
			Zoning	4. Suggests that property mentioned is more suited to R3 Medium Density Residential, rather than its current zoning due to the fact that it is flood, creek, and easement free. It also does not overlook Nu Welwyn.	
<b>Votano, Dominic</b> (JOINT SUBMISSION) • 2 Clarke Street, Riverstone • 4 Clarke Street, Riverstone • 256 Garfield Road East, Riverstone	127161	2	Zoning	1. Believes E4 Environmental Living zone should be changed to a higher density residential zone to ensure the heritage site is well taken care of (economically, safety-wise).	See Section 4.8 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion on non-indigenous heritage. The land north and east of Nu Welwyn is proposed to be zoned R2.
			Heritage - Indigenous and/or Non	2. Believes that the heritage site should be the centre of attention and a higher density residential area would help keep the site safe and preserved.	
<b>Votano, Melinda</b> 256 Garfield Rd East, Riverstone	126543	2	Drainage/ Flooding	1. All land west of the existing Clarke Road should be environmental living. No medium density should be permitted here as this property is currently subject to regular floods. Increasing housing density increases the amount of flooding.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not all land west of the existing Clarke Street is flood liable. Those areas not flood liable are proposed to be zoned R3.</li> <li>The transmission line easements running east-west and north-south through the Precinct have 60m and 30m wide reserves respectively. Within those reserves no substantial structures can be built. The land will most likely be used for parking, private open space and small structures such as garden sheds.</li> <li>See Section 4.9 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion on non-indigenous heritage. The land north and east of Nu Welwyn is proposed to be zoned R2.</li> </ol>
			Power Lines	2. Power lines deem land uninhabitable. Hence the zoning underneath these lines should be reconsidered.	
			Zoning	3. Suggests that property mentioned is more suited to R3 Medium Density Residential, rather than E4 Environmental Living due to the fact that it is free of sensitive areas such as power lines and flood land. It also does not overlook Nu Welwyn.	

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
Vumbaca, Rita 259 Riverstone Road, Riverstone	127592	2 & 3	Zoning	1. The property in its entirety should be zoned R3 to maximise benefits of land.	1. Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density. 2. Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staged rezoning and infrastructure delivery. 3. Endeavour Energy own a site on Guntawong Road which is planned to accommodate the future new zone substation.
			Timing of Development	2. Rezoning process should be accelerated to increase housing supply.	
			Infrastructure Provision	3. Willing to negotiate with Endeavour Energy to locate a possible substation on property in exchange for medium-high density.	
Wedage, Shashika 35 Oak Street, Schofields	127008	1	Zoning – Place of Worship	1. Believes the rezoning of the Temple should be reconsidered and altered to reflect a zoning that allows current function due to the religious and cultural significance of the site.	The zoning proposed for this site has been amended. It is proposed to zone it part E3 Environmental Management (to cover the creek corridor) and part E4 Environmental Living (to cover the existing structures).  Places of public worship are permissible under the E4 zone and the existing structures on site will benefit from 'existing use rights' provisions under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> .
Zappia, Natale 24 Clarke St, Riverstone	127359	2	Zoning	1. Recommends that the eastern sections of R2 land facing Clarke St on the eastern side be reclassified as R3 zoning, 25 dwelling density target, 12m in height, rezone the residual of the blocks facing Clark St to R2 with a 20 dwelling density target.	1. Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density. 2. The transmission line easement running east-west through Stage 2 (and the commercial centre) has a 60m reserve. Within that reserve no substantial structures can be built. The land will most likely be used for parking, 3. The commercial centre is placed on a collector road to enable safe vehicular access and a more appropriate pedestrian atmosphere. A centre could not have direct vehicular access off a sub-arterial road.
			Power Lines	2. Oppose shopping centres and 4 storey apartments under power lines on Guntawong Rd. 3. Should be placed on sub-arterial roads where accessibility is maximized by local residents.	
Name Withheld Rouse Hill	127698	1	Open Space	1. Playing fields next to stabling yard lack safety. Should be relocated. 2. Too many fields.	Refer to Section 4.5.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses 67, 77, 83, and 87 Tallawong Road – proposed playing fields and passive open space.  Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.
			Zoning	3. Properties at 67-87 Tallawong Rd should be zoned for a higher density. 4. R3 land on western side of Clarke St appears unjustified.	
Name Withheld Rouse Hill	127441	1	Traffic and Transport	1. Remove road between property and Local Park. Rouse Rd extension is good enough to provide access to the future local park. Roads on both sides of the park create danger.	Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density
			Height	2. Increase 16m maximum building height to 26m to be consistent with surrounding Area 20 development.	
Name Withheld Rouse Hill	127631	1	Open Space	1. Playing fields next to stabling yard lack safety. Should be relocated. 2. Too many fields.	Refer to Section 4.5.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses 67, 77, 83, and 87 Tallawong Road – proposed playing fields and passive open space.  Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.
			Zoning	3. R3 land on western side of Clarke St appears unjustified. 4. Properties in this area should be zoned for a higher density.	
Name Withheld Rouse Hill	127434	1	General	1. Does not support the draft Precinct Plan.	Refer to Section 4.8 in the Finalisation Report which discusses the Community Centre relocation to the Local Centre.
			Community Centre	2. Proposed community centre should be relocated to an area that would not affect existing households, as it will be inconvenient and no acquisition time has been given. 3. Community centre should be repositioned within Area 20 due to it being near a shopping centre, public transport, and open space.	
			Zoning	4. Zone property R3 once community centre has been relocated to provide dwellings that achieve the dwelling density target and housing mix.	
Name Withheld Schofields	127124 127409	1	Drainage/ Flooding	1. Does not understand how property has been changed to flood affected land in the last few years and is now zoned as flood affected, When the land was purchased it was not zoned as flood affected land. 2. Property is proposed for drainage and flood affected when Blacktown City Council maps show the land as not being affected by flooding. 3. Plans have changed the natural flow of the water to run along the boundary of the property. There is a green zone connecting to the natural flow of the water that runs to the creek that should be used for drainage.	The flood mapping for precinct planning is the most up-to-date flood data and has been prepared on a broader scale taking into account predicted post-development flows from upstream areas. It will replace flood mapping held by Council.

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
Name Withheld Rouse Hill	127652	2	Power Lines	1. Zoning under power lines should be R3 Medium Density Residential to better achieve objectives of DCP.	The transmission line easement running east-west through Stage 2 has a 60m reserve. Within that reserve no substantial structures can be built. The land will most likely be used for parking, private open space and small structures such as garden sheds.
Name Withheld Rouse Hill	127561	1	Zoning	1. RE1 zoned land should be zoned R3 Medium Density Residential to fully utilise area due to proximity to services and amenities.	Refer to Section 4.10 in the Finalisation Report which discusses the Cudgegong Road Station Priority Precinct – Five lot rezoning.
			Height	2. Increase 9m maximum building height to 14m as line-of-sight from the Rouse Hill House is not a valid reason for height restriction on property.	
Name Withheld Riverstone	126749	2	General	1. Does not support the draft Precinct Plan. Unable to find map showing the water management plan.	Noted.
Name Withheld Rouse Hill	127522	1	General	1. General support for the draft Precinct Plan. 2. Increase potential of space to maximise land use.	1. Noted. 2. Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density.
Name Withheld Riverstone	127985	2	Traffic and Transport	1. Removing the proposed intersecting centre road will eliminate further disturbance to Clarke St as well as provide a better site layout for development.	1. Roads shown are indicative only. Final road layout can be determined at development application or subdivision stage. 2. Refer to Section 4.1.3 in the Finalisation Report which discusses residential zoning and density (and height).
			Height	2. Increase 12m maximum building height to 14m to be consistent with other developments approved in region. A 14m maximum building height is suitable to proximity to amenities and services.	
Name Withheld Riverstone	127571	2	Drainage/ Flooding	3. Drainage/Flooding map must be reconsidered as it is affecting development.	1. The flood mapping for precinct planning is the most up-to-date flood data and has been prepared on a broader scale taking into account predicted post-development flows from upstream areas. It will replace flood mapping held by Council. 2. The Department has worked closely with Council on the location of open space and playing fields.
			Zoning	4. RE1 zone should be reconsidered as it does not achieve criteria for a sporting field.	
Name Withheld Rouse Hill	128869	1	Open Space	1. Opposes RE1 Public Recreation as too many playing fields have been planned. 2. Will cause traffic congestion and noise pollution.	Refer to Section 4.5 in the Finalisation Report which discusses the provision of open space.
Name Withheld Rouse Hill	127931	3	Zoning	1. R3 zoning along Guntawong Rd should be reconsidered. High voltage lines may expose residents to unknown health effects. Open space in other areas should be reconsidered as residential if above suggestion is considered. 2. Village centre should be relocated due to proximity to high voltage easement and topography of site.	1. The transmission line easement has a 60m reserve. Within that reserve no substantial structures can be built. The land will most likely be used for parking, private open space and small structures such as garden sheds. 2. The village centre has been primarily located to be central to the Precinct and accessible by way of car or walking. The R3 land surrounding the centre supports the village centre and locates a higher density of residents close to services. 3. Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staged rezoning and infrastructure delivery and refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses stage 3.
			Infrastructure Provision	3. Infrastructure for Stage 3 should be fast tracked due to proximity to Cudgegong Rd Station and high demand for land.	
<b>PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS - RIVERSTONE EAST STAGE 3</b>					
Attard, Joe 1316 Windsor Rd, Riverstone	129744	3	Traffic and Transport	1. Requesting extension of Clarke Street to Windsor Road be relocated to run between subject site and neighbouring property to lessen devaluing of land. 2. Neighbour's property is earmarked for flood land and will not impact in future development if the road is moved.	Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
			Acquisition & Value of Land	3. The effect of this proposal will decrease value of land and vastly detract from its value compared to similar size properties in the area.	
Barrett, Jason & Sharron 283 Garfield Road East, Riverstone	127074 127183	3	Acquisition & Value of Land	1. The effect of this proposal has made land unsellable and detracts from its value compared to similar sized lots in the area.	1. Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3. 2. Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staged rezoning and infrastructure delivery.
			Drainage/ Flooding	2. Believes section north west of Garfield Road East (west of proposed Clarke St extension) should be released with stage 2 to provide for water management services as there will be a greater water run off with the proposed new developments. This will ensure that there will be no future flooding issues with this area as water management work to cater for the vast upstream development could be started and progressed to accommodate the expected population increase to the area.	
Bartolo, Patrick 77 Worcester Rd,	127965	3	Open Space	1. Area already has enough open space. Zoning of land for parks will lead to excessive amounts of parks in and around the area.	Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
Rouse Hill				2. Topography of land isn't suitable for playing fields.	
			Acquisition and Value of Land	3. Zoning will immediately devalue property and make it difficult to sell.	
			Zoning	4. Land should be zoned residential due to proximity to Cudgegong Road Station.	
<b>Burgdorf, Desley</b> 90 Guntawong Rd, Riverstone	128044	3	Zoning	1. Current proposed zoning is RE1. Suggests a residential zoning would be more appropriate due to an oversupply of open space. Also in close proximity to public transport, retail facilities, and community amenities.	Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
			Open Space	2. There is an oversupply of open space.	
<b>Burgdorf, Peter</b> 90 Guntawong Rd Rouse Hill	127702	3	General	1. General support for the draft Precinct Plan.	Noted.
			Traffic and Transport	2. Including the suggested area in stage 2 would provide a better outcome for traffic in all of stage 2 with clear access to major roads both Garfield and through to Windsor Road. Would avoid the bottleneck at Garfield Road particularly in an effort to get to Windsor Road.	Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
<b>Callanan, Ronald</b> 293 Garfield Rd East, Riverstone	127149	3	Not Supportive of Staged Rezoning	1. Believes area should be included in Stage 2.	Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
<b>Eagle, Kathryn</b> 289 Garfield Rd East, Riverstone	126845	3	Traffic and Transport	1. Including the suggested area in stage 2 would provide a better outcome for traffic in all of stage 2 with clear access to major roads both Garfield and through to Windsor Road. Would avoid the bottleneck at Garfield Road particularly in an effort to get to Windsor Road.	Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
			Infrastructure Provision	2. Water and sewer available will make development easier. 3. Suggested area should be included in stage 2 (currently in stage 3) as it has the same access to services as the current stage 2 as displayed.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staged rezoning and infrastructure delivery.
<b>Feely, David</b> 136 Guntawong Rd, Rouse Hill	127145	3	Not Supportive of Staged Rezoning	1. Would like property to be included in the stage 2 release as it is believed that it will meet all service requirements with the right planning and design. 1/3 of property has natural fall already to the southern boundary to connect onto the services of sewer and storm water. Cut and fill can be done to contour R/Ls to achieve the desired minimal fall of 1% or greater. Would like to be included in stage 2 to be included in group sale negotiation.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staged rezoning and infrastructure delivery.
<b>Fitzgerald, Terrence</b> 1264 Windsor Rd, Riverstone	127934	3	Not Supportive of Staged Rezoning	1. Stage 3 should be fast tracked so it will not be too far behind stages 1 and 2, due to proximity to Windsor Road where there are already bus services in place.	Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3. Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staged rezoning and infrastructure delivery.
			Zoning	2. Consider medium density housing along main transport route of Windsor Road.	
<b>Gangemi, Richard</b> 85 Worcester Rd, Rouse Hill	127927	3	Zoning	1. The property should be zoned for residential due to proximity to Cudgegong Rd Station, and topography. Sporting fields should be relocated to a more suitable area.	Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
<b>Moylan, Michael</b> Riverstone East	126712	3	Not Supportive of Staged Rezoning	1. Stage 3 properties next to the future Cudgegong Station should be considered stage 2. Would allow new home buyers to live closer to the new station.	1. Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
			Rates	2. New home buyers pay higher prices and therefore ongoing rates as the staged release purposely keeps supply low.	2. Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staged rezoning and infrastructure delivery.
<b>Moylan, Peter</b>	128009	3	Not Supportive of Staged Rezoning	1. Property should be rezoned now due to proximity to Cudgegong Road Station.	Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
<b>Moylan, Steven</b> 136 Cudgegong Rd, Rouse Hill	125914	3	Zoning	1. Suggested the release of Cudgegong Road in an earlier stage due to proximity to Cudgegong Road Station.	Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
<b>Raguz, Ilija</b> 61 Worcester Rd, Rouse Hill	127746	3	Open Space	1. Opposes open space on land. Not a suitable location.	Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
			Acquisition and Value of Land	2. Value of property has lowered.	
<b>Raguz, Nikola</b> 97 Worcester Rd, Rouse Hill	126812	3	General	1. General support for the draft Precinct Plan.	1. Noted.
			Timing of Development	2. Stage 3 should be fast tracked as it is believed that there is a huge demand for land and housing in this area.	2. Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staged rezoning and infrastructure delivery.
			Drainage/ Flooding	3. Suggests that property is to be zoned for too much SP2 Infrastructure – Local Drainage, as it is believed that the remedial work being done upstream on the creek will eliminate the problems downstream and only has excess water along the drainage line in heavy rain.	3. Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
			Zoning	4. Suggests the rezoning of land to R3 Medium or High Density Residential due to the fact it is close to community facilities and public transport.	4. Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
<b>Rouse Hill Anglican College, Peter Fowler</b>	128575	3	School Site	1. Position of school site raises safety traffic concerns as line of sight is diminished along portion of road. 2. The proposed school site is in too close proximity to Rouse Hill Anglican College, which can cause traffic and pedestrian issues.	These issues can be addressed as part of any development application for any future school.

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
49 & 55 Worcester Rd, Rouse Hill					
<b>Tabone, Lina</b> 271 Garfield Road East, Riverstone	126950	3	Traffic and Transport	1. Including the suggested area in stage 2 would provide a better outcome for traffic in all of stage 2 with clear access to major roads both Garfield and through to Windsor Road. Would avoid the bottleneck at Garfield Road particularly in an effort to get to Windsor Road.	1. Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3. 2. Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staged rezoning and infrastructure delivery. 3. Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
			Infrastructure Provision	2. Water and sewer available in an effort to get to Windsor Road. 3. Suggested area should be included in stage 2 (currently in stage 3) as it has the same access to services as the current stage 2 as displayed.	
<b>Triantopoulos, Thrasivoulos</b> 163 Cudgegong Rd, Rouse Hill	127397	3	Zoning	1. Believes property should be zoned a higher residential density due to proximity to various local amenities, open space, and public transport.	
<b>Urbis, Carlos Frias</b> Riverstone East (Representing multiple landowners in Stage 3)	127671	3	Not Supportive of Staged Rezoning	1. The parcel of land in stage 3 should be considered stage 2 as the inclusion of this land will enable the orderly connectivity of an existing planning and gazetted neighbouring release area to the north, with Cudgegong Road Station a key transport node to the south.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staged rezoning and infrastructure delivery.
			Infrastructure Provision	2. The inclusion of the northern portion of land within the Stage 2 release would not appear to impede on achieving sufficient services for the future urban development of the wider precinct.	
			Compatibility with Surrounding Areas	3. Subject land is in close proximity to the Box Hill Business Park, Box Hill Town Centre, Box Hill Industrial, and Cudgegong Rd Station.	
<b>Urbis, Carlos Frias</b> Riverstone East (Representing multiple landowners in Stage 3)	128060	3	Zoning	1. There is an opportunity to zone an additional centre in the northern parts in Stage 3 of RE. Would provide a convenient service for future residents, especially if there were higher densities around. Would complement adjoining centre in Box Hill Business Park. 2. Residential zoning should be considered for higher densities.	1. Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staged rezoning and infrastructure delivery. 2. Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Riverstone	127391	3	Zoning	1. Property is zoned as RE1 Public Recreation and believes this is not necessary due to the large Regional Park being built to the east of the precinct. If this were to happen, it should be distributed amongst other residents also.	Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Riverstone	126776	3	Traffic and Transport	1. Including the suggested area in Stage 2 would provide a better outcome for traffic in all of Stage 2 with clear access to major roads both Garfield and through to Windsor Rd. Would avoid the bottleneck at Garfield Rd particularly in an effort to get to Windsor Rd.	1. Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staged rezoning and infrastructure delivery. 2. Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
			Infrastructure Provision	2. Water and sewer available will make development easier. Suggested area should be included in Stage 2 (Currently in Stage 3) as it has the same access to services as the current Stage 2 as displayed.	
<b>Name Withheld</b> Riverstone	127439	3	General	1. Does not support staged rezoning.	1. Noted 2. Flood mapping as shown in the Water Cycle Management Report is the most up-to-date flood mapping and cannot be altered for land value purposes. 3. See comment 2. 4. Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3. 5. Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staged rezoning and infrastructure delivery. 6. See comment 5.
			Drainage/ Flooding	2. When the property was purchased, the section 149 Certificate did not show that property was affected by flooding. Attached map obtained from Council also shows that land is half totally free of flood and other half is in Low Risk Floor category. Does not agree with the flooding maps provided for this precinct.	
			Acquisition & Value of Land	3. If the land stays within the Yellow Zone Water Management map, it would make it difficult for any future sale to a developer, causing great financial strain.	
			Traffic and Transport	4. Including the suggested area in Stage 2 would provide a better outcome for traffic in all of Stage 2 with clear access to major roads both Garfield and through to Windsor Rd. Would avoid the bottle neck at Garfield Rd particularly in an effort to get to Windsor Rd.	
			Infrastructure Provision	5. Water and sewer available in an effort to get to Windsor Rd. 6. Suggested area should be included in Stage 2 (Currently in Stage 3) as it has the same access to services as the current Stage 2 as displayed.	
<b>Name Withheld</b> Stanhope Gardens	127428	3	Zoning	1. Believes the bordering properties of the Rouse Hill Regional Park should have a higher residential density zoning due to high amenity, and closeness to open space.	1. Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3. 2. No changes are proposed to the current suburb name, Rouse Hill.
			Naming	2. Believes the current suburb name, Rouse Hill, should be retained or at least partly kept. If it changes, it will cause confusion.	
<b>Name Withheld</b> Rouse Hill	126751	3	General	1. General support for the draft Precinct Plan.	1. Noted. 2. Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
			Zoning	2. Believes that property should be zoned R3 Medium Density Residential when the time comes for Stage 3 to be rezoned. Also believes that it is in an ideal location for public transport and main road access.	
<b>Name Withheld</b>	127954	3	School Site	1. Property is not suitable for a school site given the topography of the land.	Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
Rouse Hill					discusses Stage 3.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Rouse Hill	128486	3	Zoning	1. Rezoning application suggests that residential development would be better suited to these sites rather than sports fields and a school site due to the topography of the land, and the difficulty of providing disability access.	Refer to Section 4.11 in the Finalisation Report which discusses Stage 3.
			Open Space	2. Provision of open space is inappropriate due to topography of land. 3. Provision of open space on these specific sites. 4. Provision of disability access across the sites would be difficult to achieve due to the cost of supplying the necessary access features.	
			School Site	5. Provision of school site is inappropriate due to topography of land. 6. Position of school site raises safety traffic concerns as line of sight is diminished along portion of road. 7. The proposed school site is in too close of proximity to Rouse Hill Anglican College, which can cause traffic and pedestrian issues. 8. Provision of disability access across the sites would be difficult to achieve due to the cost of supplying the necessary access features.	
<b>PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS - CUDEGONG ROAD STATION (AREA 20)</b>					
<b>Castle Development Group, Aaron Gray</b> 119 Cudgegong Rd, Rouse Hill	128036	1	Zoning	1. Current proposed maximum building height is 9m. Suggests property should have a maximum building height of 12m due to close proximity to public transport routes and close proximity to parks. 2. Increase in height can be achieved without overshadowing existing or proposed residential areas or open spaces, and without a loss of privacy to adjoining residential developments. 3. Can be achieved without significantly altering the skyline visible from the Rouse Hill Estate. 4. Integrates well into surrounding built form.	Refer to Section 4.10 in the Finalisation Report which discusses the Cudgegong Road Station Priority Precinct – Five lot rezoning.
<b>DFP Planning, Warwick Gosling</b> 87 Cudgegong Rd, Rouse Hill	127691	1	Height	1. Height should be increased as it will still remain out of view from Rouse Hill House.	1. Refer to Section 4.10 in the Finalisation Report which discusses the Cudgegong Road Station Priority Precinct – Five lot rezoning. 2. The Rouse Road extension has been designated as a collector road (20m reserve width) to allow for future public transport (eg buses) linkages between precincts and especially from Cudgegong Road Station Precinct. Transport for NSW has requested the road be a collector status for this reason which is supported by traffic modelling undertaken for precinct planning.
			Traffic and Transport	2. Collector road located along the southern side of boundary of subject site is unnecessary.	
<b>Lin, Jackson</b> 122 and 116 Cudgegong Rd, Rouse Hill	125874	N/A	General	1. General support for the draft precinct plan.	Noted, subject sites within the Area 20 Precinct but are not proposed to be rezoned.
<b>Liu, Lily</b> 95 Cudgegong Road, Rouse Hill	126658	1	General	1. General support for the draft Precinct Plan.	1. Noted. 2. The open space is provided to protect view lines from Rouse Hill House – see Section 4.9 of the Finalisation Report. In addition the open space covers the transmission line easement under which no substantial structures can be built. 3. Noted. 4. The transmission lines cannot be placed underground due to their high voltage.
			Open Space	2. There are already two parks that add up to 10 acres just 72 metres from property mentioned. Requesting change to this zoning.	
			Compatibility with Surrounding Areas	3. This parkland (including parkland on property) will impact on the liveliness on the street, making it too peaceful.	
			Infrastructure Provisions	4. Suggested installing power lines underground so the street can be beautified and safer.	
<b>Min, Kyung-man</b> 105 Cudgegong Rd, Rouse Hill	127432	1	Heritage – Indigenous and/or Non	1. Protection of Rouse Hill House visibility has placed unnecessary restrictions on property including RE1 zoning and a 9m building height. Believes future construction on property won't be seen from Rouse Hill house due to vegetation and ridgeline.	Refer to Section 4.10 in the Finalisation Report which discusses the Cudgegong Road Station Priority Precinct – Five lot rezoning.
<b>O'Brien, Jonathan</b> 82 Cudgegong Rd, Rouse Hill	127421	1	General	1. Currently has an approved DA from Blacktown Council for subdivision on land in Area 20 that has been included in stage 1.	1. Noted. 2. The land rezoned for RE1 will be acquired at market rate. 3. Local roads shown are indicative only. Final road layout can be determined at development application or subdivision stage 4. Refer to Section 4.10 in the Finalisation Report which discusses the Cudgegong Road Station Priority Precinct – Five lot rezoning.
			Acquisition and Value of Land	2. Believes that compensation should be paid for provision of an RE1 Public Recreation zone on land that currently has an approved DA for subdivision.	
			Traffic and Transport	3. Proposed road running through property is unnecessary and should be removed.	
			Height	4. Increase 9m maximum building height to 12m.	

APPENDIX B Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME	WEB SUBMISSION ID	STAGE	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
<b>Think Planners</b> 81 Cudgegong Rd Rouse Hill	127695	1	Zoning & Height	1. RE1 zone to be considered due to lack of effect on line-of-sight for Rouse Hill House. Property in its entirety should be zoned R3. 2. Increase 9m maximum building height to 14m as the land has been restricted based on the preservation of a view that is to be radically altered.	1. Refer to Section 4.10 in the Finalisation Report which discusses the Cudgegong Road Station Priority Precinct – Five lot rezoning. 2. See comment 1. 3. The road layout has been altered on the ILP to be shared equally between the two properties.
			Traffic and Transport	3. Indicative road layout to be realigned to show a more equitable 50-50 distribution between subject land and land to the south.	