

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses Table (November/December 2012 Exhibition)

The purpose of this document is to provide a summary of the submissions received during the exhibition of the draft Precinct Planning package for the Catherine Fields (Part) Precinct. This document summarises each submission and provides a response to each issue. A number of submissions were made by Government agencies and utility providers during the exhibition period, as well as individual landowners and members of the public. Full versions of the submissions can be accessed on the Department's website.

Document structure

This document contains:

- Part A – Responses to Camden Council and agency submissions
- Part B – Responses to land owner submissions
- Part C – Responses to group or private organisation submissions

Part A - Responses to Camden Council and agency submissions

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
Camden Council Number 25	<p>Inconsistencies between the technical studies should be amended.</p>	<p>A number of studies were completed prior to the finalisation of the Precinct Planning Report and the draft ILP. This has led to some inconsistencies between the information and figures in the reports and the Precinct Planning Report, draft DCP and draft ILP. These inconsistencies were not considered critical to the land use planning or the environmental, social and economic outcomes. Further, differing professional opinions and recommendations from the consultants are to be expected.</p>
	<p>Post exhibition changes need to be incorporated into the Section 94 Plan.</p>	<p>The Section 94 Contributions Plan has been updated post-exhibition to reflect the final Precinct Plan, in collaboration with Camden Council.</p>
	<p>R1 Zone with DCP controls for density is more flexible than the exhibited R2 and this may lead to planning proposals. The zoning regime needs to allow for the subdivision to be ground truthed during the DA process.</p>	<p>It is the Departments understanding that this issue primarily relates to the zoning of open space and drainage land on the large landholdings (i.e. RE1 and SP2 was proposed at exhibition). After considering the submissions and weighing the risks of not zoning local drainage and open space land on the large landholdings, and following extensive consultation with Council, the decision was made to apply the R2 Low Density Residential zone to these areas to provide greater flexibility for the major land owners at development application stage. Additional provisions have been included in the DCP Schedule in relation to the delivery of the open space and recreation network, as suggested by Council. The R2 zone permits a broad range of land uses including residential, convenience retail, as well as drainage, and open space.</p>
	<p>There is an undersupply of open space and no guarantee that the riparian corridor will be dedicated to Council.</p>	<p>The peer review conducted by Elton of the exhibited Demographics and Social Infrastructure report stated that there is a myriad of different numerical standards that can be applied to determine the quantum of open space that a given population will require. Using the Growth Centre standard of 2.83 ha/1000 persons and based upon a forecast population of over 10,210 people, the Precinct will provide adequate open space to satisfy this benchmark. It is the Departments view that factors other than the quantum of open space should be considered when planning for the open space and</p>

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
		<p>recreation network, including the quality, variety, and accessibility of open space areas. The numerical standard stated above is taken to include all types of open space, including local parks, sporting fields, district parks and passive open space areas that provide recreation and amenity value.</p> <p>The major land owners of the riparian corridors have indicated an intention to dedicate the land to Council in the future, in accordance with Council's policy for the dedication of riparian corridors. Elton agreed that the use of a portion of the South Creek riparian corridor as passive open space, particularly if the fringing land is activated with recreational equipment and pedestrian walkways, is an acceptable outcome. Activation nodes for recreation and pedestrian paths will be required along the riparian corridors by the DCP and a level of embellishment will be included in the Section 94 Contributions Plan to ensure that the passive open space is usable.</p>
	Supports 2 double playing fields	Noted and supported by Elton Consulting. Two double playing fields have been retained in the final Precinct Plan.
	Council supports the exhibited residential zoning of the lots fronting Camden Valley Way.	Noted. This zoning has been retained in the final Precinct Plan in accordance with the advice of Urbis (at exhibition) and SGS Economics and Planning.
	Supports medium density housing fronting Camden Valley Way.	Noted. This zoning has been retained in the final Precinct Plan.
	Suggests amending the DCP layout to group the environmental controls together, e.g. all noise controls to be placed together.	The DCP is structured to group the controls for certain broad types of development together. The alternative DCP structure proposed by Council would make it difficult for an applicant to determine which environmental controls applied to their application.
	DCP should include a control requiring detailed salinity investigations for any subdivision or bulk earthworks DA.	The DCP provisions represent an outcome negotiated with Council and seek to balance the competing considerations of developers and Council. The Salinity Assessment and the controls in the DCP adopt a precautionary approach to deal with the uncertainty arising from the inability to complete comprehensive sampling due to the size of the Precinct. The DCP enables an applicant to propose less stringent construction standards if they choose to prepare a detailed salinity investigation and management plan that demonstrates the proposed construction standards and mitigation measures are

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
		appropriate.
	Controls need to be more specific in relation to when a Remedial Action Plan is required and if required, it should be part of the DA.	Section 2.3.7 of the DCP states “A Remediation Action Plan (RAP) will be required to be submitted and approved by Council prior to development consent being granted for areas identified as contaminated land in the Stage 2 Site Investigation”.
	Noise attenuation measures figure is needed. Noise controls to be reworded to require compliance rather than consideration of Council’s standards.	This control was negotiated with Council as part of the planning for Austral and Leppington North Precincts. It is not considered necessary to require strict compliance with these criteria in all situations, for example where the noise conditions are changing rapidly due to urban development.
	The odour map from the technical report should be included in the DCP. A DCP control to quarantine odour effected land from development.	The Growth Centres are the main locations for expansion of Sydney’s urban footprint. It is therefore anticipated that over time, intensive agricultural activities will be removed from the Growth Centres. Preventing development from occurring until these land uses have been removed would potentially impede urban development, with significant implications for housing supply in Sydney. An example of this situation is the purchase of the poultry farm affecting the southern portion of the site by a developer, subsequently removing the risk.
	To prevent illegal dumping of demolition waste, DCP should include a control to require a reconciliation between the estimated waste and the tipping docket for waste to a landfill site.	It is considered this control would be difficult to enforce and that it is controlled by separate legislation.
	Council does not support the wording of control 2.6.12 which requires a validation report that is consistent with NSW Office of Water guidelines to be provided to Council regarding any proposed imported fill.	Noted. The comments would be addressed as part of any future review of the DCP with Council. NSW Office of Water would also need to be consulted regarding any changes to the control.
	Council seeks plans to be submitted with subdivision applications, rather than building envelopes.	It is not necessary for detailed plans to be submitted as part of a subdivision application.
	Council requests full control of the DCP.	The Department works with Councils to prepare the DCP controls. Also, Council is the consent authority under the Precinct Plan. It is envisaged that future amendments to the DCP will be delegated to Council.
	Supports Cobbity Road/Dan Cleary Road continuing to enter into the Precinct via a roundabout on Oran Park Drive.	The Traffic and Transport Assessment undertaken by AECOM recommends that a connection from Dan Cleary Drive into the Precinct is necessary. A signalised intersection was also

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
		recommended, based on both the projected traffic numbers and local sight line safety issues. This connection has been retained in the final Precinct Plan.
	Supports the exhibited Rickard Road.	It is noted that amendments to the route and cross-section for Rickard Road were negotiated following the exhibition in consultation with Council and other stakeholders.
	Supports the route of Peter Brock Drive as established in the RMS Road Network Strategy.	Noted. As a result of consultation with Council, transport agencies and other stakeholders, the final Precinct Plan is generally consistent with the route of Peter Brock Drive in the RMS Road Network Strategy.
	Road from the Precinct that connects to South Circuit should be given priority at the intersection over South Circuit.	This matter can be resolved at Development Application stage with the major landowner/developer, given it is located in the Oran Park Precinct.
	Council objects to the exhibited Water Cycle Management Strategy for numerous reasons, mostly relating to a lack of detail. It fails to provide adequate information for Council to be sure that modeling undertaken is best practice and that adequate measures are in place to mitigate impacts for downstream residents. The 150mm baseline discrepancy previously conveyed by Council to both the Department and Brown Consulting has not been adequately addressed or incorporated into the report.	The Department engaged drainage engineers J. Wyndham Prince to conduct a peer review of the exhibited Water Cycle Management Strategy by Brown Consulting and to clarify the points of contention arising from Council's submission. The peer review was generally supportive of the strategies proposed, but identified several issues requiring clarification, additional modelling and supporting documentation. JWP did not agree with all of the issues raised by Council in its submission.
	In numerous sections the wording of the updated May report (Brown 2012,) has not been appropriately updated to reflect Council's review and/or updates in other sections of the report, such as figures for example. Also the report does not provide answers in regard to various issues of importance to Council. For example, suggested works, such as detention basins and filling, are likely to cause impacts that have not been adequately investigated. Council also raised objection to the exhibited flood response planning, stream erosion index and the flood extents.	Brown Consulting prepared a revised post-exhibition Water Cycle Management and Flooding Assessment that responds to Council's comments and the suggestions made by J. Wyndham Prince. In particular, the revised assessment provides greater justification for the stormwater and floodplain management strategy, including clarifying the 150mm baseline discrepancy, the provision of updated and more accurate survey information, a flood fringe filling strategy over the existing farm dams, and confirmation that flood levels would not change outside the Precinct boundary.
Dam removal be staged to enable any aquatic fauna that may potentially be utilising these areas as habitat, have the opportunity to seek alternative habitat.	The Department was advised that while this is a valid issue, there are not many options with regards to statutory controls. A number of the dams are online and on non-certified lands so the provisions of the <i>Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995</i> still apply. In	

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
		assessing dam removal at the Development Application stage, it would be a practical approach to stage the removal, and ideally undertake this once stormwater detention basins have been constructed elsewhere on site.
	Clear identification of hollow bearing trees that are to be retained onsite. Council wants confirmation as per recommendation Section 3.8 of the Catherine Fields Biodiversity Assessment report that that the hollow bearing trees are being retained in pocket parks or as street trees.	The DCP provides that native trees and other vegetation are retained where possible by careful planning of development, particularly at the subdivision stage.
	Clarify who will be responsible to cover the potential risk if riparian areas within drainage zones are not managed.	The developer will be tied to an establishment stage (typically 5 years) under the <i>Water Management Act 2000</i> . Once this establishment stage is completed ideally the riparian zones will be dedicated to Camden Council in compliance with council's riparian policy. If council does not accept ownership than the land will likely stay in the ownership of the major developers.
	The rehabilitation works must closely follow the former Department of Environment and Conservation's 2005 document titled Recovering bushland on the Cumberland Plain – Best practice guidelines for the management and restoration of bushland. It may also be necessary to refer to the former Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water's Approved Recovery Plan Cumberland Plain Recovery Plan January 2011.	EcoLogical Australia has advised that rehabilitation works should not be tied to any particular document as any control would be become moot once a document was updated. There are also likely to be inconsistencies between documents such as that referred to above, and policies such as those implemented by NSW Office of Water via the <i>Water Management Act, 2000</i> . The Cumberland Plain Recovery Plan should not be referenced, as its focus is not on restoration ecology.
	Requests a zoning to reflect the very low and low-medium density areas shown on the ILP.	These areas will primarily be zoned R2 Low Density Residential in the final Precinct Plan, with the exception of barrier housing along Camden Valley Way and Oran Park Drive, which will be zoned R3 Medium Density Residential. Under the Standard Instrument, upon which the Growth Centres SEPP Amendment is modelled, there is no lower order residential zone than R2. The planning provisions that achieve these outcomes in combination include minimum subdivision lot size, minimum residential density, floor space ratio, and maximum building height, are utilised in this instance to achieve the desired different outcomes under the same land use zone.
	The State Heritage Register curtilage should be shown on the ILP.	The proposed State Heritage Register (SHR) curtilage boundary is shown in Figure 2-6 and elsewhere in the DCP Schedule, including

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
		an indicative concept for the Oran Park House Quarter. The proposed State Heritage Register (SHR) curtilage boundary has also been adopted and mapped as the item boundary in the SEPP Amendment to provide an additional level of protection until the item is formally listed on the SHR. A formal SHR curtilage will not be established until the site is listed on the SHR in the near future.
	Section 3.1 – should make reference to potential archaeology in Coach House area.	Figure 2-6 in the DCP Schedule has been updated to identify areas of historical archaeological potential, which includes the Coach House area, as recommended by GML.
	Fig 3-2: Active frontages should also adjoin the pedestrian path for safety.	The relevant figures in the DCP Schedule and Public Domain and Landscape Strategy indicate that active frontages would be required where they adjoin the pedestrian paths.
	Fig 4-1: is missing figure number and title. The figure should indicate the views as per fig 16 in Precinct Planning Report as the controls require these views to be maintained. The figure should plot the OPH perimeter road.	Noted. The figures in the DCP Schedule have been updated to indicate the important view lines.
	Fig 4-2: is inconsistent with the ILP in the densities south-east of OPH (areas 6 and 7). It is considered that fig 4-2, being the detailed design, is correct and the ILP should be amended accordingly.	The final Oran Park House Quarter concept (see Figure 4-2 in the DCP Schedule) and final ILP are consistent. These figures are also consistent with the relevant SEPP maps and associated provisions.
	Fig 4-3: min lot width must be 31.25 to comply with 1000m2 min lot area.	The DCP Schedule demonstrates options to configure the large lots, including appropriate frontages.
	Fig 4-6: should indicate the 1m high low planting described in Schedule 3, Section 4.1 Control 15.	Figure 4-6 in the DCP Schedule presents optional road cross-sections incorporating the Dawson-Damer driveway. It is not necessary to duplicate the planting controls in this figure.
	Fig 4-7: for clarity should cross reference the different precincts shown in Fig 17 in the Precinct Planning Report and/or description on pg 50 of the Landscape and Visual Analysis Report.	The “Dawson-Damer Drive” name is used in the European Cultural Heritage figure and written controls in the DCP Schedule. Adequate cross-referencing exists to make it clear where the controls apply. It is not considered necessary to cross-reference to the Precinct Planning Report and relevant technical studies, which would be superseded in time.
	Several recommendations from the Non Indigenous Heritage Report and the Landscape and Visual Analysis Report were not adopted in the exhibited plan and should have been included.	Recommendations from the technical studies are considered during the Precinct Planning, but not all are necessarily adopted, given the final Precinct Plan must represent a balanced outcome. The final outcomes have been developed in consultation with the relevant stakeholders.

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
	Confirmation that an arborist assessment will be carried out on the tree groups identified in figure 17 of the Planning Precinct Report and as recommended in 2.6 and 2.8.1 in the Landscape and Visual Analysis Report. A location plan and control to retain the groups of trees (if supported by the arborist report) are required in the DCP.	The main body of the DCP provides that trees should be maintained where practical in the subdivision planning stage. The Public Domain and Landscape Strategy (referenced in the revised DCP Schedule) prepared post-exhibition provides principles and objectives for tree preservation, with cross-references to the exhibited Landscape and Visual Analysis Report.
	The GML Heritage Report (pg 52) recommends a 10m setback to the coach house on all sides. The DCP recommends 4m. How was the lower setback decided upon?	The final ILP and DCP Schedule have been amended to include the requirement for a 10m setback to the Coach House, as recommended by GML.
	The GML Heritage Report (pg 52) recommends a 10m setback from the silo to the new road. Confirmation that this is satisfied is required.	The final ILP and DCP Schedule have been amended to include the requirement for a 10m setback to the Silo, as recommended by GML.
	Section 4.1, Control 6 should make reference to the revised Conservation Management Plan and <i>Landscape and Visual Analysis Report</i> , by Aecom, dated 6 March 2012.	Overall the final Precinct Plan responds to the recommendations in the Landscape and Visual Analysis report, where appropriate. Other recommendations in the Landscape and Visual Analysis Report have been adopted in the Public Domain and Landscape Strategy, which is referenced in the DCP Schedule. A Conservation Management Plan (CMP) will need to be prepared by the Precinct Proponent in consultation with the Heritage Branch of Office of Environment and Heritage at the time of listing on the SHR. It is also not appropriate to make reference to the existing CMP in the DCP Schedule, as it was prepared for the previous owner of Oran Park House.
	Recommends substantial setbacks on the 1000m2 lots. Fig 4-3 indicates a 5m façade setback which is a standard residential setback and not considered substantial.	The minimum subdivision lot size controls have been amended in consultation with Council and Heritage Branch. The revised controls have been informed by 3D modelling of alternative scenarios by AECOM. The area to which the controls apply has also been reconfigured. The controls will continue to provide for larger lots around Oran Park House than is required elsewhere in the Precinct. The controls aim to retain important view lines, a sense of openness in the surrounding landscape, and the prominence of Oran Park House in accordance with the 'summit model'.
	Recommends no front or side fencing to the 1000m2 lots throughout the report so as to not obscure the important views of OPH along the historic driveways. However in the DCP - Section 4.1, Controls 5, 21 and 24 permits fencing designed by an urban designer or landscape	Restrictions on front fencing on the large lots have been adopted, though it is not considered reasonable or practical to remove fencing entirely. The DCP Schedule requires a detailed Public Domain and Landscape Plan to be prepared in collaboration with a qualified

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>architect. It is considered that Section 4.1, Control 5, points ii, v, vii and viii; and Controls 21 and 24 should be designed by a person with suitable heritage qualifications and experience.</p>	<p>heritage consultant with the first subdivision in the Special Heritage and Landscape Area. This Plan must be prepared with reference to the Department's Public Domain and Landscape Strategy and will need to establish residential fencing guidelines.</p>
	<p>The recommended park at the intersection of the Cobbitty historic driveway with Oran Park Drive (see fig 12 of that report) has not been provided.</p>	<p>A full review of the open space and the recreation network has been undertaken following exhibition. A new pocket park has been located along Dawson-Damer Drive which incorporates an area of moderate Aboriginal cultural heritage value.</p>
	<p>Confirmation is required that the strategies described to retain the views in the design of the public domain will be carried out as outlined in recommendations 2.3.1, 2.4.1 and the Appendix.</p>	<p>A range of planning controls provide for the retention of the key views including the proposed road layout in the final ILP, maximum building heights and minimum subdivision lot size controls in the SEPP Amendment, and view line controls in the DCP Schedule. AECOM has undertaken a post-exhibition 3D modelling exercise to predict the view retention under a range of planning control scenarios. The final controls retain the important view lines as far as practical, given the development of the Precinct. The Public Domain and Landscape Strategy also establishes guidelines for the retention of key view lines.</p>

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
<p>Deborah Stevenson, A/Manager Planning & Aboriginal Heritage Regional Operations Group</p>	<p>Supports the use of an E2 Environmental Conservation zone and recommends that the permitted uses be limited to those that are consistent with the objectives of the zone, i.e. remove the following uses from the 'permitted with consent' category:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Environmental facilities; o Information and education facility; o Kiosks; o Recreation area; o Research stations; and o Waterbodies (artificial). 	<p>The uses in the E2 zone are consistent with recently notified precincts in the Growth Centres. The intent of the E2 Environmental Conservation zone is not to prevent any development, but rather to limit development to uses that are consistent with the purpose of environmental conservation.</p> <p>It is noted that the majority of the E2 land is constrained in terms of flooding, riparian corridors, and existing native vegetation. It is also non-certified under the <i>Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995</i> (TSC Act). These factors would also need to be addressed in any development application.</p>

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
NSW Office of Environment and Heritage Number 20	Australasian Bitterns were identified on the site by Eco Logical Australia. The birds were sighted on certified and non-certified land in the precinct. As the habitat of the species may be affected, development would be subject to the normal assessment process under the <i>Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995</i> .	Following exhibition EcoLogical Australia prepared a paper on Australasian Bittern Habitat within the Precinct, which provides recommendations for protection of existing habitat and the creation of compensatory habitat within the E2 zone along South Creek. The DCP Schedule has been amended to include objectives and controls for the protection of habitat areas. The Precinct Plan protects existing habitat and provides for compensatory habitat within the riparian corridor, which has been discussed with NSW Office of Water (NOW). The habitat requirements have also been considered by Brown Consulting in preparing the Water Cycle Management and Flooding Assessment. At the Development Application stage, impact assessment will need to be undertaken accordance with the TSC Act for any proposed development potentially affecting habitat.
	OEH does not consider the Kelleher Nightingale Consulting Report to be adequate to support an AHIP application, and requested more detail on many items in the report.	An AHIP has not been sought as part of the Precinct Planning Process. Additional detail will be provided as part of any future AHIP.
	Flood plain risk management is most appropriately assessed through the Floodplain Development Manual 2005.	The Floodplain Development Manual 2005 will continue to apply to the Precinct.
NSW Rural Fire Service Number 6	The submission notes that consideration should be given to providing adequate Asset Protection Zones (APZs), emergency access, and utilities, in particularly water. The submission provides general guidance only and does not respond to specific aspects of the exhibited plan.	The draft and final Precinct Plans allow for APZs and emergency access/egress in accordance with RFS requirements.
Sydney Water Corporation Number 8	Sydney Water Corporation's (SWC) submission lists the infrastructure that will be required to service the Precinct and advises that SWC is continuing to liaise with Hixson.	Hixson's discussions with Sydney Water are well advanced and on track to deliver the required water-related infrastructure in line with the first stage of development.

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
Endeavour Energy Number 5	<p>Endeavour Energy's submission notes that the ideal location for the substation is in the northern part of the Precinct, but does not specify a precise area. The submission also notes that access to the 132Kv transmission lines is required.</p>	<p>The proposed electricity substation site has been relocated slightly to the north of the exhibited location alongside the riparian corridor and TransGrid electricity transmission easement, as a result of the proponent's consultation with Endeavour and further consultation with NSW Office of Water in relation to riparian corridors.</p> <p>The final ILP continues to provide sufficient access to the transmission lines and assumes undergrounding of the line for the most part of the Precinct, as is the intention of the major developers. Controls in the DCP Schedule will ensure the access to and safety of electricity infrastructure.</p>
NSW Department of Primary Industries Number 4	<p>The Department of Primary Industries' submission is supportive of the riparian zones and the E2 zone. The submission notes the need for waterway crossings to comply with Fisheries NSW documents.</p>	<p>Noted. The controls in the DCP Schedule relating to the protection of Australasian Bittern Habitat within the riparian corridors will ensure fish passage is considered in the design of the habitat areas.</p>
NSW State Emergency Service Number 21	<p>The State Emergency Service (SES) wishes to be consulted at the strategic level to determine the appropriate flood evacuation response strategy. The submission requires strategic assessment of the impact of the cumulative growth targets on flood emergency management capability to be undertaken. The submission also states that the precinct plan should provide a robust road network, with steadily rising local roads linking to arterial or regional routes to enable timely evacuation during floods, as 'vertical evacuation' (or 'shelter-in-place") as a response strategy is not adequate.</p>	<p>The final Precinct Plan continues to provide for roads that are perpendicular to and steadily rising away from flood prone land.</p> <p>The Department will seek to consult with the SES at the strategic-level to ensure that planned flood evacuation is adequate for the South West Growth Centre.</p>

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
Housing NSW, Department of Family and Community Services Number 1	Acknowledgement letter only.	Noted.
Family and Community Services Number 3	In this submission, Family and Community Service is supportive of the proposed social infrastructure. However, the submission notes that the plan should address/provide for before and after school care, preschools, and long day care centres.	These land uses are permissible in residential zones and will generally be provided by the private sector. Precinct Planning does not determine precise areas for preschools and day care centres. Noting the close proximity of Oran Park Town Centre, it is probable that these facilities will be adequately catered for within walking distance or a short drive from the Precinct. It is envisaged that after school care will be provided for in the Precinct, given a private and public school will be available in the future.
South Western Sydney Local Health District Number 17	This submission makes general comments on the draft plan in relation to access to healthy food, open space and physical activity, public transport, employment, and social and community infrastructure.	Noted and agreed. The Precinct Plan adopts many of the planning principles set out in the Growth Centres Development Code. The final Precinct Plan provides for shared cycle and pedestrian paths, access to public transport, open space areas and social infrastructure, including ready access to Oran Park Town Centre and its associated facilities.

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
<p>Department of Education and Communities</p> <p>Number 22</p>	<p>The Department of Education and Communities' submission notes the exhibition documents and is satisfied with the planning for education facilities in the Precinct.</p>	<p>Noted. Further consultation has been undertaken with DEC following exhibition in relation to the location of the proposed public primary school site. The final location of the site is slightly further south than the exhibited location and is on flatter ground in accordance with DEC's criteria for school sites. The Infrastructure Plan at Annexure A to the Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA), which requires the dedication of a 2 hectare site, has been amended to show the final location. No further changes have been made to the VPA.</p> <p>Consultation was also undertaken with Council and DEC with regard to the shared use of the adjoining Council open space. The school site will continue to be co-located with a local park to provide passive open space for both the school and nearby residents. The adjoining park has been increased from 1 to 1.2 hectares, with 0.4 hectares being accessible to the public at all times (assuming only 0.8 hectares is required by the school during operating hours). The final operational and design outcomes will be negotiated by Council and DEC when the school and park are developed in the future.</p>
<p>Department of Trade & Investment – Mineral Resources Branch</p> <p>Number 23</p>	<p>Objects to the proposed Precinct Plan for Catherine Fields (Part) Precinct, on the basis that the location of the Precinct is too close to existing coal mining titles (less than 7km away) and petroleum production leases. MRB indicates that other sites may be more suitable.</p>	<p>The Precinct Plan aims to provide housing and other urban land uses and is consistent with the NSW Government's policies.</p>
<p>Transport for NSW</p> <p>Number 24</p>	<p>Peter Brock Drive alignment should follow the Road Network Strategy route.</p>	<p>As a result of further consultation with the transport agencies and Council, and more detailed road design advice from AECOM, the final Precinct Plan has been amended to be generally in accordance with the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) Road Network Strategy for the South West Growth Centre. Peter Brock Drive will link the Precinct with Oran Park Town Centre and Dickson Road to the north, crossing the north-eastern corner of the Precinct.</p>

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
	In principle approval to the LILO off Camden Valley Way.	Noted. The final ILP retains this left in – left out arrangement, noting that the final design and location will be addressed further at the Development Application stage.
	In relation to Rickard Road, the submissions report should discuss the difference between the EMME models forecast and the Cube models forecast for the precinct.	The final Transport and Access report prepared by AECOM discusses the modelling assumptions and outcomes and the development of the strategic traffic model. AECOM has advised that the CUBE model used by AECOM generally shows a reduced traffic flow within the Precinct on Rickard Road in comparison to the EMME model. The forecasts are very close, excluding the northbound flow in the PM Peak. The difference in the 2036 models being 65 vehicles (10%) in the AM Peak direction and 39 vehicles (7%) in the PM Peak direction. The CUBE model is more accurate/current, given it is based on a more detailed road network, incorporates the proposed staging of major roads across the network, and is based on updated population and employment forecasts from BTS.
	Vehicular and pedestrian accesses to St Benedict's and St Justin's schools should be via local roads.	Noted. The final Precinct Plan provides for this arrangement and assumes that the main access will be from within the Precinct in the long term. A bus-capable local road is now proposed along the length of the northern boundary of the school at the interface with the future residential area.
	An electronic copy of SIDRA models should be submitted to RMS for determination of the geometric layout of the intersections.	Noted. This matter can be determined as part of the Development Application process. The modelling outcomes will be made available, as necessary.
	No RMS approval has been granted to the traffic signals at Catherine field/Oran Park Drive/Harrington Parkway intersection and Oran Park Drive/Cobbitty Road intersection.	This matter can be determined as part of the Development Application process. The final Transport and Access report prepared by AECOM identifies the proposed intersection treatments based on the modelling undertaken. These treatments have in turn been included in the relevant figure in the DCP Schedule. AECOM recommends that signals be provided at the intersection of Oran Park Drive/ Dan Cleary Drive and a roundabout at Oran Park Drive/ Harrington Parkway.
	The intersection of Peter Brock Drive/Rickard Road extension should be modelled to identify the appropriate traffic control device and the geometric layout of this intersection.	The DCP Schedule reflects the modelled scenario. The final Transport and Access report prepared by AECOM recommends a 'seagull' style intersection. Again, this will be addressed in further detail at the Development Application stage.

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
	Excessive queue lengths are identified at the intersection of Camden Valley Way/Oran Park Drive/Gregory Hills Drive for right turning vehicles approaching from the east (AM & PM peak) and west(AM Peak). Investigation should be undertaken to identify whether any mitigation measures are required.	The final Transport and Access report prepared by AECOM identifies that further study of the Camden Valley Way corridor will be required prior to 2036 in order to determine the potential need for an upgrade of intersections. Camden Valley Way is strongly influenced by modifications to the wider regional road network and it is not appropriate to suggest future mitigations measures given the level of uncertainty in the 2036 forecasts.
	Road noise attenuation should be provided in accordance with the draft Camden Growth Centre Precinct Development Control Plan. Physical noise barriers (ie Noise walls or solid fencing) are not supported along Camden Valley Way.	Noted and agreed. The proposed barrier housing incorporating architectural treatment measures has been retained in the final ILP along Camden Valley Way and the eastern section of Oran Park Drive.
	The upgrading of Oran Park Drive and the signalised intersection of Catherine field Road/Oran Park Drive/Forrest Grove Drive should be programmed for provision in the first stage of development.	This is consistent with the VPA. The intersection will be delivered prior to the creation of the first urban lot, forecast to be during 2014.
	TfNSW and RMS continue to prefer the transit boulevard/sub-arterial road cross sections as specified in the South West Growth Centre strategy.	Noted. The proposed cross-section for Rickard Road provided in the DCP Schedule is an outcome that has been negotiated between government agencies and Council and partly reflects the lower traffic volumes expected south of Springfield Road. AECOM has advised that this cross-section and the proposed operation of the road will be consistent with its function as a transit boulevard.
	TfNSW supports a fourth lane corridor for Rickard Road for safe and efficient bus movements. Rickard Road cross section should delete parking in the 3.5 metre bus lane or increase the width of the inner lane from 3.25 metres to 3.5metres to better accommodate buses.	The final Precinct Plan, including the cross-section in the DCP Schedule, has been updated to reflect the suggested 3.5m inner lanes. The kerbside lane will continue to operate as a clearway. It is anticipated that the cross-section will also need to accommodate a formal median at intersections.
	The Long term bus network for the south west is currently being reviewed. Potential bus network for the precinct connecting it to Camden, Campbelltown, Leppington, Liverpool and Narellan. Further bus coverage may be provided by local bus routes and operated along the collector road network. Roads indicated in submission must be capable of accommodating bus movements.	The final Transport and Access report prepared by AECOM has been prepared in consultation with Transport for NSW (TfNSW) and is based on the most current (draft) version of the South West Growth Centre Bus Servicing Strategy. The final ILP and DCP Schedule have adopted these bus capable roads and cross-sections accordingly.

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
	TfNSW notes the proposed lha centre in the southern section of the precinct is not located near any of the AECOM proposed bus routes but are proposed by TfNSW as per the Figure 6 diagram. This highlights TfNSW earlier comments regarding the need for collector roads to be able to accommodate two passing buses on two 3.5metre lanes and parallel parking that meets AS 2890.5 — On Street Parking Facilities.	As discussed above, the DCP requires roads to be designed to accommodate bus movements where necessary.
	DCP must require that should a school be constructed at the proposed northern indicative school location, bus turn around bays would need to be constructed on the collector road that the school site fronts to allow buses operating on the potential bus route to divert via the school at school start/finish times and resume the normal route with the shortest diversion as possible. This is identified in Figure 1.	The planned primary school site will be served by bus-capable collector roads and a bus turn-around bay, in accordance with this recommendation and AECOM's final Transport and Access report.
	TfNSW supports the traffic and transport report finding (page iii) that indented bus stops are not recommended	Noted.
	TfNSW supports the mix of low to medium density housing along Rickard Road. This will support the proposed high frequency, high speed and priority bus service between Liverpool, Leppington, Oran Park and Campbelltown.	Agreed. The final ILP continues to require higher residential densities along Rickard Road, except where the route of the road has been revised to adjoin the electricity transmission easement.
	Active transport network appears appropriate and the cycling facilities should be provided in general in accordance with the Australian Standards.	Noted. Cycling facilities are to be designed in accordance with the DCP and relevant, guidelines, policies, specifications and standards.
Heritage Branch, Office of Environment and Heritage	The Heritage Branch concurs with the assessment of Oran Park House (and gardens, silo, coach house, outbuildings and associated driveways) as being of state heritage significance. The Heritage Branch also concurs that an appropriate curtilage is necessary to protect the heritage values of the site and retain its prominence in its location during and after the residential subdivision of the precinct has occurred.	Noted. The Precinct Planning has progressed following rezoning on the basis that Oran Park House continues to be of state heritage significance, which is reflected in the development controls. Discussions between the Proponent and the Heritage Branch have progressed on the basis that the State Heritage Register (SHR) listing will be implemented shortly after rezoning.

Author and Submission ID Number	Issue summary	Response
Number 26	The Heritage Branch maintains its support for this curtilage being listed on the State Heritage Register.	The proposed SHR curtilage boundary will continue to be shown in the DCP Schedule. A minor change has been made to the proposed curtilage since exhibition in consultation with Heritage Branch and Council, and on the advice of GML. The Oran Park House lot has been reduced in size by approximately 0.4 hectares and the shape of the lot has also been amended to exclude the sheds at the rear of the property, which is supported by Heritage Branch.
	The Heritage Branch recommends that the heritage curtilage be overlaid onto existing maps to demonstrate the extent of Oran Park as a heritage item. Currently the 'Heritage Map' indicates that the only the house and coach house are separate heritage items which the Heritage Branch considers is inaccurate.	In accordance with this recommendation, the area indicated on the Heritage Map in the SEPP Amendment has been increased in size to match the proposed SHR curtilage boundary. This area will be subject to the Heritage Conservation Clause 5.10 in the Growth Centres SEPP. The proposed SHR curtilage is also included in several figures in the DCP Schedule and detail is provided in the Oran Park House Quarter Concept plan.
	The Heritage Branch considers that, once Oran Park has been listed on the State Heritage Register, appropriate controls will be established by the Heritage Council to facilitate residential housing around Oran Park House, and within the curtilage, that will be sympathetic to its heritage values while retaining view lines and the historic prominence of the house in its setting, while satisfying the Government's broader housing objectives.	Noted. The final Precinct Plan accords with this approach to integrate heritage conservation principles within the future urban layout and built form.

Part B – Responses to land owner submissions

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
Hixson Pty Ltd – Submission prepared by Development Planning Strategies (NSW) Pty Ltd Number 19	SEPP Instrument	
	Add an objective to provide that bulk and scale ratios should correspond with the density of permissible development.	It is not necessary to add such an objective. The Residential Density Map and associated clause will ensure that minimum densities are achieved in the desired areas.
	The plan should not include the protection of flood prone land as an objective, as flood prone land may be developable.	Flood prone land presents a risk to life and property and also has an ecological function. Accordingly, this objective has been retained in the final Precinct Plan. It is noted that the DCP Schedule assumes a level of flood fringe filling, where modelling proves it is justified and appropriately managed.
	Clarify minimum lot size for attached dwellings.	Minimum lot size is 125sqm for each dwelling.
	Requests opportunity to review the draft SEPP for specific drafting for a range of clauses.	The Proponent was advised to review the previously notified Appendix 9 Camden Growth Centres Precinct Plan of the SEPP, but was not given the opportunity to review the draft SEPP Amendment in accordance with the Probity Plan.
	Amendments to weaken the existing native vegetation and native vegetation retention standard clauses.	These clauses were developed as part of the biodiversity certification of the Growth Centres SEPP. The suggested amendments are contrary to the aims of the clause and are not supported.
	SEPP Maps	
	Update SEPP maps to reflect ILP changes.	Noted. The SEPP maps have been updated to reflect the final ILP and other provisions.
	E2 zone to be used for riparian protection areas only.	The E2 Environmental Conservation zone within the final Precinct Plan applies primarily to the riparian corridor and assumes some flood fringe filling and creekline redefinition will be undertaken as part of the detailed design. As a result, the E2 zone applies primarily to the riparian corridors along South Creek, Kolombo Creek and the eastern tributary.
	Open space and drainage areas to be zoned R2.	After considering the submissions and weighing the risks of not zoning local drainage and open space land on the large landholdings, and following extensive consultation with Council, the decision was made to apply the R2 Low Density Residential zone to

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
		these areas to provide greater flexibility for the major land owners at development application stage. Additional provisions have been included in the DCP Schedule in relation to the delivery of the open space and recreation network. The R2 zone permits a broad range of land uses including residential, convenience retail, as well as drainage, and open space.
	R3 zoned area near Oran Park Drive to be R2.	The R3 Medium Density Residential Zone was deployed in this area to encourage the development of barrier housing and has been retained.
	Decrease minimum lot size around Oran Park House from 1,000sqm to 600sqm.	The minimum subdivision lot size for the dwellings immediately around Oran Park House has been reduced to 700sqm, following a post-exhibition review and consultation with Camden Council, the Heritage Branch and the Proponent. A minimum subdivision lot size of 500sqm has been adopted for the second row of houses surrounding Oran Park House. The objective of larger lots was to create an area with less dense development in the vicinity of the heritage item to protect its prominence in the landscape and important view lines. The controls also provide for different types of housing from the rest of the Precinct.
	Delete residential density map. Include density provisions in the DCP.	It is the Department's position that, to ensure certainty in dwelling yields, minimum densities should continue to be prescribed in the Growth Centres SEPP, not the DCP. The residential density provisions have been retained and reviewed to be consistent with the final ILP.
	Delete maximum building height maps. Include 12m building height across whole precinct in the DCP.	It is the Department's policy that principal development standards should be addressed in the SEPP, not the DCP. This provides certainty and is consistent with the Standard Instrument template. A maximum building height of 9m has been adopted for most of the R2 Low Density area, excluding the lots around Oran Park House, consistent with the character of a low density area and recent amendments to the Growth Centres SEPP.
	Deletion of FSR map.	It is the Department's policy that principal development standards should be addressed in the SEPP, not the DCP. FSR controls will only apply to the larger lots surrounding Oran Park House.
	Deletion of open space from the 'Infrastructure Map'.	There is no infrastructure map. The Land Reservation Acquisition

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
		<p>Map is a standard map and is necessary in the event of acquisition for certain types of infrastructure. The final Precinct Plan provides for a limited amount of acquisition for local open space and drainage land on the small landholdings.</p> <p>As discussed previously, the open space and drainage areas have been removed from the Land Reservation Acquisition Map where it applies to the two large landholdings. Additional provisions have been included in the DCP Schedule in relation to the delivery of the open space and recreation network. All local infrastructure is identified in Council's Section 94 Contributions Plan.</p>
	Revise heritage provisions to reflect recommendations in Tropman and Tropman report.	<p>The Department sought further advice from GML and consulted with the Heritage Branch and Council in relation to the changes proposed by Tropman and Tropman and the Proponent.</p> <p>Some elements of the submission were adopted in the final ILP, including the reconfiguration of open space around Oran Park House, moving the Dan Cleary Drive extension south, the removal of the roads adjacent to the local park, and the exclusion of the sheds at the rear of the property from the proposed SHR curtilage.</p> <p>Other suggestions were not adopted and were contrary to the advice provided by GML in its Post Exhibition Heritage Advice report. Any future changes to the layout and key heritage conservation principles proposed by the Proponent at the detailed design stage will be undertaken in consultation with Heritage Branch and Council.</p>
	Amendments to the riparian corridors.	Ecological Australia has prepared a post-exhibition addendum to its original Riparian Corridor Assessment outlining the revised outcomes for riparian land and the results of the riparian averaging exercise undertaken in accordance with NSW Office of Water guidelines. The new guidelines have enabled further rationalisation of the riparian corridor boundaries to optimise development.
	Move the flooding controls from the Development Control map and associated provisions to the DCP.	It is the Department's policy that flooding controls be included in both the SEPP Amendment and the DCP.

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
		<p>Areas identified as Environmental Conservation in the final ILP are generally aligned with the post-development flood extents determined by Brown Consulting, including the proposed fill strategy. The post-development flood extents are shown in the figure in the DCP Schedule titled “Flood Prone Land”. Further detailed modelling will be required at the detailed subdivision design stage to ensure the Strategy is consistent with Council’s Upper South Creek Floodplain Management Plan (in preparation) and associated modelling parameters. To ensure that the Strategy is adequately justified at the Development Application stage, the flood prone land indicated on the Development Control map sheets in the Growth Centres SEPP Amendment has been updated from the exhibited draft Plan to reflect the revised existing flood extents, which are significantly wider than the post-development extents.</p>
	<p>DCP Main Body</p> <p>This submission identified numerous issues and suggested changes and deletions from the main body of the DCP, relating to the following sections and controls:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.0 – Water Cycle Management, salinity and soil management, Aboriginal and European heritage, native vegetation and ecology, bushfire hazard management, site contamination, development on and adjacent to electricity and gas easements, noise, odour assessment and control, CPTED, earthworks; • 3.0 – neighbourhood and subdivision design, residential character, street network and design, lot dimensions for residential subdivision; • 4.0 – cut and fill, sustainable building design, salinity, sodicity and aggressivity, visual and acoustic privacy, fencing, streetscape and architectural design, garages, storage, site access and parking, attached dwellings, secondary dwellings and dual occupancies, exhibition homes and exhibition villages, child care centres; and • 5.0 – acoustic and visual privacy. 	<p>The Department has reviewed all of the suggestions made against the exhibited DCP main body and has reached the view that none of these changes will be included in the main body of the DCP, given that these controls were developed in consultation with Camden Council and the local community, including the development industry, through the formal exhibition of the draft Leppington North Precinct Plan. The Camden Growth Centres Precincts DCP applies to multiple precincts and the ramifications of amendments must be considered in the broader context.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the suggestions made will be noted and discussed with Camden Council and other stakeholders, including the development industry, at a later stage.</p>
	DCP Schedule	

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
	Tables and figures throughout the schedule should be updated to reflect proposed ILP.	Noted.
	Delete bushfire risk and asset protection zone figure.	This figure is required under the Camden Growth Centres DCP and has been retained under the final Precinct Plan.
	Revise the cross section design for Rickard Road.	The cross-section and alignment of Rickard Road have been revised in consultation with Council and the transport agencies. The final cross-section design provides for 3.5m lanes in both directions. Certain elements of Hixson's submission are consistent with the final Precinct Plan, including the route of Rickard Road.
	3.1 Coach House and Neighbourhood Centre - delete controls 1-14 because they are too specific and replace with controls that reflect the proposed ILP.	<p>The Department maintains that the proposed controls are important given the presence of the historically significant Coach House within the centre and as such, these controls have been retained in the final DCP Schedule. The revised controls were developed with input from Camden Council, Heritage Branch, GML and the Proponent, and reflect the integration of good urban design principles for centres with overarching heritage conservation objectives.</p> <p>Any departures from the DCP will be a matter for discussion with Council and Heritage Branch at the Development Application stage.</p>
	Delete Indicative Layout of Coach House and Neighbourhood Centre figure.	<p>The Department maintains that the proposed controls are important given the presence of the historically significant Coach House within the centre and as such, these controls have been retained in the final DCP Schedule. The revised controls were developed with input from Camden Council, Heritage Branch, GML and the Proponent, and reflect the integration of good urban design principles for centres with overarching heritage conservation objectives.</p> <p>Any departures from the DCP will be a matter for discussion with Council and Heritage Branch at the Development Application stage.</p>
	Delete all controls and figures for development around Oran Park House and replace with controls and figures that are consistent with the preferred design.	The final provisions for land around Oran Park House were developed with input from Camden Council, Heritage Branch, the Proponent and GML. The controls are consistent with these negotiated outcomes and the final ILP.
	Delete Section 4-2 Development near or on electricity easements control 5 - <i>"All proposed activities within electricity easements"</i>	This general control has been the subject of previous consultation with energy providers and is retained in the final DCP Schedule,

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
	<i>require approval from the relevant electricity infrastructure agency (TransGrid or Endeavour Energy). Applicants should consult with the agency and obtain the relevant approvals prior to submitting a development application to Council. Evidence of approval is to be submitted with the development application.”</i>	given the presence of major transmission lines.

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
Greenfields Development Company 2 – Submission prepared by Development Planning Strategies (NSW) Pty Ltd Number 11	An alternative regional road network, whereby the Rickard Road transit boulevard is redirected from the Precinct to Oran Park Town Centre.	<p>As a result of further consultation with the transport agencies and Council, and more detailed road design advice from AECOM, the final Precinct Plan has been amended to be generally in accordance with the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) Road Network Strategy for the South West Growth Centre. The Rickard Road transit boulevard will continue to intersect with Oran Park Drive.</p> <p>Peter Brock Drive will link the Precinct with Oran Park Town Centre and Dickson Road to the north, crossing the north-eastern corner of the Precinct. The final ILP provides the opportunity for two access points into the Oran Park Precinct, via Springfield Road, Rickard Road and the proposed linking collector to Peter Brock Drive, or via Springfield Road directly onto the extended Peter Brock Drive/Dickson Road.</p>
	Blanket low density residential zoning of open space and infrastructure.	After considering the submissions and weighing the risks of not zoning local drainage and open space land on the large landholdings, and following extensive consultation with Council, the decision was made to apply the R2 Low Density Residential zone to these areas to provide greater flexibility for the major land owners at development application stage. Additional provisions have been included in the DCP Schedule in relation to the delivery of the open space and recreation network. The R2 zone permits a broad range of land uses including residential, convenience retail, as well as drainage, and open space.
	Residential density should be addressed in the DCP rather than the SEPP.	It is the Department’s position that, to ensure certainty in dwelling yields, minimum densities should continue to be prescribed in the

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
		Growth Centres SEPP, not the DCP. The residential density provisions have been retained and reviewed to be consistent with the final ILP.
	Removal of floor space and lot size controls for the dwellings around Oran Park House.	<p>The Department sought further advice from GML and AECOM, and consulted with the Heritage Branch and Council in relation to the provisions for land around Oran Park House following exhibition.</p> <p>Floor space and lot size controls have been retained in the vicinity of Oran Park House to permit development that is appropriate in the context of the heritage item and its landscape. As a result of the additional analysis and consultation undertaken, the subdivision lot size provisions have been amended to 700sqm for the first row of houses and 500sqm for the second row of houses surrounding Oran Park House.</p>
	Building height limit of 5m should only apply to dwellings that are directly adjoining the Oran Park House lot.	<p>Following exhibition the Department engaged AECOM to 3D model various minimum subdivision lot size and height controls, and the extent to which the controls applied. These scenarios formed the basis of consultation with Heritage Branch and Council to provide an indication of the views that would be retained, the prominence of Oran Park House in the landscape under the different scenarios, and the built form outcomes surrounding the house.</p> <p>As a result, the single storey height limits have been retained for all of the dwellings, with the exception of the second row dwellings on the northern edge.</p>
	The Odour Unit Report prepared for Oran Park should be adopted in relation to the Precinct.	Following exhibition the Department discussed this report with Camden Council officers, whom advised that this report was not suitable for use in the Catherine Fields (Part) Precinct.
	<p>An alternative ILP was proposed including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of one double playing field (north-western) • Reduction and relocation of open spaces • Revised drainage locations • Relocation of school site closer towards Oran Park Precinct 	<p>Following exhibition the Department has undergone an extensive review process informed by additional technical advice and consultation with key stakeholders.</p> <p>The Department engaged Elton Consulting to undertake a peer review of MacroPlans exhibited report. Elton confirmed the social infrastructure requirements for the Precinct, including the need for</p>

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
		<p>two double playing fields, which was supported by Council. The final ILP retains the playing fields in the north-western portion of the Precinct alongside South Creek and includes some revisions to the location and extent of other pocket parks.</p> <p>The final location of drainage infrastructure was also informed by a post-exhibition review of the water cycle management strategy by Brown Consulting. The zoning approach provides ample flexibility for relocation of open space and drainage areas at the Development Application stage.</p> <p>The proposed primary school site location was chosen in consultation with the Department of Education and Communities, following the testing of alternative scenarios, including a variation of the suggestion put forward by GDC2. The final site is central to the DEC catchment, is well located for bus services, and is located on slightly flatter ground.</p>
	Main Body DCP comments	
	<p>This submission identified numerous issues and suggested changes and deletions from the main body of the DCP, relating to the following sections and controls:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.0 – information to be submitted with Development Applications, variations to development controls and DCP Amendments; • 2.0 – Water Cycle Management, salinity and soil management, Aboriginal and European heritage, native vegetation and ecology, bushfire hazard management, site contamination, noise, demolition, CPTED, earthworks; • 3.0 – neighbourhood and subdivision design, street network and design, lot dimensions for residential subdivision, construction environmental management; and • 4.0 – dwelling height, massing and siting, child care centres. 	<p>The Department has reviewed all of the suggestions made against the exhibited DCP main body and has reached the view that none of these changes will be included in the main body of the DCP, given that these controls were developed in consultation with Camden Council and the local community, including the development industry, through the formal exhibition of the draft Leppington North Precinct Plan. The Camden Growth Centres Precincts DCP applies to multiple precincts and the ramifications of amendments must be considered in the broader context.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the suggestions made will be noted and discussed with Camden Council and other stakeholders, including the development industry, at a later stage.</p>
	DCP Schedule	
	Amend all figures to reflect preferred ILP.	The final DCP Schedule is consistent with the final ILP, SEPP

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
	<p>Rickard Road should be delivered as a bus capable Collector Road instead of a Transit Boulevard. A Transit Boulevard Link should be provided further to the north, connecting the Oran park Town Centre and Leppington Regional Centre.</p>	<p>Amendment and associated provisions.</p> <p>Rickard Road is identified in the Special Infrastructure Contribution as a road of strategic importance for the South West Growth Centre and the Precinct. The government agencies and Council agree that the road needs to be delivered as a transit boulevard. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that a narrower road corridor is possible south of Springfield Road and the proposed cross-section in the DCP reflects this.</p> <p>The final ILP is consistent with the Roads and Maritime Services Road Network Strategy for the South West Growth Centre, which links Dick Johnson Drive with Springfield Road and Peter Brock Drive with Dickson Road.</p>
	<p>“Special Heritage Control Area” between Oran Park House and an existing knoll to the west is identified as an “additional new view” in the heritage report prepared by GML. This area should not be represented as part of the Special Heritage Control Area.</p>	<p>The DCP Schedule retains the view line and knoll in the eastern portion of the Precinct in a Special Heritage and Landscape Area. This change to the notation signifies that part of the area is important for its public domain and landscape qualities, and not necessarily heritage.</p>
	<p>Only development immediately adjacent to Oran Park House should be subject to the special controls in the SEPP and DCP.</p>	<p>The final provisions for land around Oran Park House were developed with input from Camden Council, Heritage Branch, the Proponent and GML. The controls are consistent with these negotiated outcomes and relate primarily to land within the proposed State Heritage Register curtilage, but also for other land considered to be of importance as a transition and/or for its landscape qualities.</p>

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
<p>Inspire Planning on behalf of Camden Valley Way Landowners</p> <p>Number 9</p>	<p>Camden Valley Way land owners suggest the land should be zoned 'B4 Mixed Use' and the ILP and other planning controls be updated accordingly.</p> <p>Submission argues this is necessary to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • capitalise on the opportunity to use the site as a highway oriented mixed use employment corridor; • provide an appropriate alternative to residential uses deemed unsuitable due to noise, vibration and pollution constraints; • meet the acknowledged shortfall in employment lands in the South West Growth Centre; • utilise the site's high ranking in relation to attractiveness for strategic employment locations, creating competition with the Turner Road and Edmondson Park precincts; and • will not be negatively affected by the current limited access to the site (being left in/left out). 	<p>In response to this submission, the Department engaged SGS Economics and Planning to undertake a peer review of the exhibited report prepared by Urbis and further analyse the proposed departure from the SWGC Structure Plan. The SGS report included a subregional assessment of the nearby employment lands and supported the findings of Urbis; that the area would on balance be better suited to residential than employment uses. On the advice of SGS, the Department maintains that the land along Camden Valley Way is better suited to residential development and the exhibited residential zones have been retained.</p> <p>The technical advice provided by Urbis and SGS found that there was a strong supply of more suitable employment land in surrounding areas and the broader region, and that access issues would pose a significant impediment to industrial businesses.</p> <p>The submission prepared on behalf of the Camden Valley Way owners argues for a slightly different outcome than shown in the SWGC Structure Plan; that a B4 Mixed use zone should be applied. It should be noted that the B4 Mixed Use zone includes mandatory residential uses and aims to integrate business, office, residential, and retail development. This zone is more appropriately applied in edge of centre locations, where it could provide for a mix of residential and commercial uses in accessible locations. This proposal would constitute a very large centre in its own right and be inconsistent with the SWGC Structure Plan.</p>
<p>Name withheld</p> <p>Number 7</p>	<p>Submission argues for fewer roads on the subject lot to enable more land to be developed for residential purposes. The landowners also propose that stormwater be diverted into the transmission line easement.</p>	<p>The subject land is affected by a small tributary draining from Harrington Grove, denoted Reach 11 in the Riparian Assessment undertaken by Ecological Australia.</p> <p>Following exhibition, the Department reviewed the location of riparian corridors, flood prone land and drainage infrastructure across the site. The post-exhibition technical work (by Brown Consulting, J. Wyndham Prince and EcoLogical Australia) confirmed</p>

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
		<p>the 1:100 year flood extents and associated riparian corridor. The final ILP continues to co-locate the required drainage land with the electricity transmission easement and riparian corridor uses. No further land is impacted by these uses. The drainage under Oran Park Drive should be consolidated to drain to the proposed corridor as part of the detailed subdivision design process.</p> <p>The Department also undertook a review of local roads in the vicinity following exhibition. The final ILP proposes an alternative arrangement to the exhibited draft ILP, providing for a north-south local road and fewer east-west roads. The final layout optimises development outcomes in this area, allowing for three rows of standard housing between Rickard Road and the transmission easement. Notwithstanding this, changes to the road layout can be achieved through the Development Application process.</p>
<p>Peter and Rosa Sicari</p> <p>Number 10</p>	<p>Support the exhibited plan and raised concern about potential changes to the plan relating to relocation of open space.</p>	<p>There has been no significant change in the final ILP that affects this landowner.</p>
<p>PC Law on behalf of Mr and Mrs Sammut</p> <p>Number 15</p>	<p>The proposed zonings (SP2 Drainage, RE1, and E4) are inappropriate because of the topography of the site. The submission supports Hixson's proposal to relocate the double playing field and states that adjoining land is zoned as "green belt". The submission notes that drainage land should be relocated to an adjoining site and the SP2 zoning should be replaced with a residential zone.</p>	<p>The main change in the final ILP affecting this landowner is the relocation of the eastern double-playing fields to a central location within the Precinct. The exhibited draft ILP proposed playing fields in the north-eastern portion of the Precinct, partly on the subject land. The land is no longer partly affected by open space and the area now reflects a residential outcome.</p> <p>Following exhibition, the Department reviewed the location of riparian corridors, flood prone land and drainage infrastructure across the site. The post-exhibition technical work (by Brown Consulting and EcoLogical Australia) confirmed that the subject land is impacted by the existing 1:100 year flood extents and an associated riparian corridor. The final ILP seeks to co-locate drainage and riparian uses in this location, taking advantage of the natural topography of the site and optimising developable land. The</p>

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
		<p>subject land is also partly zoned E4 Environmental Living, reflecting the numerous constraints, but assumes a certain amount of flood fringe filling at the development stage. The Department has removed the associated Native Vegetation Protection provisions from this part of the watercourse instilling more flexibility in how the watercourse is managed in the future.</p>
<p>Anthony Martin Number 18</p>	<p>Upon completion of the Camden Valley Way upgrade, no water will enter the riparian corridor and requests an on site meeting.</p>	<p>Following exhibition, the Department reviewed the location of riparian corridors, flood prone land and drainage infrastructure across the site. The post-exhibition technical work (by Brown Consulting, J. Wyndham Prince and EcoLogical Australia) confirmed that the subject land is impacted by the existing 1:100 year flood extents and an associated riparian corridor. The Camden Valley Way upgrade and associated stormwater management was specifically considered as part of the Brown Consulting study.</p> <p>The outcomes for this landowner have not changed significantly post-exhibition. The final ILP continues to show an E4 Environmental Living zone in the vicinity of the riparian corridor, reflecting the natural topography of the site, but also optimises developable land by assuming a certain amount of flood fringe filling at the development stage. The Department has removed the associated Native Vegetation Protection provisions from this part of the watercourse instilling more flexibility in how the watercourse is managed in the future.</p>
<p>Terry O'Neill Number 13</p>	<p>Objects to the drainage and riparian corridor being located on his land. Believes that neighbouring developer-owned properties should be used for the drainage and riparian land.</p>	<p>The subject land is affected by a small tributary draining from Harrington Grove, denoted Reach 11 in the Riparian Assessment undertaken by Ecological Australia.</p> <p>Following exhibition, the Department reviewed the location of riparian corridors, flood prone land and drainage infrastructure across the site. The post-exhibition technical work (by Brown Consulting, J. Wyndham Prince and EcoLogical Australia) confirmed that the subject land is impacted by the existing 1:100 year flood extents and an associated riparian corridor. The final ILP continues to co-locate the required drainage land with the electricity transmission easement and riparian corridor uses. The main change</p>

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
		since exhibition is that all flood prone, riparian and local drainage land has been consolidated into the transmission easement land, impacting less land than proposed at exhibition. The drainage under Oran Park Drive should be consolidated to drain to the proposed corridor.
Ed Lupitt Number 16	Submission states that there is no location in Australia named "Catherine Fields".	The Department acknowledges the inconsistency with the suburb name, but has retained the "Catherine Fields (Part) Precinct" name for the purposes of planning, consistent with the Growth Centres SEPP.
Catholic Education Office Number 14	The Catholic Education Office's (CEO) submission is in relation to the Transport and Access Strategy prepared by AECOM. Notes that alternative access arrangements for the school have been negotiated. The CEO is supportive of walking and cycling paths in the Precinct.	Noted. The access arrangements shown in the final ILP are consistent with the outcomes negotiated by Hixson, the Catholic Education Office, Roads and Maritime Services and Camden Council. This includes locating the main school access along the northern boundary of the school in the future away from Oran Park Drive, with road access via a new signalised intersection at Rickard Road/Oran Park Drive/Forest Grove Drive.

Part C - Responses to group or private organisation submissions

Author and Submission ID Number	Summary	Response
<p>YMCA Number 12</p>	<p>YMCA recommends co-location of the community facility with outdoor courts.</p>	<p>The final Precinct Plan and associated Section 94 Contributions Plan allows for the provision of hard courts within a regional out of Precinct facility. The small community space is proposed to be co-located with the neighbourhood centre.</p>