

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
 Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

AGENCIES

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
Camden Council	119836	General	Recommended that Council support Leppington Precinct rezoning subject to Government working with Council to resolve issues and technical matters.	Noted.
		Land Fragmentation and Infrastructure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Land fragmentation means there is no lead developer and no definitive development projections for infrastructure service providers to rely on.</li> <li>2. Results in series of 'infrastructure service risks' to Precinct outlined in Precinct Planning Report.</li> <li>3. Infrastructure Delivery Plan needs to clearly define the timing of key infrastructure delivery and be integrated with the provision of local infrastructure via the preparation of an infrastructure masterplan.</li> <li>4. Preparation of masterplan will assist Council and Government in aligning the delivery of services in their respective budgeting processes to stimulate development within fragmented land holdings.</li> </ol>	<p>The IDP acknowledges that standard practice to the delivery of infrastructure to urban growth areas needs to be tailored to enable development in Precinct. The Department will continue to work with key service authorities and other parts of Government to develop appropriate funding and delivery models that allows for the timely delivery of infrastructure that is able to service development as demand arises.</p> <p>Given the existing subdivision and ownership pattern in the Precinct, land owners wishing to develop or sell may need to consider the intentions of their neighbours, and where these align, cooperate to foster interest from the development industry and to demonstrate to infrastructure agencies that there is a willingness to develop the land. The Department will work with landowners and developers that are interested in developing their land to help coordinate the future discussions and planning with servicing authorities.</p>
		Development Implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Will be more difficult given fragmented land ownership and lack of lead developer. The IDP that delivery of infrastructure needs to be tailored to enable development.</li> <li>6. Council accepts staged development but needs to work with Department resolve impediments to development including funding.</li> </ol>	See comments above.
		Staged Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Staged rezoning is supported in principle as consistent with planning objectives and may alleviate concerns raised by landowners about rezoning of land without services that result in increased values and rates and land taxes.</li> <li>8. However number of issues need to be worked through with DPE such as assessments of DAs.</li> </ol>	Noted.
		St Andrews Rd	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Notes SW Growth Centre Structure Plan does not reflect role and function of St Andrews Road consistent with RMS draft Road Network Strategy as a sub arterial link to F5 and Campbelltown Rd and Northern Rd. Structure Plan makes no reference to St Andrews Rd and shows no extension to Camden Valley Way.</li> <li>10. DPE has advised it will review traffic access in update of SW Growth Centre Structure Plan.</li> <li>11. DPE should investigate and resolve role and function of road in consultation with Council.</li> <li>12. Should Road retain its status as sub arterial road then recommend that funding and delivery be a State Government responsibility.</li> <li>13. Request Government's Special Infrastructure Contribution Scheme is reviewed to</li> </ol>	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			incorporate the road.	
		Sports grounds	<p><b>District sportsgrounds</b></p> <p>14. Requests that DPE confirm its commitment to the provision of a district sportsground facility in Rossmore location.</p> <p>15. DPE should note this facility would serve population of 60,000 and a contribution will be included in Council's draft Section 94 Plan to collect contribution to this facility equivalent to the demand from the Leppington Precinct. The same approach will be used in future Growth Centre Precincts.</p> <p>16. Council has revised its approach to the delivery of such facilities since precinct planning process commenced and has greater focus on providing fewer, larger facilities.</p> <p>17. To deliver request that DPE investigate enlarging the 2 sportsground facilities situated on the SW perimeter as part of planning for adjacent precinct.</p>	A district sportsground is planned within the Rossmore Priority Precinct.
		Timing of Draft s.94 Development Contributions Plan	<p>18. Council has told DPE that draft exhibition package should include s.94 Plan so local infrastructure can be funded however this has not occurred.</p> <p>19. Council considers it to be low risk as the rezoning unlikely to take effect until mid-late 2015 and development will be delayed due to lack of services.</p> <p>20. If rezoning takes place without plan development would be levied under Camden Contribution Plan 2004 which would be at lower rate than State Governments cap.</p> <p>21. That DPE note that Council maintain its strong commitment to Precinct Planning Project and preparation of s.94 Plan concurrently with the Precinct Planning Package.</p>	Consultants have been engaged to prepare a s94 Plan that should be exhibited late 2015/early 2016 and should therefore be in place prior to services being available and subdivision applications being approved.
		Infrastructure Funding	<p>22. Expected that average s.94 contribution per residential lot will exceed the \$30,000 cap given fragmented land ownership pattern, the amount of infrastructure required and amount of constrained land.</p> <p>23. State Governments policy restricts the Draft s.94 Plan to levying for "essential infrastructure" and Plan can levy for "base level" embellishment of open space to make it safe and suitable for use which means funding for a proportion of the land and capital works costs specified in draft s.94 Plan is uncertain.</p> <p>24. State Government identified two funding options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply under Local Infrastructure Growth Scheme or</li> <li>• Apply for a Special Rate Variation.</li> </ul> <p>25. Concerns regarding impact of the cap on its ability to fund local infrastructure and request work with Council to develop an infrastructure funding strategy.</p>	Camden Council is preparing a draft Section 94 Contributions Plan to establish funding mechanisms for local infrastructure (roads, drainage, open space and community facilities) required to service development in the Precinct. The likely timing for exhibition and finalisation of the Section 94 Plan is late 2015/early 2016. Where Section 94 costs exceed \$30,000 per residential lot, the Local Infrastructure Growth Scheme (LIGS) funds the gap between the maximum contribution that councils can charge developers and what it actually costs councils to deliver the infrastructure, such as roads, stormwater facilities and public open space. To be eligible for funding, a council must have a development contributions plan reviewed and approved by the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (IPART).
		Funding Strategy	<p>26. Council wrote to Department seeking it's assistance to establish an infrastructure funding strategy for Growth Centre Precincts.</p> <p>27. Funding strategy should include forward funding of essential infrastructure, funding for the non-essential infrastructure shortfall and regional infrastructure funding.</p> <p>28. To facilitate growth of Leppington North and Leppington Precincts Council need to be able to access funds to forward fund infrastructure projects. Council currently does not have access to a funding source and is requesting assistance to explore 'seed funding' opportunities such as interest free government loPascoeans.</p>	As part of the review of the South West Priority Growth Area Structure Plan the Department will identify strategic infrastructure requirements and their indicative delivery timeframes to support development of rezoned precincts. Options for prioritisation and funding will also be considered. The Department will be also monitor the rate of development in line with the provision of infrastructure, in consultation with the utility agencies, to maintain a supply of rezoned and serviced land. In terms of local infrastructure, a Section 94 Contributions Plan is being developed that will fund the delivery of essential infrastructure when it is needed.
Campbell-town City	115929	Roads	1. Council reviewed Planning Report and is concerned with references made to St Andrews Rd with respect to indications concerning what seems to be intention to upgrade the road	St Andrews Road is no longer proposed to be extended. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
<b>Council</b>			east of Camden Valley Way linking F5 and Campbelltown Rd (p.60). Figure 5-14 p.62 depicts St Andrews Rd as 4 Lane sub arterial road being part of Leppington Road Network. Council seeks deferral of any planning decisions for Leppington that have implications with respect to St Andrews Rd until Council is fully consulted; decided it's position; had the opportunity to bring its position to the attention of NSW Government; and assessed the impact on the integrity of the Scenic Hills.	
<b>Heritage Council</b>	119838	Heritage	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Raby House, a State listed item is located just outside the Precinct to the south west. Distant views of Raby from Camden Valley Way should be protected, possibly by limiting building heights, and appropriate type and placement of landscaping along the road corridor.</li> <li>2. Concern is raised regarding the reduced curtilage to the proposed items at 43 and 66 Rickard Road, and 168 Heath Road.</li> </ol>	<p>A low density residential zoning is proposed for Stage 5 of the Precinct which will ensure distant views are maintained. Any plantings in the road corridor of Camden Valley Way are the responsibility of the RMS.</p> <p>Refer to Section 4.5 in the Finalisation Report for a discussion on the curtilage to the proposed heritage items.</p>
<b>Jemena</b>	115869	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Reviewed proposal and acknowledge commentary concerning aspects of natural gas reticulation.</li> <li>4. Essential to understand the requirements of the development within an approved pipeline corridor. Australian Standard 2885 provides guidance in assessing changes in land classification.</li> <li>5. Jemena requests further discussions and communication through process.</li> </ol>	Noted.
<b>NSW Rural Fire Service</b>	115937	Bushfire	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vegetation in riparian corridor of Kemps Creek and proposed open space will remain and therefore be a bushfire hazard.</li> <li>2. Potential for additional bushfire hazard to be created due to eastern riparian corridor being designated for native vegetation retention/environmental protection.</li> <li>3. Any development adjacent to bushfire prone vegetation must ensure appropriate level of protection through appropriate APZ (Asset Protection Zone) as set out in <i>Planning for Bushfire Protection 2006</i>.</li> <li>4. Access also important and RFS supports absence of dead end roads.</li> <li>5. It is assumed reticulated water will be supplied to entire area which should be via a ring system and of sufficient pressure to ensure it remains during fire fighting operations.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The eastern corridor has an APZ specified in the DCP.</p>
		Bushfire Assessment Report	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. RFS has reviewed the Bushfire Assessment Report prepared by Ecological Australia and agrees with assessment and recommendations. This report was done on landscape scale and more detailed assessment required at a site specific level when planning advances which may result in some variations to identified APZs.</li> <li>7. Report has not identified several areas of bushfire prone vegetation within proposed passive open space/public recreation zones, school sites and land adjoin the site in eastern and western corners. These areas identified on attached plan in orange border. Appropriate APZs should be identified and provided.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted. Detailed assessment will be done at the development application stage.</p> <p>At the end of September 2014, the RFS published a revised set of guidelines for assessment and determination what constitutes a bushfire hazard, for the purposes of the NSW planning system. These guidelines provide the parameters for the preparation of the Bushfire Prone Land (BFPL) maps, which then act as a planning trigger for future development as to whether the potential impacts of bushfire needs to be assessed in further detail and mitigated against.</p> <p>Section 6.1(2) of the guidelines defines a collection of vegetation areas and arrangements that are considered to be of a total area and/or arrangements that warrant an insignificant bushfire risk and have therefore been 'excluded' from being classified as bushfire prone. There include, but are not limited to:</p> <p>(i) areas of vegetation less than 1 hectare in total area (and</p>

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
				<p>greater than 100m from other vegetation);</p> <p>(ii) multiple areas of vegetation less than 0.25 hectares in area (and not within 30m of each other);</p> <p>(iii) strips of vegetation less than 20m in width (regardless of length, and not within 20m of other vegetation); and</p> <p>(iv) areas of 'Managed grassland' including grazing land, recreational areas, commercial/industrial land, maintained public reserves and parklands, etc.</p> <p>Furthermore, section 1 and section 6.1(1) of the guidelines provides definition for what is described as 'Remnant Vegetation' and the subsequent mapping of the same. Remnants are considered to be areas of lower bushfire risk due to the size of the parcel and includes vegetation greater than 1 hectare, but less than 2.5 hectares. This vegetation is classified as Category 2 (lower hazard) and has only a 30m buffer applied (where there is separation of 100m from other Cat. 1, and 30m from other Cat. 2 vegetation).</p> <p>Based on the above revisions and the intended land uses throughout the majority of the ILP, being future development and managed open space areas, it is likely that the majority of areas highlighted by the RFS will be either excluded as hazards, or determined as remnant hazards only. When this is considered in conjunction with extensive infrastructure in the form of perimeter access roads, pathways, managed road reserves and landscaping, it is unlikely that many of these areas will be triggered as bushfire prone, and even less will require the implementation of extensive APZ / setbacks within the properties proposed.</p>
		Special Fire Protection Purposes	<p>8. RFS notes identification of school sites in plan. Schools are Special Fire Protection Purpose that require higher level of protection particularly in greater APZs.</p> <p>9. In 2 cases schools would incorporate existing areas of bushfire prone vegetation and one other is adjacent to bushfire prone vegetation. The vegetation would be required to be reduced and managed to the standard of an APZ or schools developed with provision of appropriate APZ adjacent to and/or within the schools sites.</p>	<p>Development of this nature does require setbacks of a greater magnitude from the hazard areas than those for residential development or for other proposed uses. The majority of school sites are of sufficient size to be able to absorb any future required setbacks, and/or already have sufficient separation from the hazard areas (depending on future management).</p>
NSW Office of Water	115897	Riparian Corridor Widths	<p>1. Consider that the Biodiversity and Riparian Studies prepared by Ecological Australia are consistent with Office of Water advice regarding merit assessment of stream order and riparian zone widths for the precinct and generally with Office of Water's Guidelines for Controlled Activities.</p>	Noted.
		Flood Risk and Vegetation Densities	<p>1. The Revised Water Cycle Management Report by Parsons Brinckerhoff outlines conceptual design criteria for online basins and assumes Mannings roughness of 0.06 for vegetated surface swales. Reference to swale is a reference to main channel in precinct as understood by OW.</p> <p>2. Not clear from report as to what Mannings roughness has been used in modelling bank</p>	<p>A Manning's n value of 0.06 (page 33 of the Parsons Brinckerhoff WCM report) was not used in the TUFLOW modelling, but was used to undertake the preliminary sizing calculations of the swales, which are open drainage lines that convey flow into the main creek system. The swales were not modelled in the interim TUFLOW model, as the aim of the interim TUFLOW modelling undertaken by</p>

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			<p>and overbank areas on watercourses.</p> <p>3. Adopted Mannings values for flood modelling should not compromise establishment of riparian corridors representative of Cumberland Plain and Alluvial Woodlands as specified in Biodiversity and Riparian Studies prepared by Ecological Australia.</p> <p>4. Preparation of VMPs would be appropriate to concentrate more dense plantings adjacent to areas of high stability risk and less dense to outer areas of the corridors as not to impact adversely on flood levels. Supporting documents should reference this approach.</p>	<p>Parsons Brinckerhoff was to test the basin performance in the existing Upper South Creek TUFLOW model developed by Cardno for Camden Council.</p> <p>The Manning's n values used in the interim TUFLOW modelling were not changed from the values set by the original TUFLOW modelling undertaken by Council's flood consultant Cardno, which were based on aerial photography and landuse mapping.</p>
		Riparian Corridor Ownership	<p>1. Office of Water supports the public ownership of the riparian corridors through SP2 zoning.</p>	<p>Noted. Parts of riparian corridor are also within E2 and RE1 zoning, but will also result in public ownership.</p>
		Controlled Activities	<p>1. Future detailed design of non-riparian uses including detention basins, drainage infrastructure and public open space should not compromise Office of Water's Guidelines for Controlled Activities.</p> <p>2. Future development will require controlled activity approval for works on waterfront land as defined in <i>Water Management Act 2000</i>.</p> <p>3. Works should be conducted in accordance with Office of Water's Guidelines.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<b>Office of Environment &amp; Heritage</b>	117111	Biodiversity	<p>1. Prefer ENV to be in public ownership and concerned that objectives of RE1 and SP2 zones do not recognise the protection of biodiversity value and the zones permit a range of uses incompatible with biodiversity protection.</p> <p>2. OEH does not support the location of a detention basin in the ENV area.</p> <p>3. Supports recommendation that targeted surveys be performed where ENV is to be retained on certified land.</p>	<p>There are no areas of ENV within Stage 1.</p> <p>Further work will be undertaken on the drainage strategy (basin locations) in Stages 2 to 5 when those stages are to be rezoned to avoid impacts on ENV that is to be protected.</p>
		Aboriginal cultural heritage	<p>5. Figures removed from public version of report need to be forwarded to OEH to enable proper assessment.</p> <p>6. Concerned that ILP and zoning plan do not contain areas for protection and conservation of Aboriginal cultural heritage. Five areas with moderate to high archaeological significance not specifically incorporated into precinct planning.</p> <p>7. Aboriginal Community Consultation raised concerns with protection of Aboriginal cultural heritage sites. DCP identifies areas of archaeological sensitivity in riparian corridors, where significant stormwater infrastructure will be located. Location and design of such infrastructure should be modified to avoid impact and test excavation undertaken.</p>	<p>Full report supplied to OEH.</p> <p>The Camden Growth Centres DCP contains controls for European and Aboriginal heritage (Section 2.3.4) and the proposed Schedule 5 (Leppington specific maps and controls) will contain a map titled 'Aboriginal cultural heritage sites' which gives a broad area around each creek corridor where areas of high and medium sensitivity could be impacted. The controls and maps plus the development application process through Council to enable subdivision/ works will trigger further investigations and provide protection to any Aboriginal cultural heritage.</p>
		Flood risk management	<p>8. The Leppington Precinct Flood Assessment was completed prior to the completion of the Flood Study for the flood scenario prepared as part of the Upper South Creek Floodplain Risk Management Plan. Recommended that the flood assessment is included in the main Water Cycle Management report and the flood planning area, hydraulic and hazard categories maps are replaced with the latest version.</p>	<p>Noted. Additional work undertaken to model stormwater and detention systems has incorporated the latest version of the Upper South Creek FRMP.</p>
<b>Roads and Maritime</b>	115909	General	<p>1. Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) have reviewed the Plan and raise no objection however issues raised as below.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>



**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
<b>Services</b>				
		Traffic Signals	<p>2. Transport and Access Strategy concludes on p56 that ‘signalisation for the intersections of Rickard Rd/Ingleburn Rd and Rickard/Heath Rd’ on the basis that traffic volumes in 2036 are forecast to exceed the minimum RMS signal warrant requirements in the weekday PM peak period. Warrant requirements are outlined in RMS Traffic Signal Design Guide and apply to brownfield sites, no warrant criteria exists for green field sites.</p> <p>3. Current position of RMS is signals will be approved within greenfield sites if satisfactory evidence in form of traffic analysis submitted demonstrating signal warrant (Traffic Signal Design Guide) is met within medium term (10 yrs).</p> <p>4. Recommend Council, Urban Growth and RMS work in close partnership in early phase of land release to identify intersection where traffic signals may be warranted in medium term and future proofing intersections identified for long term (15-20 yrs). Once identified then intersections should be incorporated into DCP.</p>	Noted.
		Noise Attenuation	<p>5. Camden Valley Way is principal road and will carry additional vehicles including residential, industrial and employment lands. It is responsibility of developers to provide noise attenuation treatments to comply with RMS noise criteria.</p> <p>6. RMS does not favour noise walls as undesirable urban design outcome and pose ongoing maintenance.</p> <p>7. RMS favours architectural treatments, setbacks and noise mounds to comply with noise criteria. These should be identified in DCP.</p>	Appropriate noise treatments contained in Camden Growth Centre Precincts Development Control Plan.
		Infrastructure Delivery Program	<p>8. Notes draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies RMS as provider of certain roads within precinct however RMS advises these roads are not state roads and there is no agreement in place for RMS to deliver roads.</p> <p>9. Recommends Council TfNSW, RMS and UrbanGrowth work collaboratively to establish way forward in delivering roads.</p>	Noted. Review of infrastructure provision will be ongoing throughout the delivery of the Precinct.
		Camden Valley Way	<p>10. All vehicular access to precinct via Camden Valley Way should be in accordance with the approved Review of Environmental Factors for upgrade of road as exhibited.</p>	Noted.
<b>Sydney Water</b>	115843	General	<p>1. Supports development of staged zoning that aligns to infrastructure investment but raises issues (below).</p> <p>2. Would like to be advised on likely timing of further rezoning so that they may make future plans.</p>	Noted.

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
 Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
		Infrastructure Servicing	<p><b>Stormwater and Water Cycle Mgt</b></p> <p>3. Leppington Precinct South West Growth Centre Water Cycle Mgt Strategy July 2014 misses opportunity to develop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrated water cycle strategy</li> <li>• Trunk drainage corridor that facilitates restoration and rehabilitation of a continuous creek and floodplain system</li> </ul> <p>4. Any adopted strategy must make clear distinction and either be 'at source' (lot and street scale facilities) or 'end of pipe' (precinct scale facilities)-a hybrid mix is not supported.</p> <p>5. Use of creek corridor as part of water quality treatment system, installing bio retention beds and embankments sacrifices opportunity to achieve quality creek improvements.</p> <p>6. Should promote 'at source' facilities.</p> <p>7. Flood management targets have been set without overarching regional western Sydney strategy which could cause cumulative flood impacts downstream.</p> <p>8. Strategy provided mixed messages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promoting infiltration but expressing concerns on consequences re salinity management</li> <li>• inconsistencies in percentage size of 'rain garden' base areas</li> </ul>	Noted.
		Infrastructure and Servicing	<p><b>Leppington Reservoir</b></p> <p>9. Under South West Growth Centre 2nd Release Precincts Water Strategy have identified new 50ML reservoir may be required in future at existing reservoir and SP2 zoning should be applied so it is "System Land".</p>	SP2 zone applied to Leppington Reservoir as requested.
Transport for NSW	115917	General	1. Provide support for the plan but raises issues as below.	Noted.
		Delivery of Roads	2. Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies RMS as provider of several roads. TfNSW advises that these are not state roads and there is no formal agreement with RMS to deliver roads.	Noted.
		Bus Capable Roads	<p>3. All bus capable roadways need to adhere to the Austroads Design Guidelines.</p> <p>4. Eastwood Rd and Rickard Rd are proposed as bus capable with adequate widths and design but Dickson Rd is proposed as two lane sub arterial road with one travel lane in each direction and has been identified in Transport and Access Strategy as potentially accommodating a Leppington to Oran Park bus route. To accommodate bus route and facilitate other traffic it is recommended to be a four lane sub-arterial road.</p> <p>5. <i>Austroads Guide to Road Design part 3: Geometric Design</i> recommends general traffic lane widths of 3.5m. TfNSW supports all bus roads in precinct have at least a 3m width in the parking lane for other vehicles to pass or overtake, without either vehicle having to move sideways towards the outer edge of lane.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A review of Dickson Road is being included in the Land Use and Infrastructure Strategy review.</p> <p>Noted. Can form part of any detailed road design.</p>

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			<p>6. Any roundabout on bus capable lane should be designed with a swept path to accommodate a turning circle for a 14.5m rigid non-rear steer bus. Intersections on bus capable roads should also be capable of accepting a swept path of a 14.5m rigid non-rear steer bus.</p> <p>7. As indicated on previous advice TfNSW has concerns with the location of 2 school sites- Heath Rd near intersection of Heath and Eastwood Rds and the site within block bounded by Heath Rd, Camden Valley Way, Rickard Rd and St Andrews Rd as neither of these sites are located on roads planned to accommodate regular bus services.</p> <p>8. TfNSW request consideration be given to relocating the school sites so they share a boundary with a road planned for regular bus services.</p>	<p>Noted. Can form part of any detailed road design.</p> <p>Both of these sites are not located in Stage 1, road widths can be considered again when relevant stages rezoned.</p>
		Active Transport Accessibility	<p>9. TfNSW supports the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision for bicycle rider to cross main creeks</li> <li>• Referencing the cycling aspects to Austroads Guides</li> <li>• Development of Green Travel Plans for activity centres in precinct.</li> </ul>	Noted.
<b>TransGrid</b>	112537	General	<p>1. Plans of TransGrid’s easement that traverses the precinct attached.</p> <p>2. Note majority of land over which easement situated is zoned low density residential and TransGrid infrastructure can be situated in any land use zone in accordance with Planning Practice Note (PN 10-001) and therefore TransGrid has no objection to draft Plan but raises issues as per below.</p> <p>3. Residential subdivided lots will not be permitted on the transmission line easement.</p> <p>4. Attached <i>TransGrid Guidelines for Easement Activities and Restrictions</i>. Guidelines not exhaustive and therefore TransGrid should be consulted for any development proposed near our easements and/or infrastructure and is subject to TransGrid prior written approval.</p> <p>5. Development approval must comply with regulation 45 of <i>SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007</i>.</p>	Easement does not affect Stage 1 and can be addressed when relevant stages rezoned.



**OTHER**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
<b>Action for Public Transport NSW</b> (Jim Donovan)	114970	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfied that Glenfield to Leppington rail line is nearing completion prior to rezoning Leppington Precinct</li> <li>Discussion on previous suburbs built from 1950s being car dependent.</li> <li>Discussion on previous flawed assumptions that workers would work close to home which did not happen and assumption of containment was unrealistic and unsustainable with collapse of manufacturing industry.</li> <li>Well paid jobs draw workforce from wide range of areas and likely many workers will travel outside precinct.</li> <li>“Business as usual” would see RMS predict that majority of travel would be by private car, for which the negative consequences of are well documented. This approach has delivered congestion in Sydney.</li> </ol>	Noted.
		Transport and Access Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AECOM Transport and Access Strategy notes that public transport and active travel uptake critical to reduce pressure on Camden Valley Way and other north/south road corridors in 2036 to ensure ongoing functionality. Concerns that inadequate attention to public transport can contribute to unemployment and other social problems.</li> <li>Believe new rail link step in right direction but more is needed to maximise patronage of Leppington line by maximising access of potential passengers. Suggest frequent, fast comfortable bus services.</li> </ol>	Noted.
		Linkages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Best approach is not to scatter jobs across Cumberland plain but to connect growing suburbs to clusters of higher order jobs in accessible public transport locations. Biggest concentration is in Sydney CBD and South line is heavily congested.</li> <li>Congestion less acute on Cumberland line between Glenfield and Parramatta where there is also significant concentration of higher order jobs. Therefore suggest greater improvement to public transport linkages from South West to Parramatta and Macquarie park area using Leppington line.</li> <li>Suggest the heavy rail Parramatta to Epping be reinstated as high priority.</li> </ol>	Noted. General comments applicable to the Growth Centres.
		Transport Infrastructure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The planning report recognises that servicing the precinct will ‘require investment by the Government in water, sewer, power and road infrastructure’, same is true for public transport and this should be the norm.</li> <li>Support timely construction of rail line but more certainty needed about bus services before parts of precinct not within walking distance to station are rezoned.</li> <li>Planning report refers to South West Sector Bus Servicing Plan 2009 where the level of service mooted for bus passengers is very low outside peak hours. The expectation that it is acceptable to expect people to walk 800m to access non peak bus services is unreasonable in an area with common high summer temperatures.</li> <li>Their view that must provide for high levels of service throughout day and weekends if patterns of the past to be broken.</li> <li>Note Ingleburn Station is only 6 km from the precinct but no future services in Transport and Access Strategy.</li> <li>Rezoning should wait for review by Transport NSW and it should be publicly exhibited for comment and should also wait for certainty about funding and therefore actual availability of bus services.</li> </ol>	Noted.
		Design of	17. Walkability and safety of streets critical for public transport users who make part of journey	The Camden Growth Centres DCP is a guide and controls can be

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
 Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
		Roads and Streets	<p>on foot. There are encouraging provisions in DCP in relation to block design and crime prevention but if not translated into road designs then are nothing more than exhortations.</p> <p>18. There are instances of uncritical adoption of road engineering standards geared towards car travel and these have potential to render streets to be pedestrian unfriendly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure 3-2 (DCP p.43) shows a long block;</li> <li>• cul-de-sac are to be used only where other more permeable options are not available (AECOM p.46) but diagram on p.58 of DCP shows cul-de-sac with no pedestrian pathway through at the end ; and</li> <li>• car parking standards and the abhorrence of battle axe blocks (p.58) will promote a proliferation of driveway crossings.</li> </ul> <p>19. Road designs and planning controls need to be critically reviewed to ensure support aims and principles set out in supporting documents and to weed out any that do not.</p> <p>20. A specific walk score (above 80) should be targeted for precinct (<a href="http://www.walkscore.com/">http://www.walkscore.com/</a>)</p>	<p>varied by Council.</p> <p>The DCP provides for a range of development scenarios but it does not encourage the use of cul-de-sacs.</p> <p>Subdivision and development in the growth centres will deal with a range of original lot sizes and so a range of subdivision layouts need to be permissible/ considered by Council.</p>
		Cycle Paths	<p>21. Proposed cycle path planned to run through open space which suggests cycling is seen as recreational and not as a means of access of access to the new Leppington station. Strategy notes that commuter cyclists prefer direct routes. Direct routes which separate vehicle traffic from cyclists and pedestrian can easily be designed in early stages.</p>	<p>Cycle routes are planned for all major road linkages, including towards Leppington Station. The DCP contains a figure with proposed routes.</p>
		Density and DCP	<p>22. Despite SEPP amendment referring to make more efficient use of infrastructure the DCP seeks to move to minimum residential densities but densities too low as 88% precinct devoted to low density as defined between 12.5-20 dwellings/ha. Note Housing market analysis has reduced amount of medium density which is feasible but cannot see necessity to prohibit a form of development considered unlikely to be proposed. Suggest excessively low densities increased without assuming the construction of any more medium density housing by a serious review of contents of DCP including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street widths</li> <li>• Front and side setbacks (p.74, p.96) should not work against low impact ways to increase density such as town houses and villas</li> <li>• Car parking requirements (e.g. environmental living requires triple garage suggest as being orwellian pt 16 p.76)</li> <li>• Open space standards-why shop top housing would require communal open space (p.100)</li> </ul> <p>23. Designation of area near station as Business “park” will not make proper use of its location if it conforms to the appropriate development standards. Business parks are by their nature impermeable to pedestrians and walking distances are needlessly long.</p>	<p>These issues have been addressed through separate work by the Department on housing diversity.</p> <p>Business Park near Leppington Station is part of the Leppington North Priority Precinct and already rezoned as part of the precinct planning process.</p>
Planning Institute of Australia	115905	Master Planning Process	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Generally support master planning process for Leppington and Growth Centres and consider it to have been streamlined and strategic.</li> <li>2. Welcome the release of Indicative Layout plan to guide future urban development and comment partnership between DP&amp;E and Camden Council to produce sound masterplan.</li> <li>3. Concern raised about rate of development within Growth Centres is slow and redevelopment ad hoc and consider that a process which is fair, reasonable and</li> </ol>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
 Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			<p>transparent is required to speed up development. Suggest include following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process for acquiring land and /or bringing together landowners to consolidate land to make more attractive for development-provide incentives</li> <li>• Consider utilising a development authority to assist in achieving development outcomes</li> <li>• Relocation of agricultural pursuits to nearby locations to continue supply of fresh healthy food to Sydney and retention of skilled farmers nearby.</li> </ul>	<p>Strategies to ensure timely provision of infrastructure and further encourage development being investigated outside precinct planning process.</p>
		<p>Staging of Rezoning</p>	<p>4. Support approach as manages artificial inflation of land values, and takes pressure off Council and infrastructure agencies to deliver less cost effective infrastructure.</p> <p>5. Benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• giving land owners greater capacity to plan to develop their land; and</li> <li>• ensures that they don't have to pay higher rates on land that can't be developed because there is no infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p>6. While idea sound that is what the planning and development agencies in Growth Centres have always tried to do but staged rezoning does not mean that mismatches between infrastructure funding/delivery and development will not arise.</p> <p>7. Concerns raised about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• possible limitations on the continuance of existing uses</li> <li>• Provide certainty to tenants</li> <li>• Approach may not affect inflation of land values</li> <li>• Impact the ability of land owners in other sub precincts to sell their land if land values decrease</li> <li>• Create unnecessary costs and delays associated with rezoning and exhibition later</li> <li>• Potentially slow down the rate of development</li> </ul>	<p>The staged approach better aligns the delivery of infrastructure with the ability to develop. The staged approach to rezoning means land will be rezoned when a commitment from the government or a developer is in place to provide essential infrastructure, reducing the time between rezoning and the ability for land to be developed. The Department will continue to work with developers and infrastructure agencies such as Sydney Water and Endeavour Energy to ensure the timely rezoning of land aligns closely with the delivery of infrastructure and enables development to happen.</p> <p>Existing use rights will allow landowners to continue lawfully commenced operations.</p>

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
 Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
		Infrastructure Provision	<p><b>Delivery of Infrastructure</b></p> <p>8. Range of measures identified for design, funding and delivery of infrastructure welcomed but raise issues as below</p> <p>9. Infrastructure delivery schedule and initial development as actual rate of development differ from those assumed there are potential risks of underutilised infrastructure or constraints in available service capacity.</p> <p>10. Higher than anticipated demand may require earlier provision of infrastructure.</p> <p>11. Delivery of infrastructure will require significant ongoing commitment from State government.</p> <p>12. Important delivery of both physical and social infrastructure is matched to support new communities.</p> <p>13. Developing sequencing.</p>	Noted. Refer above.
			<p><b>Land Acquisition</b></p> <p>14. Land fragmentation and can significantly delay infrastructure delivery and makes it difficult to determine likely development fronts for the Precinct.</p> <p>15. Support DP&amp;E continuing to work with key service authorities to develop appropriate funding, and with landowners and developers to coordinate future discussions with service authorities.</p> <p>16. Recommend clear practical pathway to co-ordinated approach of land ownership or creation of consortia be developed.</p> <p>17. Consideration be given to utilising development authority such as Urban Growth to assist facilitating co-ordinated approach to consolidation of land</p> <p>18. A fair process for compulsory acquisition which is transparent be established for public benefit.</p> <p>19. Given it is matched with infrastructure commitments and is a logical progression because of proximity to transport.</p>	Noted. Refer above.
			<p><b>s. 94 Contributions</b></p> <p>20. Funding of local infrastructure above the s.94 contributions cap. Currently s94 contributions limited to \$30000 per lot. Likely that average contribution will exceed cap and would need to be compensated by other means due to significant amount of infrastructure required and constrained land.</p> <p>21. Number of mechanisms proposed to compensate such as special rate variation and contributions gap funding under NSW Local Infrastructure Growth Fund.</p> <p>22. Recommend Camden Council work in collaboration to develop strategies to meet cost of infrastructure. Council investigate support for increase to rates for certain period to support specific projects</p> <p>23. Notes s.94 Plan will be reviewed by Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal prior to adoption by Council to qualify for funding under Local Infrastructure Growth Fund.</p> <p><b>Delivery Sequencing</b></p> <p>24. Timely provision of primary utilities in line with rezoning and development can prevent development from occurring in release areas.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Where Section 94 costs exceed \$30,000 per residential lot, the Local Infrastructure Growth Scheme (LIGS) funds the gap between the maximum contribution that councils can charge developers and what it actually costs councils to deliver the infrastructure, such as roads, stormwater facilities and public open space.</p> <p>To be eligible for funding, a council must have a development contributions plan reviewed and approved by the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (IPART).</p>

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			Proposed rezoning sequence is considered reasonable	
<b>Macarthur Developments Narellan on behalf of D &amp; AI P/L</b>  Adjoining precinct	115885	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. State D&amp;AI P/L is a landowner of the Emerald Hills property to the east of the Leppington Precinct. Emerald Hills rezoned to urban on 19 Sept 2014 (map attached).</li> <li>2. No objections to rezoning but raise issues below.</li> </ol>	Noted.
		St Andrews Rd	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. St Andrews Rd- future of the road raised by TfNSW during rezoning of Emerald Hills and recommend Camden Council convene working group to resolve issues.</li> <li>4. Part of road east of Camden valley Way was included in the ILP for East Leppington Precinct as a collector road but in current Leppington Precinct exhibition road is shown as a 4 lane east-west sub arterial connection between the Precinct, areas to east and F5.</li> <li>5. This is big change in role for road and believe there is a strong nexus between role of road and the Growth Centre Precincts.</li> <li>6. Should Department proceed to broaden function of road its upgrading should be funded via States 'Special Infrastructure Contribution' (designed as a SIC road).</li> <li>7. Would be happy to discuss.</li> </ol>	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Leppington Progress Association</b>  P.O. Box 123 Leppington 2179	115785	Location of School	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Association raises concern about proposed location of primary school on Ingleburn Rd Leppington and oppose it for following reasons.</li> <li>2. Future conditions placing safety of parents and students accessing the site in danger.</li> <li>3. The vast volume of traffic that will be generated at the site due to its proximity to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Camden Valley Way a major 4 lane arterial rd only one block away and resulting traffic past the school.</li> <li>• Proposed Business Park on the northern side of Ingleburn Rd and traffic generated from it.</li> <li>• Traffic generated from proposed medium density housing estate on eastern side of Byron Rd.</li> <li>• A functioning school with drop offs and pick ups morning and afternoon.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Local knowledge also state that Ingleburn Rd is used by a huge number cars as short cut to Bringelly and Penrith which leads to higher volume of traffic currently travelling along the road, at speed, presently.</li> <li>5. Noise levels from the constant vehicular traffic will also make site unsuitable for school.</li> <li>6. Suggest that the current school site on Rickard Rd be maintained and redeveloped to cater for influx of students from development. It is a large school site and already owned by government and holds historical significance to the community.</li> </ol>	The school has been moved off Ingleburn Road. Refer to Section 4.6 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Scenic Hills Association</b>  P.O Box 5946 Minto 2566	115913	St Andrews Rd	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Surprised at inclusion of St Andrews Road as 4 lane sub-arterial road connecting Camden Valley Way to the F5 and Campbelltown Rd as outlined in Access and Transport Strategy.</li> <li>2. Road currently intersected by the Upper Canal and cannot be accessed past this point from Camden Valley Way.</li> <li>3. Understood western side adjoining Camden Valley way would be upgraded to accommodate green field developments that have been allowed to proliferate but were never part of original South West Growth Centre. However we have been constantly assured by the Growths Centre Commission and RMS that the eastern side of the Upper Canal would not be touched.</li> <li>4. St Andrews Rd east of Upper Canal to F5 is a rural road that traverses important stands of critically endangered Cumberland Plain Woodland that is part of a wildlife corridor.</li> <li>5. It is also lined with sensitive land uses such as two schools, two Carmelite Monasteries, a Carmelite Retreat Centre and the last intact 19<sup>th</sup> century rural estate in Campbelltown area</li> </ol>	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
 Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			<p>which has been protected up until now by Campbelltown’s Scenic Hills Environmental Protection Area and supported by NSW Heritage Council for decades.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Road has never been scheduled for upgrading and is a surprise in Precinct Plan to us and Campbelltown Council.</li> <li>7. St Andrews Rd not included in the South West Growth Centre Structure Plan 2010 and Growth Centres Commission and Department until now told us that it has consistently rejected approaches from developers to include it.</li> <li>8. Recent discussions with RMS confirmed they had no intention of opening road up across the canal.</li> <li>9. Would expect such major variation to Structure Plan would have warranted explanation but no discussion in Precinct Plan.</li> <li>10. State aware that developers and speculators who have acquired land in Campbelltown’s Scenic Hills Protection Area have been lobbying for many years to open up St Andrews Rd to connect to the F5 to facilitate rezoning of the area.</li> <li>11. Reports of above have come from Growth Centres Commission &amp; RMS.</li> <li>12. Reasons for not upgrading or opening road across the Upper Canal are unchanged as follows:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An F5 interchange at road would disrupt traffic flow given close proximity to interchanges at Raby and Campbelltown Rds.</li> <li>• Previous consistent rejection by Growth Centres Commission (2007 &amp; 2013) on environmental grounds and consequent costs.</li> <li>• Sensitive land uses adversely affected.</li> <li>• Compromising existing compatible land uses in Scenic Hill Protection Area and opening up access increase likely loss of Scenic Hills to inappropriate and unwanted development.</li> <li>• The Scenic Hills have been fiercely protected by local community and council since 1945.</li> <li>• Preservation of the Hills and its heritage has had planning support since inclusion in <i>The New Cities of Campbelltown, Camden and Appin Structure Plan 1973</i> and confirmed in 2 studies done for Campbelltown’s Draft LEP 2014.</li> </ul> </li> <li>13. Concern for lack of clarity in the Transport Strategy regarding classification and role of road.</li> <li>14. Does not seem to have been any consultation on ‘Draft’ plan and concerned that it’s partial inclusion in Plan would give it statutory effect while the Draft plan it derives from remains not agreed and at odds with <i>South West Growth Centre Structure Plan, 2010</i>.</li> <li>15. Concerned its inclusion seems to be a revival of a planned expansion to St Andrews Rd that was originally part of <i>The New Cities Of Campbelltown, Camden and Appin 1973</i> which Growth Centres Commission told us was to be abandoned with planning for South West Growth Centre.</li> <li>16. A search under GIPA Act 2009 last year indicated that DP&amp;I (Dept Planning and Infrastructure) was still working on the latter assumption in mid-2013 and declared that land it owned –part Minto special Uses Corridor between St Andrews Rd and F5 road corridor was ‘no longer needed for its planning purpose’ (PMIN13/347/6).</li> <li>17. Concern that Campbelltown Rd on eastern end of St Andrews Rd no longer operates efficiently as part of this network since it can be accessed directly by cars heading north</li> </ol>	



Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
 Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			<p>from Campbelltown.</p> <p>18. Clearly large network has not been thought through and inadequate communication and consultation with relevant authorities.</p> <p>19. Strongly object to inclusion in Plan of St Andrews Rd as expanded sub-arterial Rd connecting Camden Valley Way to Campbelltown Rd and the F5 and to any opening up of road across the Upper Canal. Also object to sudden appearance in the Plan and request any planning within Precinct that depends on St Andrews Rd is put on hold subject to full consultation on the broader Draft RMS Road Network Strategy for the SW Growth Centre and its role in a revised Structure Plan which should also consider public transport options.</p>	
<p><b>Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church Wollongong</b></p> <p>Bishop of Wollongong                      (Rev Peter Ingham)                      Xavier Centre 38                      Harbour St                      Wollongong</p>	115831	General	<p>1. Support Precinct Plan but raises issues (below)</p> <p>2. Highlights site of St Mary’s Church and acquisition of land for possible future school.</p>	Noted.
		Water supply	<p>3. Has been identified that water trunk system will require upgrade to service Precinct to be undertaken approximately 2020.</p> <p>4. Timing considerations suggested within Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan may affect the program currently being discussed within the Diocese of Wollongong for the proposal to establish a catholic School on the St Mary’s site.</p> <p>5. Remains aim of Catholic Education Office to provide facilities at the time of resident occupation and requires guaranteed water services at this time.</p> <p>6. Suggested timeline for school establishment would be 2018/19.</p> <p>7. Timeline will be affected by Precinct Plan Item 6: Local provisions-specifically important to proposed development on St Mary’s site is following provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Public utility infrastructure</i> which requires that Council must not grant consent unless public utility infrastructure is available to the site or made available when required.</li> </ul>	Proponents will need to liaise with Sydney Water to ensure timely provision of water. Existing infrastructure has limited capacity to service initial development.
		Local Roads	<p>8. Currently a local road is depicted within the land holdings of the Trustees on draft Plan. The placement of road will reduce available land area to enable development of suitably sized school.</p> <p>9. Road may not be required if land owned by the Trustees is consolidated to provide single lot.</p>	<p>Local road alignments are shown so as to promote orderly development of fragmented land and encourage cooperation between land owners. The local road network surrounding the proposed school is able to be amended at development stage to accommodate the intended development pattern.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
		Public Open Space	10. Site of proposed catholic school not in vicinity of any major sportsground within Plan. It would be appreciated if there is an opportunity for this consideration to be included in any proposed modifications of layout. 11. Catholic Education Office supports principle of shared use of play space.	Open space is located to the north of Ingleburn Road in Leppington North and in various locations to the south. Noted.
		St Andrews Rd	12. Further submission in relation to clarification in the connection of Camden Valley Way and Campbelltown Rd by the extension of St Andrews Rd. 13. Are mindful and agree with concerns raised in submissions from Sister Jocelyn Kramer of the Carmelite Nuns and Fr Paul Maunder and Fr Gregory Burke of Discalced Carmelite Order in that a major four lane Rd would significantly alter the peaceful amenity of the Retreat Centres and have negative impact on the long term historical use of the sites. 14. Important that green space of Scenic Hills is preserved for future generations.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Sister Jocelyn Kramer OCD, Discalced Carmelite Nuns</b>  Carmel of Mary and Joseph 345 St Andrews Rd VaroVille NSW 2565	114370	St Andrews Rd	1. Submission written on behalf of Carmelite Nuns and as a member of the Scenic Hills Association and object to an aspect of the Strategy. 2. Object to proposal to develop St Andrews Rd as 4 lane sub-arterial road linking Camden Valley Way and the F5. 3. SW Growth Centre Structure Plan makes no reference to St Andrews Rd and shows no extension eastward from Camden Valley way to F5 or Campbelltown Rd. How does this appear in the Precinct Plan and not the SW Growth Centre. 4. Not first time that major development in Camden LGA has lacked regard for Scenic Hills, also happened with the Emerald Hills Development which was revised and re-exhibited after public criticism. 5. If upgrade proceeds there will be major impacts on the community, the Scenic Hills, local heritage and the Carmelite communities at St Andrews Rd at Varroville. 6. Main concern is absence in Draft Plan of any justification for a third connection between Camden Valley Way and Campbelltown Rd and F5. 7. Question the justification and safety of a third access point on F5 in addition to Raby Rd and Brooks Rd. 8. Four lane road will have adverse effect on sensitive land uses either side of St Andrews Rd at Varroville including Our Lady of Mount Chapel parish church, Mt Carmel Retreat Centre and priory, the Carmel of Mary and Joseph and Varro Ville House (State Heritage listed). 9. Most serious impact will be on Mt Carmel Retreat Centre which is a centre for people seeking spiritual refreshment in a tranquil semi-rural setting for days or weeks. Centre is close to St Andrews Rd and was refurbished in 2012. It is the main house of Discalced friars in Australia and hosts visitors from around the world. 10. If St Andrews becomes a four lane sub-arterial road there will be constant traffic, noise and lighting impacting on the Centre and could lead to centre becoming unviable. 11. The Carmelite nuns will also experience permanent traffic noise, lighting and disruption to the tranquil environment they have chosen for their monastery life. The widening of road will seriously diminish the quality of the semi-rural environment. 12. There will be a negative impact on local heritage associated with State listed Varro Ville House and its heritage landscape. Probable that land may be resumed from the estate for the road widening and therefore compromising its landscape and heritage dams built by Charles Sturt. The house is one of the most significant heritage houses in area and should be quarantined from development and conserved. 13. The road connection across the Sydney Water Channel (heritage listed) and widening will involve destruction of important stands of critically endangered Cumberland Plain Woodland. The loss of habitat will impact on bird life and fauna in the area and wildlife corridors are rapidly diminishing in the area. Biodiversity offsets do not compensate. 14. Believe it is important to conserve scenically beautiful green space of Scenic Hills area for	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
 Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			the quality of life and spiritual wellbeing of present and future residents 15. Support Campbelltown Councils concerns and ask for the upgrade of St Andrews Rd be removed.	
Fr Gregory Burke OCD and Fr Paul Maunder OCD, Discalced Carmelites Varroville  Mount Carmel Priory 247 St Andrews Rd Varroville NSW 2566	115853	St Andrews Rd	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Oppose proposal to develop St Andrews Rd as a Four lane sub arterial road or arterial road linking Camden Valley way to Campbelltown Rd and M5.</li> <li>2. Confusion in the Traffic Strategy documentation as to classification and role of the Road (p.13). If it is to be a link road then consequences are drastic.</li> <li>3. Carmelite friars have owned land since 1964 and have worked in conjunction with the Government to rehabilitate the land.</li> <li>4. The land has great visual amenity valued by their neighbours and Catholic community groups.</li> <li>5. The SW Growth Centre Structure Plan makes no reference to St Andrews Rd and shows no extension eastward from Camden Valley Way to the M5/M31 or Campbelltown Rd. Would like to know how this happened?</li> <li>6. If proceeds then major implications for the Community, The Scenic Hills, local heritage and the Carmelite communities on St Andrews Rd.</li> <li>7. Main concern is absence in Draft Plan of any justification for a third connection between Camden Valley Way and Campbelltown Rd and M5.</li> <li>8. Question the justification and safety of a third access point on M5 in addition to Raby Rd and Brooks Rd.</li> <li>9. Four lane road will have adverse effect on sensitive land uses either side of St Andrews Rd at Varroville including Our Lady of Mount Chapel parish church, Mt Carmel Retreat Centre and priory, the Carmel of Mary and Joseph and Varro Ville House (State Heritage listed).</li> <li>10. Most serious impact will be on Mt Carmel Retreat Centre which is a centre for people seeking spiritual refreshment in a tranquil semi-rural setting for days or weeks. Centre is close to St Andrews Rd and was refurbished in 2012. It is the main house of Discalced friars in Australia and hosts visitors from around the world.</li> <li>11. If St Andrews becomes a four lane sub-arterial road there will be constant traffic, noise and lighting impacting on the Centre and could lead to centre becoming unviable.</li> <li>12. The Carmelite nuns will also experience permanent traffic noise, lighting and disruption to the tranquil environment they have chosen for their monastery life. The widening of road will seriously diminish the quality of the semi-rural environment.</li> <li>13. There will be a negative impact on local heritage associated with State listed Varro Ville House and its heritage landscape. Probable that land may be resumed from the estate for the road widening and therefore compromising its landscape and heritage dams built by Charles Sturt. The house is one of the most significant heritage houses in area and should be quarantined from development and conserved.</li> <li>14. The road connection road through Scenic Hills at Varroville has the potential to spell the end of the Scenic Hills as an area of scenic beauty and open it up to commercial development.</li> <li>15. Support Campbelltown Councils concerns and ask for the upgrade of St Andrews Rd be</li> </ol>	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			removed.	
<b>1Group P/L North Sydney on behalf of Cuneyt Kilicoglu</b>  61 Woolgen Park Rd Leppington NSW 2179  <b>Bruno Spatari</b>  71 Woolgen Park Rd Leppington NSW 2179	115863	Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Long-term strategy for Leppington and adjoining areas is a sensible approach to the highest and best use for the subject properties given the identified growth corridors.</li> <li>2. Proposed zoning of client’s properties is Recreational Open Space. Active open space should be located on inferior land not capable of quality medium density residential development and which is also adjacent to a transport hub.</li> <li>3. Given location of client’s properties believe more suited to being medium density development as proposed for adjacent blocks.</li> <li>4. Clients concerned that there will be traffic issues associated with the open space and sporting facilities proposed.</li> <li>5. Clients believe more suitable location for open space and sporting fields would be corner of Woolgen Park and Riley Rds.</li> <li>6. Request compensation that is in line with the proposed medium density developments.</li> <li>7. Clients submit proposed rezoning have not taken into account:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Its highest and most appropriate use;</li> <li>• New traffic flow considerations on Woolgen Park Rd that would be generated from adjacent medium density development;</li> <li>• Public transportation hub location; and</li> <li>• Parking and ingress and egress issues to Woolgen Park Rd.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Active open space has been identified based on numerous constraints and opportunities, and is not only limited to highly constrained land.</p> <p>The adjacent land is identified for a community centre, not medium density; medium density has been located in locations closer to employment and transport facilities.</p> <p>Traffic matters associated with future land uses will be considered as part of any required development assessment process. Transport requirements have been addressed in the precinct planning process.</p> <p>Land required for a public purpose will be acquired for the nominated use when needed, as identified in the SEPP Amendment.</p>
<b>MacroPlan Dimasi, Sydney on behalf of Mr Bruno Spitari</b> 71 Woolgen Park Rd Leppington	115031	Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr Spitari’s property is proposed to be zoned part RE1 Public Recreation and part SP2 Infrastructure.</li> <li>2. Believe that proposed quantity of recreational public open space provided is excessive and have quoted from report. The quote relates to Precinct proximity to Western Sydney Parklands and Mt Annan Botanic Gardens there are no requirements for regional level open space or recreational facilities in the Precinct. Furthermore there are existing and proposed regional level recreational facilities accessible from Precinct. Future residents will be able to access district sporting facilities in nearby Leppington North, Austral and Oran Park.</li> <li>3. Therefore in light of above submission provides there is an oversupply of active open space in Precinct and suggests rezoning Mr Spitari’s land to an alternative land use including residential or commercial.</li> </ol>	See above comments.
<b>Graceland Community for property owner of</b> 125 Eastwood Rd, Leppington	115927	Staging of Rezoning	<p><b>Submission 1- Memorandum</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Signed Memorandum (13 signatures) from landowners in Leppington requesting that their land is included in the first stage of rezoning and not the third stage.</li> <li>2. Request inclusion land between Heath Rd in South and Ingleburn Rd in the North; Dickson Road in the East and Western boundary of Leppington Precinct.</li> <li>3. Wish to express our preference to rezone entire precinct together.</li> <li>4. Express willingness to develop their land as soon as rezoned.</li> </ol> <p><b>Submission 2- Graceland on behalf of owners</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Do not support proposal of ‘Sequenced rezoning’.</li> </ol>	<p>Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging and infrastructure provision.</p> <p>Landowners can investigate opportunities to provide essential infrastructure ahead of the Government’s program.</p>

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
 Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Believe feedback from Austral Precinct rezoning is not relevant to Leppington Precinct as austral is far away from Leppington railway Station and Major City Centre whereas Leppington Precinct is in heart of happening place.</li> <li>7. Rezoning at once necessary for acceleration of development process around railway Station and major City Centre area.</li> <li>8. Notes land price already appreciated with expectation of rezoning and railway line and Council rates will be high. So proposing sequencing to keep Council rates low is a false argument.</li> <li>9. Prefer get land rezoned at earliest and develop as soon as possible.</li> <li>10. Make land north of Heath Rd as 1<sup>st</sup> Stage for Development and include land area near Eastwood Rd (between Heath Rd in South, Ingleburn Rd in North and Dickson Rd in the East and west boundary of Leppington Precinct).</li> <li>11. This area is a walkable distance from Railway Station and Major City Centre.</li> <li>12. The only 'Local Area' for entire Leppington Precinct is located in this area and will accelerate the development process.</li> <li>13. Have had discussions with Sydney Water and they propose a "pump and Rising Main" method for the area which connects to sewerage facility at Ingleburn Rd area under construction so this area can also be included in Stage 1 of development, if sufficient landowners in this area are ready.</li> <li>14. Consultant contacted landowners in the area and almost all were eager to develop their land as early as possible. Thirteen have signed a joint memorandum mentioned above.</li> <li>15. As Sydney Water is looking for certainty in usage of infrastructure and as they are giving confirmation in writing the request inclusion of area north of heath Rd in first stage of development.</li> <li>16. Additional road proposed parallel to Eastwood Rd (in front of 131,121 and 115 Eastwood Rd) at the entrance of the property (125 Eastwood Rd) is a burden to land owners. So request proposal for connection of the 'Local Road' directly to Eastwood Rd.</li> <li>17. Near Rickard Rd, Dickson Rd there is no parallel 'Local Rd' proposed at the entrance to the property. In Eastwood Rd area parallel roads just near the sub arterial are proposed. Believes this will increase the land loss and make developments unviable.</li> <li>18. Proposed widening of Eastwood Rd to a sub arterial Rd from current 20m to 29.1m. However there is already an easement for Transmission lines east of Eastwood Rd and request that the additional 9.1 metres of land is not acquired for road widening as this will minimise the hardship to the landowners on the eastern side of Eastwood Rd.</li> </ol>	
Flow Systems Sydney (Leckie Terry) Suite 201 Level 2,	114386	Water Infrastructure Provision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Precinct Plan relies on outdated reports that do not reflect existing legislation and regulation around water infrastructure provision.</li> <li>2. Ignores establishment of independent water market providing water servicing strategies to developers and Government.</li> <li>3. NSW Water industry Competition Act (WIC Act) 2006 removes land release delays and improves affordability by providing developers with alternative to water based services.</li> <li>4. Plan ignores WIC Act and regulations and does not include advice from independent</li> </ol>	DP&E recommends that the delivery phasing of all infrastructure, including water and sewer, is reviewed regularly to consider additional information available regarding other potential serviceable development fronts within the precinct. Any servicing strategy is to cater for the entire Precinct's development; however the staging plan does not preclude any landowner from developing, subject to ensuring that essential is made available in accordance with its funding and delivery program. Separate



**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
Alfred St Sydney			<p>licensed water utilities only relies on studies from Sydney water and presumes the only water servicing options are for gravity fed sewers.</p> <p>5. Locks in centralised water infrastructure servicing solutions which can cost 50% more and take longer to deploy.</p> <p>6. Plan ignores land supply shortages and need for alternative faster approaches to water servicing.</p> <p>7. WIC Act enables range of alternatives that are quicker and more sustainable, taking flexible modular approach.</p> <p>8. Flow Systems already providing or committed to provide 30000dwellings in NSW using decentralised water centres.</p> <p>9. Decentralised water centres being proposed in Qld and other states.</p>	arrangements will need to be made with servicing authorities.
		Water Cycle Management Strategy	<p>10. Section 4.4 of Plan refers to water Servicing Strategy and states it must be updated with outcomes of 2013 review.</p> <p>11. The Plan ignores current opportunities committing only to conventional full potable supply from elevated water reservoirs. This is misinformed and locks out current alternatives.</p> <p>12. Section 4.5 Wastewater (Sewer) servicing strategy reference document is "Proposed water and wastewater infrastructure plan for South West Growth Centre" and prepared about 2007and included in environmental assessment to DoPI in 2009 for Part 3AProject Approval.</p> <p>13. In March2012 Sydney Water withdrew the application as recycled water withdrawn from servicing requirements for Growth Centres.</p> <p>14. WIC Act licensed water utilities can provide recycled water for less cost.</p> <p>15. Section 4.6 discussed recycled water as if it is part of Sydney Water strategy.</p> <p>16. Strategy prepared by Parsons Bickernoff (PB) in 2012 based on Sydney Water information. Since then Sydney Water has been working on alternative wastewater treatment programs in Growth Centres.</p> <p>17. August 2014 Sydney Water held seminar to indicated centralised sewer systems including recycling of refined water now part of solutions for Growth Centres. Report by PB and Planning Report in exhibition were silent on alternative servicing solutions.</p>	See above comments.
		EPA license conditions	<p>1. Exhibited material fails to point out that now defunct Growth Centre plan is unworkable due to EPA license conditions regulating discharges to South Creek and its tributaries including Kemps Creek.</p> <p>2. Gravity based sewer proposed is dependent upon sewer being pumped out of the Kemps Creek catchment to Liverpool system.</p>	Noted.
		Water systems	<p>1. Public centralised systems are more expensive than private because decentralises systems can be deployed in flexible modules following the development schedule, include recycled water which reduces size of potable mains and treatment upgrades.</p>	See above comments.
		Staging of Development	<p>1. Due to land fragmentation it will be difficult for large developers to acquire over a</p>	The IDP acknowledges that standard practice to the delivery of infrastructure to urban growth areas needs to be tailored to



**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			<p>reasonable time and competitive price. Small developers may not have funds for sewer main extensions and therefore approach that enables only centralised water infrastructure that costs more and will be restrictive.</p> <p>2. DP&amp;E needs to consult more broadly with the industry to determine alternative servicing scenarios and release land where services can be provided.</p>	<p>enable development in Precinct. The Department will continue to work with key service authorities and other parts of Government to develop appropriate funding and delivery models that allows the timely delivery of infrastructure that is able to service development fronts as demand arises.</p> <p>Given the existing subdivision and ownership pattern in the Precinct, land owners wishing to develop or sell may need to consider the intentions of their neighbours, and where these align, cooperate to foster interest from the development industry and to demonstrate to infrastructure agencies that there is a willingness to develop the land. The Department will work with landowners and developers that are interested in developing their land to help coordinate the future discussions and planning with servicing authorities.</p>
<p><b>Speedy Seedlings and Supplies Pty Ltd (John Vella)</b>            PO Box 167            Riley Rd            Leppington            2179</p>	115132	Business Impacts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to Plan in current design.</li> <li>2. Detrimentially affects Riley Rd premises of my company and business.</li> <li>3. Owns 6 contiguous properties in Riley Rd and Plan only include 1 which is 83 Riley Rd which includes water supply and storage for property.</li> <li>4. Business not functional without good water supply and water quality no longer controlled by business is fatal as requires high quality.</li> <li>5. Concerns related to polluted runoff impacting on business.</li> <li>6. Proposed use of remaining land on single affected property is recreation land and prevents receiving of any significant offsetting benefit.</li> <li>7. Business will not be able to continue to operate in location and believes it to be unfair outcome of government decision.</li> </ol>	<p>The site is located within Stage 4 and is predominantly proposed to be zoned for public purposes. The delay in rezoning will provide the owners with additional time to plan for eventual relocation. The issue of including additional land in the precinct was considered as part of the boundary review process and this issue will not be re-visited as part of the current precinct planning process.</p>
		Precinct Boundary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Refer to previous submission regarding amending Precinct boundary.</li> <li>9. Request boundary realigned as per submission above.</li> </ol>	See comments above.
<p><b>Hunt &amp; Hunt Lawyers Sydney</b> on behalf of the Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation (SASC)</p>	115931	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SASC owners of 50 Heath Rd and 26 Byron Rd Leppington.</li> <li>2. Anglican Church Property Trust owner of 30 Heath Rd Leppington.</li> <li>3. Properties purchased for a proposed church and school and are within Precinct.</li> </ol>	See Section 4.6 in the Finalisation Report.
		Biodiversity Certification	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. On purchase of land s.194 certificate for each parcel said that it did not include or compromise critical habitat.</li> <li>5. Minister conferred Biodiversity Certification on land known as 50 Heath Rd, Leppington. The land within 30 and 50 Heath Rd and 26 Byron Rd, Leppington were certified for development, this remains in force indefinitely or for period as the Minister determines or specifies in the order. To amend Minister may modify by order</li> </ol>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The proposed Public Recreation (RE1 zone) land currently shown on the exhibited Indicative Layout Plan (ILP) within the school site contains Additional High Conservation Value Vegetation (AHCVV), vegetation that has been mapped since the original Growth</p>

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			<p>published in NSW Government Gazette.</p> <p>6. Approximately 1.7 ha on the northern part of Heath Rd is proposed to be RE1 Public Recreation and Educational Establishments are not permissible. This land fell within Biodiversity Certification in 2007.</p> <p>7. SASC relied upon s.149 certificate and Biodiversity Certification.</p> <p>8. With zoning of land to RE1 the Biodiversity Certification appears useless as appears zoning has arisen to protect biodiversity values identified in Ecological Australia P/L Report.</p> <p>9. SASC had an ecologist ground truth the 1.7 ha and has advised that land not worthy of being removed from Biodiversity Certification.</p> <p>10. Assessment of consistency of 1.7ha does not contribute to existing 2000ha of existing native vegetation to be retained.</p> <p>11. Further difficulty of rezoning to RE1 is there is no road access to this land and will be contained within boundaries if proposed Anglican school and not appropriate to give access over this land.</p> <p>10. Request Biodiversity certification is respected and RE1 zoning is reversed and land zoned SP2 for schools or R2 like surrounding land as schools permissible in R2 zone.</p>	<p>Centres vegetation mapping in 2007. The subject vegetation is located on certified land which means it does not have to be retained but is worthy of consideration for retention with an appropriate sympathetic land use such as open space.</p> <p>However, it is recognised that for the school site to operate efficiently, the location of the open space as proposed would sever the site and limit the integration of components of the school.</p> <p>Open space must be retained on site as it contributes to the quantum of open space required for the precinct as a whole. The open space will be relocated to the north east of the site to adjoin the Council owned area of open space.</p> <p>The site will not be zoned SP2 Special Purposes. An SP2 zoning for a school site is generally applied to a public school, at the request of the Department of Education for acquisition purposes or to a school site that is of regional significance and/or 20ha in area or greater.</p>
<p><b>Ingham Planning</b> on behalf of Anglican Church Property Trust and the Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation</p>	<p>115865</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>1. Submission relates to properties 30 Heath, 50 Heath and 26 Byron Rd Leppington.</p> <p>2. Purchased for church and school for integrated common use facilities.</p> <p>3. s.149 certificates on purchase state land does not have critical habitat and says no requirement to conserve or preserve any part of the site for threatened species.</p>	<p>See Section 4.6 in the Finalisation Report for a discussion on the school site.</p>
		<p>Rezoning</p>	<p>4. Now less than 4 months since issue of s.149 1.7ha on northern part Heath Rd proposed to be zoned RE1 and this zoning will reduce value of land and make operation of the school difficult.</p> <p>5. Request rezoning of whole site to SP2 Infrastructure like other schools in Precinct to allow for school to be built.</p> <p>6. Proposed Church site 30 Heath Rd is best left R2 as only part of this land required for church.</p> <p>7. Complete integration of school site between northern and southern site is necessary as without it would be difficult to have aesthetically pleasing and viable integrated school. Essential for the functioning of the school site that direct access be available to the northern lot 26 Byron Rd through the vegetation on the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest triangular strip of land on western side of 50 heath Rd owned by Council could be preserved as additional vegetation instead.</li> </ul>	<p>See above comments.</p>

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
		Biodiversity Certification	<p>8. All information up until exhibition did not include subject land in preservation zone or zone required to be acquired by Council. This present identification of additional High conservation Value Vegetation not required to satisfy Growth Centre’s Biodiversity Certification Order.</p> <p>9. Appears that other land nearby identified as containing Shale Plains Woodland identified under the TSC act and EPBC Act have not been required to be retained while 50 Heath Rd vegetation is only identified under TSC Act and shown as being retained. Justification for this decision not provided.</p> <p>10. Surprised current Growth centres Biodiversity Certification does not discuss the higher order Shale Plains Woodland identified in Precinct Planning Report and why Certification made by Minister is now not valid.</p> <p>11. Attached report by Mr Dominic Fanning of Gunninah discussed vegetation on 50 heath Rd and concludes that it is not worthy of retention and that Ministers Biodiversity Certification should stand.</p>	See above comments.
		Roads	<p>12. Need for some roads within Precinct ILP be amended to allow a church and school be developed on site.</p> <p>13. There are at least 3 roads within 50 Heath Rd and 4 roads within 26 Byron Rd which will need removal. Plan indicates that this can be reasonably satisfied. At 30 heath Rd there is 1 road which passes through that land that could be retained and still allow the church to be developed.</p> <p>14. Due to small scale of ILP difficult to determine road setback but request 30m to allow typical residential subdivision allotment depth.</p>	Roads shown are indicative only. Final road layout can be determined at development application or subdivision stage.
		Growth Centres Biodiversity Certification Report	<p>15. Lands shown as Shale Plains Woodland within Precinct Report are not shown in Growth Centres BC Report by Eco Logical Australia.</p> <p>16. Report identifies in respect of Precinct the assessment has been prepared to satisfy the relevant biodiversity measure however Growth Centres Biodiversity Certification report there is nothing in it that would identify why Shale Plains Woodland shown on Figure 5-4 of Precinct Planning Report has been excluded from discussion.</p> <p>17. In Growth Centres BC Report p.13 is a comment that land zoned RE1 and SP2 will be under the ownership of Camden Council however no reason why area on 50 Heath Rd should be dedicated to Council.</p> <p>18. Not desirable to dedicate to Council as land with school being on either side.</p> <p>19. Suggest exclusion of discussion of the Shale Plains Woodland identified in Precinct Planning Report indicates there is another agenda being undertaken in relation to land.</p> <p>20. Further anomaly with Growth Centres BC Report in area of Shale Plains Woodland to SW of 50 Heath Rd connects directly via corridor of vegetation to the watercourse system running north. Council oval and rec area west of Byron Rd and north of Heath Rd has vegetation which would extend to creek with this providing habitat corridor which connects to 50 Heath Rd. Why no attention given to habitat corridors is not explained.</p> <p>21. On p.7 Growth Centres BC Report concerning ground trothing of native vegetation Eco</p>	See above comments.

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			<p>Logical have not understood the biodiversity measure stated in Relevant Biodiversity Measure (RBM) “13”. Provision is not to add to the certified area additional land but to exclude any certified land that no longer satisfies the requirement. Clause 11 and 12 make no reference to adding additional vegetation but only refer to clearing if vegetation no longer meets biodiversity measure.</p> <p>22. To add section in 50 Heath Rd would be contrary to Minister’s 2007 Certificate.</p> <p>23. The area of additional high conservation value vegetation should be removed.</p> <p>24. Following Appendix included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix I Concept Plan of church and school</li> <li>• Appendix II Submission of Hunt &amp; Hunt</li> </ul> <p>25. Appendix III Report by D Fanning of Gunninah</p>	
Aleksander & Sasha <b>Mielczarek</b> Razorback NSW	115833	Rezoning	<p>1. Objects to land use-specific rezoning of land and would prefer Government apply a residential zoning over all of the land and then say that within that area infrastructure like schools will be provided when needed. Provides flexibility to land developer. Considers the property located on Ingleburn Rd which will soon be 4 lane highway and not suitable for a school.</p>	<p>Fragmented nature of precinct requires identification of suitable sites for public infrastructure and to support the acquisition process.</p> <p>The school proposed in Stage 1 is being moved slightly south so it has no frontage to Ingleburn Road. The balance of the site fronting Ingleburn Road is proposed to be R3 Medium Density Residential.</p>
<b>Planzone Consulting</b> on behalf of Ali Hammoud Liverpool NSW 26 Rickard and 116 Heath Rd Leppington NSW	115138	Rezoning	<p>1. Concerns raised by owners that proposed E4 zoning on eastern side of creek is unreasonable and severely restrictive.</p> <p>2. Review of technical studies indicates concerns warranted and there is scope for reconsideration.</p> <p>3. Subject sites to east of Creek zoned E4 not identified as containing any significant environmental characteristics, biodiversity or riparian value including endangered species or bushfire, flooding and geotechnical constraints that warrant this zoning.</p> <p>4. Requests land be changed to R2 to provide consistent planning approach.</p> <p>5. Also requested that same maximum building height, minimum dwelling density and ILP be applied to the subject part of those that are proposed to be zoned R2 and adjoin the site to the east.</p>	<p>The E4 zoning has been used for flood affected land and APZs where required. Development is limited on this land, hence the large lot sizes and minimum lot size requirements. The zoning is not proposed to be reviewed for the E4 land.</p>
<b>Ayouch Khodr</b> 51 Ridges Square Leppington NSW 2179	115119	Rezoning	<p>1. Disappointed and concerned about rezoning sequence. Land will be in Stage 4.</p> <p>2. In November 2011 when Leppington Precinct released residents were promised that at end of 2014 lands would be rezoned but now staged.</p> <p>3. Objects to enforcement of draft Precinct Plan as will have adverse effects on land as the high density area will bring pollution and traffic congestion and land will remain rural for a long time.</p> <p>4. Request Department to rezone all land residential.</p> <p>5. It would be appropriate for subject land given proximity to SW Rail Link and Major Centre, and request rezoning immediately.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.</p>
<b>Boris Tintner</b> 69 Heath Rd Leppington NSW 2179	115200	Rezoning	<p>1. Land zoned for low density housing has been reduced and may no longer be attractive to developers.</p> <p>2. May be stuck with it and the increased rates it attracts.</p> <p>3. Land zoned E4 may similarly leave us unable to subdivide as two dwellings on it are not situated to fit subdivision.</p> <p>4. Concerned about possible rate increases that as retirees may not be able to sustain and could be forced out of home.</p>	<p>The E4 zoning has been used for flood affected land and possible APZs. The remainder of the site is drainage and open space which reflect s the constraints present on the site.</p>

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
 Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Accept that Scalibrini Creek flows through our property so will impact on zoning and also believe several decisions made during drafting of Plan have compounded the effect of the topographical features on the rezoning.</li> <li>6. Believe need for exaggerated area of RE1 land on property has been created by other decisions which were dubious necessity.</li> <li>7. Decision to run drainage canal down our side of the boundary from the top of our block to the creek may look ok on paper but would run or not run against the topography.</li> <li>8. Boundary fence actually runs along shallow rounded ridge with streams of flood water presently running down both sides of this. Both of your flood maps suggest that the greater flow moves through our neighbours-so why choose our side?</li> <li>9. Issue is what would this RE1 land achieve?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is a drainage basin needed to slow 100 year flood? No-your own maps indicating drainage basins does not include it.</li> <li>• 50% seen as flood prone-ness in 100 year flood and accept this but Euclidian solution of running a straight line boundary across at right angles from our boundary means that hillside included that only carries rainfall from the hillside above.</li> <li>• Passive recreation area? Doesn't believe anybody would use such a small area when in close proximity to oval.</li> <li>• As sanctuary for flora and fauna? Presently vegetable patch surrounded by grasses and no native flora present.</li> </ul> </li> <li>10. Has been repeatedly told by Council reps that it was Councils interest to zone maximum land for development so shouldn't worry-but did not mention inflated percentage of recreational land.</li> <li>11. Objects to straight line demarcation of zone to maximise RE1 land where as properties on either side and elsewhere zone boundaries follow natural landscape. E4 zoning on other side of creek may prove counterproductive as may force targeting of larger native trees for removal to achieve larger block sizes. Larger minimum block sizes= less room to manoeuvre and run against concept E4.</li> </ol>	
<b>Donald Kennedy</b> 14 Dwyer Rd Leppington NSW 2179	112961	Staging of Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerns about staging of rezoning.</li> <li>2. Request that entire precinct released with a publicised time frame with committed dates for each 5 stages or rezone at same time.</li> <li>3. Believes opens up owners being manipulated and defrauded by unscrupulous dealers who will see as opportunity to frighten people into selling under true value.</li> <li>4. Believes it to be the responsibility of the Department to protect the rights of owners. Rate relief is easily fixed by Council only charging new land rates on properties sold for development, leaving people who stay on their land paying normal rates.</li> </ol>	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Name withheld</b> Leppington NSW	112877	Staging of Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports rezoning of entire precinct together.</li> </ol>	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Ginu Abraham</b> Bella Vista NSW 125	115789	Staging of Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does not support current Plan in relation to staging of rezoning, infrastructure provision and timing of development.</li> <li>2. Requests whole of precinct rezoned at same time to help make plans for development as ready to develop property.</li> <li>3. Points out only commercial centre in Precinct is in Eastwood Rd.</li> </ol>	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.



**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
Eastwood Rd, Leppington			4. First rezone entire precinct, second bring facilities stage wise. Include Stage 1 infrastructure up to Eastwood Rd, this will help commercial development and attract more developers and owners to develop land. Revise Council rates based on the availability of facilities not based on rezoning.	
<b>Helen &amp; Stan Ditrich</b> 36 Woolgen Park Rd Leppington	115827	Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Draft Plan Map shows a proposed St Andrews Rd extension to Woolgen Park Rd going through family home.</li> <li>2. Strongly object with plan.</li> <li>3. Don't believe people who drafted plan up visited the property or they would have seen devastating impact on the occupying family, its businesses, as well as environment.</li> <li>4. Points out house features and surrounds in mud map.</li> <li>5. Historical account of family and their story and how the property developed-with several photographs.</li> <li>6. Acknowledge additional roads required to cater for the population explosion expected but submit that consideration be given to long term residents. They were the first buyers in their road.</li> <li>7. Farm mentioned in local history book, excerpt included.</li> <li>8. Chicken business they have built up on property is their livelihood and they are the no 1 or 2 grower with the company they have contract with.</li> <li>9. Currently 5 businesses operating from the property and they work for charitable organisations from the premises-list given.</li> <li>10. Always viewed themselves as caretakers and feel close connection to nature and look after environment. List things they have done.</li> <li>11. Property is seasonal home for native and introduced wildlife, listed in submission with photographs.</li> <li>12. Support animal welfare.</li> <li>13. Suggest alternatives to proposed plan as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cancel extension of St Andrews Rd completely as Park Rd and George Rd will connect proposed Rickard Rd and will adequately service the area.</li> <li>• Change alignment and curvature of St Andrews Rd extension through our property so it completely avoids house and swimming pool area.</li> <li>• Have no objection to road passing through greenhouse.</li> <li>• Object to it going through machinery shed, garage and workshop.</li> <li>• Object to road going through house and gardens.</li> </ul> </li> <li>14. Mud map of alternatives suggested included. Request further consultation process happen with their family to create win: win scenario.</li> </ol>	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Janet Munro</b> Canberra ACT	114592	St Andrews Rd	Object to proposal to develop Road as four lane sub arterial linking Camden Valley Way to Campbelltown Rd and the F5 freeway as will impact negatively on Carmelite Communities.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Marcelle Droulers</b> Northmead NSW	114380	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Maria Maciejewska</b> Lane Cove NSW	114416	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.



Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
<b>Michael Camilleri</b> Catherine Field NSW 50 & 51 (1203) Camden Valley Way, Leppington	114763	General	Supports the broader Precinct Plan and critical infrastructure support it provides for development in SW area.	Noted
		Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to Lot 50 nominated for Open Space as impacts on future use of the land to point where site cannot be used for what it was purchased for.</li> <li>2. Purchased property with intention that it would house one of the children in future.</li> <li>3. This open space in addition to land acquired by RMS in 2012 for turning bay for St Andrews Rd extension.</li> <li>4. Questions location and topography of land allocation for open space being safest and most efficient use of land when it would be more appropriate residential land as park lands are usually low lying areas inappropriate for other uses but this lot is elevated. Also close to two main roadways and busy intersection. Believes location on busy roadway is unsafe suggest residential more appropriate.</li> </ol>	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
		Land Acquisition	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Concerned will not be awarded fair market value for the area and seeks written confirmation of the process to be used for compensation. Cites examples of court proceedings they have had with RMS over compensation for acquired land. Believes land unfairly devalued.</li> <li>6. States further disadvantage by not sharing in the appreciated value that the open space will benefit other owners.</li> </ol>	<p>The acquisition of land is undertaken in accordance with the <i>Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991</i> (the Act).</p> <p>Most privately owned land, required by government for public purposes, is acquired by negotiation and agreement between the landholder and the acquiring authority.</p> <p>When an acquiring authority and a landholder are unable to negotiate the purchase of the land, an acquiring authority can compulsorily acquire the land for a public purpose.</p> <p>The Valuer General is required under the Act to determine the amount of compensation to be paid by the acquiring authority to the former landholder. Provision is also made for owner initiated acquisitions in cases of hardship.</p>
<b>Michelle Munzone</b> 66 Rickard Road Leppington NSW	116477	Heritage Listing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acting as Power of Attorney for parents who own property and do not want property heritage listed.</li> <li>2. House exterior may be worthy of Heritage 'tag' however interior has been fully modernised. Strongly request listing to be changed.</li> </ol>	<p>Five properties within the entire Precinct are proposed for heritage listing, 66 Rickard Road being one of them. The property still has heritage significance despite the fact the interior has been modified and is continued to be recommended for listing.</p> <p>The Statement of Significance from the heritage report is quoted: <i>66 Rickard Road has historical and aesthetic significance as one of the earliest Interwar weatherboard cottages with Art Nouveau detailing of the verandah brackets and window awning built not long after the Raby Estate subdivision of 1914. It is an intact example of the type of architecture that was advertised by Rickard as a part of the land sale of the time. The building has</i></p>

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
				<i>been extended at the rear, and the site retains the original subdivision block, which is larger than the usual suburban subdivision to allow for market gardens. As there is further land release and subdivision in this area, the item may become an increasingly rare example of an early 20<sup>th</sup> century farmlet residence.</i>
<b>Norman Walters</b> 85 Byron Rd Leppington NSW	114900	School site	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School to be built on this and neighbouring site unsuitable because of following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ingleburn Rd becoming 4 lane sub arterial road and Byron Road a 2 lane sub arterial which will make it too busy and difficult for pickups and drop offs at the school.</li> <li>Business Park across road will generate more traffic and if fire in business park school would need to be evacuated because of smoke.</li> <li>Dept of Education may not be able to provide safe bus areas.</li> <li>Noise due to busy road location.</li> <li>Maybe sufficient locations for schools in area already and better to expand original Leppington School.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Safety of pedestrians and cyclists on busy roads.</li> </ol>	<p>The school proposed in Stage 1 is being moved slightly south so it has no frontage to Ingleburn Road.</p> <p>The school is required in this vicinity as it will serve Leppington Precinct and the precinct to the north, Leppington North.</p>
<b>Patricia Newman</b> Newport NSW	114286	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Penny Ho</b> Varroville NSW	115829	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Philip Farrugia</b> 35 Ingleburn Rd Leppington NSW	116798	Heritage Listing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question whether any part of dwelling suitable for preservation.</li> <li>P.89 Non-Indigenous Heritage Study by Conybeare Morrison Intl states item fulfils criteria (a) and (c) and is of moderate significance.</li> <li>Believes close inspection of house inside and out would show it had very little significance.</li> <li>Substantial cracks in walls and no aesthetic appearance or harmony in additions to front.</li> <li>Dwelling hasn't been improved by previous owner and cannot be improved unless substantial costly changes made.</li> <li>P.105 of study says located some distance within ILP but the location of dwelling could interfere with location of one of proposed roads which passes across the lot.</li> <li>Therefore oppose any suggestion that demolition of any buildings on property should be prohibited.</li> <li>Both owners perplexed by heritage value.</li> </ol>	The property was assessed as having a moderate level of heritage significance but will be not listed as a heritage item under the SEPP.
<b>Raju Dommaraju</b> 83 Ridge Square, Leppington	114732	Staged Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surprised and disappointed by rezoning staging due to following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Huge differences in land values across sub precincts</li> <li>Drop in land value in stages 2-5</li> <li>Uneven development of suburb</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
NSW			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Underutilisation of investment in SW rail link and other other infrastructure</li> <li>• Lost opportunity for individual owners in stage 2-4 to make further investment in subdivision and home building.</li> <li>• Lost opportunity for private companies larger investment in development of whole suburb.</li> <li>• Lost opportunity for job creation and tax collection.</li> <li>• Lost opportunities for affordable housing supply.</li> </ul> <p>2. Requests accelerate provision essential services for whole suburb and rezone in one stage.</p>	
<b>Terence McBride</b> Arncliffe NSW	115160	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Thomas Komban Lazar</b> 125 Eastwood Rd Leppington NSW	113416	Staged Rezoning	Requests to be included in first stage.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Tom Kokoris</b> Queenscliff NSW 133 Ingleburn Rd Leppington	114714	Access	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Current plans have completely obliterated any form of access from Ingleburn Rd to the developable area at the higher end of the property after land acquired for storm water and environmental land takes place.</li> <li>2. Previous DA (1990) for subdivision of property (4 ha in 2 x 2ha) had conditions that provided access to the whole property over a piped watercourse and wholly contain dam on one property which is now the neighbours so watercourse doesn't flow onto my property.</li> <li>3. Object to plan as a large area for stormwater and environmental purposes is proposed to be acquired where there is no water course running through property except in front of the property where pipes were installed.</li> </ol>	The site includes developable R2 land that will provide access to the southern section of the site. Closure of the existing access will await availability of the new access. Additional drainage land required due to the significant higher density of development than the current RU4 zone.
<b>Yanjun Li</b> 74 Woolgen Park Road, Leppington	112790	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Jill Ditton</b> Balmain NSW	114290	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Lot 51 228 George Rd Leppington NSW	114206	Infrastructure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposed stormwater infrastructure taking up large portion of property and requests to have part of it moved to neighbours property.</li> <li>2. Advised by consultant that will be unable to achieve the target of R2 density in rest of property due to infrastructure.</li> <li>3. If can be moved 16m into neighbours then enough land left to subdivide (has included plan).</li> </ol>	Location of drainage reflects topography and is based on consultant's recommendation. Altering these locations is likely to result in higher construction costs. Landowner will be compensated for drainage land.
<b>Name</b>	114182	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
<b>Withheld</b> Leppington NSW				staging.
<b>Name</b> <b>Withheld</b> Box Hill VIC	114412	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Name</b> <b>Withheld</b> North Rocks NSW	114359	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Name</b> <b>Withheld</b> Lurnea NSW	114320	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Name</b> <b>Withheld</b> Leppington NSW	112792	General	Supports proposal.	Noted.
		Density	Supports density but states high density should be contained within a 400m radius of Leppington station.	Medium density locations based on both location criteria and housing supply analysis.
		Height Provisions	Height of 17m around the Local Centre off Eastwood Rd should be reduced.	Height controls around the proposed Local Centre in Stage 3 will be determined when rezoning of that stage occurs.
		Open Space	Would like to see more open space along the three creeks consistent with report by Conybeare Morrison.	The provision of open space seeks to balance the provision of good quality useable open space in accessible locations while ensuring the cost of its provision does not result in excessive contribution rates.
<b>Name</b> <b>Withheld</b> Leppington NSW	112641	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Name</b> <b>Withheld</b> Portland NSW	114325	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Name</b> <b>Withheld</b> Leppington NSW	113096	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Name</b> <b>Withheld</b> Leppington NSW	114722	Staged Rezoning	Supports staged rezoning so doesn't have to pay rates on land with no infrastructure.	Noted.
<b>Name</b> <b>Withheld</b> Leppington NSW	114882	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Name</b>	115861	Rezoning	1. Negative impact to property values.	This issue has been discussed at length with the owner and

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
<b>Withheld</b> 221 Anthony Rd Leppington			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has less benefits on community as it's adjacent to semi-rural areas with other proposed RE1 sites on Joseph Rd and George Rd.</li> <li>Lists other open and recreation space which believes to be sufficient.</li> <li>Low site better located to higher ground to give community panoramic views.</li> <li>Not consistent with s.1.2 part d of Camden Growth Centre Precincts DCP- to promote high quality urban design outcomes etc.</li> <li>There is no significant vegetation</li> <li>Not fair to lose a considerable amount from property rather than divide the loss with other properties.</li> <li>Requests cancel proposal and divide proposed RE1 equally between 3 lots, or reduce to 1000m2 from subject property.</li> </ol>	Council. The location of the park has been chosen to align with the surrounding local road network and comprise existing vegetation and suitable area for active open space. Alteration of the layout would require re-design of the road network and is not supported.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington NSW	115824	Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns relate to size and location of public space on their land and believe to be disadvantaged by it, and requests land rezoning size is reduced.</li> <li>Concerned amount of roads through property are excessive.</li> <li>These reasons will make the land unviable to develop and better to leave it as rural land.</li> </ol>	Provision of open space seek to balance the provision of good quality useable open space in accessible locations with ensuring the cost of its provision does not result in excessive contribution rates. Refer to Section 4.7 of planning report.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Camden	114954	Rezoning	<b>Owner of 80 Heath Rd Leppington</b> 7 out of 10 acres is allocated for expansion of existing oval and believe it should only be 5 acres.	Provision of open space seek to balance the provision of good quality useable open space in accessible locations with ensuring the cost of its provision does not result in excessive contribution rates. Refer to Section 4.7 of planning report.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Normanhurst	114926	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>A Mifsud</b> Leppington NSW	115889	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
		Eastwood Rd Upgrade	Residents on one side of road do not want the expansion because they will lose half of their frontage and landscaped gardens. The other side have older fibro homes and are mostly rentals with no driveways and wire fencing so better to take from this side.	
<b>Boby Paul &amp; Betty Thalody</b> Bow Bowing NSW 2566 125 Eastwood Rd Leppington	115919	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Bruno Spatari</b> 71 Woolgen Park Road, Leppington	115915	Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to property L38 DP205952 as parkland/recreation as believes would support residential subdivision alongside an electricity easement.</li> <li>Believes parkland in precinct is excessive.</li> <li>Requests property rezoned to residential.</li> </ol>	Provision of open space seek to balance the provision of good quality useable open space in accessible locations with ensuring the cost of its provision does not result in excessive contribution rates. Refer to Section 4.7 of planning report.
		Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Sub ID</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Christopher Firmstone</b> Lake Haven NSW	115857	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Clement Mitchelmore</b> Wombarra NSW	115891	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	115859	General	Supports the plan but raises issues.	
		Roadway	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns raised about planned roadway on subject property aligned with natural vegetation goes through a shed and requests realignment angled from its existing start point in the south to join the adjacent road fronting the environmental zone land to north. Diagram included.</li> <li>Requests consideration of making adjacent and forward area of block medium or high density.</li> </ol>	Given significant increase in density, ILP is not able to avoid all existing buildings. The proposed road layout may be able to be incorporated into the subdivision design at the development stage. As local roads are not zoned as SP2 the final location may be altered following design investigations.
<b>Daniel Ballantyne</b>	115849	Height Provisions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports plan but concerns raised about high rise outside of the areas close to railway station will spoil suburb.</li> </ol>	Camden Growth Centre Precincts DCP incorporates design guidelines to ensure high quality residential design. Height controls around Leppington Station were gazetted with the Leppington North Precinct Plan.
<b>Elia &amp; Mona Azzi</b> 24 Cordeaux Street, Leppington	115845	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has calculated areas of property affected by zoning, easements and roads and raises following concerns.</li> <li>House feasible</li> <li>Access to subject land will require removal of trees for extension of Phillip Rd.</li> <li>Restriction with power easement.</li> <li>Request alternate route for Phillip Rd extension.</li> <li>Does not support staged rezoning</li> </ol>	<p>Given significant increase in density, ILP is not able to avoid all existing buildings. The proposed road layout may be able to be incorporated into the subdivision design at the development stage. As local roads are not zoned as SP2 the final location may be altered following design investigations</p> <p>Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.</p>
<b>Anna &amp; Ferdinando Mazzaferro</b> 46 Hulls Road, Leppington NSW	115887	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Jisha John</b> 125 Eastwood Road, Leppington	115873	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Joseph Jobince</b>	115871	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.



**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
125 Eastwood Road, Leppington				
<b>John &amp; Jane Said</b> 15 Rickard Road, Leppington	115911	General	Supports plan but concerned that process too slow.	Noted.
<b>Jomon Varghese on behalf of the landowner (Wong &amp; Soo)</b> 107 Ingleburn Road, Leppington	115921 115925	Height Provisions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Land closest residential R3 property from Leppington Station, Major Centre and commercial area but building height proposed only 12 metres.</li> <li>2. R3 in North Leppington heights given are 21 metres and allowed for flat/unit construction.</li> <li>3. Excerpt included from North Leppington Precinct Planning Report <i>4.2.2 Changes to zoning tables</i></li> <li>4. Requests building height amended to 21 metres.</li> </ol>	Heights are based on the housing supply analysis to support a suitable residential yield.
<b>Jomon Varghese on behalf of the landowner</b> 125 Eastwood Road & 107 Ingleburn Road, Leppington	115925 115921	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Joyce Mitchelmore</b> Haberfield NSW	115893	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Justin Innasi</b> Land north of Heath Road near Eastwood Road	115867	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Mary Theresa Said</b> 138 Heath Road, Leppington	115939	General	Supports Plan but concerned it will be too slow.	Noted.
<b>Patricia Craven</b> Lugarno	115855	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Roberto Paolucci</b> 1369 Camden Valley Way, Leppington	115901	General	1. Were unaware of meeting in November 2014. Objects to the following issues.	

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
		Rezoning	2. Large part of property to be zoned SP2 Drainage, how will this affect our property?	Land identified for public purposes will be acquired by Council for the nominated use at the time it is needed.
		Access to Camden Valley Way	3. Once development through access to Camden Valley Way will be blocked off and we will be forced to use feeder road behind our property which will affect our minibus business as due to size of buses we need both driveways on Camden Valley Way. 4. Queried the location of the road and timing of development.	The site is identified for drainage and a local road. Land identified for public purposes will be acquired by Council for the nominated use at the time it is needed.
<b>Sandra Johnson, Discaled Carmelite Order</b>	115877	St Andrews Rd	Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Tan Than Ma</b> 243 McCann Rd Rossmore NSW 2557	115881	Rezoning	1. Purchased house in hope to stay for rest of lives and grow organic fruits. 2. ILP house has been selected to build drainage for the community. 3. Have supplied a diagram of land on their property they are willing to supply for local drainage.	The sizing and location of drainage areas are based upon a hydrological assessment.
<b>Tony &amp; Rosa Racca</b> 8 Joseph Road, Leppington	115907	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Name withheld</b> Blacktown	115903	Drainage	1. Trunk drainage running through property as per table 5.9 p47 Water Cycle Mgt Strategy, row B9-Western trib applies to drainage swale on property. 2. 25m would be needed for swale width and substantial amount of land will be denied its development potential. 3. Does channel flow path meet definition of watercourse. 4. Request drainage swale relocated close to northern periphery of property and a local road built on the site of the drainage channel. 5. Request swale reduced in size like in Austral and Leppington North precincts. 6. In ILP triangular part of land to NW of proposed drainage channel cannot be developed to full potential and suggest explore ways to do so and incorporate with rest of property. Maximum development should be allowed on property due to close proximity amenities.	The sizing and location of drainage are based upon a hydrological assessment. Any change would need to be based upon detailed investigations at development stage.
		Roads	7. Road along SE of drainage swale occupies excessive amount of land limiting land for development. 8. Local road layout should not restrict development and limit density so some should be moved to prevent creation of narrow parcels which make it difficult to subdivide without amalgamation. 9. Request road SE of drainage swale removed altogether.	The proposed road layout may be able to be incorporated into the subdivision design at the development stage. As local roads are not zoned as SP2 the final location may be altered following design investigations.
		Contamination	10. Land is identified as high risk contamination see p.18 of Preliminary Environmental Site	Further field work is required at development stage due to previous land use history as identified in Contamination Study.

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			Assessment. Could you provide an explanation? 11. Request further field work done to verify contamination as land currently used to grow fruit and veg and not known to have intensive agriculture use.	Further detail on reason for high risk ranking available in that Study.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116112	Rezoning	1. Request upzoning from R2 to R3 like adjacent land and directly opposite proposed school and oval, close to railway and freeways. Map attached.	Amount of R3 land provided based upon Housing Study. Refer to Housing Diversity provision for land adjacent to open space.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116110	General	Would like to be informed when development will happen as they will be losing their house to 4 lane road.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116108	Staged Rezoning	1. Objects to staged rezoning. 2. Wishes to know if Heath road will be 2 or 4 lane road.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116106	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116136	Rezoning School site	1. Suggests existing Leppington School suitable for expansion and safer than proposed Ingleburn road location. 2. Do not wish to wait long for the purchase of the property for a school. 3. Site may not be needed like Springfarm. Request R3 or R4 zoning like surrounding properties.	Refer to Section 4.6 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Bonnyrigg Heights	116134	Rezoning	1. Objects as bought the place to live on acreage now land proposed as SP2 local drainage and house will become normal house size block. 2. Would appreciate if could keep 1/3 or 1/2 of land zoned SP2 as R2.	The sizing and location of drainage land is based upon a hydrological assessment. Any change would need to be based upon detailed investigations at development stage.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116130	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116128	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116124	Rezoning	1. Insufficient R3 land 2. Ingleburn Road school site inappropriate 3. Request R3 zoning for above proposed school site	Refer to Section 4.6 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116122	Stormwater Easement	1. Object to planned drainage easement on site as would like to develop into service station and is currently in discussions with owner.	Refer to Section 4.3 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116120	General	1. Supports plan in relation zoning, council rates and infrastructure provision.	Noted
<b>Name Withheld</b> Toowoomba QLD	116118	St Andrews Rd	1. Objects to St Andrews Road upgrade.	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report.
<b>Name</b>	116116	Staged Rezoning	1. Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
<b>Withheld</b> Leppington				staging.
		Roads	2. Objects to road layout going through home.	The proposed road layout may be able to be incorporated into the subdivision design at the development stage. As local roads are not zoned as SP2 the final location may be altered following design investigations.
<b>Name</b> <b>Withheld</b> Leppington	115927 116114	Staging of Rezoning	1. Owner of 23 Dickson Rd Leppington and would like to see both sides of Dickson Rd in Stage 1.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Viet Ngyuen</b> 125 Heath Road, Leppington	116458	Heritage Listing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Property should not be listed under Plan.</li> <li>Reasons based on report by Rappoport P/L <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary heritage significance of property to be severely compromised by imminent demolition of all auxiliary buildings</li> <li>Fragmented site comprised of cottage, pond and redundant driveway will not communicate heritage values.</li> <li>Slated demolition and irrevocable loss of heritage values on property will render site unworthy of listing.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Has attached: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage Assessment by Rappoport P/L</li> <li>Structural Report by D&amp; M Consulting</li> <li>Photos in support</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>The site is located in Stage 2 of the Precinct. It is proposed to be listed as a heritage item under the SEPP. It is not listed currently under Camden’s LEP.</p> <p>In light of the advice provided by the owner (future demolition of outbuildings etc), its significance should be reviewed at part of the rezoning of Stage 2.</p>
<b>Name</b> <b>Withheld</b> Leppington	116469	General	1. Commends efforts but raises concerns that all the SEPP Maps provided for Draft ILP are now 8 years old and may not be appropriate now and raises following issues.	All draft exhibition maps and the exhibited and final ILPs were informed by current technical studies.
		School Site	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School site on SW corner Ingleburn and Byron Rd and author’s property to be zoned SP2.</li> <li>Concern with location of school onto Ingleburn Road.</li> </ol>	<p>The school proposed in Stage 1 is being moved slightly south so it has no frontage to Ingleburn Road.</p> <p>The school is required in this vicinity as it will serve Leppington Precinct and the precinct to the north, Leppington North.</p>
		Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited number of R3 zoning in 1.6km radius of major town centre.</li> <li>Leppington North/Austral provide good support for major town centre.</li> <li>Edmondson Park is not major TC yet planning proposals range from 12m up to 32m from TC.</li> <li>Requests Plan amended to include more R3 and R4.</li> </ol>	The Housing Analysis study has informed development yields and built form controls, to allow for a suitable residential yield.
		Compulsory Acquisition	8. Consider giving adequate compensation for disruption of people’s lives and expenses of re-establishing themselves.	<p>The acquisition of land is undertaken in accordance with the <i>Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991</i> (the Act).</p> <p>Most privately owned land, required by government for public purposes, is acquired by negotiation and agreement between the landholder and the acquiring authority.</p> <p>When an acquiring authority and a landholder are unable to negotiate the purchase of the land, an acquiring authority can</p>

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
				compulsorily acquire the land for a public purpose.  The Valuer General is required under the Act to determine the amount of compensation to be paid by the acquiring authority to the former landholder. Provision is also made for owner initiated acquisitions in cases of hardship.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116167	Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Property proposed to be parkland.</li> <li>2. Objects as will significantly impact on value of land.</li> <li>3. Requests residential zoning.</li> </ol>	Council will acquire land that is required for a public purpose at the time it is required.
<b>Pascoe Planning Solutions on behalf of Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116160	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Draft ILP ignores presence of existing facilities and long established use of land for commercial and integrated residential purposes.</li> <li>2. Lands current commercial and residential use benefits from existing use provisions as land currently zoned RU4.</li> <li>3. Important that planned redevelopment and timing does not discriminate against their business and continuity and optimises their return consistent with current development outcomes.</li> </ol>	Refer to Section 4.3 of the Finalisation Report.
		Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Object to zoning in ILP as use of land for low density residential and infrastructure purposes discriminates against reasonable continuance and future urban expectation of client.</li> <li>5. Holding is free of constraints which would mitigate against continued commercial and residential use.</li> <li>6. Investigations that underpin plan fail to recognise long term commercial and residential use and improvements to site.</li> <li>7. Requests rezoning to B1 to facilitate ongoing use and redevelopment capitalising on its arterial road position.</li> </ol>	Refer to Section 4.3 of the Finalisation Report.
		Infrastructure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Proposed road obliterates existing shop residence and stormwater mgt reservation renders access, parking and manoeuvring support infrastructure inoperable. Also constrain any commercial /residential redevelopment opportunities.</li> <li>9. Review of stormwater design by J. Wyndham Prince concluded significant proposed stormwater infrastructure reservation is not required to accommodate the conveyance of significant future stormwater events and the road system would manage stormwater flows.</li> <li>10. Requests deletion of stormwater reservation.</li> <li>11. Need for and location of road is challenged. Proposed road network evaluated by specialist urban designers who believe precinct can be satisfied in respect future accessibility demands by the suggested amended plan (see Annexure 'D') can be serviced by a less intrusive scenario.</li> <li>12. Included a series (A-D) of Annexures and lists a series of suggested amendments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B1 zoning</li> <li>• Height of Building be 12m not 9m</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	Refer to Section 4.3 of the Finalisation Report.

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete SP2 Local Drainage</li> <li>• Residential Density Map to T- 25 dwellings ha</li> </ul> 13. Delete drainage and road infrastructure.	
<b>Pascoe Planning Solutions on behalf of Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116158	General	1. Concern with north west boundary adopted in Plan. 2. Concern with construction of train stabling facility and amenity impacts including acoustic and light spillage.	The boundary review process was completed with a recommendation to amend the Leppington Precinct boundaries in line with that exhibited. Precinct planning of the Rossmore Precinct will occur in the future.
		Infrastructure	3. Protracted disturbance from construction of nearby train stabling facility and concerned about future amenity when it becomes operational. Acoustic and light spillage impacts- images supplied Attachment B.	Not relevant to ILP.
		Precinct Boundary	4. Cites review exercise commissioned of western boundary in Planning Report s.2.4 and that extension of NW boundary of Precinct to include Mark Rd/McCann Rd area(or his clients land) appears capable of ready inclusion into Plan in a geographic/catchment servicing context. 5. Refers to Attachments included in submission. 6. Request review of subject boundary and provide reasonable inherent market opportunity for client to relocate away from negative impacts discussed above. 7. Facilitate introduction of buffer to negative land use activities.	Precinct boundary review completed and not to be revisited at this stage.
<b>Pascoe Planning Solutions on behalf of Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116156	Rezoning	1. Clients withheld property investments and improvements waiting for rezoning. 2. Now in Stage 2. 4. Acknowledged land can't be serviced at outset however considers market forces will reflect the same should Precinct be zoned as one entity.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
		Land Rates and Staged Rezoning	3. Cited concerns around increased land rates until land disposed of or developed. Concern fails to acknowledge 'relief' available pursuant ch.15,p.8,div.2 LG&A Act s.558-599. 4. Concern with potential negative impacts of increased land values and commensurate rates payable should not be cited as reason to stage rezoning. 8. Given this and absence of any substantive reason for staging of rezoning requests review of staged rezoning and rezone whole precinct.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Pascoe Planning Solutions on behalf of Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116154		1. Submission prepared for owners of sub precinct "Camden Valley Heights" includes Annexures A-G.	Noted



**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
		Rezoning and other mapped provisions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Clients land proposed E4 and object to rezoning which discriminates against the reasonable future urban expectations.</li> <li>3. Land not subject to any prime order constraints which would mitigate zoning of R2. See Attachment D.</li> <li>4. Extensive slope and integrated building design undertaken see Annexure C which demonstrates low density 600m2 can be achieved.</li> <li>5. Requests deletion on Lot size map reference to 1000m2</li> <li>6. As land visually prominent suggests what is important is final design template incorporating street trees.</li> <li>7. Objects siting of the park in current configuration as does not optimise its hilltop setting.</li> <li>8. Suggests amendment in Annexure C proposed siting adjusted slightly to optimise hilltop setting and medium density development proposed to capitalise on high amenity setting.</li> <li>9. Requests amend height of buildings map to 12m for R3 land <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests amend density map to 25 dwellings per ha within R3 area and 15 dwellings per ha within E4.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>The land is proposed to be zoned E4 because it is located on a major ridgeline and has significant views to and from the land. The DCP now proposes additional controls for E4 visually sensitive land.</p>
		Stormwater Management Facilities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. Significant stormwater management impact on site.</li> <li>11. Review of stormwater design by J. Wyndham Prince concluded significant proposed stormwater infrastructure reservation is not required to accommodate the conveyance of significant future stormwater events and the road system would manage stormwater flows.</li> <li>12. Recommends alternative proposal in Annexure F be adopted.</li> <li>13. Amendment reflected in Plate 3.3 of J Wyndham Prince Report and mirrored in Annexure C should be reflected in ILP and associated documents.</li> </ol>	<p>The Water Cycle Management study prepared for the Leppington Precinct identified the need for a drainage strategy to support future urban development.</p>
		Staged Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14. Support property being in first stage.</li> </ol>	<p>Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.</p>
		Land Contamination	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15. Review Land capability and Salinity Study by Worley Parsons fail to establish why the quality of subject land and its history different to others surrounding which have been assigned moderate risk rating.</li> <li>16. Land despite historical vegetable production has been declared acceptable for raising livestock and similar activities.</li> <li>17. Only possible explanation is forme Ampol Service Station but was remediated in accordance with Contamination Lands Management Act. In 1994 declared suitable for activities including human habitation-see Annexure G.</li> <li>18. Sites in this submission were never part of former service station site and request reports to describe land as moderate risk.</li> </ol>	<p>Individual site specific assessment at development stage will identify suitable level of investigation, and this can be adjusted based upon previous remediation activity.</p>
		Compensation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>19. Requests that Dept ensure appropriate mechanisms in place to address monetary compensation for land and paid in timely manner. Dept expected to work with Camden</li> </ol>	<p>Council will acquire land identified for a public purpose at the time it is required.</p>

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
 Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			Council for timely delivery of infrastructure/funding/compensation.	
<b>Pascoe Planning Solutions on behalf of Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116152	Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ILP identified subject site largely for parkland.</li> <li>2. Predicted on existing vegetation of variable quality and potentially inconsistent ecological reporting.</li> <li>3. Optimum urban outcomes not reflected in ILP.</li> <li>4. Land currently zoned RU4, 2 ha minimum lot size.</li> <li>5. Proposed zoning discriminates against the reasonable future urban expectation of client.</li> <li>6. Land not subject to any prime order constraints which would mitigate residential purposes. See Annexure C.</li> <li>7. Subject land not identified on fig.5.4 TSC Act vegetation community classification.</li> <li>8. Veracity of 'Additional High Conservation Value Vegetation' in fig.5 of field validated Vegetation Biodiversity and Riparian Studies by EcoLogical is challenged.</li> <li>9. Vegetation is not of such significance to require retention in parkland reserve only part of it.</li> <li>10. View reinforced in field investigation and report prepared by ACS Environmental PL in Annexure E. Fig 1 highlights lack of veg, African Olive infestation and lack of understorey.</li> <li>11. Better quality vegetation extends onto adjacent properties N and S, see Annexure E.</li> <li>12. Suggests amendment to zoning Annexure D to R2 zoning and capitalise on high amenity open space setting while providing passive surveillance and ownership.</li> <li>13. As minimum open space should be reconfigure minimising impact on clients property and additional residential opportunities as in Annexure D. Open space area remain the same size but address prevailing vegetation qualities and urban design objectives as follows:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Realign roads for flexibility of subdivision design and conservation Cumberland Plain Woodland (CPW).</li> <li>• Consultants mapped CPW conservation maximised.</li> <li>• Reconfigure open space to provide maximum conservation area, recreation areas and same open space in ILP.</li> <li>• Facilitate stormwater management through open space and road network.</li> <li>• Remove road crossing under electricity easement consistent with cl.2.38 Camden Growth Centres DCP.</li> <li>• Bushfire risk managed through design and ongoing management.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	Provision of open space seek to balance the provision of good quality useable open space in accessible locations with ensuring the cost of its provision does not result in excessive contribution rates. Refer to Section 4.7 of planning report.
		Staging of Rezoning and Land Rates	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14. Object to proposed staging as in stage 5.</li> <li>15. Concern with potential negative impacts of increased land values and commensurate rates payable should not be cited as reason to stage rezoning.</li> <li>16. Cited concerns around increased land rates until land disposed of or developed. Concern fails to acknowledge 'relief' available pursuant ch.15,p.8,div.2 LG&amp;A Act s.558-599.</li> </ol>	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
		Compensation	20. Requests that Dept ensure appropriate mechanisms in place to address monetary compensation for land and paid in timely manner. Dept expected to find solution to impasse with Camden Council for open space provision/funding/compensation upfront.	Council will acquire land identified for a public purpose at the time it is required.
		Mapped Provisions	17. Requests following amendments: 3. Height of Buildings be 9m 4. Residential Density be 15 dwellings per ha 21. Delete proposed acquisition of component of land proposed for residential development in this submission which is proposed RE1.	Housing controls are based on the Housing Analysis.  Provision of open space seek to balance the provision of good quality useable open space in accessible locations with ensuring the cost of its provision does not result in excessive contribution rates. Refer to Section 4.7 of Finalisation Report.
<b>Pascoe Planning Solutions on behalf of Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116150	Rezoning	1. Object to future designation of open space on draft ILP. 2. Land on NW side within proximity of telecommunications facility and is largely cleared of native vegetation. 3. Land free of prime order constraints besides high risk contaminated land designation. 4. Proposed zoning discriminates against the reasonable future urban expectation of client. 5. Land not subject to any prime order constraints which would mitigate residential purposes. 6. Dual road frontage would enhance opportunities for residential development. 7. Subject land does not exhibit referenced qualities as stated in 5.5.5 of Precinct Planning Report and is not flood affected in any way constrained. See Annexure D. 8. There are other constrained/ more appropriate and contiguous to proposed core open space that should be utilised rather than clients. See Annexure C. 9. Requests rezoning to residential consistent with nearby land to R3 or R2 as minimum to capitalise on high amenity open space setting and provide passive surveillance. 10. As minimum open space should be reconfigured and include relevant development controls to ensure integration with open space including access and parking overlooking by residential development and residences should be orientated to Dickson Rd. See Annexure C.	Housing controls are based on the Housing Analysis.  Provision of open space seek to balance the provision of good quality useable open space in accessible locations with ensuring the cost of its provision does not result in excessive contribution rates. Refer to Section 4.7 of Finalisation Report.
		Rezoning Staging	11. Object to staging as in Stage 3 and extends period for resolution of future lifestyle choices for potentially decade.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
		Land Contamination	12. Review Land capability and Salinity Study by Worley Parsons fail to establish why the quality of subject land and its history different to others surrounding which have been assigned moderate risk rating. 13. Land was formerly owned by Ingham's but only used for residential purposes not farming. 14. Oppose 'high risk' designation and request amended to low or moderate.	Individual site specific assessment at development stage will identify suitable level of investigation, and this can be adjusted based upon previous land use.
		Mapped Provisions	15. Requests following amendments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Height of Buildings be 12m</li> <li>• Residential Density be 25 dwellings per ha</li> <li>• Delete proposed acquisition of component of land proposed for residential</li> </ul>	Housing controls are based on a Housing Analysis which showed the majority of demand in the Precinct will be for single detached dwellings.  A broader water management review will be done for the

Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses  
Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			development in this submission which is proposed RE1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete the free standing spots on land given they do not form flood prone land.</li> </ul>	Precinct which will consider this matter.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116148	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116146	Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request rezoning to R3 as adjoins property at rear and next door that is R3.</li> <li>Property close to proposed school and town centre and between two RE1 reserved areas.</li> <li>Would like to subdivide and build asap after rezoning and is in a good position to do so.</li> </ol>	Housing controls are based on a Housing Analysis which showed the majority of demand in the Precinct will be for single detached dwellings.
		Roads	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests road at right of property be moved to boundary in line with the other connecting road and not inside property.</li> </ol>	The proposed road layout may be able to be incorporated into the subdivision design at the development stage. As local roads are not zoned as SP2 the final location may be altered following design investigations.
		Land Acquisition	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests no acquisitions on property as lost out before and does not think it's fair for some and not others to lose out.</li> </ol>	<p>The acquisition of land is undertaken in accordance with the <i>Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991</i> (the Act).</p> <p>Most privately owned land, required by government for public purposes, is acquired by negotiation and agreement between the landholder and the acquiring authority.</p> <p>When an acquiring authority and a landholder are unable to negotiate the purchase of the land, an acquiring authority can compulsorily acquire the land for a public purpose.</p> <p>The Valuer General is required under the Act to determine the amount of compensation to be paid by the acquiring authority to the former landholder. Provision is also made for owner initiated acquisitions in cases of hardship.</p>
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116144	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports plan but raises concerns in relation to staging, Council rates, timing and roads and traffic.</li> </ol>	
		Roads	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan to build road through house and has included a map where requests road to be moved to as hoping to stay in home.</li> </ol>	Given significant increase in density, ILP is not able to avoid all existing buildings. The proposed road layout may be able to be incorporated into the subdivision design at the development stage. As local roads are not zoned as SP2 the final location may be altered following design investigations.
		Staged Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In stage 3 with shopping centre and requests to be in stage 2 as area will be built with no shopping amenities.</li> </ol>	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging. R2 zone provides for corner stores, and nearby shopping centres at East Leppington and Leppington North.

**Appendix B – Summary of Submissions and Responses**  
**Leppington Priority Precinct Finalisation Report September 2015**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Sub ID</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116142	General	Supports Plan but raises concerns about zoning.	
		Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Land proposed R2 and would like R3 as right next door to R3.</li> <li>2. Five minute walk to station and 5 min drive to freeway exits, opposite oval and proposed school.</li> </ol>	Housing controls are based on a Housing Analysis which showed the majority of demand in the Precinct will be for single detached dwellings.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116140	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Neither supports nor objects as says has no choice.</li> <li>2. Do not want development at all but as going ahead doing best to be informed.</li> </ol>	Noted.
<b>Name Withheld</b> Leppington	116138	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports Plan but raises concerns on staging, zoning, rates, timing and roads and traffic.</li> </ol>	Noted
		Staging of Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Objects to staged rezoning.</li> </ol>	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.