

REPORT:

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide details of the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy (RLS), progress of the implementation of the RLS and to discuss options for review of that document.

Consultation

The issues raised in this report do not trigger the community consultation requirements of Council's Policy. Should the review of the RLS be required there will be a separate report to Council proposing a community engagement strategy for that review.

Background

On 25 February 2014 Council resolved, on a foreshadowed motion when considering a planning proposal matter, the following:

"That a report be submitted to Council regarding a review of the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy."

The following provides a summary of the preparation of the RLS prior to adoption to provide some context to the document and also discusses some of the issues that have been raised during the implementation of the Strategy that could be considered in any review of the RLS.

History

The preparation of the RLS commenced in July 2008. The RLS strategy preparation was the subject of several reports to Council as follows:

8 July 2008	Resolution of criteria for use in the preparation of the RLS. The criteria being as follows: • Maintain the rural character and atmosphere of the Hawkesbury • Achieve balanced growth • Provide housing choice • Develop strong town centres • Encourage better public transport
8 December 2009	Draft Strategy recommended to be placed on public exhibition. Council resolution suggested changes to reduce building heights and densities in Town and Village areas and referred draft Strategy to a briefing session.
28 September 2010	Council again reduced density provisions in the strategy and resolved to place on public exhibition after those density reductions were made.
10 May 2011	Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy adopted by Council.

A copy of the Council report of 10 May 2011 is attached for background information that outlays the significant public consultation undertaken as part of the preparation of the Strategy.

Throughout the above process the draft RLS was the subject of Councillor Briefings and reports to gain agreement on the criteria used in the strategy preparation. At the meeting on 10 May 2011 the

consideration of this matter attracted four speakers. The Council vote in support of adopting the RLS was unanimous at the meeting with Councillors Porter and Calvert absent from the meeting.

The brief for the preparation of the RLS was as follows:

- *Review and analysis of the Statutory framework for the Residential Strategy;*
- *Analysis of the existing and projected demographic makeup of the Hawkesbury and the impacts this will have on the provision of housing in the Hawkesbury;*
- *Analysis of the existing supply of residential (urban, semi urban/rural village and rural residential) land;*
- *Projections of future residential land requirements by type (urban, semi urban/rural village and rural residential) to at least the year 2031;*
- *Analysis of physical and environmental constraints to residential development in the Hawkesbury;*
- *Analysis of existing and required infrastructure for residential development;*
- *Recommend, based on demographic needs and infrastructure costs and efficiency, a ratio of urban and rural housing required to achieve projected targets;*
- *Applying the criteria contained in the Metropolitan Strategy, the draft North West Subregional Strategy and the Council adopted criteria (report dated 8 July 2008), identify, both infill and greenfield, future investigation areas for urban, semi urban/rural village and rural residential housing provision;*
- *Develop methodology for strategic planning approach for future Greenfield residential land provision;*
- *Develop methodology for strategic planning approach for future redevelopment and infill residential development;*
- *Recommend urban design principles for each housing type to assist in the maintenance of desired character of localities;*
- *Recommend timing and options for the implementation of the Strategy recommendations;*
- *A monitoring and review program for the Strategy.*

The adopted RLS has addressed all the above requirements of the brief.

The principle aim of the RLS is to identify land locations to accommodate additional dwellings for the projected population growth, preserve the natural environment of the LGA, accommodate the changing population in terms of housing needs, services and access, identify the pressures to expand urban growth into natural and rural areas and focus those pressures into appropriate locations, and identify the physical constraints (flood, native vegetation and bushfire risk) that would preclude land for residential uses. In this regard, the RLS, by identifying areas for further investigation, precludes the further investigation of land for residential development that is outside the criteria for the Strategy, i.e., it does not set a precedent for development when a proposal is approved if it complies with the RLS. However, a precedent would be set if the RLS is varied to permit land that is outside the Strategy to be developed.

The RLS did not, and was not intended, to prepare a development plan or master plan for the development of the identified areas, nor was it intended for the document to prepare infrastructure plans for such development. This work was identified in the RLS as additional work that was required to be completed prior to release or development of land for residential development.

The RLS is similar to the NSW Government Strategy that identified the North West Growth Centre including the Vineyard Precinct. In this situation the land areas were identified in the Strategy and the more detailed precinct planning (Integrated Land use Planning including, traffic, access, flora and fauna, economic, social, etc.), currently underway for the Vineyard Precinct, is undertaken as a follow-on from the identification of the land in the strategy.

Section 6.2 *Review and Monitoring* section of the RLS identifies the timing for a review of the Strategy.

This section states:

“The Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy should be reviewed, in consultation with the community, every five years to meet State Planning and LEP requirements and to update with ABS Census and population projection data.”

Whilst it is possible to undertake minor reviews outside this timeframe, it is of little value to review such a Strategy unless there is up to date population and ABS Census data to review projections.

Progress of the Implementation of the Residential Land Strategy

Since the adoption of the RLS on 10 May 2011, 10 planning proposals for residential development have been lodged with Council for consideration. A summary of these applications is shown in the following table:

Application status	Location	No. of additional allotments proposed	No. of allotments created or dwellings constructed
Gazetted (rezoned)	Redbank - 96 & 98 Grose Vale Road, 26 & 28 Arthur Philip Rd, North Richmond	1400	0
Refused by Council	1. 278 Hermitage Rd, Kurrajong Hills 2. 1059A Grose Vale Rd, Kurrajong	450 6	0
Awaiting Gazettal	Jacaranda Ponds, Glossodia	580	0
	1411 Kurmond Rd, Kurmond	4	
Council support awaiting Gateway	136 Longleat Ln, Kurmond	3	0
	396 Bells Line of Rd, Kurmond	22	
	1442 & 1442A Kurmond Rd, Kurmond	12	
Not yet reported to Council	Mitchell Rd, Pitt Town	112	0
	373 Bells Line of Rd, Kurmond	7	

Whilst the Vineyard Precinct of the Growth Centre is not included in the above 10 planning proposals or included in the RLS, it should be noted that the investigation and planning for this precinct (enabled under the provisions of the Growth Centres SEPP), initiated by NSW Planning and Infrastructure and assisted by Council, is underway. It is expected that the Vineyard Precinct rezoning (not allotment creation) will be completed mid to late 2015. The expected yield for this precinct is approximately 2,000 allotments.

As seen from the above table only one planning proposal has been gazetted and no allotments or dwellings have been created to date.

If the planning proposals above are gazetted the subject properties must then first obtain development consent for subdivision works and that subdivision is registered and the allotment titles issued before a lot is counted as 'created'. Following that creation a separate development consent and construction approval is required for dwelling construction. In this regard there can be a significant time lag between the rezoning of a site and the construction of any dwellings or introduction of any residents to the site.

Issues raised during the Implementation of the Residential Land Strategy

The RLS, as well as identifying the constraints to development and only identifying land suitable for further investigation, has also identified sustainability principles and implementation actions in order to assist with the orderly consideration of land suitable for further residential development.

The following issues have been raised by community members and Councillors when considering the planning proposals that are implementing the RLS:

- Question whether the land is included in the RLS
- RLS does not provide infrastructure
- Funding for infrastructure (Section 94)
- Questions and confusion regarding density of development
- Context of the RLS and relationship with other Strategies and Policies

An explanation of the manner in which the current RLS deals with these issues is outlined below. Where required a recommendation for an amendment or enhancement to the RLS is provided.

Question whether the land is included in the RLS

It has been stated, during the consideration of several planning proposals for large lot residential zonings, by community members and some Councillors, that the proposals are not consistent with the RLS in relation to locational criteria. In this regard, the questions raising this concern make statements *that the properties are not mapped for future investigation, as shown on pages 5/9 to 5/13 in the RLS, and as such are not included in the Strategy*. This interpretation is incorrect.

The mapped areas on the above mentioned pages in the RLS delineate the investigation areas for potential General, Low Density or Medium Density Residential zoning. In this regard, the mapped areas are for investigation of more 'urban' zonings.

The RLS provides for rural residential (Low Density Residential) zonings in a variety of locations and instead of mapping these areas, it defines the criteria that the location must meet prior to consideration. In this regard, the RLS sets the "strategy for rural village development" at section 2.10 (page 2/3) and defines that criteria in Sections 3.3.8 (page 3/11) and section 6.5 (page 6/9). This criteria has been quoted in the assessment reports to Council for a number of planning proposals and is as follows:

"Additionally all future low density and large lot residential development in rural villages must:

- *Be able to have onsite sewerage disposal;*
- *Cluster around or on the periphery of villages;*
- *Cluster around villages with services that meet existing neighbourhood criteria services as a minimum (within 1km radius);*
- *Address environmental constraints and with minimal environmental impacts; and*
- *Within the capacity of the rural village."*

The above criteria clearly indicate that the investigation area is to be within a one kilometre radius of the neighbourhood services. This method of identifying investigation areas for large lot residential is used in the RLS in order to provide sufficient flexibility in the interpretation of the strategy (after all it is a strategy and not a development plan or development application). The investigation area is then broad enough so that the exact location of development can be more appropriately defined following detailed environmental investigation. However, it seems that there have been various interpretations of this criteria that have caused confusion.

Suggested action

That an addendum be made to the RLS that shows the areas that meet the above criteria on a map so that the investigation areas align with the cadastral (property) boundaries in the investigation area and there is no subjective interpretation of these investigation areas.

RLS does not provide infrastructure

The purpose of the RLS is as stated in section 1.1 of the Strategy as follows:

“The purpose of the Strategy is to determine the future residential needs of the Hawkesbury LGA and to identify localities that are worthy of further, more detailed assessment for suitability for residential development.”

The RLS requires any application for release or rezoning of land to be located within the “future investigation areas” only and they must also address the Sustainable Development Framework contained in Chapter 6 of the document. The RLS must also be read in context with other relevant State and Local development strategies.

Section 6.6 of the RLS sets out actions for implementing the strategy. In this regard, the strategy recommends a number of actions to be undertaken before, or as part of, the release or rezoning of land. Some of these actions are as follows:

- Council to undertake structure planning, subject to funding, to determine capability of investigation areas
- Council to prepare design guidelines
- Facilitate partnerships to facilitate affordable housing
- Investigation into servicing, renewal of existing centres

The above list is not all inclusive and the RLS sets out these implementation actions based on specific issues (Housing types, Service infrastructure, employment and centres, transport and access, open space, etc.). The RLS only identifies the broad constraints to land release locations and identifies the areas worthy of additional investigation and outlines the nature of those additional investigations based on specific development issues rather than location.

The RLS assessed the demand for dwellings up to the year 2031 and stated that up to 6,000 additional dwellings were required to be constructed to meet the projected demand. This equates to approximately 300 additional dwellings (including units) per year. As seen in the previous table showing the applications received at Council over the last three years, there is the potential for approximately 2,140 allotments to be released for future development. This equates to approximately 710 allotments per year.

From the above figures, it is clear that the Hawkesbury is ahead of the identified target for land release. However, it should be noted that this is only approximately 10 years supply of land, at the predicted demand, and Council should not be complacent about the release of more land in the near future. However, the situation of being ahead of the target does allow Council to slow the acceptance of planning proposals, for the short term, and undertake the required implementation planning as mentioned above to permit that future land release.

In order to implement the RLS as envisaged and to ensure that the appropriate locality and regional planning can be undertaken in the identified investigation areas, it is proposed that Council not accept any additional planning proposals until the appropriate development plans and Section 94 plan (if required) is in place for the locality. This does not affect the planning proposals currently lodged with Council which will continue to be assessed and processed. This would allow the existing staff resources within Council to undertake much of this work in the short term, without the need to assess additional planning proposals that result in the planning focus being site specific rather than locality or regionally based.

Suggested action

That prior to consideration of additional planning proposals for residential land release (i.e. continue processing the existing applications that have been lodged with Council) Council identify distinct land investigation areas, similar to the identification of the “Kurmond Investigation Area” in February 2013, and undertake some of the specific additional investigation work outlined in the RLS, i.e. prepare a development plan for the location. In order to undertake this work there will need to be a specific program for investigation that would need to be initially funded upfront by Council with the ability, via application fees or Section 94 Plan, for Council to recoup those funds at the time landowners make application to Council. This program and funding structure will be the subject of a separate report to Council.

Funding for infrastructure (Section 94)

This issue has been partly addressed in the previous section of this report. Whilst there is the ability to recoup some funds and fund some infrastructure via Section 94, this avenue is limited in its ability to raise funds for all required infrastructure. Some infrastructure required for development will be State provided (e.g. Bells Line of Road, river crossings, etc.) some will be funded by Council, e.g. district facilities such as libraries or district sporting facilities, and more local infrastructure can be partly funded via Section 94 Plans or Voluntary Planning Agreements (VPA).

Section 94 Plans are tightly controlled in relation to what infrastructure can be included, the amount of funds that can be raised per additional allotment and there must also be a firm nexus between the additional development and the proposed infrastructure. A VPA is based on similar principles as Section 94 but has more flexibility in the infrastructure that it can provide. However, it must be remembered that a VPA is “voluntary” and Council cannot require a developer to enter into such an agreement and it cannot “require” certain contributions to be made by the developer. The whole process is a negotiated outcome.

The most significant issue that must be noted is that prior to the preparation of a Section 94 Plan a Strategy, such as the RLS, must be in place to provide the basis for the works program and to identify the extent of the infrastructure. It must be noted that a Section 94 Plan can only levy contributions on development to provide additional infrastructure specifically required by that development and cannot collect funds to rectify existing infrastructure backlogs or gaps. The existence of a Strategy also assists with VPA negotiations and other State Agency discussions about infrastructure provision.

Suggested action

That as part of the preparation of a development plan for a location proposed to be released for development, a Section 94 Plan or similar provision is to be in place prior to the finalisation of a landowner initiated planning proposal. Similarly, Council should develop and adopt a Voluntary Planning Agreement Policy that contains a standard Agreement template and provides guidelines as to what Council will and will not accept as inclusions in these agreements and also provides a procedure for the preparation and negotiation of such agreements. This would be the subject of a separate report to Council.

Questions and confusion regarding density of development

During the preparation of the RLS it was originally proposed that certain areas, generally infill proposals within existing urban centres, would have a higher density in order to conform with the “centres model” for development that the RLS is based upon and to also reduce urban sprawl and assist in the retention of the rural character outside those centres. This higher density, maximum of 6 storeys, was only proposed within the main centres (Windsor, Richmond and North Richmond) and only where other criteria, such as character and amenity, would not be adversely impacted. As mentioned previously in this report, Council removed this proposed increase in density and expanded the provision for a small amount of Greenfield development adjoining existing centres (based on the “Neighbourhood Centre” criteria in the RLS).

The reduction or removal of density provisions in the RLS seems to have resulted in a misunderstanding during implementation where the proposed outcome for some proposals is thought to be a higher density than what is actually proposed. This is particularly in locations where large lot residential (rural residential) is proposed. In some of these cases there is a fear that the proposal will result in a more urban style development when in reality the proposed large lot residential proposal is similar to, or sometimes larger than, the existing subdivision pattern in the locality.

Suggested action

During the preparation of the Development Plans, as mentioned previously, the proposed building heights, lot sizes and resulting dwellings per hectare ratio should be more clearly defined to better articulate the desired outcome for the locality. For infill development, particularly in Windsor and

Richmond centres, consideration be given to increasing densities and building heights, subject to detailed community consultation, consideration of heritage character and amenity, so that existing infrastructure can be better utilised and there is less pressure for urban sprawl.

Context of the RLS and relationship with other Strategies and Policies

The adoption and implementation of the RLS has been seen by some as the only issue that needs to be considered when considering growth. Whilst the RLS is an important aspect for consideration, it must be viewed in the context of other local and State Strategies. The State Strategies include the Metropolitan Strategy, Subregional plans and the various infrastructure provider strategies. The local strategies to be considered include the Community Strategic Plan, Operational Plan, Employment Land Strategy and the Revitalisation Plan project process that Council considered and adopted at the meeting of 29 April 2014. It is the Revitalisation Plan project that is most relevant for considering context.

The preparation of Development Plans for localities will involve the input from a variety of local strategies. The proposed Revitalisation project (for the three towns of Windsor, Richmond and North Richmond) will be the vehicle where the implementation of the RLS, and other strategies, is informed by the community consultation and matters such as density, timing and infrastructure needs can be more clearly defined and actioned. The investigation areas in the RLS can then be viewed in the context of issues such as: additional river crossing location/s; individual town streetscape plans; short, medium or long-term actions relating to growth and setting of Council position statements; setting long-term position on issues outside Council's control such as provision of health, education or defence facilities in the LGA.

Council has in the past developed a number of Policies that have addressed specific matters and, over time, these Policies have been overtaken by more recent Policy or Strategy. In the case of the RLS the existing Policy "Our City Our Future" is an example where much of the Policy has essentially been incorporated into the RLS or some aspects of that Policy have, during the implementation of that Policy, been incorporated into the LEP. In these cases there appears to be some confusion as to the relationship of the Strategy and Policy and it is recommended that those Policies be amended to rectify that situation.

Suggested action

That Council be stable on its position in relation to land strategies and not significantly amend the direction of those strategies so that the Revitalisation project can use those long-term strategies as a basis for community consultation and local revitalisation actions. It will be critical to have strategies in place in order to assist in preparing submissions to obtain funding for any projects arising from the Revitalisation project for the three town centres.

The RLS be reassessed against existing Policies with a view to amend those Policies to ensure consistency.

The RLS is an important document to communicate intended areas for residential development investigations (and to demonstrate Council's compliance with State Government requirements for subregional strategies). The information needs to be readily available to Government Agencies, existing residents and the broader community as well as potential investors in a future Hawkesbury. Council's website information will be improved to provide a clearer section about planning proposals, the Residential Land Strategy and related policies.

Proposed Criteria for the introduction of Second Dwellings on Rural Properties

The issue of permitting "Second dwellings" in rural areas has been the subject of a report and Councillor Briefing in the past. "Second dwellings" are separate to the use of "Secondary Dwellings" which is a defined term which are currently permitted in a number of zones in the Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 2012 (LEP). In this case a "Secondary Dwelling" is a separate dwelling on an allotment established in conjunction with another dwelling (the Principal dwelling) and is limited in size to 60m² or 10% of the total floor area of the Principal Dwelling.

The following discussion is related to “Second Dwellings”, which is an undefined term in the LEP, which are essentially a “detached dual occupancy”.

It is suggested that investigation be undertaken into permitting detached dual occupancy dwellings in a variety of locations that are defined by certain criteria that is set in the RLS. In this regard the criteria used for the consideration of large lot residential proposals, i.e. *Section 3.3.8 Role of Rural Residential Development*, should be used to consider the permissibility of detached dual occupancy. The suggested criteria proposed is the same as in the above mentioned Section 3.3.8 with changes shown in italics (NOTE: the following criteria is a suggestion only and is subject to further consultation):

All future detached dual occupancy residential development in rural locations must:

- Be able to have *separate* onsite sewerage disposal systems
- Cluster around or on the periphery of villages
- Cluster around villages with services that meet existing neighbourhood criteria services as a minimum (within *1.5 – 2.0 km* radius)
- Address environmental constraints and with minimal environmental impacts and
- Be within the *servicing* capacity of the rural village
- *Have a minimum allotment size of 2.0ha.*

If outside the above criteria and is located on a heritage listed property, detached dual occupancy permitted where attachment to the main dwelling would be detrimental to the significance of the heritage item.

Suggested action

That when mapping the location for rural residential development proposals as an addendum to the RLS an additional map, accompanied by defined criteria as mentioned above, be prepared to indicate the locations where detached dual occupancies can be considered for rezoning.

Detached Dual Occupancy development should only be permitted once an appropriate infrastructure contribution plan (Section 94 Plan) is in place. Additionally, whilst Council has existing Policies to address retrospective development, there is a need for Policy/procedure clarification to guide how existing illegal dual occupancy dwellings, if found, will be addressed in relation to building controls (BCA matters), compliance action and contribution payments by these developments.

Conclusion

The above report has outlined the background to the RLS and has also identified some issues that have been raised during the implementation of the RLS that have resulted in misunderstandings or misinterpretation of the role of the Residential Land Strategy. Whilst many of those issues can be individually addressed at the time of implementing, it is recommended that some minor addendums be included in the existing RLS to overcome those subjective interpretation issues.

It is also recommended that the implementation actions that are already contained in the RLS be given greater focus, i.e. defer acceptance of additional planning proposals until those actions are completed, so that the subsequent implementation of the RLS can proceed in a more streamlined manner.

Conformance to the Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan

The proposal is consistent with the Looking After People and Place Direction Statement;

- Offer residents a choice of housing options that meets their needs whilst being sympathetic to the qualities of the Hawkesbury
- Population growth is matched with the provision of infrastructure and is sympathetic to the rural, environmental, heritage values and character of the Hawkesbury

- Have development on both sides of the river supported by appropriate physical and community infrastructure

and is also consistent with the nominated strategy in the Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan being:

- Encourage affordable, diverse and quality housing solutions in serviced areas.

Financial Implications

The mapping suggestions and minor changes are able to be undertaken within existing budgets. The preparation of development plans may need to be funded through amendments to the budget at a quarterly review. A Section 94 Plan/s can be prepared to recoup some of these funds but some initial expenditure by Council will be required.

Planning Decision

As this matter is covered by the definition of a “planning decision” under Section 375A of the Local Government Act 1993, details of those Councillors supporting or opposing a decision on the matter must be recorded in a register. For this purpose a division must be called when a motion in relation to the matter is put to the meeting. This will enable the names of those Councillors voting for or against the motion to be recorded in the minutes of the meeting and subsequently included in the required register.

RECOMMENDATION:

That:

1. The areas identified in the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy for large lot residential investigation be mapped to align with cadastral boundaries and form an addendum to that Strategy.
2. The investigation area for Kurmond identified by Council on 5 February 2013 be the first area to have a development/structure plan (as described in this report) prepared and a report be brought back to Council identifying priority areas for the preparation of structure plans and Section 94 Plans.
3. Council not accept additional planning proposals for residential development unless a structure plan and/or Section 94 Plan has been prepared for the locality. Existing planning proposals currently submitted to Council will continue to be processed.
4. A Voluntary Planning Agreement Policy be drafted and reported to Council for consideration.
5. Existing Council Policies in relation to development be reviewed to be consistent with the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy.
6. The suggested action for the introduction of Second dwellings on rural properties as outlined in this report be commenced and reported back to Council in the fourth quarter of 2014.

ATTACHMENTS:

AT - 1 Copy of Council Report dated 10 May 2011

AT - 1 Copy of Council Report dated 10 May 2011

ITEM: CP - Progress and Review of Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy - (95498)

Previous Item: 148, Ordinary (8 July 2008)
273, Ordinary (8 December 2009)
223, Ordinary (28 September 2010)

REPORT:

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to review the issues raised in submissions received during the public exhibition of the draft Residential Land Strategy, propose changes as a result of the review of public submissions and to recommend that Council adopt the amended draft Residential Land Strategy.

Consultation

The issues raised in this report concern matters which do not require further community consultation under Council's Community Engagement Policy.

The preparation of the draft Strategy has previously been the subject of two separate Briefings to Councillors on 17 November 2009 and 1 June 2010. The report to Council on 28 September 2010 proposed the following engagement process:

- Place the document on public exhibition for a minimum of 28 days.
- The document to be available at Council's office and libraries and also on Council's website during the exhibition period.
- Relevant industry and community groups be advised of the exhibition period and be invited to submit comments during that period.
- Staff briefings to community groups, should that be required by those groups.

The draft Residential Land Strategy was originally placed on public exhibition for the period from 7 October 2010 to 4 November 2010 in accordance with the Council resolution. However, due to requests from the community this exhibition period was extended on two separate occasions, firstly to 7 January 2011 and then to the end of January 2011.

This has resulted in the draft Residential Land Strategy being on public exhibition from 7 October 2010 to 28 January 2011, a total period of 16 weeks, or approximately four months. During the exhibition period the following occurred:

- The document was on public exhibition for a period of at least 114 days.
- The document was available at Council's office, libraries and Council's website. Copies of the draft document were also available on CD upon request.
- 35 letters were sent to Community groups and Government authorities, with a further 24 industry and development groups (that deal with Council on a regular basis) also notified of the exhibition by email.
- Presentations, followed by questions and answer sessions, were made by the Director City Planning to public meetings at North Richmond and Glossodia. This is in addition to numerous phone and counter enquiries that were dealt with by staff during the exhibition period.
- The Director City Planning also had three separate 2 hour meetings in January 2011 with a group calling themselves the "Hawkesbury Community Consultative Group" made up of representatives of the North Richmond District Community Action Association (NRDCAA), Kurrajong Action Group, Council Watch, Hawkesbury Harvest, Vineyard Action Group, Bowen Mountain Action Group, Agnes Banks Action Group, Land Care Groups, Glossodia resident

representative. This group was organised and invited via a representative of the NRDCAA. These meetings discussed the draft Strategy in detail and also discussed some wording changes that addressed some of the community concerns raised. Details of these changes are discussed later in this report.

As seen from the above, there has been extensive consultation with Community representatives about the content of the Strategy and this has appeared to assist those representatives better understand the content and intent of the Strategy and how the Strategy is applied. This is evidenced by a comment from one of the community members stating in one of the workshops *"I hate to admit this, but the more you read this (the Strategy) the more sense it makes"*.

Background

On 28 September 2010 Council considered a report that proposed the public exhibition of the Draft Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy. The resolution of that meeting was as follows:

"That:

1. *The Draft Residential Land Strategy be amended:*
 - (a) *To replace references in 3.3.5 and 6.4 to "high density" with references to "medium density (vertical)" and that this description is to apply to "flats, home units and apartments" of a height broadly consistent with existing and approved development in Richmond and Windsor.*
 - (b) *In item 6.4 to identify a density of "up to 25 – 30 dwellings per hectare" in the Town Centres, rather than "25 – 50".*
 - (c) *With the addition of an additional sentence at the end of the second paragraph in item 3.3.6 as follows: "It is therefore not an objective of this strategy to satisfy a predetermined ratio of infill to greenfields development".*
2. *The Draft Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy be placed on public exhibition for a minimum of 28 days commencing immediately and relevant industry and community groups be advised of the exhibition period and be invited to submit comments during that period.*
3. *Any issues raised in submissions received during public exhibition be reported to Council for consideration prior to the finalisation of the Residential Land Strategy."*

The abovementioned amendments were made to the draft Strategy and the draft Strategy was placed on public exhibition for a total period of 114 days with additional discussions and meetings held during that period as detailed in the "consultation" section of this report. During the exhibition period Council received a total of 13 submissions.

These were comprised of one submission from the University of Western Sydney, Industry and Investment (old Department of Primary Industries) and 11 submissions from individuals. As well as these submissions, the three meetings with the group calling themselves the "Hawkesbury Community Consultative Group" raised a number of specific individual matters that were discussed and either agreed to remain in the draft Strategy or changes to the Strategy were proposed and agreed in the group meetings. Council also received three "requests" for rezoning in the 24 months prior to the exhibition of the Draft Strategy and the authors of those requests were advised at that time that their submissions would be considered with the Draft Strategy.

The individual submissions and issues raised during public exhibition are discussed in the following section of this report.

Public Submissions and Suggested Actions

The following is a summary of the issues raised in the submissions received.

Submissions requesting the inclusion of additional land in the draft Strategy

A number of submissions were made that requested the following properties be included in the Draft Strategy;

1. 28-30 Ivy Avenue, McGraths Hill
2. 7 West Hill Street, McGraths Hill
3. Area known as “Bligh Park North”
4. Include various properties being (Lot 2 DP 578886 (Dight Street), Lot Y DP 419316 (Evans Cres) and Lot 100 DP 877011 (Francis Street) Richmond
5. 165 Grose Vale Road, North Richmond
6. Lot 27 DP 1042890, 108 Grose Vale Road, North Richmond
7. Include area to the south of Spinks Road, Glossodia, being the following:
 - Lot 2 DP 533402 and Lot 52 DP 1104504, 103 Spinks Road, Glossodia
 - Lot 20 DP 214753, 213 Spinks Road, Glossodia
 - Lot 75 DP 214752, 361 Spinks Road, Glossodia
 - Lot 3 DP 230943, James Street, Glossodia
 - Lot 44 DP 214755, 3 Derby Place, Glossodia
 - Lot 50 DP 751637, 746A Kurmond Road, Freemans Reach
 - Lots 1, 2 and 3DP 784300, 780A – 780C Kurmond Road, North Richmond
8. 88 Spinks Road, Glossodia
9. Land in the vicinity of Ebenezer and Wilberforce for rural residential development
10. 119 Argents Road Wilberforce
11. 41 Stone Terrace, Kurrajong Hills
12. Flood Free land in Vineyard

Comments

Some changes are proposed as a result of these submissions.

The following comments are provided in relation to the inclusion of the abovementioned properties in the Draft Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy;

McGraths Hill properties

The draft Strategy uses the criteria adopted by Council in the report dated 8 July 2008 for the preparation and identification of land for inclusion in the strategy. On page 5/8 of the Draft Strategy the following comments are made in relation to McGraths Hill and non-urban flood prone land;

“Mulgrave/McGraths Hill – This area has been removed from the investigation areas as it is subject to unacceptable flooding and evacuation impact.

Non-urban flood prone land – All non-urban zoned land currently affected by the 1:100 year flood event is not considered suitable for intensification of residential development.”

Given the adopted criteria and the above comments it is not considered appropriate to include the above properties, or other additional properties in the McGraths Hill locality in the residential strategy.

“Bligh Park North”

It should be noted that this land is already listed on the Metropolitan Development Plan (MDP) and is also currently identified in the Draft Residential Land Strategy for investigation subject to the resolution of the flood issues. It is not proposed to remove this land from the Strategy. However, as previously advised by the Department of Planning in relation to the rezoning application for this land, the flood issues in relation to this land will need to be resolved prior to further progress to land release. The Draft Strategy reiterates this requirement.

Land at Richmond

The land requested for inclusion at Richmond is already included in the draft Strategy and it is not proposed to remove it from the strategy. It is noted that the submissions received were in support of the lands' inclusion in the Strategy.

Land at North Richmond

The land requested for inclusion at North Richmond is already included in the draft Strategy and it is not proposed to remove it from the strategy. It is noted that the submissions received were in support of the inclusion of the land in the Strategy.

Land at Glossodia

The land requested for inclusion at Glossodia is immediately adjoining, to the south and east, of the land identified for further investigation in the Draft Strategy for Glossodia. The land to the south of Spinks Road is subject to a rezoning application that was submitted to Council prior to the exhibition of the Draft Strategy. This application will be the subject of a separate report to Council. It is proposed to include this land (to the south of the current investigation area) in the Strategy Investigation Area for the purpose of assessment of the current rezoning application. The subject properties are as follows:

- Lot 2 DP 533402 and Lot 52 DP 1104504, 103 Spinks Road, Glossodia
- Lot 20 DP 214753, 213 Spinks Road, Glossodia
- Lot 75 DP 214752, 361 Spinks Road, Glossodia
- Lot 3 DP 230943, James Street, Glossodia
- Lot 44 DP 214755, 3 Derby Place, Glossodia
- Lot 50 DP 751637, 746A Kurmond Road, Freemans Reach
- Lots 1, 2 and 3 DP 784300, 780A – 780C Kurmond Road, North Richmond

It should be noted that the inclusion of the land in the Strategy for further investigation does not guarantee that all or part of the land will be supported for further development.

The land to the east of the investigation area (88 Spinks Road) received approval for a nine lot subdivision for rural residential development in 2000. Given the restricted capacity of the existing sewer infrastructure in the locality (preventing the identification of this land for urban residential) and the size of the allotments recently approved for the site (Rural Residential), and the growth projections for the locality, it is not considered appropriate to include this land in the draft Strategy as this would result in the identification of a further over supply of land in the Glossodia locality.

Land at Ebenezer, Wilberforce and Kurrajong Hills

The land requested for inclusion in the Strategy in these localities is proposed for use as rural residential. The draft Strategy uses the criteria adopted by Council in the report dated 8 July 2008 for the preparation and identification of land for inclusion in the Strategy. In relation to rural residential development the following criteria, as stated in the 8 July 2008 report, is used:

- *minimise the fragmentation of rural land;*
- *development needs to build on existing settlements;*
 - *adjoining an existing centre or village for urban development,*
 - *within reasonable distance from centre or village for rural residential (defined by short distance, topography or physical feature),*
 - *isolated, or stand alone, residential subdivisions should not be developed further or used as justification to undertake additional similar development, as these are contrary to the Sub-Regional actions,*
- *avoid prime agricultural land (Defined by the agricultural land classification and/or the need to protect the particular purpose for which the locality is currently used.);*
- *need to promote and protect existing productive and economic activities (both rural and urban activities);*
- *minimise potential land use conflicts (i.e., not make existing conflict worse or introduce new conflicts);*
- *avoid vegetated land or land that will require significant clearing (for actual development or asset protection zones) or landform alteration (particularly to raise currently flood liable land).*

The draft Strategy, in relation to rural residential development, on page 6/9, states the following:

*“All future low density and large lot residential development (Rural residential style development) in rural villages must:
Be able to have onsite sewerage disposal;
Cluster around or on the periphery of villages;
Cluster around villages with services that meet existing neighbourhood criteria services as a minimum (within 1km radius);
Address environmental constraints and with minimal environmental impacts; and
Within the capacity of the rural village.”*

The draft Strategy, in relation to rural residential development, has used the approach of not mapping areas for investigation but simply setting out the criteria, as shown above, that must be met. The use of criteria rather than mapping gives greater flexibility for localities and properties that may be suitable for such development. In this regard, there is no need to include or exclude specific properties from the draft Strategy.

Flood Free Land in Vineyard

The land in Vineyard is already included in a development Strategy, i.e., the North West Growth Centre. As the North West Growth Centre is a Strategy that would take precedence over the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy, there is no need to include this land in the latter.

Submission from University of Western Sydney

The University notes that the draft Strategy has identified some University land in Richmond for further investigation. *“The University supports flexibility for these land holdings to potentially accommodate future mixed use however, this would be on the basis that it would not impact on existing uses of the land”*. The University currently undertakes a number of projects on the land including the Hawkesbury Forestry Experiment and the Free Air CO₂ Experiment which includes field research equipment on that land.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

The University land has been identified in the draft Strategy for future investigation of uses. Discussions have been held with the University regarding their plans for the campus land, including the Director City Planning being on the Steering Committee for the development of the University campus master plan.

The identification of the University land was to enable the land to be included in future planning by both the University and Council to ensure that the University land was given the flexibility required for their uses whilst ensuring that any future development of the locality did not result in land use conflicts. The land is proposed to remain in the Strategy.

Submission from Industry and Investment

A summary of the submission is as follows:

Issues:

- Agriculture:
 - Supports the focus of new residential within existing urban zoned land and areas identified via State Government strategic planning processes.
 - Cost benefits for infrastructure provision
 - Provides certainty for agricultural investors in the rural resource lands
 - Ad-hoc residential development across rural zones increases potential for land use conflict and restricts agri-business expansion.
 - Supports Sustainable development criteria G9, acknowledging that good soil is not the only criteria for agricultural land.
- Fisheries:

- Best design practices should be used for residential development that includes riparian buffers using native vegetation and water sensitive urban design principles.
- Division will work with Council to ensure that land use changes from Agriculture to urban will not result in significantly reduced water quality outcomes for Hawkesbury River.
- Strong support for Council's introduction of Water Sensitive Urban Design principles
- Strong support for objective that there is neither increase in the volume, nor reduction in the quality of the stormwater flows from urbanisation.
- Supports the practical and straightforward framework adopted by the strategy for assessing the sustainability of the catchment to further development.
- Division recommends the use of Riparian Buffers (using native species)
- The strategy currently refers to "DPI maps of significant aquatic biodiversity" and I & I NSW recommend that section be amended to refer to "maps of Key Fish Habitat and distributions of threatened species prepared by I & I NSW".
- Minerals:
 - Extractive areas should be protected. These are outside areas identified for residential development, i.e. Richmond lowlands.
 - Lowlands should be acknowledged as important rural resource lands in the Natural Environment Chapter of the Key Issues document under 4.7.1 Agricultural and Rural Land.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

The above comments from Industry and Investment are noted. The comments support the approach used in the draft Strategy and the additional comments in relation to "best practice" relate to the more detailed planning that will be undertaken for localities at the rezoning or development application stage.

The comments in relation to the Richmond lowlands are noted. However, as this strategy deals with Residential Land matters it is not proposed to insert comments about the resource lands as the lowlands are not proposed for any residential development as a result of this Strategy. These comments could be included in any rural strategy that is prepared by Council.

General issues raised in Submissions

Many of the submissions received indicated support for the Strategy in relation to:

- Agreement to the inclusion of their land in the Strategy for further investigation,
- Agree with the principles used in the Strategy including, servicing and infrastructure criteria, clustering of development around existing settlements to prevent "sprawl" and erosion of productive rural land and reduce the need for expensive extension of services and infrastructure to service rural residential development, etc,
- Agree with the importance of protecting Agriculture,
- Agree with the Sustainability criteria to be used for assessment of future development and land release proposals,
- Agree with the identification and protection of the Hawkesbury Character as indicated in the strategy,
- Agree with the further detailed investigation of localities to protect the character, heritage and amenity of each of the individual areas.
- Agree with the recommendation on page 4/16 of the Strategy that land auditing is required.

The following is a summary of other issues raised, and improvements recommended, by the submissions received with each followed by a "Comment" as to what is proposed for change in the Strategy or what other action is proposed:

- The Strategy is “Flawed” *“in that it has been produced with blind acceptance of the NSW Department of Planning’s nomination that the Hawkesbury LGA will contain a further 5,000 dwellings to 2031”*,
- There has not been any provision for additional growth beyond the provision of 5,000 dwellings.
- *“There is no further thought on what is required within the Hawkesbury other than to blindly accept that 5,000 dwellings are to be provided by 2031.”*
- Agree with identification of University land but this land is capable of accommodating more than the planned 5,000 dwellings.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

Whilst the NSW Department of Planning’s “target” for the Hawkesbury of 5,000 dwellings by 2031 has been a consideration, there has not been “blind acceptance” of that target. The focus by these submissions on the target number of 5,000 is unwarranted as that figure was simply a target mentioned in the Northwest Subregional Strategy that needed to be confirmed or amended by the relevant Council when preparing and adopting their own residential or land use strategy.

The Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy aims to identify land that, subject to further investigation, may be suitable for consideration for residential development. Chapter 3 - Population and Housing Needs, of the Strategy undertakes an assessment of the population forecasts and trends and considers the implications of those trends for housing provision. Based on that assessment the Strategy has indicated that there may actually be a need for approximately 6,000 dwellings.

The land identified in the Strategy for further investigation is sufficient in area to cater for these numbers and, in fact, the Strategy has identified more land than is actually required for the life of the Strategy. The additional land has been identified to account for the removal of some land that is found, after more detailed investigation, to be unsuitable for development or unable to be adequately serviced in the timeframe required. The additional land also allows for some flexibility to occur in the density provision of housing in different areas.

- Support the philosophy of developing rural residential development around existing towns and villages, but, questions the figure quoted in the draft Strategy of only 400 lots to 2031.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

The numbers referred to are estimate numbers only and are not intended to be a definitive number that cannot be varied. The philosophy and criteria developed for the location of rural residential development is the only limitation that is being proposed and, subject to the conformance with the adopted philosophy and criteria, there is no number limitation to rural residential development. However, it should be noted that the figure quoted suggests an average of approximately 20 allotments/dwellings per year which is a substantial increase in the number of rural residential dwellings to that determined by Council currently.

- There should be some flexibility provided in the Strategy to allow development outside the areas that have been shown on the investigation area plans.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

The Strategy has identified, via a desktop assessment using the adopted criteria, virtually all the suitable land available in the eastern portion of the Local Government Area (including west of the river). Whilst the Strategy states that future release land should be contained within the identified areas, or criteria, it is agreed that there may be an opportunity for a proposal that will be outside these areas. It is considered that if such an opportunity arises there are other mechanisms that could be pursued to enable that proposal to proceed. However, any such opportunity would need to be large

enough to provide for substantial, long term economic benefits for the Hawkesbury to take advantage of such mechanisms and must also comply with the sustainability criteria contained in the Strategy. The chance of this occurring is low as generally residential development does not provide long term economic benefits in the same way as employment related development affords. The existing Employment Land Strategy allows for this to occur.

- The Strategy identifies a need to plan for accommodating a changing population but does not identify that there is a need to plan for the previous decline in population and the future very limited growth projected.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

There is no doubt that there is a need for additional work required in relation to actual housing needs. However, it is considered that the purpose of the current Strategy, to identify residential land needs and potential locations for that use has been achieved. The inclusion of the sustainability matrix and criteria contained in chapter six of the Strategy identifies the service levels that different sized settlements should achieve. These criteria can also be used and applied to existing settlements to test if the settlements are meeting the minimum level of servicing. If not then the criteria can be used to identify the upgrades required before any new growth of those areas is considered.

- *“A thriving economic future for the Hawkesbury will not come about by the limited growth indicated within the Draft Strategy.”* There is a need to provide at least 2% PA growth rate.
- The projected growth rate is too low.
- Whilst agreeing with the need for more medium density, questions the proportion of medium density dwellings proposed and concerned with the impact on the Hawkesbury character.
- The strategy notes the increase in demand for medium density but Council has done little to address this demand, the LEP & DCP are too restrictive and “no additional services have been lobbied for”.
- Given the lead time for provision of additional services and infrastructure it is pressed that the planning for these additional services should begin now.
- Question whether the existing services are suitable for the extension areas in Wilberforce and if not then planning for these extensions should start immediately.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

The Strategy has identified, via a desktop assessment using the adopted criteria, virtually all the suitable land available in the eastern portion of the Local Government Area (including west of the river). This land is considered to be in excess of the land requirements for the life of the Strategy and some of the investigation areas have notations that acknowledge this. It is considered that the Strategy identifies enough land to cater for a significant growth rate should the infrastructure be available and the community and market wish to have such growth.

It is acknowledged that there is a need for additional work in relation to the detailed planning of individual settlements and locations in order to deal with the servicing capacity, heritage and character issues. The whole purpose of the Residential Land Strategy is to gain agreement on the preferred location for future residential development so that infrastructure planning and other detailed planning can be undertaken. There is no use doing infrastructure, or other, planning for growth etc, unless there is agreement on the preferred locations for development, i.e., adoption of the Residential Land Strategy.

- Reference documents used do not mention the Urban Lands Draft Strategy and Rural Lands Draft Strategy of the 1980's. Nor is there mention of the Our City Our Future strategic investigations of the 1990's. These have made similar recommendations as the current proposed strategy, albeit with greater population projections.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

These documents and Policies were used when the criteria for the development of the Strategy were prepared and the “Our City Our Future” document is a current Council Policy. These criteria were adopted by Council at the meetings of 8 July 2008 and 8 December 2009. References used in the Strategy refer to those Council reports.

- Agree with the importance of Agricultural land as a constraint to urban development. However, there has not been a proper assessment of agricultural land and its uses and potential for ongoing agriculture (or any other use) since the early 1980’s.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

This is agreed and, as mentioned previously, that work is beyond the brief of this Strategy work which was to identify residential land needs and potential locations to 2031. The Council report of 29 May 2007 “Preparation of Land Use Strategy for the Hawkesbury Local Government Area” identified the need for an overall Land Use Strategy but also the practical need to break down this work into manageable areas. The Council resolution agreed to the proposal in the report to undertake that work in sections, being the employment lands (adopted in December 2009), Residential Lands (current draft Strategy) and Rural Lands (to be programmed when the current strategy is finalised). Doing this work in that order was driven by the current development pressures in the employment and residential field.

- The Hawkesbury has been described as the “hole in the donut”. All the adjoining LGA’s have significant growth and *“none have had negative population growth over the last 10 years”*. The Draft Strategy contains “core philosophy” that reads that the area is vibrant and is to experience significant growth patterns.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

The surrounding LGA’s have not all experienced significant growth and in the 2006 census there have been some population losses in surrounding LGA’s. It is appropriate for a Strategy, that looks forward to the next 20 years, to use language that is positive and optimistic rather than using negative language that uses past negative indicators

- The strategy indicates that future development in rural villages should be of low density and large lot dwellings. Why? *“Many of the villages are capable of containing some other forms of housing that are denser and in proximity to shops/services etc.”*

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

It is true that many rural villages may be capable of more dense settlement. However, the villages that the Strategy refers to in this manner are villages that do not have the required sewer services that would service a more dense settlement. It is appropriate to restrict development in these villages until there is agreement on the provision of the necessary sewer services as, from previous experience with servicing village areas with reticulated sewer, this may be a very long time. Upon obtaining such agreements and setting timeframes for the provision of these services, the Strategy can be reviewed as appropriate. The Community Survey has also indicated that the community wish to preserve the rural character of these areas and this is also a Direction in the Community Strategic Plan. Significantly increasing density in Rural Villages would not be consistent with that sentiment.

- The Strategy discusses affordability of housing is impacted by the stock of affordable housing and housing stress for mortgage and rental markets. *“Nowhere is it indicated that a prime impact on affordable housing is the almost complete absence of new and additional housing opportunities.”*

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

This comment relating to lack of supply impacting on affordability is agreed and has been discussed in relation to the reason for preparing a Residential Land Strategy to generate additional land supply, i.e. it is one of the basic reasons for preparing this strategy.

- Questions raised in relation to the maps and mapping used in the Strategy, particularly the vacant land map (page3/10) and the vegetation mapping.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

In relation to the vacant land map, it is agreed that this map is difficult to see the detail at the reproduced scale. However, the purpose of the map is to simply show the quantum of vacant/available land that was investigated and not the individual parcels. The map indicates the spatial spread of this land and it is clear from this map that there is not an abundance of vacant land that is available for residential development. Hence, due to the lack of available land for residential development the Residential Land Strategy is needed to provide the guidance for the provision of appropriate land for that purpose.

In relation to the vegetation mapping, it is agreed that some of the mapping used may not be perfect. This can be said for all the mapping used at the scale that it has been used. The 'Key Issues' chapter and constraint and opportunity mapping in the Strategy need to be viewed in the context of a strategic, long term document and not in the same manner as assessing a development application. This strategy work is undertaken, based on the best available information at the time, so that a desktop identification of the constraints and opportunities can be made to provide greater focus for the further, more detailed, investigations and environmental studies required for land release, rezoning and development. This focus will allow these more detailed investigations to be undertaken in a more cost efficient way. If these studies were to be undertaken in the absence of a Strategy there would be the need for more detailed studies to be undertaken on land that, for some other unidentified constraint, should have been excluded prior to undertaking a costly study.

- If development to north of Hawkesbury River, as per NW Subregional Strategy, is to be followed, as does the draft Residential Land Strategy, then the development of Peels Dairy at North Richmond is most appropriate. This land is the largest tract in single ownership adjoining an existing urban area. However, historical and servicing issues need to be addressed and the draft Strategy target of medium density is not appropriate for this site.
- The land identified for further investigation, particularly in North Richmond, would seem to be capable of contributing well in excess of the required number of dwellings. *"Further the area noted for investigation of additional density should be increased to at least the 800 metre town centre.... Most of the North Richmond town is within this 800 metres circle and therefore should be available for appropriate urban infill."*
- The catchment distances (800 metres) around Windsor and Richmond should be more flexible and the current LEP provision should change. Also North Richmond catchment of 400 should be at least 800, same as Windsor and Richmond, as *"North Richmond should have no less medium density housing capability than other urban areas within the Hawkesbury"*

Comment

Some changes are proposed as a result of these submissions.

This is generally agreed, subject to the area being appropriately investigated and master planned as required by the draft Residential Land Strategy.

The matter raised about medium density is an issue raised in a number of discussions during exhibition. The need for a glossary of terms is required and the term “medium Density” and “Medium Density (vertical)” needs to be defined in the context of the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy. It would be appropriate to separate ‘medium density’ in the infill and Greenfield context.

The Strategy has identified investigation areas in excess of the requirements for the life of the strategy for three main reasons:

1. The first being that in some locations the investigation area identifies all of the area in the locality that is considered relatively constraint free, i.e. outside the area is too constrained for further investigation.
2. The second is that, for practical reasons, it is more appropriate to locate the investigation area boundary on a cadastre (property) boundary so that there is no question as to whether a property is in or out of the investigation area.
3. The third is that the over identification of the investigation area will enable a full investigation of the suitability of an area for further development to be undertaken. In this regard, all aspects of development, including buffer areas, riparian zones, open space, bushfire asset protection zones, etc, can be incorporated into this investigation area and not “spill out” of the identified investigation area.

The issue of the 400 and 800 metre zones and catchments, or any corresponding zone identified from other centres, can be amended to incorporate the bulk of an existing locality if supported. In this regard the density provisions can be extended when undertaking the structure, LEP or DCP work rather than changing the Strategy.

- The Strategy states, on page 4/43, that “*rural/residential development utilises large amounts of land and promotes a sprawled urban form.*” The submission states that “*What this fails to do is to recognise that rural/residential development can also provide a positive transition between urban and rural land*”.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

The comments made in the Draft Strategy were made in the context that if too much rural residential development is permitted, amongst other issues that this would create (such as increased cost of servicing, lack of public transport viability, increased car use and associated car parking problems this creates in nearby centres, housing affordability pressures and lack of housing choice), the development form would essentially be of an urban form but on a larger scale, i.e. road layouts (cul-de-sacs, etc) with housing fronting those roads but just larger allotments (Urban sprawl on a larger scale). The principles recommended in the Strategy for rural villages (rural residential) development do recognise the importance of this style of development and the ability of this to provide a transition between different types of development, hence, the principle of distance from centres or services.

- Agreement with the identification of Glossodia for reduction in the residential zone. However, states that “*The Glossodia future investigations map at 5.6.4 gives landowners false expectations as it is all shown as being subject to residential investigation. The map should more accurately reflect what is proposed.*”

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

The map and text contained in the Draft Residential Land Strategy is considered to be clear in relation to the intention for Glossodia and the other investigation areas shown in the Strategy. The comment in the submission refers to the map itself, however, as with all the Strategy documents, a single section or parts of the document cannot be taken in isolation as all the aspects of the Strategy relate to each other. Whilst it may be convenient to get all the information onto one map, in relation to a strategy that deals with the future 20 or 30 years, such as the residential land strategy, this is not possible.

- *"I query why South Windsor should be totally removed from consideration from further urban development?"*

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

South Windsor has not been "totally removed from consideration from further urban development" as shown Figure 5.6.5 at the end of chapter 5 of the Strategy. This figure identifies the existing urban areas in Windsor and South Windsor as potentially suitable for *"Longer term opportunities to increase densities subject to resolution of flood evacuation issues."* Council has already commenced the investigation of these issues and the draft results of this work should be available for comment in the early second half of 2011.

- Identification of land along Francis St, Richmond, whilst supported, is inconsistent with the noise criteria contained in the strategy.
- Aircraft noise restrictions seem to be too strict. Questions raised as to the desirability or need for the blanket prohibition of further development in areas higher than 20 ANEF noise exposure from the RAAF base.

Comment

Some changes are proposed as a result of this submission.

The land that this submission refers to is shown on Figure 5.6.1 as "short" and "medium term opportunities above flood level". These areas are relatively minor portions of the allotments on the edge of the floodplain that are above the 1 in 100 year flood level. These portions were identified initially to "tidy up" the edge of the development surrounding Richmond to coincide with the edge of the floodplain.

The Australian Noise Exposure Forecasts (ANEF) classifications for different uses are contained in Australian Standard – AS2021-2000 Acoustic Aircraft Noise Intrusion – Building siting and Construction and are reproduced in Table 4.7 of the draft Strategy. In relation to residential use the Standard states the following:

Building type	ANEF Zone of Site		
	Acceptable	Conditional	Unacceptable
House, home unit, flat, caravan park.	Less than 20 ANEF	20 to 25 ANEF	Greater than 25 ANEF
Commercial building	Less than 25 ANEF	25 to 35 ANEF	Greater than 35 ANEF

The properties that have been identified for further investigation along Francis Street, Richmond are within the 25 – 30 ANEF. From the above table, this is in the unacceptable range as suggested by the Australian Standard. However, these sites need to be considered in context with the rest of Richmond.

The area within the zoned town of Richmond currently affected by the 25 – 30 ANEF is substantial, bound, approximately, from west of Chapel St to the RAAF base and all the land between Windsor Street and Francis Street. There is also some land south of Windsor Street, between Paget and Chapel Streets that is also affected by the 25 – 30 ANEF. Within this affected area the land zoning, under the provisions of the Hawkesbury LEP 1989 (LEP 1989), includes Housing, Multi-unit housing and Commercial. The conversion of the LEP 1989 to the Standard Instrument format will retain these zoning provisions.

In this situation, i.e., the minor "tidy up" of the edge of the zones for Richmond, it would seem to be inconsistent that a more restrictive provision should apply to these minor areas when the remainder of the area of Richmond affected by the ANEF is less restrictive. In this case it is considered reasonable to make minor amendments to the "blanket" noise restrictions contained in the Strategy.

In this regard the following additional comments are proposed to be included in the Strategy on page 4/38, in Section 4.6.4 Noise exposure (replacing the last paragraph):

As Figure 4.15 identifies, the area immediately surrounding Richmond from approximately McGraths Hill to North Richmond is affected by aircraft noise exposure forecast (ANEF) ranging from 20-35. In this regard the ANEF Classifications of Acceptable, Conditional and Unacceptable as shown in Table 4.7 are to be applied to applications for rezoning to release land in those areas affected by these ANEF levels. However, these levels, due to the existing zoned land in Richmond affected by this high ANEF level, should not be strictly applied to the land identified for further investigation in Figure 5.6.1 ("Short and medium term opportunities") adjoining Richmond to the north, west and east.

Prior to the consideration of any rezoning of these properties in Richmond, development controls are to be incorporated into Council's Development Control Plan to address suitable provisions for the mitigation of noise for residential development in both the existing zoned areas and the proposed release lands. In these localities it is strongly suggested that zoning for uses other than residential be encouraged rather than provision of costly, elaborate noise mitigation measures.

The following point to be added, as a replacement to the current final point, to the "Implications for the Hawkesbury Residential Strategy" section 4.6.4:

Residential development in areas above 25 ANEF is considered unsuitable except in the vicinity of Richmond where up to 30 ANEF may be considered, conditional on appropriate noise mitigation measures being consistently applied. However, in areas where ANEF levels are above 25 the land should be more appropriately considered for non-residential uses.

- Redevelopment around the Richmond rail station should include residential development with the overriding design parameter being heritage integrity.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

This is agreed and the Draft Strategy does not prevent this.

- The Strategy should have 3, 5 and 10 year targets as well.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

It is agreed that there is a need for shorter targets. However, due to the lack of a Residential Land Strategy currently in the Hawkesbury, the limited vacant land supply and the potential 'unrealised' demand for housing development, it is difficult, if not impossible, to identify any trends in this field. It is considered that realistic short term targets could not be determined at the present time. These could be considered as part of the first review of the plan in the next five years, or following the release of the Census figures, when better estimates of the demand can be determined. However, there is scope for the setting of short term targets, via including the implementation tasks (generally set out in chapter 6 of the Strategy) in the Council's Management Plan process.

- Is there a possibility of a Housing Strategy to be developed in the near future?
- Housing Demand and supply:
 - Need for more investigation into the circumstances that drive the housing market.
- Analysis of Hawkesbury target is focused on theoretical application of demographic analysis in absence of market demand and experience.
- The Strategy acknowledges that many significant issues remain to be considered in detail that will affect Hawkesbury's ability to deliver the growth rates identified across parts of the LGA.
- Need to determine the reasons for decline of existing areas before identifying for medium density redevelopment.

- Agree that there is a decline in household occupancy rates and that there is a need for a greater range in dwelling sizes and opportunities. However, the draft Strategy does not properly acknowledge this and lacks a method for achieving these changing dwelling needs.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

These issues raised in submissions are correct in that the primary purpose of the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy was to identify land suitable for additional investigation and to set the criteria under which that land should be investigated.

It is agreed that there is a need for a more comprehensive analysis of the housing demand and supply. Many submissions, and discussions during the exhibition period, had raised the issue, e.g., “what we need is more rural residential development”, “everyone wants to live on larger allotments”, “no one wants to live in units, etc. However, none of these statements seem to be based on any substantive evidence. As such, it seems that these statements were simply personal preferences. In order to overcome the arguments of personal preferences for housing, a more comprehensive analysis of market demand and experience is required. However, due to the lack of a Residential Strategy currently in the Hawkesbury, the limited vacant land supply and the potential ‘unrealised’ demand for housing development, it is difficult, if not impossible, to identify any trends in this field. This work can be proposed once the direction for further development land, i.e., the adoption of the Hawkesbury residential Land Strategy, is set.

- In relation to the land identified for further investigation at North Richmond:
 - Strategy “*clearly recognises the role which future development may have in addressing road infrastructure inadequacies.*”
 - Strategy has only limited analysis of the flood matters. Then points out a number of these matters.

Comment

No change to the Strategy is proposed as a result of this submission.

These statements are correct.

The Strategy has set out to identify land that is suitable for further investigation, with the understanding that there is the need for a significant amount of additional work that is required prior to development proceeding. The sustainability criteria contained within the Strategy also recognises that some of the additional work can be undertaken as a result of a development proposal, e.g., rather than prior to a development being proposed.

The Strategy has identified a number of matters in relation to flooding that should be resolved by the Flood Risk Management Study and Plan or can then be further progressed after completion of that work.

- The following general comments were made in several submissions received:
 - The density proposed/projected in the Strategy are a substantial shift in the current situation in the Hawkesbury and are not backed by market analysis,
 - There seemed to be some confusion in the submissions and discussion as to the meaning of some terms used in the Strategy, particularly when referring to medium density and “medium density (vertical)”, amongst other terms,

Comment

Some changes are proposed as a result of these submissions.

The density ratio originally suggested in the draft Strategy has been removed. However, the Strategy is still based on a centres model, as resolved by Council on 8 July 2008, which has been agreed to by many submissions. Some wording changes are proposed to the Strategy to reinforce the proposal that, whilst the Strategy is proposing development based on existing centres, the Strategy does not

suggest that development should occur in these centres at the total disregard of the character, heritage or capacity (infrastructure and servicing) of the existing settlement.

In relation to the density, and other, terms used in the Draft Strategy, it is proposed to include a "Glossary of Terms" to the strategy to assist in the understanding of the document and to clarify the intent of some of the statements in the document.

General comments made in relation to jobs growth etc that were not relevant to residential strategy but have been dealt with in Employment Strategy.

Issues Raised and Discussed in Meetings with 'Hawkesbury Community Consultative Group'

Three, two hour meeting were held with a group calling themselves the "Hawkesbury Consultative Committee Group". These meetings were informal and generally consisted of up to nine attendees plus the Director City Planning. Minutes were taken at these meetings and were then circulated to all the members. The meetings discussed a variety of matters contained in the Strategy and many of these were for clarification of the meaning and application of parts of the Strategy. The specific matters worked through during these meetings were as follows:

- *Motivation for the Strategy. Why is it being prepared?*

Comment

The group was advised that the motivation for the Strategy was the lack of a Residential Strategy in the Hawkesbury and the need for such a strategy to provide direction for such matters. The need for the preparation of such a Strategy was identified and outlined in a report to Council dated 27 May 2007 where the program and outline was adopted by Council.

The group accepted the above explanation and no change was required to the Strategy.

- *Status of the Strategy. Can the draft be changed following exhibition or in the future?*

Comment

The group were advised that the draft is placed on exhibition for comment and then, if supported by Council, it can be changed prior to adoption. The Strategy is a Council document and, subject to following the appropriate processes and Policies, the document can be reviewed and changed to accommodate changing needs. However, it is not usual, and is not good practice, to change a long term strategy regularly or in less than five years.

The group accepted the above explanation and no change was required to the Strategy.

- *Impact of the latest version of the Metropolitan Strategy*

Comment

The recent changes to the Metropolitan Strategy do not significantly impact on the draft Hawkesbury residential Land Strategy. The group accepted the above explanation and no change was required to the Strategy.

- *Preparation of Complementary Plans, being Rural/Agricultural Strategy, Commercial and Industrial Strategy, Transport Plan.*

Comment

The Group were advised that the Council report of May 2007 proposed the preparation of a Land Use Strategy for the Hawkesbury to be prepared in small, manageable task so that certain areas could be addressed earlier. Similarly the Community Strategic Plan has identified some other tasks for completion, such as an Integrated Transport Plan. In this regard the Employment Land Strategy has been adopted by Council in December 2008, the draft Residential Land Strategy has been prepared and it is intended to commence work on a rural land strategy upon completion of the current strategy,

LEP conversion and the DCP review and other tasks currently underway to meet the State Government reform agenda.

The group accepted the above explanation and no change was required to the Strategy.

- Discussion surrounding numerous issues in the Strategy including;
 - Perceived inconsistency between dwelling targets and prediction tables,
 - Infrastructure provision, particularly sewer and public transport,
 - Land investigation at Vineyard and University lands,
 - Building heights, dwelling types, agricultural land and affordable housing.

Comment

The discussion around these issues occupied almost an entire 2 hour workshop with the group and included the following:

- The perceived inconsistencies related to the various tables within the Strategy. The principle perceived problem related to the “target of 5000 dwellings” and the Strategy calculation relating to 5,932 - 6,000 dwellings. As the tables relate to prediction models there are errors in rounding but also a calculation may achieve an exact figure, but as it is a prediction these figures are usually rounded.
- Clarification in relation to the Sustainability Matrix – The infrastructure requirements for settlement types are essentially the requirements for future development, i.e., development is not supported unless the required level of infrastructure is provided progressively with or before the development proceeds.
- General discussion about the inclusion of University land and the situation of Vineyard being included in the Growth Centre Strategic planning rather than Council’s.
- Clarification as to how building heights, dwelling types etc are addressed as they are not dealt with in the Strategy. (These are dealt with in the next phase of detailed planning including the Structure planning, LEP and DCP preparation for the localities).
- Agricultural land to be addressed via a separate Rural Land Strategy.

The group accepted the above explanations and no change was required to the Strategy.

- *How can Council justify additional development in centres, particularly in North Richmond, Glossodia and Wilberforce, when the infrastructure and services are inadequate for the existing development?*

Comment

This was the subject of significant discussion and clarification. There seemed to be a perception that additional development would be allowed in these localities without the provision of additional infrastructure and services. This is not correct.

The Strategy sets out the required services for typical settlement types, i.e., neighbourhood centre, village, town, etc. The Strategy requires that if additional development is proposed in these settlements then the infrastructure and service levels set in the Strategy must be provided either prior to development or staged as development proceeds. Similarly if an existing locality is not currently up to the standards identified in the Strategy then the “gap” can be identified and planned for upgrading as resources permit. (Note: This may not be able to be provided by an individual development proposal and may need to be provided via other means.) However, if development is proposed in an area with an infrastructure “gap” then appropriate arrangements need to be made (not necessarily only by the developer) for the gap to be addressed.

The group accepted the above explanation and no change was required to the Strategy.

- *If the target is quoted as “5,000 dwellings over 25 years” from 2004, how many have already been developed and what remains?*

Comment

Between January 2004 and October 2010 a total of 521 dwellings were approved by Council. This equated to an average of 76 dwellings per year. To achieve 5,000 dwellings over 25 years the figure

would need to be 200 per year. However, this growth rate is a “planned” rate, i.e., the planning is proposed to be in place, and the actual rate of growth will essentially be driven by the market.

The group accepted the above explanation and no change was required to the Strategy.

- On page 2/1, Section 2.3 last paragraph should add *“in consultation and expectations of the Community” in relation to the preparation of the Strategy.*

Comment

It was explained that the Strategy is written in preparation for adoption. The exhibition period, 4 months and including the current workshops, was the consultation that was being required. No change was required.

- On page 2/2, Section 2.7 – Sustainable Development. *“How long will it take to provide the requirements set out in 2.7?”*

Comment

Section 2.7 discusses sustainability indicators and outcomes. The implementation of these matters will take time as development proceeds, i.e., the life of the Strategy. Chapter six of the Strategy proposes a broad range of tasks to implement over time, via a range of strategies, plans and general Council operations, to work towards those outcomes.

The group accepted the above explanation and no change was required to the Strategy.

- On page 2/3, Section 2.8, Third paragraph “Residential Strategy will seek to”. *“Seek to should be deleted for obvious reasons”*

Comment

A strategy, as it is predicting a “desired future” should not use terms that are as specific as proposed by the group as in this section it is setting out desired outcomes of other proposed actions. The group agreed with the proposal to change the word “seek” to “aims”.

- On page 3/2, final paragraph. *Skill sets should be what the economy wants rather than what is existing.*

Comment

Group agreed to insert the words “and training” at the end of the paragraph.

- On page 3/12, Section 3.4.4 states “good access to existing services ...infrastructure”. *“I do not believe these essentials are available currently”.*

Comment

This statement was discussed in the context of the rest of Section 3.4.4. In this regard the statement is *“The majority of future dwellings will be located in existing urban areas where there is good access to existing services, facilities and infrastructure.”* The intent of this statement is that unless there is provision for an upgrade to these facilities to meet this requirement, the development would not be supported, i.e., the development would need to upgrade the services to meet the increase in demand generated by the development.

The group agreed that there is no need for a change to this section.

- Page 4/6, “Implications for Hawkesbury”. *“Who is to carry out the detailed site specific studies” Should the body responsible be inserted?*
- Page 4/30, Section 4.4.2 Implications for strategy. *When and who will carry out “Detailed investigations”?*

Comment

In these cases the responsibility varies depending on the situation. Generally if a proponent wishes to proceed with a development prior to any additional investigation being done, then they undertake the

work and it is reviewed by Council. In other cases the responsibility may be with the landowner. If Council wants to promote a particular area as a priority then Council may undertake the work subject to the resources being available. The group accepted this explanation and no changes required in regards to the nomination of the responsible body.

- Page 4/12, "Implications for Hawkesbury". *"Who is to prepare the "Flood Risk Management Plan"?"*

Comment

Explanation given to group that Council had previously resolved to prepare this Plan and work had commenced. Explanation accepted by the group.

Page 4/16, Section 4.1.7 last point in "Implications for the Hawkesbury residential Strategy" *"after "required" add urgently"*.

Comment

After discussion the group agreed to add the following words:

"...in the short term before further erosion of this important resource."

- Page 4/20, Section 4.2.2. How are the jobs defined, *"In accordance with the job definition of 1 hour in the week surveyed?"*

Comment

Following discussion regarding this matter the group agree the use the standard definition for jobs as used by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) will be used as this provides reliable data that can be repeated, used and measured.

- Page 4/22, Section 4.3.1. Question regarding train timetables.

Comment

Upon review and agreed by the group the last part of the last paragraph *"during peak hour and an hourly service for all stops during off-peak times."* be deleted.

- Page 4/22, Section 4.3.2 *"final paragraph add after Authority "and community groups"*.

Comment

This paragraph refers to the technical review of traffic and road capacities. It is not appropriate for community groups to be involved in a technical review of this kind. This was discussed with the group and it was agreed to not amend this paragraph as there is opportunity for community groups to have input into the review of the Strategy when required.

- Page 4/26, Section 4.3.6 Implications for strategy. *"Most of the implications do not apply at North Richmond, Wilberforce or Glossodia now. How is this going to be overcome?"*

Comment

It is understood that these matters do not apply in these localities at present. It is not reasonable to expect that an existing area can grow or change without an equivalent change to infrastructure and services. The intent of this section is to identify the infrastructure and services that would be needed so that the necessary planning and infrastructure and service provision program can be put in place prior to any further development occurring.

This explanation accepted by the group and no changes required.

- Page 4/33, Table 4.6. Questions in relation to the hospital bed numbers.

Comment

This table needs to be completed in relation to current provision of hospital beds and aged care facilities and will be inserted into the document when all the other recommended changes are made.

- On Page 4/34, Section 4.5.1, Determination of Community needs, who is going to do this and when is it to be done?

Comment

The Community Strategic Plan has identified the need to consult with the community to define the character of the Hawkesbury. This work is scheduled in the Management Plan for 2011/2012 financial year. This work, combined with land release investigations, will also contribute to the determination of community needs as these needs will vary from locality to locality. The Strategy deals with the tasks for this work on page 6/18.

The group accepted the above explanation and no change was required to the Strategy.

- On page 4/36, Implications for the Hawkesbury Residential Strategy. Progress report on this *matter* (investigation and upgrade of infrastructure) should be on every Council meeting agenda for the Community to gauge the progress.

Comment

This was discussed with the group and the Integrated Planning and Reporting framework and other reporting requirements for Councils were explained. It was suggested that a report on these matters was not required on every agenda as the existing reporting regime for these matters will provide an update at least every 6 – 12 months. There is also the opportunity for a report to be sent to Council as required outside these timeframes.

The group accepted the above explanation and no change was required to the Strategy.

- On page 4/42 there are comments regarding the preservation of “prime Agricultural” land. “*Prime*” should be defined and there is an urgent need to develop a rural land strategy to identify and preserve such land.

Comment

This matter of “prime” or “high quality” agricultural land was the subject of lengthy discussion at the group meetings. It was agreed by the group to remove these terms such as “prime” and “High Quality” when referring to this land. The reason for this is that there are a range of agricultural activities that have a broad range of needs. These needs are not always reliant on “prime” or “high quality” land or soils to produce their products. In these cases there needs to be a range of factors for consideration when undertaking investigations into agricultural use of land.

During the preparation of the Glossary of Terms (Copy attached to this report) it was considered more appropriate to define these terms as one rather than delete the words “Prime” and “High Quality” when referring to agricultural land. The reason for this was that it is generally accepted to refer to agricultural land as “prime” or “high Quality” and by leaving these terms in the Strategy it would assist in the understanding of the document. The combined definition of these terms allows the assessment of the land to consider more than just the soil classification and will enable all relevant considerations of agricultural uses to be considered.

- On page 4/42, Section 4.8.3 Environmentally Responsive Design, second paragraph, last sentence, “*on-site retention and recycling ... of water*”. Will this save every dam on Peel’s paddocks at North Richmond? This is a good example of “site retention and recycling”.

Comment

The comment in the Strategy refers to stormwater reuse and water sensitive urban design principles to be applied to future development. Whilst the Peels paddock dams are a good example of water recycling, they have been constructed to recycle water for a particular land use, i.e., dairy or grazing agricultural uses. If the land use changes (not proposed by the Strategy but identified for investigation) the water recycling measures would need to change for the changed land use, i.e., the appropriate solution for a farming land use is not generally suitable for an urban or other residential land use.

This explanation was discussed by the group and the explanation was accepted.

- On page 4/44, final point on that page, delete the word “encourage”

Comment

The point referred to in the Strategy currently states the following:

Subdivision controls should encourage/require lot design/layouts that provide that allotment layout that will facilitate more sustainable dwelling design/siting.

The meaning of this was discussed with the group. The reason for using the word “encourage” is that there are some sustainability controls, e.g., BASIX, that are set by the State Government and presently Council cannot require controls above those standards. As such the group agreed to change this section to the following:

*Subdivision controls should encourage/require lot design/layouts that provide ~~that~~ **an** allotment layout that will facilitate more sustainable dwelling design/siting **and development would be encouraged to design beyond the minimum requirements.***

It should also be noted that this section of the Strategy is proposing principles for a secondary issue to the strategy, i.e., sustainable dwelling design, which would be used in the development of dwelling design codes for any new release areas. These Codes could vary for each area (to retain character or fit with heritage considerations) and can then be included in the Development Control Plan.

- On page 4/45, Section 4.8.8. Delete the words “Generally be 3 – 6 Storeys” and insert “generally be 2 Storeys”.

Comment

This section is, like the above comment, proposing principles for the secondary issue to the Strategy, being preparation of more detailed controls for sustainable dwelling design. This part of the Strategy proposes generic principles for low, medium and high density development. These three categories are mentioned for the sake of being complete rather than being a requirement in the Strategy.

It was suggested in the discussion at the group meetings that to be describing “high density” development and limiting it to two storeys, in this context, did not make sense. It was discussed and agreed by the group that on the last line in the first paragraph of Section 4.8.8 (page 4/45) the words “generally be 3 – 6 storeys” be removed completely. This will allow the principles proposed in the strategy to be applied in different localities in the most appropriate manner. The matter of building heights, lot sizes etc, are not a matter for a strategy to define but will be matters that are addressed in the detailed planning for any future areas. As such, it is recommended that all references to number of storeys in a building be removed from the Strategy.

The group accepted the above explanation and the changes to remove the reference to building heights in the Strategy will be made.

- On page 4/45, Section 4.8.8, Key Principles. The strategy makes comments about attached dwellings facing the road and to “minimise site coverage to allow stormwater to infiltrate”. “*Would you explain as most attached dwellings currently do not face the road*” and “*The attached dwellings I have seen, seemed to be dwellings and concrete.*”

Comment

After some discussion at the group meetings and explanation of the Strategy by the Director City Planning, it was clear that the above comments (admitted by author of comments) that there was a misunderstanding of the language and tense used in the Strategy.

The Strategy is written in positive terms and written in future tense, i.e., the comments are written for future development and not referring to existing or current development in this instance. Current development and trends are considered in the earlier chapters of the Strategy where population and

demographic analysis (Chapter 3) is undertaken as well as the key issue analysis (most of Chapter 4). Chapter 5 is the opportunity and constraint analysis section where there is discussion as to the constraints and what should be considered to enable opportunities to be explored. Chapter 6 contains the sustainability matrix and sustainability actions that should be followed to ensure appropriate development occurs.

Following this discussion the group had a better understanding of the terms used and were satisfied with the explanation. No change to the Strategy was required.

- On page 6/2, Table 6.1. What does the “m” stand for and if it is metres where did these figures come from?

Comment

Table 6.1 contains a hierarchy of Centres in the Hawkesbury based on the terms and criteria used in the North West Subregional Strategy. The “m” stands for metres and the catchment distances are the same distances used in the North West Subregional Strategy. These terms were used to ensure some consistency between the relevant State and Local strategies. These figures are a general standard used in similar documents and are based on walking distance catchments. However, it is not intended that these catchment distances be “hard and fast” rules that cannot be varied. It is always the case that a town, village or neighbourhood centre is not exactly round and the catchment varies in size and shape depending on topography and the like. The terms are used for consistency to enable categorising the settlement into the sustainability matrix in Chapter six of the Strategy.

The group accepted the above explanation and no change was required to the Strategy.

- *“At page 6/3, Section 6.4 at Public Transport and Access point 4, Transport infrastructure is available.... Urban development”. “or scheduled” needs to be absolutely watertight. As you are aware too many commitments are abandoned by the stroke of a pen.”*

Comment

This comment refers to the Sustainability Matrix (Chapter 6) requirement to address certain matters as part of any land release or future development. In this case the comment refers to the following comment:

“Transport infrastructure is available or scheduled to be provided in a timely and efficient way to service future urban development.”

The above sustainability criteria are one of many (see section 6.4 in Strategy) that will apply to new development. These criteria will apply to all areas identified in the Strategy, and as the detailed investigation and planning for each of those areas will differ to cater for the unique circumstances in each of those areas, the wording of the criteria cannot be “watertight” in the same sense as if it referred to a particular, individual development application.

The discussion at the group meeting came to this understanding and did not require any change to this section. The understanding was that these matters are more appropriately addressed at the DA stage.

- The following submission was received from a representative of the ABRAG (Agnes Banks Residents Action Group Inc.):

“In view of this being our apparent last meeting tonight to consider this strategy, I thought I should put in writing the formal rejection of the Draft Strategy on behalf of ABRAG (Agnes Banks Residents Action Group Inc.) and Agnes Banks residents due to the failure of the report to address our concerns on the omission of any particular reference to Agnes Banks in this strategy.

Our concern is that this omission will not protect Agnes Banks from unreasonable development within it's area, given the problems already experienced on this

occasion with the Hawkesbury Gas DA, and subsequent problems caused by the failure of the occupants to comply with the provisions of the DA.”

Comment

This submission was received in the afternoon prior to the last meeting with the “Hawkesbury Community Consultative Group”. The submission was discussed with the representative from the ABRAG prior to the meeting and also with the group as a whole.

The principle concerns of the ABRAG related to the Strategy not specifically mentioning Agnes Banks which made the group feel that the locality had been forgotten. The second concern related to the residents concern that this apparent exclusion of the locality in the Strategy would result in “unreasonable development” (This concern originated from issues about a matter unrelated to the Strategy, being a past development application for Hawkesbury Gas).

In relation to the first concern that there was a perceived exclusion of the locality, the Director City Planning explained the provisions of the Strategy in relation to Agnes Banks. The Strategy has identified all the flood free land around Agnes Banks for further investigation. This can be seen in Figure 5.6.1 Richmond Future Investigation Areas. The existing parts of Agnes Banks that is currently zoned “Housing” under the provisions of the Hawkesbury LEP 1989 has not been included for investigation as it is already zoned for urban purposes.

The second concern related to development in the existing area zoned for housing. The Strategy does not undertake the detailed planning of existing or proposed development areas. However, the Strategy has identified design and development principles to be used as part of that detailed planning as well as identifying tasks for the implementation of the Strategy (See Chapter 6 of the Strategy).

Following this explanation and discussion with the ABRAG representative and the rest of the group it was understood by the Director City Planning that the submitted objection was no longer relevant. The concerns about development within and surrounding Agnes Banks can be addressed via more detailed Structure planning should the investigation areas be supported in the Strategy.

Summary of changes to the Draft Residential Land Strategy

The following table is a summary of the proposed changes to the Draft Strategy following public exhibition. There are some relatively minor wording changes that have been described in the main body of this report and are not specifically nominated in the following table. These minor changes and the more substantial changes that are being proposed in this report will be made to the document following Council adopting those changes.

Proposed Change to Strategy	To be added to the Document
Include area to the south of Spinks Road, Glossodia being the following properties: • Lot 2 DP 533402 and Lot 52 DP 1104504, 103 Spinks Road, Glossodia • Lot 20 DP 214753, 213 Spinks Road, Glossodia • Lot 75 DP 214752, 361 Spinks Road, Glossodia • Lot 3 DP 230943, James Street, Glossodia • Lot 44 DP 214755, 3 Derby Place, Glossodia • Lot 50 DP 751637, 746A Kurmond Road, Freemans Reach • Lots 1, 2 and 3DP 784300, 780A – 780C Kurmond Road, North Richmond	✓
Glossary of Terms (Attached to this report)	✓
Change to the wording in relation to ANEF controls (Page 4/38)	✓
Some wording changes were made to the Strategy to reinforce the proposal that, whilst the Strategy is proposing development based on existing centres, the Strategy does not suggest that development should occur in these centres at the total disregard of the character, heritage or	✓

capacity (infrastructure and servicing) of the existing settlement.	
General and minor wording changes as set out in the “Issues Raised and Discussed in Meetings with ‘Hawkesbury Community Consultative Group’” section.	✓
Removal of all references to building heights in the Strategy.	✓
Include a more comprehensive Table of Contents	✓

Conformance to Community Strategic Plan

The proposal is consistent with the Looking After People and Place Directions statements;

- Be a place where we value, protect and enhance the historical, social, cultural and environmental character of Hawkesbury's towns, villages and rural landscapes.
- Offer residents a choice of housing options that meets their needs whilst being sympathetic to the qualities of the Hawkesbury.
- Population growth is matched with the provision of infrastructure and is sympathetic to the rural, environmental, heritage values and character of the Hawkesbury.
- Have development on both sides of the river supported by appropriate physical and community infrastructure.
- Have future residential and commercial development designed and planned to minimise impacts on local transport systems allowing easy access to main metropolitan gateways

and is also consistent with (or is a nominated) strategy in the Community Strategic Plan being:

- Prepare residential land strategy.
- Identify community needs, establish benchmarks, plan to deliver and advocate for required services and facilities.

The Residential Land Strategy, apart from being a specific strategy within the Community Strategic Plan, is also a document that will provide guidance for the achievement of a number of other strategies, e.g. *Create a sustainable land use strategy that protects environmentally sensitive lands, Facilitate the integration of a transport network*, and goals, e.g. *Accommodate at least 5,000 new dwellings to provide a range of housing options (including rural residential) for diverse population groups whilst minimising environmental footprint, People are living more sustainably, Council demonstrate leadership by implementing sustainability principles*, contained in the Community Strategic Plan.

The proposed implementation timeframe for this matter, as specified in the CSP Milestones is 2010.

Financial Implications

The preparation and exhibition of the Residential Land Strategy has been provided for in Component 43 – City Planning, Consultancy, of the 2010/2011 Adopted Budget. The project has progressed within the adopted budget and the additional work required as recommended in this report following public exhibition can be undertaken within the remaining budget allocation for this matter.

Planning Decision

As this matter is covered by the definition of a “planning decision” under Section 375A of the Local Government Act 1993, details of those Councillors supporting or opposing a decision on the matter must be recorded in a register. For this purpose a division must be called when a motion in relation to the matter is put to the meeting. This will enable the names of those Councillors voting for or against

the motion to be recorded in the minutes of the meeting and subsequently included in the required register.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. Adopt the changes proposed to the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy following public exhibition as detailed in the report.
2. Adopt the amended Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy.

ATTACHMENTS:

- AT - 1** Glossary of Terms to be included in the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy
AT - 2 Exhibited Draft Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy (*Distributed under Separate Cover*)

AT - 1 Glossary of Terms to be included in the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy

Glossary of Terms

ABS

Australian Bureau of Statistics

ANEF

Australian Noise Exposure Forecast. These forecasts are shown on a map showing noise contours based on the operations of an airport. These forecasts are referred to in Australian Standard – AS2021-2000 Acoustic Aircraft Noise Intrusion – Building siting and Construction.

Centres Hierarchy

Term used to classify different centre types into an order of size, i.e., Strategic Centre (Global Sydney, Regional Centre (Penrith), Specialised Centre (Norwest) and Major Centre (Castle Hill or Blacktown) and Local Centres (Town, village, small village and neighbourhood centres.)

Character

The aggregate of qualities that distinguishes one locality or settlement from another. This is a subjective matter and will vary from locality to locality.

DCP

Development Control Plan. Supplements the LEP by providing more detailed planning controls that apply to various land uses in different zones.

DECCW

Department of Climate Change and Water

DPI

Department of Primary Industry

Employment Land Strategy

Hawkesbury Employment Land Strategy, adopted by Council in December 2008.

Flood Prone Land

Land susceptible to flooding by the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF). Flood Prone Land is synonymous with flood liable land.

Flood Risk Management Plan

A management plan developed in accordance with the principles and guidelines in the *“Floodplain Development Manual”*. This plan usually includes both written and diagrammatic information describing how particular areas of flood prone land are to be used and managed to achieve defined objectives.

Future Investigation Areas

Localities identified from the Constraint Severity Index (CSI) mapping that have a high opportunity for future development. These areas need further investigation to determine the locality's ability to support additional or new housing development. The principle future investigation areas are identified in Section 5.6 of the Strategy and include Richmond, North Richmond, Windsor, Wilberforce and Glossodia

Heritage

In relation to the Residential Land Strategy heritage refers to State and Locally listed items, areas or landscapes. Heritage can also be considered in relation to character and heritage listed and non-listed items can contribute to the overall character and amenity of the locality.

I & I

NSW Department of Industry and Investment (Former Department of Primary Industry)

Infrastructure

Generic term used to describe the services and facilities that are required for development to take place. In its broadest terms this will include, Roads, Water, Sewer, Electricity, Telecommunications, Open Space, Parks, Community Facilities (Community Halls, etc), shops, and any other services that are required for the developed community.

LEP

Local Environmental Plan. This Plan is the principle planning document for a Local Council which defines the location and contents of land use zones and controls. This Plan is prepared by the Council but is finalised by the Minister for Planning when it is published in the Government Gazette.

Low Density

Low density development is typically characterised by single dwellings located on a single allotment. This type of development is usually a density of less than 10 dwellings per hectare.

Medium Density (Greenfield)

Greenfield development is the development of land that is currently not developed for urban purposes. In relation to this Strategy Medium Density (Greenfield) is development of vacant land adjoining existing centres, such as North Richmond or Wilberforce. This type of development provides an important smaller housing format suited to the increasing number of smaller households such as couples without children, lone person households and options for older people. This type of development is usually a density of up to 20 dwellings per hectare.

Medium Density (Infill)

Infill development is development of vacant land, or the redevelopment of land, within existing centres. In this regard it is the development, or redevelopment, of land already zoned for such a purpose. Medium Density (Infill) development has the same characteristics as Medium Density (Greenfield) except that it usually replaces existing older housing stock at a higher density, usually up to 20-25 dwellings per hectare. This type of development is often referred to as "Townhouses, villas and flats".

Medium Density (Vertical)

This description applies to "flats, home units and apartments" of a height broadly consistent with existing and approved development in Richmond and Windsor. This development type will usually be located in "infill" development areas and has a density up to 25-30 dwellings per hectare.

Neighbourhood Centre

Generally a centre containing one or a small cluster of shops and services. Generally contains between 150 and 900 dwellings. Current examples of Neighbourhood centres in the Hawkesbury include Glossodia, Hobartville, Kurmond, Kurrajong, Pitt Town, and Wilberforce.

Prime or High Quality Agricultural Land

General term for describing land that is more suitable for agricultural land uses. Whilst these terms usually relate to soil classification (soils more suited to agriculture) these terms when used in the Residential Land Strategy refer to the land characteristics in general and are not solely reliant on soil types. In this regard the terms are also used where location, surrounding land uses or other relevant characteristics make land more suited to agricultural or aquaculture pursuits.

Probable Maximum Flood

The Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) is the largest flood that could conceivably occur at a particular location. The PMF defines the extent of flood prone land, that is, the floodplain.

Rural Residential

This development type is low density; large lot residential development located surrounding rural villages and within rural zoned land where the predominant land use is residential. The density of this development is approximately 1 dwelling per hectare.

Short, Medium and Long term

Short term refers to a time period of approximately 5 years,
Medium term refers to a time period of approximately 5 - 10 years,
Long term refers to a time period in excess of 10 years.

Structure Plan

A plan to develop the overall concept of an area, locality or settlement. The Structure Plan will outline the general concepts and parameters for future development to enable the preparation of more detailed development control plans for future development. A Structure Plan is usually developed for an area following the completion of a Strategy and prior to the preparation of a Development Control Plan or assessment of a Development Application.

Sustainability Matrix

A tool to assist in the establishment of minimum levels of services and facilities for a particular centre type. The matrix nominates the character and level of service provision in terms of numbers of dwellings, type of retail and employment, infrastructure requirements, public transport provision and level of community service.

Town

A settlement of generally one or two supermarkets, community facilities, medical centre, schools, etc. Generally contains approximately 4,500 to 9,000 dwellings. Examples of Town Centres in the Hawkesbury are Windsor and Richmond.

Urban Land

Any land zoned for urban purposes, such as residential or commercial land uses, and excludes any land that is zoned for any rural or environment protection purpose.

Village

A settlement with a strip of shops and surrounding residential area within a 5 to 10 minute walk containing generally one supermarket, takeaway food shops, hairdresser, etc. Generally contains approximately 2,100 to 5,500 dwellings. An example of a Village Centre in the Hawkesbury is North Richmond.

oooO END OF REPORT Oooo

