



File no: LEP-17-0002

#### 14 September 2017

Catherine Van Laeren Regional Director Department of Planning & Environment GPO Box 39 SYDNEY NSW 2001

Department of Planning Received 2 1 SEP 2017

Scanning Room

Dear Madam,

### Gateway Submission of Planning Proposal - Elara Estate Precinct 3 - part of Lot 111 DP 1190510, Richmond Road, Marsden Park

We are submitting herewith a Planning Proposal for your consideration at the next available LEP Review Panel Meeting for a Gateway Determination.

Council prepared this Planning Proposal to amend *State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006* as it relates to part of Lot 111 DP 1190510, Richmond Road, Marsden Park, to make minor boundary adjustments to RE1 Public Recreation zones and rezone part of SP2 Local Drainage to RE1 Public Recreation.

The Planning Proposal document, relevant maps, supporting studies and Council Report are enclosed. We request that this matter be considered and a Gateway Determination issued to enable the Planning Proposal to proceed.

If you would like to discuss this matter further, please contact Student Strategic Planner, Brock Cauchi on 9839 6049.

Yours faithfully,

emot

Fiona McDermott Team Leader Releases Areas

> Council Chambers • 62 Flushcombe Road • Blacktown NSW 2148 Telephone: (02) 9839 6000 • Facsimile: (02) 9831-1961 • DX 8117 Blacktown Email: council@blacktown.nsw.gov.au • Website: www.blacktown.nsw.gov.au All correspondence to: The General Manager • PO Box 63 • Blacktown NSW 2148

This letter contains important information. If you do not understand it, please come to Council's Administration Centre and discuss the letter with Council staff who will arrange interpreter services.

هام

عربي

هذه الرسالة تحتوي على معلومات هامة. إذا لم تفهمها، نرجوك الإتصال بمركز إدارة المجلس ومناقشة الرسالة مع موظفي المجلس والذين سيقومون بترتيب خدمات مترجم.

#### ΠΡΟΣΟΧΗ

#### ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΑ

Η παρούσα επιστολή περιέχει σημαντικές πληροφορίες. Για τυχόν διευκρινίσεις, παρακαλούμε να προσέλθετε στο Διοικητικό Κέντρο της Δημαρχίας για να συζητήσετε την επιστολή με τους αρμόδιους υπαλλήλους, που θα φροντίσουν να σας παρασχεθούν υπηρεσίες διερμηνέα.

#### IMPORTANTE

#### ITALIANO

Questa lettera contiene informazioni importanti. Se non la capisci, sei invitato a venire al Centro amministrativo del Municipio per parlare della lettera con gli impiegati del Municipio, i quali organizzeranno i servizi di un interprete.

#### IMPORTANTE

#### TAGALOG

Ang liham na ito ay naglalaman ng mahalagang impormasyon. Kung ito ay hindi ninyo maintindihan, makipagkita sa empleyado ng Konseho sa Sentro ng Administrasyon ng Konseho (Council's Administration Centre) upang mapagusapan ito. Ang serbisyo sa pagpapaliwanag ay ihahanda para sa iyo.

#### IMPORTANTE

### ESPANOL

Esta carta contiene información importante. Si usted no la entendiera, le rogamos venir a las oficinas administrativas del municipio (Council's Administration Centre) para tratar la carta con un funcionario municipal, quien se encargará de proporcionarle los servicios de un intérprete.

#### ÖNEMLİ

#### TÜRKÇE

Bu mektup önemli bilgiler içerir. Mektubu anlayamazsanız lütfen Belediye'nin Yönetim Merkezi'ne gelip Belediye'nin tercümanlık hizmetlerini ayarlayacak olan görevliler ile görüşünüz.

#### VAŽNO

## informaciju. Ako ga ne razumije

Ovo pismo sadrži vaznu informaciju. Ako ga ne razumijete, molimo dođite u administrativni centar Općinskog Odbora i razgovarajte o pismu s općinskim osobljem, koje će se pobrinuti za tumača.

#### महत्वपूरण

#### हनिदी

इस पत्र में महत्वपूर्ण सूचना है। यद आप इसे न समझ पा रहे हों, तो कृपया ज़लिा परषिद (काउंसलि) के प्रशासन केंद्र में आइये और परषिद के कर्मचारयों से इस पत्र के बारे में बात करएि, जो आपके लपि दभाषयाि सेवा का परबंध करेंगे।

#### IMPORTANTI

Din l-ittra fiha taghrif importanti. Jekk int ma tistax tifhimha, jekk joghgbok ejja fie-Centru ta' l-Amministrazzjoni tal-Kunsill biex tiddiskuti l-ittra ma' l-istaff tal-Kunsill u dawn jirrangawlek biex ikollok servizz ta' interpretu.

#### ВАЖНО

СРПСКИ

Ово писмо садржи важне информације. Ако га не разумете, молимо дођите у Административни центар општинског одбора и поразговарајте о писму са општинским особљем, које ће се побринути за тумача.

#### TĀUA

O lenei tusi o loo iai ni faamatalaga tāua. A e lē malamalama iai, faamolemole susū mai i le Council's Administration Centre ma talatalanoa ai i le aufaigaluega a le Council e ala i se tagata faaliliuupu ua fatulagaina.

#### QUAN TRỌNG

#### TIẾNG VIỆT

Có những tin tức quan trọng trong bức thư này. Nêu quý vị không hiều, xin vui lòng đến Trung Tâm Hành Chánh của Hội Đồng và thảo luận lá thư này với nhân viên của Hội Đồng Thành Phố. Nhân viên này sẽ dàn xếp để dịch vụ thông ngôn giúp quý vị.

#### WAŻNE

#### Niniejszy list zawiera ważne informacje. Zgłoś się do OśrodkaAdministracjiLokalnej (Council's Administration Centre), jeśli go nie rozumiesz i chcesz w tej sprawie porozmawiać. Pracownik administracji zorganizuje tłumacza.

#### ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਣ

#### ਪੰਜਾਬੀ

ਇਸ ਪਤ੍ਰਿਕਾ ਵਿੱਚ ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਣ ਜਾਣਕਾਰੀ ਹੈ। ਜੋ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਇਸ ਦੀ ਸਮਝ ਨਹੀ ਆਉਦੀ, ਤਾਂ ਕ੍ਰਿਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਕੈਂਸਲ ਦੇ ਐਡਮਿਨਸਟ੍ਰੇਟਿਵ ਸੈਂਟਰ ਆ ਕੇ ਕੈਂਸਲ ਦੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਅਧਿਕਾਰੀ ਨਾਲ ਇਸ ਪਤ੍ਰਿਕਾ ਬਾਰੇ ਗਲਬਾਤ ਕਰੋ ਅਤੇ ਉਹ ਦੁਭਾਸ਼ੀਏ ਦੀ ਸੇਵਾ ਦਾ ਪ੍ਰਬੰਧ ਕਰਨਗੇ।

#### 重要!

#### 简体中文

这封信中包含有重要讯息。若您不理解信中的内容,请 前往市议会管理中心,市议会的员工将会为您安排翻译 人员服务并与您一起探讨信中的内容。

#### 重要!

#### 繁體中文

這封信中包含有重要訊息。若您不理解信中的內容,請 前往市議會管理中心,市議會的員工將會爲您安排翻譯 人員服務並與您一起探討信中的內容。

65



# **Planning Proposal**

# Elara Estate Precinct 3

Part of Lot 111, DP 1190510, Richmond Road, Marsden Park September 2017

### INTRODUCTION

Blacktown City Council has received a request from GLN Planning on behalf of Stockland to facilitate an amendment to *State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Regional Growth Centres) 2006* (the Growth Centres SEPP) to rezone land in Stockland's 'Elara' development located in the vicinity of Richmond Road, Marsden Park.



The proposal relates to two parcels of land owned by Stockland within Precinct 3 of Stockland's 'Elara' Estate. The subject sites are zoned RE1 Public Recreation and SP2 Local Drainage under the Growth Centres SEPP. The figure below illustrates current zoning of RE1 Public Recreation and SP2 Local Drainage in the boundaries of Precinct 3 surrounded by R2 Low Density Residential zoning.



The proposal seeks to vary the location of future playing fields and facilitate a modified drainage design to improve connectivity and provide level access for residents walking to the

fields. Minor changes are also sought to the location of a proposed local park to ensure the zone boundaries match new lot boundaries as a result of subdivision. This will allow consistency between land use zones and property boundaries, and requires an amendment to *State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006.* 

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of this proposal is to facilitate the amendment of the Growth Centres SEPP to rezone the affected land to RE1 Public Recreation and SP2 Local Drainage, and to rezone previous boundaries to R2 Low Density Residential given the new subdivision. The zoning amendments will also necessitate corresponding amendments to the Land Zoning, Dwelling Density, Height of Buildings and Land Reservation Acquisition Maps (Sheets 002 and 005) under the Growth Centres SEPP.

#### THE SITE

The subject sites, within Precinct 3 of Stockland's 'Elara' Estate, are located to the west of Richmond Road in the North West Growth Priority Area at Marsden Park. Precinct 3 is currently located at Lot 111, DP 1190510, and consists of future lots 31 (Playing Field) and 32 (Local Park) that will be subdivided under approved and future DAs relating to the site. Lot 111 has a total area of approximately 40.05ha, and is currently undergoing construction works in order to enable its subdivision. The figure below illustrates the sites which will undergo boundary adjustments within Precinct 3 of Stockland's 'Elara' Estate.



This subdivision will create residue lots which will require further subdivision to create smaller residue lots. These smaller residue lots will then be subdivided into residential lots once the rezoning is processed and the lots are zoned wholly for residential use.

#### COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

The request from GLN on behalf of Stockland to facilitate an amendment to the Growth Centres SEPP was received by Blacktown City Council through a draft Planning Proposal dated 6 June 2017. Council recommendation has resolved to:

1. Prepare and forward a Planning Proposal to the Department of Planning and Environment requesting a Gateway Determination to amend State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Regional Growth Centres) 2006 to make minor zone boundary adjustments and corresponding changes to planning controls that apply to land within Precinct 3 of the Marsden Park Precinct.

- 2. Implement any conditions attached to a Gateway Determination issued by the Greater Sydney Commission.
- 3. Advise the proponent that Recommendation 1 does not imply or guarantee that the Planning Proposal will ultimately be supported. Council's final determination of the proposal will occur when Council resolved to adopt the Planning Proposal following exhibition and consideration of all relevant matters.

Accordingly, this Planning Proposal has been prepared by Council Officers with the assistance of information provided by GLN, and in accordance with the Department of Planning & Environment's format for planning proposals as outlined in *A Guide to Preparing Planning Proposals* and *Guide to Preparing Local Environment Plans.* 

Consequential amendments to relevant sections of the Blacktown City Council Growth Centre Precinct Development Control Plan (BCC-GC Precincts CP) Schedule 5 are also required to be amended to reflect the proposed changes to zoning.

This Planning Proposal is accompanied by the following supporting documents:

- J Wyndham Prince Report Trunk Drainage Channel (Appendix 1)
- Precinct 3 sports field zoning area map (Appendix 2)
- Precinct 3 Local Park zoning area map (Appendix 3)
- Precinct 3 combined zoning changes map (Appendix 4)

### THE PLANNING PROPOSAL

#### PART 1 – Objectives and Intended Outcomes

The objective of this Planning Proposal is to:

• Facilitate the amendment of the Growth Centres SEPP to reflect boundary changes to Lot 111, DP 1190510 Richmond Road, Marsden Park including playing fields, a local park and drainage.

The intended outcome of this Planning Proposal is to promote a more suitable subdivision pattern for the use of public recreation, and to install a drainage system which increases connectivity and aesthetic qualities of the local area.





#### PART 2 – Explanation of Provisions

The effect of the Planning Proposal would be attained by amending the Blacktown LEP 2015 to facilitate an amendment to the Growth Centres SEPP in terms of zoning and other relevant provisions of the subject site required to achieve the objectives and intended outcomes of the Planning Proposals as outlined below:

- 1. Amend the Growth Centres SEPP NWGC Land Zoning Map (Sheet 002 + Sheet 005) to align land use zones with approved property boundaries and adjust the location of the playing field eastwards. **Attachment 1.**
- Amend the Growth Centres SEPP NWGC Dwelling Density Map (Sheet 002 + Sheet 005) to align the 15 dwelling density area with the adjusted location of the R2 Low Density Residential zone and remove it over RE1 and SP2 zoned land. Attachment 2.

- Amend the Growth Centres SEPP NWGC Height of Buildings Map (Sheet 002 + Sheet 005) to align the 9m height limit with the adjusted location of the R2 Low Density Residential zone and remove it over RE1 and SP2 zoned land. Attachment 3.
- 4. Amend the Growth Centres SEPP NWGC Land Reservation Acquisition Map (Sheet 002 + Sheet 005) to align the land identified to be acquired with the RE1 Public Recreation and SP2 Local Drainage zoning and remove the acquisition layer and to remove the acquisition layer over residential zoned land. Attachment 4

#### PART 3 – Justification

#### Section A – Need for the Planning Proposal

#### 1. Is the Planning Proposal a result of any strategic study or report?

No. The Planning Proposal is in response to normalising zone boundaries to ensure there is consistency with approved development.

# 2. Is the Planning Proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes, or is there a better way?

Yes. The proposed changes to the playing fields, in terms of its boundaries and associated drainage, as well as the regularisation of zone boundaries of subject sites can only be achieved via amendments to the Growth Centres SEPP Maps.

As per Section 74 of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979 'an environmental planning instrument may be amended in whole or in part by a subsequent planning instrument whether of the same or a different type.'

The Planning Proposal seeks to amend Blacktown LEP, to facilitate the amendment of the Growth Centres SEPP, therefore providing Council with an ability to propose amendments to a SEPP via its LEP. Given the SEPP operates in Blacktown similar to an LEP, amending the Growth Centres SEPP via the LEP (through a Planning Proposal) is considered the best mechanism to zoning and boundary changes on the site.

#### Section B – Relationships to Strategic Planning Framework

3. Is the Planning Proposal consistent with the objectives and actions of the applicable regional or sub-regional strategy (including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and exhibited draft strategies)?

#### (a) A Plan for Growing Sydney

The current Sydney metropolitan strategy *A Plan for Growing Sydney* identifies that Sydney will need around 664,000 additional homes over the next 20 years. The North West Growth Priority Area is identified within the Plan as a release growth area and includes objectives and actions to guide the development of this area which will assist with housing supply and housing choice.

The Plan identifies greenfield development in new land release areas as an important component of Sydney's overall housing supply comprising almost a quarter of Sydney's housing growth in recent years.

The rezoning sought under this Planning Proposal will facilitate a better design of the playing field and drainage infrastructure providing better accessibility by local residents living within the Precinct. The Planning Proposal will also provide clarity in the planning controls by fixing irregular zoning patterns over lots.

The Planning Proposal lodged is minor in nature and will not be inconsistent with the proposed changes to *A Plan for Growing Sydney*.

#### (b) Draft West Central District Plan

The Greater Sydney Commission has released draft District Plans to help guide Government decisions. The Marsden Park Precinct is located within the draft West Central District, and is illustrated as a strategic centre within the North West Growth Centre. The proposed amendments do not affect the Marsden Park strategic centre located to the south of the site, and will facilitate housing within the Precinct and the delivery of infrastructure to support additional resident with the aims of this draft plan.

#### (c) West Central Subregion

Marsden Park is located within the West Central Subregion of Sydney. The Planning Proposal is consistent with the objectives outlined for the West Central Subregion in that it will support the priority to 'accelerate housing supply, choice and affordability and build great places to live.'

# 4. Is the Planning Proposal consistent with a Council's Local Strategy or other Local Strategic Plan?

The *Blacktown Planning Strategy 2036* is Council's key strategic land use planning document that will facilitate and manage future growth and development within the City of Blacktown to 2036. The document identifies that by 2036, Blacktown LGA is predicted to grow to approximately 500,000 people and 180,000 dwellings. A key direction under the strategy is to accommodate population and employment growth within the new release areas in the North West Growth Centre.

The strategic directions outlined in the plan include:

- 1. A vibrant and inclusive community
- 2. A clean and sustainable environment
- 3. A smart and prosperous economy
- 4. A growing city supported by accessible infrastructure
- 5. A sporting and active city
- 6. A leading city

The Planning Proposal is consistent with this local strategy by providing clarity to the planning controls so as to enable the provision of housing within a key growth area, along with ensure infrastructure is provided to support the growth in population and infrastructure demand.

Piped drainage supports direction 2 in creating 'a clean and sustainable environment'. Having greater access to green spaces through increased connectivity supports direction 2 in creating a 'sporting and active city'.

# 5. Is the Planning Proposal consistent with applicable State Environmental Planning Policies?

A review of State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs) has been undertaken and the consistency of the Planning Proposal with the applicable SEPPs is summarised in **Attachment 1**.

This Planning Proposal does not contain provisions that will contradict or would hinder the application of these SEPPs. Further assessment against the relevant SEPPs will be undertaken during the DA stage.

The principle planning instrument affecting the Subject Site is *State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres)* 2006.

SEPP	Aim	Comments
Growth Centres SEPP	Relevant aims of the Blacktown Growth Centres Precinct Plan under clause 1.2 include:	The Planning Proposal is consistent with the aims of the Growth Centres SEPP.
	<ul> <li>(a) to rezone land to allow for development to occur in the manner envisaged by the growth centre structure plan and the indicative layout for the land to which this Precinct Plan applies,</li> <li>(b) to deliver housing choice and affordability by accommodating a wide range of residential</li> </ul>	The Planning Proposal seeks approval for a minor rezoning related to the northern playing field and an amendment to the land use zoning and associated planning control maps to address minor inconsistencies between them and approved subdivision layouts. These inconsistencies are based on DA approvals that
	<ul> <li>dwelling types that cater for housing diversity,</li> <li>(c) to guide the bulk and scale of future development within the Precinct,</li> </ul>	have relied on the zone boundary flexibility clause under the Growth Centres SEPP. The changes to the northern playing fields are to facilitate a more functional design and improved
	(f) to rezone land to allow for retail and commercial uses to meet the needs of future residents of the Marsden Park Precinct and surrounding areas.	amenity. These amendments will 'tidy up' the inconsistencies to support and facilitate the aims of the Growth Centres, particular in relation to aims (a), (b), (c) and (f).
SEPP 55 – Remediation of land	Relevant considerations of SEPP 55 relating to Planning Proposals under clause 6 include:	Contamination has been assessed as part of the bulk earthworks DAs over the site and found to be suitable.
	<ul> <li>(a) the planning authority has considered whether the land is contaminated, and</li> <li>(b) if the land is contaminated, the planning authority is satisfied that the land is</li> </ul>	A Contamination Report was prepared by JBS&G. The subject site is located within Precinct 3 and forms part of the area identified within the report as the 'rear paddocks'. Based on the findings of the report, there were no known contaminants located within

A list of SEPPs relevant to this Planning Proposal, as well as notes on consistency with these SEPPs, is show in the table below:

contaminated state (or will be suitable, after remediation) for all the purposes for which land in the zone concerned is permitted to be used, and	the activity area.
(c) if the land requires remediation to be made suitable for any purpose for which land in that zone is permitted to be used, the planning authority is satisfied that the land will be so remediated before the land is used for that purpose.	

### 6. Is the Planning Proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions?

The Section 117 Ministerial Directions (under Section 117(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979) provide local planning direction and are to be considered when rezoning land. The proposed amendment is consistent with Section 117 Directions issued by the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure.

The following table outlines the consistency of the Planning Proposal to relevant Section 117 directions:

Direc	tion	Consistency of Planning Proposal			
1	1 Employment and Resources				
1.2	Rural Zones	Not applicable The MPP was rezoned for urban purposes on 4 October 2013. The subject site does not contain rural zoning.			
1.3	Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries	Not applicable			
1.4	Oyster Aquaculture	Not applicable			
1.5	Rural lands	Not applicable			
2 Environment and Heritage					
2.1	Environment Protection Zones	Not applicable The subject site is clear of any vegetation and is not within an Environment Protection Zone.			
2.2	Coastal Protection	Not applicable			
2.3	Heritage Conservation	Not applicable The subject site does not contain any heritage conservation. An AHIP has been issued over the subject site with bulk earthworks commenced across the site under DA-14-1948 and DA-16-04239, approved by Council on 27 January 2015			

		and 28 March 2017.
2.4	Recreation Vehicle Areas	Not applicable
3	Housing, Infrastructure and Urban Dev	velopment
3.1	Residential Zones	The proposal seeks minor amendments with the primary outcome being to ensure zoning boundaries are consistent with property boundaries. This Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with this policy.
3.2	Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates	Not applicable
3.3	Home Occupations	Not relevant to the assessment of this Planning Proposal
3.4	Integrating Land Use and Transport	Not applicable
3.5	Development Near Licensed Aerodromes	Not applicable
3.6	Shooting Ranges	Not applicable
4	Hazard and Risk	
4.1	Acid Sulphate Soils	This Planning Proposal seeks minor amendments primarily to the land use zoning. Future built form will be constructed in accordance with the recommendations provided within submitted Geotechnical and Salinity reports lodged during the assessments of relevant DAs.
4.2	Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land	Not applicable The site is not identified as being within a Mine Subsidence District.
4.3	Flood Prone Land	The site contains a small area of flood prone land which will be designed to sit within the future bio-retention and drainage basin as was envisaged within the current design. The residential land around the playing fields will not be impacted by flood prone land.
4.4	Planning for Bushfire Protection	Not applicable – the site is not bushfire prone.
5	Regional Planning	
5.1	Implementation of Regional Strategies	The Planning Proposal is consistent with the current aims outlined for the Central West Sub region under the Plan for Growing Sydney. Refer section 4.3.2 of this Planning Proposal.
5.2	Sydney Drinking Water Catchments	Not applicable
5.3	Farmland of State and Regional significance on the NSW Far North Coast	Not applicable
5.4	Commercial and Retail Development along the Pacific Highway, North Coast	Not applicable
5.5	Development in the vicinity of Ellalong, Paxton and Millfield (Cessnock LGA)	Not applicable

1

- - -- --

....

5.6	Sydney to Canberra Corridor	Not applicable		
5.7	Central Coast	Not applicable		
5.8	Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek	Not applicable		
6	Local Plan Making			
6.1	Approval and Referral Requirements	Not applicable		
6.2	Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not applicable			
6.3	Site Specific Provisions	Not applicable		
7	Metropolitan Planning			
7.1	Implementation of the Metropolitan Strategy	The Planning Proposal is consistent with <i>A Plan for Growing Sydney</i> and will facilitate housing growth within an identified growth area. Refer to section 4.3.2 of this Planning Proposal.		
7.2	Implementation of Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation	Not applicable		
7.3	Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy	Not applicable		

#### Section C – Environmental, Social and Economic Impact

# 7. Is there any likelihood that critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats, will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal?

No. The subject site is biodiversity certified and has been cleared under approval bulk earthworks DAs (14-1948 and 16-04239).

# 8. Are there any other likely Environmental Effects as a result of the planning proposal and how are they proposed to be managed?

There are no other likely environmental effects that are anticipated to result from the zone boundary and other map adjustments. Relevant environmental impacts have been assessed as part of previously approved bulk earthworks and subdivision applications over the site.

#### Stormwater management

The piping of piped drainage channels as opposed to open drainage will allow approximately 1.2 ha of land to be used as Public Open Space, enhancing the urban outcome of the Marsden Park residential precinct. The piping will provide Council and the community with additional active, useable open space.

#### Open space

There are no additional dwellings to be introduced as a result of zoning changes. The provision of open space has been increased with minor boundary changes to the Local Park, with an increase of  $53 \text{ m}^2$  to  $4818 \text{ m}^2$ . The redesigning of the playing field will comprise an area of 5.2105 ha, previously being 4.265 ha. This results in a net increase of 9460 m<sup>2</sup> in open space provision.

# 9. Has the Planning Proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects?

Yes. There is not considered to be any adverse social or economic effects as a result of the amendments sought. The changes are to address current irregularities between lot boundaries and planning control maps, and to achieve a better layout for the future playing fields located in Precinct 3.

J.Wyndam Prince has prepared a report on the piped trunk drainage channel (**Appendix 1**). This report investigates the reconfiguration of the trunk drainage elements MS 1.6 and MS 1.7 within the *Marsden Park Contributions Plan No.21* from landscaped channels to a piped solution. Hydrologic modelling was undertaken and assessed to determine the pipe necessary to convey the flows as an alternate to open channels. The report identifies that four 1200mm reinforced concrete pipes (**RCP**) are one 1050mm RCP would be required for MS 1.6 and three 1200mm RCPs would be required for MS 1.7 to convey the piped flows.

The changes to the playing field location include an integrated piped drainage solution which will result in a more functional design and better amenity for residents accessing this facility. By piping the channel, it will provide Council and the community with additional active usable open space with no net increase in residential land as a result of the rezoning. This is considered to provide a better outcome for the community and future nearby residents.

#### Section D – State and Commonwealth interests

#### 10. Is there adequate public infrastructure for the Planning Proposal?

Yes. The Planning Proposal merely addresses mapping anomalies in the Growth Centres SEPP and adjusts the location of the playing fields to a more desirable location.

The Planning Proposal seeks a minor rezoning to shift the playing fields to the east to facilitate an improved design and enable future DAs to be considered in this new layout.

# 11. What are the views of State and Commonwealth public authorities consulted in accordance with the Gateway determination?

As this rezoning is of a minor nature it is not considered necessary for the proposal to be referred to State and Federal public authorities. Consultation with relevant State and Commonwealth public authorities can be undertaken as part of the exhibition of the Planning Proposal, as directed by the Gateway Determination.

#### Part 4 – Mapping

- Existing Land Zoning Map
- Proposed Land Zoning Map
- Existing Height of Buildings Map
- Proposed Height of Buildings Map
- Existing Residential Density Map
- Proposed Residential Density Map
- Existing Land Reservation & Acquisition Map
- Proposed Land Reservation & Acquisition Map

#### Part 5 – Community Consultation

The Gateway Determination will stipulate the nature and extent of required community consultation in accordance with the document 'A guide to preparing local environmental plans'.

The usual exhibition of an LEP is 28 days which is considered to be reasonable in the circumstances.

Public consultation will take place in accordance with the Gateway Determination made by the GSC in accordance with Sections 56 & 57 of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*.

### Part 6 – Project Timeline

----

÷ ,

Mile Stones	Anticipated on the Week Commencing
Forward Planning Proposal to the	September 2017
Department	
Date of LEP Review Panel Meeting	September 2017
Date of Gateway Determination	September 2017
+Completion of required technical	October 2017
information & Government agency	
consultation (Pre-exhibition)	
Commencement of public exhibition	October 2017
Completion of public exhibition	October 2017
Completion of consideration of submissions	November 2017
& Government agency consultation (Post-	
exhibition)	
Report to Council (outcome of exhibition &	November 2017
recommendations)	
Council's consideration & resolution on the	November 2017
report	
Date of submission to the Department to	December 2017
finalise the LEP	
Finalise the LEP by the Department and	January 2017
Parliamentary Council	
Publish the LEP	February 2017

.

-

### Consistency with SEPPs

State Environmental Planning	Cons	istent	N/A	Comment
Policies				
(SEPPs)	YES	NO		
	1ES		<b>√</b>	The Dravisians of OEDD 4 do not explicitly the
SEPP No 1			ľ	The Provisions of SEPP 1 do not apply to the
Development Standards				site pursuant to Clause 1.9(2) of Appendix 7 of the Growth Centres SEPP.
{			<b>√</b>	
SEPP No 4			Ý	SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development
Development Without Consent	ļ			Codes) 2008 applies to the site however is not
and				relevant to the Planning Proposal.
Miscellaneous				
Exempt and				
Complying				
Development SEPP No 6			$\overline{\checkmark}$	The Standard instrument definition for the
Number of				number of storeys applies.
Storeys				number of storeys applies.
SEPP No 32	$\checkmark$			The SEPP is not relevant to the Planning
Urban			:	Proposal as it is a greenfield site.
Consolidation				r roposur as it is a greenheid site.
(Redevelopment				
of Urban Land)				
SEPP No 55			$\checkmark$	Land capability and contamination assessment
Remediation of				during the precinct planning did not identify any
Land				contamination on the subject site.
				Notwithstanding this, contamination will be
				further addressed at the DA stage.
SEPP No 60			$\checkmark$	SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development
Exempt and				Codes) 2008 applies to the site however is not
Complying				relevant to the Planning Proposal.
Development				Ŭ .
SEPP No 64			√	SEPP 64 is not relevant to the Planning
Advertising and				Proposal. The SEPP may be relevant to future
signage				DAs.
SEPP No 65	$\checkmark$			Residential flat buildings are permitted in the R3
Design Quality of				zone under the Growth Centres SEPP and the
Residential Flat				Planning Proposal is capable of consistency with
Development				SEPP 65 for future development of the site
SEPP No.70			$\checkmark$	SEPP 70 is not relevant to proposed
Affordable				amendment.
Housing				
(Revised				
Schemes)				

- ---- -

SEPP		Ý	SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) is not
(Affordable	1		relevant to proposed amendment.
Rental Housing)		•	
2009			
SEPP (BASIX)	$\checkmark$		Detailed compliance with SEPP (BASIX) will be
2004			demonstrated in a future development
			application for the scheme facilitated under this
			Planning Proposal.
SEPP (Exempt	$\checkmark$		SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development
and Complying			Codes) may apply to the future development of
Development			the site.
Codes) 2008			
SEPP	$\sim$		SEPP (infrastructure) may apply to the future
(Infrastructure)			development of the site.
2007			development of the site.
	$\checkmark$		The future development of the site is not literated
SEPP (State and	<b>v</b>		The future development of the site is not likely to
Regional			be deemed as 'regional development' and
Development)			Council will likely act as the determining
2011			authority.
Sydney Regional		$\checkmark$	This SREP does not apply to the Blacktown
Environmental			LGA.
Plan No 18–			
Public Transport			
Corridors			
Sydney Regional	$\checkmark$		The proposed development is not located within
Environmental			the foreshores and waterways area boundary.
Plan (Sydney			Any potential impacts as a result of development
Harbour			on the site, such as stormwater runoff, will be
Catchment) 2005			considered and addressed appropriately at DA
			stage.
	I		οιαγε.

\_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_\_









•
























.

CONSULTING CIVIL INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERS & PROJECT MANAGERS

ABN 67 002 318 621

Our Ref: 110350\_2\_Pipe\_TC03\_and\_TC04.docx DC:fl

J. WYNDHAM PRINCE

5 May 2017

Blacktown City Council PO Box 633 Blacktown NSW 2148

Attn: Georg Eberl

Subject: Marsden Park Section 94 Works; Piped Option for Trunk Drainage Channel TC03 and TC04

#### Dear Georg,

Further to the assessment submitted by Cardno (October 2016), J. Wyndham Prince has been engaged by Stockland to provide a simplified investigation into the feasibility of piping the proposed trunk drainage channels known as MS 1.6 and MS 1.7 within the Marsden Park Contribution Plan No. 21 in lieu of the channels which were proposed as part of the Marsden Park Residential Precinct rezoning process. The piping of these channels will allow approximately 1.2 ha of land to be used as Public Open Space, enhancing the urban outcome of the Marsden Park Residential Precinct.

The purpose of this letter is to gain Council's 'in principle' support to alter the configuration of these trunk drainage elements from channels to a series of pipes. A more detailed hydraulic assessment will be undertaken as part of the detailed concept designs to support the Section 94 works which will be formally submitted for Council's approval.

### 1. BACKGROUND

Trunk Drainage Channels TC03 and TC04 which formed part of the Water Cycle Management Strategy for the Marsden Park Residential Precinct are referred to in the Marsden Park Contributions Plan No. 21 as items MS 1.7 and MS 1.6 respectively, and discharge into trunk drainage channel MS 1.5 which conveys these flows into regional detention MS 1.0 (formerly known as Basin 4).

The Contributions Plan describes Item MS 1.6 as a 20.5 m wide landscaped open channel, and item MS 1.7 as a 27.7 m wide landscaped open channel. Plate 1.1 provides an overview of the locality of these channels within the Marsden Park Residential precinct.

The Marsden Park Residential Precinct Post Exhibition Water Cycle & Flood Management Strategy Report<sup>1</sup> documented Trunk Drainage Channel TC03 as a 370 m long channel with 1:4 batter slopes and a base width transitioning from 14.8 m to 19.2 m, with a 1% AEP flow capacity (climate change conditions) of 14 m<sup>3</sup>/s to 17 m<sup>3</sup>/s prior to the confluence with TC04. The upper portion of Trunk Drainage Channel TC04 is documented as a 294 m long channel with 1:4 batter slopes and a base width of 9.4 m which transitions to 35.4 m at the confluence with TC03, and a 1% AEP flow capacity (climate change conditions) of 10 m<sup>3</sup>/s which increases to 31.2 m<sup>3</sup>/s at the confluence with TC03.



AS/NZS 4801:20

ISO 14001:2004

ISO 9001:2008 – Quality AS/NZS 4801:2001 - Safety ISO 14001:2004 - Environment

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Marsden Park Residential Precinct Post Exhibition Water Cycle & Flood Management Strategy Report, J. Wyndham Prince, July 2013.

J. Wyndham Prince Consulting Civil Infrastructure Engineers & Project Managers



Plate 1.1 Site Locality

In September 2015, the hydrologic modelling (XP-RAFTS) that supported the *Marsden Park Residential Precinct Post Exhibition Water Cycle & Flood Management Strategy Report* was updated to support the Woorong Park Precinct 1 subdivision development application (JRPP-15-2324).

Further refinement to the hydrologic modelling has been completed to inform the design of the Section 94 works in the Marsden Park Precinct. This design will include the trunk drainage channels, regional detention basins and rain gardens throughout the precinct for multiple developers. The catchments reflect the best information for Stockland's Elara development, and Winten Property Group's Newpark and Winten Hills development.

As we understand it, the street drainage system has been designed (and constructed) to cater for 10% AEP flows, and hence approximately 73% of the design trunk drainage flow will already be in the ground at the head of the trunk drainage system. The remaining flow will overtop the kerb at sag points in the road system and be collected in an appropriately sized surface inlet pit structure at the head of the proposed trunk drainage pipe systems. Table 1.1 provides details of the anticipated flows that need to be catered for in the trunk drainage culvert design.

ID	Catchment Area	Impervious Portion of Catchment	1% AEP Flow	10% AEP Flow	Overland Flow to be Captured by Pit at Head of Trunk Drainage System (1% AEP - 10% AEP)	
	(ha)	(%)	(m³/s)	(m <sup>3</sup> /s)	(m³/s)	
MS 1.6	19.64	85	10.2	7.5	2.7	
MS 1.7	34.90	85	18.2	13.3	4.9	

Table 1.1 -	- Trunk	Drainage	System	Flow
-------------	---------	----------	--------	------

J. Wyndham Prince Consulting Civil Infrastructure Engineers & Project Managers

The overland flow off the open space/sports field (approximately 5.3 ha) will be in the order of 1.2 m<sup>3</sup>/s in the 10% AEP event, and 1.8 m<sup>3</sup>/s in the 1% AEP event (split roughly 50/50 east/west), and can be appropriately managed via an overland swale either side of the field that will be constructed over the proposed pipe infrastructure.

### 2. CULVERT ASSESSMENT

A high level culvert assessment has been undertaken in HY-8 software to confirm the piped arrangement necessary to convey 1% AEP (climate change) flows through MS 1.6 and MS 1.7. Table 2.1 provides details of the culverts required to convey these flows.

Tailwater levels (Regional 1% AEP tailwater 17.3 m AHD + 1% AEP development flows) were determined based on interrogation of the flood surface that informed Figure 6.15 in the *Marsden Park Residential Precinct Post Exhibition Water Cycle & Flood Management Strategy Report*<sup>1</sup>.

ID	U/S Road Surface (m AHD)	Invert	Length (m)	Slope	1% AEP Tailwater (m AHD)	1% AEP Design Flow (m <sup>3</sup> /s)	Configuration	Capacity (m³/s)
MS 1.6	22.00	19.10	200	0.5%	19.00	18.2	4 x 1200 mm RCP + 1 x 1050 mm RCP	18.7
MS 1.7		1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	270	Second La	19.20	10.2	3 x 1200 mm RCP	10.7

#### Table 2.1 – Preliminary Culvert Sizing of MS 1.6 and MS 1.7

The assessment indicates that four (4) 1200 mm Reinforced Concrete Pipes (RCPs) and one (1) 1050 mm RCP will be required for MS 1.6, and three (3) 1200 mm RCPs will be required for MS 1.7. The Hy-8 results are provided in Appendix A.

It is anticipated that the final section of culverts may take the form of Reinforced Concrete Box Culverts (RCBCs) to provide a more aesthetically pleasing outlet for the surrounding residents and visitors to the precinct. Further details of this arrangement will be provided as part of the detailed concept design for the Section 94 works.

## 3. URBAN OUTCOME

The piping of MS1.6 and MS 1.7 adjacent to the proposed northern playing fields at Elara will provide Council and the community with additional active, useable open space. A DA has been submitted by Stockland for the adjoining residential Stages 33 + 34 at Elara that excludes residential development within the proposed SP2/RE1 land. Note that the northern playing fields precinct will be subject to a planning proposal to adjust the zone boundary lines to reflect the amended road layout around the playing fields associated with Stages 33 + 34. There will be no net increase in residential development arising from the rezoning. To assist the finalisation of the planning proposal we seek Council's confirmation of their preferred zoning for the piped drainage section i.e. retain as SP2 or reclassify as RE1.



Plate 3.1 Proposed Amendment

## 4. SUMMARY/CONCLUSION

This report details the investigation completed in order to gain Council's 'in principle' support to alter the configuration of trunk drainage elements MS 1.6 and MS 1.7 in the Marsden Park Contributions Plan No. 21 from landscaped channels to a piped solution.

The XP-RAFTS hydrologic modelling adopted for the *Marsden Park Residential Precinct - Post Exhibition Water Cycle & Flood Management Strategy Report* has been updated to reflect the current and anticipated subdivision design within the Marsden Park Residential Precinct. 1% AEP climate change flows have been extracted to determine the pipe configuration necessary to convey these flows as an alternate to an open channel.

A culvert assessment was undertaken in HY-8 software, and it was found that four (4) 1200 mm Reinforced Concrete Pipes (RCPs) and one (1) 1050 mm RCP will be required for MS 1.6, and three (3) 1200 mm RCPs will be required for MS 1.7.

### J. Wyndham Prince Consulting Civil Infrastructure Engineers & Project Managers

Detailed design details of the trunk drainage elements will be provided as part of the detailed concept design process for Council's approval, however we trust that this letter provides Council with the necessary confidence that piping trunk drainage elements MS 1.6 and MS 1.7 is a feasible option.

Please confirm Council's acceptance of the alternate configuration of the MS 1.6 (TC04) and MS 1.7 (TC03) trunk drainage elements as well as the preferred zoning status for the piped sections (i.e. either SP2 or RE1).

Should there be any queries regarding this matter please do not hesitate to contact David Crompton on 4720 3340 or <u>dcrompton@jwprince.com.au</u>

Yours faithfully J. WYNDHAM PRINCE

20to

DAVID CROMPTON Manager – Stormwater and Environment Group

APPENDIX A – HY-8 CULVERT ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Crossing - MS1.6 (TC04), Design Discharge - 18.20 cms Culvert - 1 x 1050 mm RCP, Culvert Discharge - 2.83 cms



Crossing - MS1.6 (TC04), Design Discharge - 18.20 cms Culvert - 4 x 1200 mm RCP, Culvert Discharge - 15.36 cms



# HY-8 Analysis Results

-- -- -

## **Crossing Summary Table**

\_\_\_\_\_

## Culvert Crossing: MS1.6 (TC04)

Headwater	Total Discharge	4 x 1200 mm	1 x 1050 mm	Roadway	Iterations
Elevation (m)	(cms)	RCP Discharge	RCP Discharge	Discharge (cms)	
		(cms)	(cms)		
19.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
19.67	3.00	2.45	0.55	0.00	4
19.98	6.00	4.91	1.09	0.00	3
20.24	9.00	7.42	1.59	0.00	4
20.56	12.00	9.86	2.14	0.00	4
20.87	15.00	12.67	2.33	0.00	4
21.78	18.00	15.20	2.80	0.00	4
21.84	18.20	15.36	2.83	0.00	19
22.10	24.00	16.05	2.96	4.97	5
22.13	27.00	16.15	2.98	7.87	5
22.16	30.00	16.23	2.99	10.76	4
22.00	18.72	15.81	2.91	0.00	Overtopping

Crossing - MS1.7 (TC03), Design Discharge - 10.20 cms Culvert - 3 x 1200 mm RCP, Culvert Discharge - 10.20 cms



# HY-8 Analysis Results

-----

# **Crossing Summary Table**

## Culvert Crossing: MS1.7 (TC03)

Headwater Elevation (m)	Total Discharge (cms)	3 x 1200 mm RCP Discharge (cms)	Roadway Discharge (cms)	Iterations
19.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	1
19.88	3.00	3.00	0.00	1
20.30	6.00	6.00	0.00	1
21.17	9.00	9.00	0.00	1
21.73	10.20	10.20	0.00	1
22.08	15.00	10.90	4.08	7
22.12	18.00	10.97	7.02	5
22.15	21.00	11.03	9.95	4
22.18	24.00	11.08	12.91	4
22.21	27.00	11.13	15.83	3
22.23	30.00	11.18	18.80	3
22.00	10.74	10.74	0.00	Overtopping

-----



· \_--- \_

. \_ \_ \_ . . . .

----

\_\_\_\_

------



\_\_\_\_

\_...\_.

