

SUMMARY OF SUBMSSIONS

TABLE A - Community Submissions (2 submissions)

Submitter	Summary of Comments	Project Planner's response
1.	<p>River view impacts:</p> <p>This submission stresses the importance of Parramatta River as a tourist asset. It sees that the site has visual significance because of its unique location on the Parramatta River including its position between James Ruse Drive and the Clyde-Carlingford Rail which flank the site west and east (respectively). It therefore stresses the site's role as an entry or exit points to and from Parramatta River when travelling along the River.</p> <p>The submission suggests the proposed 28 to 40 storey heights will be visually obtrusive when viewed from the River (ie. River Cat); will have a detrimental effect on the historical value of the Female Orphan Factory; and be vastly different in scale with the UWS campus density. In summary, is suggests the proposal will have a significant visual impact on the views from the River.</p> <p>Proposed ferry terminal:</p> <p>This submission also references a section in the Master Plan that says a ferry terminal "is proposed to be east of the site beyond the railway line..".</p>	<p>Council Officers agree note visual impact of the proposal will be significant, particularly when viewed from the River, from adjoining sites and from the opposite side of the river with the most significant view impact likely to be of the 3 x 40 storey towers from the River when viewed from the River in the vicinity of No.s 1, 11 and 13 Grand Parade.</p> <p>An increase in the views to tower built forms on this site is inevitable if the Camellia Master Plan is to proceed. A decrease in density could reduce the apparent bulk of these towers with more open views between towers than would be achieved under the proposal as exhibited.</p> <p>TfNSW confirmed in a letter to CoP dated March 2015 that it does not support a ferry terminal at the location proposed in the applicant' Master Plan.</p>
2.	<p>This submission opposes the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is concerned at the precedent the proposal will establish. • Is concerned detrimental impacts will extend to a sub-regional context - that there is no capacity on local/sub-regional roads for additional density. • Does not see the relationship between the proposed density and the location. Sees the density as excessive. 	<p>The submitter's justification for opposing the proposal are noted. Redevelopment of the site is consistent with the relevant regional and sub-regional strategies.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sees the importance of a Camellia interchange between heavy rail and ferry service and sees the public transport potential. At the same time, sees the likely future growth on nearby sites as adding to any problem. Also sees movement and access as potentially problematic. • Sees the proposed 25m setback as insufficient and recommends the RE1 zoned land be enlarged with a greater setback - required for ecological and recreational reasons. Sees cycleway/cycle paths on the foreshore as incompatible. • Sees the proposed foreshore building heights (35m) as too tall and that heights should be gradually graded to the south of the site. • Is concerned at impact on views including views from the River. • Foreshore pedestrian and cycle paths should be set further back to allow for fauna and bird activity. Recommends foreshore plantings be protected. • Is pleased that freight has been considered in the proposal. • Concludes that the wider Camellia precinct needs careful planning. 	
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

TABLE B – Land Owner Submissions (2 submissions)

Submitter	Summary of Comments	Project Planner's response
Rob Moore, Pipelines Coordinator Caltex	<p><i>Hunter Pipeline – Liquid petroleum products pipeline</i></p> <p><i>The Hunter Pipeline is owned and operated by Caltex Australia Petroleum Pty Ltd. The pipeline carries refined petroleum from the Caltex Refinery at Kurnell to various terminals in Newcastle, negating the need for approximately 45,000 road tankers per year between Sydney and Newcastle.</i></p>	<p>The issues raised in this submission are proposed to be resolved as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The request for Caltex concurrence will be delivered by way of a provision requiring concurrence from <i>Caltex Australia Petroleum Pty Ltd</i> for any works will be carried over as a condition of consent in any DA for the site. • The DPE's Land Use and Safety Strategy (LU&SS) prepared for the purposes of the Camellia Town Centre Masterplan also addresses the site's proximity to the Hunter (hydrocarbon Pipeline and Jemena (gas) Pipeline

	<p>This submission notes the requirements for any civil work in the vicinity of the Hunter Pipeline “Licensed Easement” and provides a list of 20 requirements including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concurrence is required for any work over the pipeline • A requirement for a 5m wide vehicle access strip along the easement. • Tree planting is prohibited above the easement and within 2 metres of the easement. • No structures can be constructed on the easement. • Stormwater run-off cannot be discharged onto the easement. • Limitations on the type of work that can be carried out. • The responsibility for damages to the pipeline during any construction works. <p>The submission states that the pipeline is licenced by the NSW Trade and Investment. It says that the conditions attached to the licence requires that the safety of the pipeline cannot be compromised and 24 hour access is required in the event of an emergency (eg. rupture).</p> <p>The submission also notes that in the instance that a gate is being installed across the pipeline easement, approval for the gate is given on the condition that “an approved Caltex security local is installed”.</p>	<p>under the SEPP 33 – Hazardous and Offensive Development. Because of this, the applicant is not required to prepare its own, provided it relies on the DPE’s LU&SS.</p>
<p>Billbergia – owner of 1 Grand Parade, Camellia</p>	<p>General comments:</p> <p>Billbergia (owner of an adjacent site at No.1 Grand Parade which is also located within the Camellia Town Centre area notes its aspirations for a comparable density to that sought by the applicant of 181 James Ruse Drive (which equates to a net density of 8.95:1). This is also owing to it being located within the proposed town centre in the Draft Structure Plan for Camellia as well as their site having proximity to the Camellia train station and the a proposed light rail.</p> <p>The submission also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeks details of the proponent’s draft VPA. • Requests information regarding the exact location of the pipeline, owned by Hunter Pipeline Co Ltd, and affect on 	<p>The DP&E’s envisaged density for the entire Camellia Town Centre area (which includes 181 James Ruse Drive) is for 10,000 dwellings. This is based on supporting studies which have looked at the capacity of the precinct from a traffic, contamination, flooding, land use and urban design perspectives. The site at 181 James Ruse drive proposes 32% of the over despite the site occupying only 18% of the Town Centre area.</p> <p>VPA: Council Officers cannot provide any further details of the VPA other than what has been reported to Council.</p> <p>Pipeline details: The setback requirement from the Hunter (hydrocarbon) Pipeline for No.1 Grand Parade will be provided within the DPE’s LU&SS – to be exhibited in conjunction with</p>

	<p>1 Grand Parade and more details on how the pipeline can be affected by construction activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests more detail of how the proposal resolves the foreshore connection under the rail bridge between its site and the 1 Grand Parade which is located immediately east of the rail bridge. • Notes that the proposed 15,000sqm of commercial GFA has been reduced from 25,000sqm. Adds that the Billbergia site at 1 Grand Parade which contains the town centre is to provide 45,000sqm of commercial GFA. 	<p>the Camellia Town Centre Masterplan and supporting documents - is anticipated to commence in February, March 2018.</p> <p>Public space under the rail bridge: This matter is likely to be resolved via the DPE's Camellia Town Centre Masterplan process and potentially, via the applicant's VPA.</p> <p>Retail/Commercial floor space: Comment noted.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

TABLE C – State Agencies/Authorities (11 submissions)

Submitter	Summary of Comments	Project Planner's response
<p>Sydney Water</p>	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes the site is within the Camellia Town Centre Precinct where between 4,250 and 6,300 dwellings are proposed. • The Sydney Water Growth Servicing Strategy (GSS) sees up to 1,800 residential units on the site. Notes the planning proposal proposes a significant increase to a total of 3,200 dwellings. • Is carrying out strategic planning work for more optimised servicing for the corridor. • Detailed requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application stage where necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DPE has confirmed the maximum dwellings for Camellia Town Centre is 10,000 dwellings - exhibition of the Camellia Town Centre Masterplan is imminent (February 2018). • The exact density for the applicant's site will be determined as the planning proposal progresses. • Noted. • Noted.
	<p>Water servicing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anticipates there is capacity in the existing system to service initial development on the site however full development (including the remainder of the Camellia Precinct) is likely to require: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ further amplification to the trunk water network, ○ new lead in water main, and ○ diversions of existing assets. 	<p>See comments in "Recycled Waste Servicing" below.</p>

	<p>Water servicing (cont).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has frontage to a 150mm water main in James Ruse Drive. The proposed heights will require amplification of the water main to a minimum size of 200mm to comply with the Supply of Water for Fire Fighting Purposes Policy. 	
	<p>Wastewater Servicing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GSS notes the Parramatta LL sub-main is running close to its capacity given other planning precincts (Parramatta CBD and Parramatta North Urban Activation Precinct). Sydney Water is investigating the management of wet weather overflows. The extent/timing of system amplification to be confirmed by as part of strategic planning work underway - the Olympic Park Peninsula Priority Growth Corridor (OPPPGC). 	<p>This can be resolved as the site progresses to subdivision stage.</p>
	<p>Recycled Waste Servicing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity to supply recycled water to the proposed development from the Rose Hill Recycle Water Scheme and "should be investigated". Sufficient capacity for future development in Camellia to be serviced with recycled water. Network extension and possible amplification including new lead-in mains would be required. Recycled water opportunities for new development and financial viability is currently being considered as part of the OPPPGC. 	<p>The site specific DCP will contain a provision for each DA applying to a building will require reliance on recycled water (either Rose Hill Recycle Water Scheme or other).</p>
<p>Endeavour Energy (EE)</p>	<p>Network capacity/connection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that the existing electrical infrastructure surrounding the site cannot support the 3,200 dwellings proposed density which will require new underground cables from the Rosehill Zone Substation to the site and potentially a number of distribution substations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. (See next comment)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agrees with the proposed local clause requiring satisfactory arrangements for servicing the land, include the supply of water, electricity and disposal/management of sewage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The final load assessment and the method of supply can be determined at DA stage via an application for connection of load via EE's Network Connections Branch.
	<p>Asset relocation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the proponent can consider relocating the existing electrical assets on the site. Spells out the process for doing this. 	The site specific DCP can require the relocation of an existing easement or other EE asset.
	<p>Network access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to the existing electrical infrastructure on and adjacent to the site must be maintained at all times. 	These are matters for the proponent at both DA and construction stages as development of the site is rolled out.
	<p>Public safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future development will require work near electricity infrastructure and workers run the risk of receiving an electric shock and causing substation damage to plant and equipment. EE attaches their public safety training resources. Demolition work is to be carried out in accordance with AS2601. The proponent must take care not to interfere with any electrical infrastructure on or in the vicinity of the site. 	These are matters for the proponent at both DA and construction stages as development of the site is rolled out.
	<p>General</p> <p>EE note that the above matters are not apparent to the PP process. However, EE stress that proponent's must be alerted to all of the relevant issues with planning, staging and developing their sites.</p>	
Environment Protection Authority (EPA)	<p>Strategic context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that significant development within the Camellia Precinct should be undertaken within the framework of a strategic planning approach. 	Council Officers recommend delaying the progression of the PP until the Camellia Town Centre Masterplan and supporting documents are on exhibition; the exhibition of which is imminent (February 2018).
	Land use conflicts	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned at land use conflicts between the proposed residential development and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the exposure to “actual and potential sources of odour, particulate and other air emissions in the vicinity of the proposed development. the major hazards facilities such as the Viva terminals and the Caltex Pipeline. Proposed that the applicant’s <i>Health and Safety Report</i> be revised to incorporate these considerations. 	<p>Agree that the issues of Land Use and Safety pursuant to <i>SEPP 33 – Hazardous and Offensive Development</i> within the applicant’s <i>Health and Safety Report</i> and <i>Risk Report</i> have not been addressed.</p> <p>Recommend Council Officers recommend this issue be addressed via the Camellia Town Centre Masterplan and supporting documents – including the Land Use and Safety Study.</p>
	<p>Remediation staging</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reiterates its view that the remediation of the foreshore should happen concurrently with the remediation of the remainder of the site. Recommends the PP “clarify that the remediation of the foreshore area should not occur independently of remediation of the main site”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. The mechanism for the timing of the remediation of the foreshore land will delivered by the VPA.
	<p>Remediation contingency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the PP has not considered the scenario that the site may not be able to be remediated. Recommends that the PP “clarifies whether the implications of approving the PP have been considered in the unlikely even the remediation is unsuccessful”. 	<p>Noted. Should the site not be able to be remediated, then this scenario can be addressed at that time.</p>
	<p>Containment cells – Landscaping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that the establishment of landscaping above containment cells may breach the cap of the containment cells. Recommends the site specific clause confirm that “no development that poses a risk to breaching the cap, including tree planting, will be permitted above the cap”. 	<p>Council’s Landscape Architects confirm that there is a risk tree planting above and around the containment cells may breach the cap.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That further investigation* take place on whether there is an appropriate tree species suitable for planting in proximity to the containment cells (within the road corridor). If not, then the PP be amended to ensure tree planting above and around the containment cells is prohibited and this is

		<p>also reflected in a site specific DCP provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If no tree species is appropriate in proximity to the containment cells, then the site specific DCP provision ensures the that tree planting that was proposed above the containment cells in the applicant's master plan be planted elsewhere so there is no net loss in trees across the entire site. <p>*A Tree Planting Strategy or Tree Management Plan for the site which is tied to conditions of consent to all DAs over the site, including those for subdivision (but excluding those for remediation).</p>
	<p>Containment cells - Maintenance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development on the site must consider potential future long term requirements to safely and easily allow routine maintenance and monitoring, as well as requirements for contingencies for the management of potential foreseen and unforeseen issues with the containment cells. Recommends the PP ensures consideration of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "potential future long term requirements of safety and easily allow routine maintenance and monitoring"; and "requirements for contingencies for the management of potential foreseen and unforeseen issues with the containment cells". 	<p>Given the roads will remain in private ownership (under community title or the like), the VPA must ensure that the responsibility of the ongoing maintenance of the containment cells is with the future residents via a covenant with a Site Management Plan attached to it.</p>
	<p>Containment of services and utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sees that services and utilities are also sources of contamination. Recommends "confirmation is provided that maintenance, monitoring and upgrading of services and utilities around the site have been appropriately considered with respect to potential impacts at the proposal site. 	<p>Council Officers have consulted the associated owners of the utility easements (Sydney Water, Endeavour Energy and Caltex) and as well as TfNSW/RMS regarding James Ruse Drive, Carlingford Railway and PLR, some of which are required to be contacted via the Gateway determination. Further consultations have also been undertaken since receipt of submissions as required in conjunction with the DPE.</p>
	<p>Easements</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sees that the PP does not detail how the requirements for utility/service easements “will be considered in any future development resulting from rezoning of the land”. Recommends the planning proposal clarify how the requirements relating to existing utility easements on the site can be integrated into any future development. 	(See above comment).
	<p>Site Management Plan (SMP)/EPA Approval of SMP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PP does not provide information on when a SMP will be developed or how it will be adopted. The PP should “provide further detail on when a site management plan will be developed and how it will be enforced.” "The wording of in section 3.2.2 should be amended to remove the reference to EPA approval of a SMP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EPA will determine when a SMP (or plans) is required. It will replace the current SMP attached to the existing public positive covenant. The PP will be updated to reflect this before it is forwarded to the DPE. In relation to section 3.2.2, the PP will be amended accordingly.
	<p>Document revisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that the PP does not "always reference the updated documents". Notes that some documentation was omitted from the PP including the Asbestos SWMS and Soil and Water Management Plan. 	The Asbestos SWMS and Soil and Water Management Plan were not required to be exhibited as part of the Gateway determination. However, as further DA/s are lodged with CoP for the remediation of the remaining land, SWMS and Soil Water Management Plan will be part of the notification material.

	<p>Document accuracy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that the reference to the Risk Assessment Report in Appendix 1 (Supplementary Report) as the Remediation Contractor Peer Review Report. 	<p>Before the PP is finalised and forwarded to the DPE, a review will be undertaken to identify and correct all references in the PP.</p>
	<p>Future documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the VPA and DCP processes are scheduled for exhibition after the PP. Proposes that the EPA's comments on the <i>Camellia Precinct Land Use and Infrastructure Plan</i> should be considered when drafting these plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. The DPE have progressed the Camellia Town Centre Masterplan and supporting documents and are across the issues affecting the Camellia Town Centre. With regards to the timeframe, Council Officers have been advised that exhibition is imminent (February 2018).
	<p>Camellia Planning Precinct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EPA's comments on the <i>Camellia Land Use and Infrastructure Plan</i> should be considered when drafting the DCP and VPA. 	<p>The DPE have progressed the Camellia Town Centre Masterplan and supporting documents and are across the issues affecting the Camellia Town Centre. With regards to the timeframe, Council Officers have been advised that exhibition is imminent (February 2018).</p>
<p>Department of Primary Industries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A riparian buffer zone of 40 metres be established consistent with the DPI Fisheries' aquatic habitat protection guidelines and DPI Water's controlled activity guidelines. Proposes the E2 (Environmental Conservation) zone for the riparian land (ie. land proposed to be rezoned to RE1) to protect it. Alternatively, the RE1 zone should include a zone objective to protect and enhance the ecological values of the riparian zone along the Parramatta river. 	<p>The RMS (Property) does not support the foreshore boundary change nor the associated changes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing 30m foreshore building line on the Foreshore Building Line Map in <i>PLEP 2011</i>, and Therefore, the existing 30m protection zone on the Natural Resources - Riparian Land and Waterways Map in <i>PLEP 2011</i>, and Part of The Maritime Zone of the Parramatta River in <i>SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005</i> (see submission summary of RMS Property, elsewhere in this table).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not support the scale of mangrove harm (ie. the indicative vision in the master plan) 	In a follow up meeting with the applicant, DPI, RMS and EPA, RMS was more accepting of the need for the removal of mangroves to remediate foreshore. RMS also expect that: (1) the foreshore will be re-contaminated; and (2) some form of Rock fillets barrier would be required during removal and remain in place to deal with the effects of the ferry wash.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes site remediation clause only applies as far as the mean high water mark. It does not apply to the waterway zoned W2 in PLEP 2011. 	Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sees that an Acid Sulfate Soil management plan will be prepared. It needs to "specifically consider the potential excavation of actual acid Sulphate Soils in a tidally affected environment" 	Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DPI supports the dedication of the foreshore land to Council to be zoned RE1 Open Space. 	Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A clear prediction of the total volumes of groundwater likely to be dewatered, as well as detailed justification and explanation of methodologies to support that prediction will be required as part of the license application. Any future DA should include an assessment under the Aquifer Interference Policy. 	Noted. These can be considered at the DA stage.
Office of Environment and Heritage	<p>Flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that the applicant's Flood Study dated September 2014 says "that vehicle access to basement car parking would have entry crest at the 100yr flood level plus 0.5m" and this is based on a "limited flood model dated 2012 which is calibrated against a flood levels from an earlier Study dated 2005. Notes Council's recent flood model for the Parramatta River where flood levels may vary from those in the 2005 study. Also notes that the 2005 Study does not include overland flooding. 	<p>The outstanding flooding issues have been outlined in recent Council reports, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18 December 2017 (Item 13.3); and 12 February 2018 (Item 12.6) and its follow up Supplementary Report.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes it may be prudent to "design the basement vehicular access crest level at the 100yr flood level plus 1.0m. Notes the basement car park will also have to be sealed 	
	<p>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that the PP does not address Aboriginal cultural heritage. Notes that a review of the AHIMS indicates that there is a registered Aboriginal site to the south of the James Hardie site on the southern side of Grand Pde. Thus recommends that "an assessment be undertaken to determine the likelihood of Aboriginal objects being present". 	With the site currently being mostly capped, the potential for Aboriginal objects being present is best identified during the site remediation process and there is an existing framework when such objects are identified under the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i> .
Western Sydney University	<p>Zone change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has no objection to the proposed zone change. 	Noted.
	<p>Site remediation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests that the remediation works "do not expose studies and staff to any contamination risks has no objection to the proposed zone change. 	The site remediation process under NSW legislation seeks to reduce the risk associated with the remediation of a contaminated site such as 181 James Ruse Drive. This is generally achieved by way of the Remedial Action Plan and other relevant plan.
	<p>Building height</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Strongly objects to the proposed height increase". Considers the height "excessive, unjustified and intrusive to the character and amenity of the area". Notes there is little justification. Proposes the height should be determined on amenity considerations. 	The applicant's response to the proposal's consistency with SEPP 65 outlined within their <i>SEPP 65 and Adjoining Lands Report</i> and exhibited with the planning proposal shows that that the towers overshadow each other resulting in an inconsistency with the requirement that <i>a minimum of 70% of apartments in any building are required to receive 2 hours of direct solar access to living areas and private open spaces between 9am - 3pm</i> . To ensure compliance with the SEPP, changes to the building form will need

		to occur. This will also be assisted should a reduction in density on the site be provided.
	<p>Building height, views and heritage sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> References the <i>SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment)</i> in relation to development minimising any adverse impacts on views and vistas. Sees that the 125m height is not "appropriate or desirable in the area". Notes the State significance of the Female Orphan School opposite the proposed site will be dominated by the proposed building heights. 	An increase in the views to tower built forms on this site is inevitable if the Camellia Master Plan is to proceed. A decrease in density could reduce the apparent bulk of these towers with more open views between towers than would be achieved under the proposal as exhibited.
	<p>Foreshore</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the upgrades to the river foreshore and the proposed open space and this is encouraged by the University. Also supports the proposed pedestrian bridge. 	The appropriateness of the applicant's proposed pedestrian bridge as per the applicant's Alternate VPA Offer of 29 January 2018 will need to be explored in conjunction with the DPE as part of the VPA and SIC processes.
	<p>Densities and Future Growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes there is no objection to the proposed density and adds that the floor space ratio "is less cause for concern than the proposed height of buildings". Supports the concept of urban renewal on the site. States the proposed 125 metre building height is "extreme, incongruous and the arguments for which are poorly substantiated". 	<p>This statement somewhat contradicts the submitter's comment on building heights (see above). Also, it should be noted that the proposed 5.3:1 FSR over the land proposed to be zoned B4 equates to a net density of 8.95:1 which is a density more consistent with the Parramatta CBD.</p> <p>The proposed population of 7,360 people (3,200 dwellings x 2.3 persons/household) over the applicant's site (6.73ha*) equates to a density of 1,093 persons per hectare. This is slightly higher than Sydney's most dense infill site which is Central Park at Broadway which has 1,000 people/hectare.</p>
	<p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to participate as a strategic stakeholder in ongoing consultations regarding the rezoning. 	Noted. WSU have been informed WSU of the Council report of 18 December 2017 (Item 13.3) and reports scheduled for the 12 February 2018

		Council meeting (Item 12.6 and follow up Supplementary Report).
Education NSW	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports infrastructure costs being funded by developer contributions. 	A method which enables the applicant to provide contributions to State agencies for State infrastructure needs to be determined before the PP is finalised by the DP&E.
	<p>Planning Proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The "proposed density of 40 storeys will result in a substantial increase in population and a significant challenges for the DE to plan for future school growth, with student numbers anticipated to increase rapidly". The precinct presents opportunities for "a new community with its own local facilities" 	The Camellia Master Plan process will be responsible for dealing with the education needs across the whole precinct. It is not appropriate to try and resolve a precinct issue in a site-specific planning proposal.
	<p>Voluntary Planning Agreements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education NSW is willing to enter into negotiations with NSW PP&E to build greater school capacity should the opportunity arise. 	Refer to above comment.
	<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As demand for community infrastructure grows (ie. community facilities, sports fields, schools), local councils and community organisation all have resources to potentially share use. Education NSW also intent on exploring broad-spectrum opportunities with council, other govt bodes and community partners. 	(See above comments).
WSLHD and Ministry of Health	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern at "massive increase in the height" and the proposed increase "in the size and population density" and "reduce the amount of open space. Any population at Camellia over and above the projections could impact planning of public sector health services. Supports planning principles around urban renewal 	The applicant's proposal will result in a proposed population of 7,360 people (3,200 dwellings x 2.3 persons/household) over the applicant's site (6.73ha*) equates to a density of 1,093 persons per hectare. This is slightly higher than Sydney's most dense infill site which is Central Park at Broadway which has 1,000 people/hectare. As

		<p>such, the proposal will generate significant demand for educational facilities.</p> <p>The site proposes 13.17% of site area for Public Open Space (RE1). This is substantially lower than Central Park (25%), Discovery Point (35%) and Harold Park (35%) infill sites.</p> <p>The provision of open space will be explored via the VPA and or SIC process associated with the Camellia Town Centre Masterplan. The exhibition of the Masterplan and supporting studies is imminent (February 2018).</p> <p>*This area does not take into consideration the loss of land attributed to the return of the Foreshore Building Line to the current 30 metres (see submission from RMS (Property), below), which means the area of land proposed to be zoned B4 is reduced.</p>
	<p>Also provided comments on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing and density and health • Public open space - walkability and access to green space • Early provision of social infrastructure and amenities • Residential housing development and residential take up housing mix. • Consideration for specific need users/residents. 	Noted. Also refer to above comments.
	<p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is inconsistent with established principles of urban design. 	This issue has largely been addressed through response to other matters elsewhere in this table.
<p>Road & Maritime Services (Property) TfNSW & RMS</p>	<p>Note: whilst appearing as a draft submission, on 31 January 2018, the RMS confirmed that this submission should be considered as a formal submission on the exhibition of the PP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests that any rezoning of land not extend onto land owned by RMS 	<p>On 8 February 2018, clarification was sought from the RMS (Property) which confirmed RMS do not support any change to the site's foreshore boundary that would result in the rezoning of foreshore waterway current owned by RMS – either the rezoning of the W2 Recreational Waterways zone in <i>PLEP 2011</i> or the rezoning of the W1 Maritime Waters zone in <i>SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005</i>.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned of exposure to contaminated material, clean up requirements including requirement for mangroves to be removed. Happy to discuss remediation of wetland. 	In a follow up meeting with the applicant, DPI, RMS and EPA, RMS was more accepting of the need for the removal of mangroves to remediate foreshore. RMS also expect that: (1) the foreshore will be re-contaminated; and (2) some form of Rock fillets barrier would be required during removal and remain in place to deal with the effects of the ferry wash.
Department of Planning and Environment – Urban Renewal Team	<p>Capacity of the Transport Network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the limitations of development within the Camellia Town Centre owing to the capacity of the Traffic Network. 	This is consistent with more detailed advice subsequently received via the LUIP that the capacity of the entire Camellia precinct should be limited to 10,000 people due to the constraints of the site.
	<p>Contributions towards State and Regional Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the DPE are investigating a SIC framework for the Camellia Town Centre Masterplan. <p>Contributions towards Local infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the applicant should, through a VPA process, deliver local infrastructure such as <i>playing fields, drainage and upgrades to public domain.</i> 	Council Officers in conjunction with the DPE and the applicant have been progressing the outstanding issues as detailed in the 18 December 2017 (Item 13.3) Council report and the 12 February 2018 (Item 12.6) Council Report.
	<p>Other Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Density</u>: Notes the density needs to support the remediation costs and that the proponent's estimate at 2016 were consistent with the work that the DPE had done. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Views</u>: Notes the need for a view analysis to assess the impact of the proposed height and density <i>on the precinct and surrounds.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant's Vantage Point Views report prepared after the exhibition of the planning proposal in August 2016 (and not provided to Council until 20 November 2017) does not adequately respond to the DPE's issues nor address the view impacts, particularly in relation to <i>SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005</i> which is a deemed SEPP.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Overshadowing</u>: Notes the overshadowing impacts of the proposal on the proposed Town Centre and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant's response to the proposal's consistency with SEPP 65 outlined within

	<p>adjoining site look to be an issue. Requests Council confirm that the proposal will comply with SEPP 65.</p>	<p>their <i>SEPP 65 and Adjoining Lands Report</i> and exhibited with the planning proposal shows that that the towers overshadow each other resulting in an inconsistency with the requirement that <i>a minimum of 70% of apartments in any building are required to receive 2 hours of direct solar access to living areas and private open spaces between 9am - 3pm</i>. To ensure compliance with the SEPP, changes to the building form will need to occur. This will also be assisted should a reduction in density on the site be provided.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand for Retail: The DPE is undertaking economic analysis to understand the <i>demand for retail in the precinct and will provide this information as it becomes available</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contamination and Remediation: supports local clause in the <i>PLEP 2011</i> that required the remediation of the land before it is used for the proposes purpose. The DPE in consultation with NSW Health and NSW EPA may investigate additional controls associated with <i>residents living adjacent to remediation sites are managed</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding: notes the Camellia Town Centre flooding analysis that has been undertaken and is subject to exhibition (February 2018). 	<p>The outstanding flooding issues have been outlined in recent Council reports, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 December 2017 (Item 13.3); and • 12 February 2018 (Item 12.6) and its follow up Supplementary Report.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazards: notes the applicant's Health and Safety Report and Risk Report do not adequately address the Land Use Safety framework (as per SEPP 33) with regards to the proposal. 	<p>The applicant has been working with TfNSW, RMS the DPE and Council Offices to resolve the land resumption matters. These have been outlined in recent Council reports, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 December 2017 (Item 13.3); and • 12 February 2018 (Item 12.6)

TfNSW & RMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes the resumption of land required to deliver: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Future upgrade of James Ruse Drive; and ○ Parramatta Light Rail (PLR). 	<p>The applicant has been working with TfNSW, RMS the DPE and Council Offices to resolve the land resumption matters. These have been outlined in recent Council reports, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 December 2017 (Item 13.3); and • 12 February 2018 (Item 12.6).

Acronyms:

CoP	City of Parramatta
DPE	Department of Planning and Environment
DPI	Department of Primary Industries
EE	Endeavour Energy
EPA	Environmental Protection Authority
LU&SS	Land Use and Safety Strategy
PLR	Parramatta Light Rail
RMS	Roads and Maritime Services
SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy
SIC	State Infrastructure Levy
SREP	Sydney Regional Environmental Policy (which is a deemed SEPP)
TfNSW	Transport for NSW