



7 August 2012

Scott Lee
Executive Planner Government & Special Projects
Campbelltown City Council
PO Box 57
CAMPBELLTOWN NSW 2750

Dear Scott,

Re: Response to Council Comments in email of 15 May 2012 in respect to Development Application No 387/2012/DA-S for the Subdivision of Stage 1 and Construction of Goldsmith Ave and Gilchrist Drive Intersection, UWS Campus, Campbelltown

I am writing in response to your email dated 15 May 2012 regarding Council's comments in relation to the abovementioned Development Application.

This letter formally responds to the matters raised in Council's email but also confirms information discussed at meetings held with Council officers on 25 May and 24 July 2012. It is noted that additional items have been forwarded to Landcom to review and a separate response will be provided to address these issues.

I have structured this response to firstly provide detailed justification explaining how the zone objectives are met to ensure sufficient land for the growth of UWS. I know this has been addressed in a separate letter to Council from UWS but it is worthwhile placing in context the current application and how it relates to the specific zone objectives. The remainder of the items in Council's email have been included in a table each with a specific response to the matter raised.

Zone objectives and sufficient land for the future expansion of the UWS campus.

The UWS has separately sent a letter directly to Council outlining the future expansion requirements for the UWS campus (a copy of which has been attached to this letter, see Attachment A).

This letter is expressly relevant to the consideration of the objective which requires land within the zone to:-

"to accommodate tertiary education and hospital facilities for the City of Campbelltown and the Macarthur region"

The letter from the UWS confirms the process for identifying the academic footprint to cater for its future growth, which has been approved by the Board of Trustees and incorporated in the DCP. This would appear to address the objective above and was clearly a consideration when Council adopted the DCP in 2007.

Level 2, 330 Church Street
Parramatta NSW 2150
PO Box 237 Parramatta NSW 2124
DX 28448 Parramatta
ABN 79 268 260 688
Telephone 61 2 9841 8600
Facsimile 61 2 9841 8688
enquiry@landcom.nsw.gov.au



It is also worth pointing out that the land on which the residential development will be located is topographically very different and more challenging from the land identified for expansion of the UWS Campus. Universities typically have buildings requiring large development footprints and hence are more suited to flatter or gently undulating land. The areas identified for residential development are significantly steeper and more suited to buildings with smaller footprints such as housing. It is evident from the Development Application plans and extent of retaining wall construction to modify the underlying slope that the area is suited to housing.

There are two zone objectives which are specifically relevant to the consideration of the residential component of the application. The first is to identify land to:-

"encourage a variety of forms of higher density housing, including accommodation for older people and people with disabilities in locations which are accessible to public transport, employment, retail, commercial and service facilities."

This objective is considered more relevant to the Macarthur Gardens North site which is located immediately adjacent to the station and opposite (the railway line) from Macarthur Square where the land is relatively flat.

As discussed above, the residential land identified as part of the UWS Project is not flat, is comparatively not located close to these other facilities and is not suited to higher density development.

Given the above, the zone objective which is relevant to the consideration of the subject application and broader masterplan is to:-

"encourage a high quality standard of development which is aesthetically pleasing, functional and relates sympathetically to nearby and adjoining development."

The proposed residential development is an appropriate land use and will produce a standard of development which is aesthetically pleasing, functional and relates well to nearby and adjoining development including the UWS Campus, open space areas adjacent to the railway line and the Australian Botanic Gardens at Mount Annan. It is this objective that led to the adoption of the DCP by Council in 2007.

The project will also be targeted to a premium market, consistent with the "town and gown" location and access to infrastructure and services. The premium positioning proposes to target the "executive" market (including changeover residents from Glen Alpine Estate) as well as a percentage of first home investors. The landscaping and civil budgets are therefore set to provide a premium estate with a higher level of amenity and finish.

Given the above, it is contended that the proposed development is consistent and relates well to the relevant objectives of the zone.

Other Matters identified in Council email

The following table provides specific comment on the individual matters raised in Council's email dated 15 May 2012.

Council Commentary	Landcom / UWS Response
<p>Any necessary retaining walls between lots with side to side slopes should be located on the property that the wall retains, not the adjoining property as indicated on the concept drawings. This would help avoid conflicts in the future and potentially avoid the need for the creation of easements for maintenance that would burden the lots hosting the retaining wall.</p>	<p>The side retaining walls are proposed on the lot boundaries in accordance with Council's comments. Refer to Addendum E of the Statement of Environmental Effects for engineering plans 9065/DA102 and 9065/DA 103.</p> <p>Council can ensure this outcome by attaching an appropriate condition to any consent granted.</p>
<p>What type of construction for these walls is suitable/acceptable? Council would favour masonry construction not koppers logs. Walls should have a life span similar to that of the dwellings that will be built on these lots, meaning that they should be engineering designed and masonry or similar.</p>	<p>Masonry retaining walls are proposed. Refer to section 4.5.3 (Page 31) of the Statement of Environmental Effects for more detail. The retaining walls are designed for a 100 year life span which is considered standard practice.</p>
<p>With most lots having slopes to deal with, do we have enough information and certainty about the type of dwelling construction that we will be dealing with?</p>	<p>For Stage 1, Landcom has designed for least 50% of the allotments to cater for standard slab on ground construction and the project home market. The remainder of lots will be split slab or pier and beam construction (45%) with a minor number of lots to be architecturally designed (approx. 5%). Retaining walls have been proposed in key locations to reduce construction costs for end purchasers. Refer to Addendum I of the Statement of Environmental Effects for a slope analysis plan with indicative dwellings types.</p>
<p>Riparian areas have up to 3 metre stack rock walls – are these walls appropriate in terms of initial design and ongoing maintenance?</p>	<p>A sandstone style rock stack wall is proposed. This wall is low maintenance whilst also aesthetically pleasing in respect to retaining the naturalistic features of the riparian corridor.</p> <p>It is envisaged that this style of wall will be similar to what has been constructed at Spring Farm and The Ponds (see Attachment B). Refer to Addendum E of the Statement of Environmental Effects for engineering plan 9065/DA130 for the typical rock retaining wall detail.</p>

Council Commentary	Landcom / UWS Response
<p>Ecology report – the figures don't add up with the supposed clearing – we may be losing more than the report says – need to clarify</p>	<p>Table 3 of the Ecology Assessment has been updated in line with Figure 3. The key changes are highlighted.</p> <p>Please note that these changes are due to typographical errors (see Attachment C). The areas proposed for tree removal in engineering plan 9065/DA134 are consistent with the Ecology Assessment. Note that the areas proposed for tree removal which are not indicated on Figure 3 of the Ecology Assessment are trees that are not classified as threatened species under the NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995 or the Commonwealth Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.</p> <p>The majority of these trees are African Olive which is a noxious weed are prevalent across the site.</p>
<p>The riparian finger parks have a split personality being for both ecological purposes but also for recreation as they contain footpath/cycleways. Are the two purposes compatible? Need for a CPTED report?</p>	<p>Landcom intends to submit separate Development Applications for the riparian corridors for Council's future consideration. Where possible and practical, Landcom intends that the riparian corridors be used for dual purposes. The location and design of future footpaths and cycleways will be considered from a safety perspective.</p>
<p>Salinity Management Plan – need to flag additional “confirmation testing” of different stages as bulk earthworks are commenced in order to confirm initial findings of the report – how does this salinity report marry up with the ecological report?</p>	<p>The Salinity Management Plan for Stage 1 does not recommend any additional work for the Stage 1 area. As planning progresses for additional stages, Salinity Management Plans will be required for each stage. This requirement is noted in the report.</p> <p>With respect to ecology, the Salinity Management Plan (page 11) makes the following statement:</p> <p><i>Salt tolerant grasses and trees should be considered for landscaping, specifically in the lower lying parts of the site, to reduce soil erosion as in Strategy A above and to maintain the existing evapo-transpiration and groundwater levels.</i></p> <p>This recommendation is being considered by Clouston as part of the landscape designs.</p>

Council Commentary	Landcom / UWS Response
Regional traffic issues are being reviewed with further work being undertaken by AECOM – major issue as we are all aware.	As discussed, AECOM has been commissioned to collect additional traffic counts to address concerns raised by Council. An addendum report will be provided to Council for further consideration shortly.
Local traffic – should there be any mixing of Uni and residential traffic? Are there upgrades required to the existing Uni road network as a result of the residential traffic? Are the proposed streets capable of accommodating overspill Uni traffic/parking as you won't be able to stop Uni traffic infiltrating the residential areas	The road upgrades required to the existing University road network will be outlined in the AECOM addendum report. Landcom and UWS are developing a parking strategy to address University traffic potentially infiltrating the residential areas. The proposed strategy will be discussed with Council at a later stage. This is expected to occur prior to the launch of the project to the public.
The entire length of Goldsmith Drive needs to be reviewed to ensure it provides flood free access	It is noted in discussions with Council that this issue relates to pipes and culverts which may extend under Goldsmith Ave. JWP is examining this issues which can be addressed by attaching a suitable condition to any consent granted.
Change to Goldsmith will change drainage pattern and probably push water onto the oval (according to plans). Is this OK?	JWP is examining this issues which can be addressed by attaching a suitable condition to any consent granted.
Street trees – are there too many and are they of the appropriate type? Seems like a heavy reliance on deciduous which cause slip hazards and blocks drains	As discussed, Clouston is reviewing the landscaping plans submitted with the Stage 1 Development Application. Landcom's aim is to provide signature avenues with suitable tree species whilst also minimising maintenance. The number of trees is unlikely to change, however, Clouston will consult Council on the species proposed.
Road design guidelines – are we happy? What role does the existing DCP play and how does it relate to the Landcom Street Design Guidelines?	The 2008 DCP was prepared prior to Landcom's Street Design Guidelines. At previous meetings, Council officers have agreed to Landcom's Street Design Guidelines being applied to the UWS Campbelltown site. This is consistent with the road standards adopted by Council for the Edmondson Park South project (see Attachment D). Also refer to page 53 of the Statement of Environmental Effects for further justification.

I hope the above response satisfies Council's concerns.

Should you have any queries or would like to meet to discuss the Development Application, please feel free to contact me direct on 0402 181 571 or Vy Nguyen on 9841 8742.

Yours sincerely,



Peter Lawrence
Project Director

