

## Section 79C Assessment

**DA no. :** JRPP-15-01997

**Proposal:** Torrens Title Subdivision into 635 residential lots, 2 superlots, 4 residue lots, roads, temporary drainage and associated subdivision works

**Location:** Lot 168 DP 1191299 Elara Boulevard and Lots 111 and 112 DP 1190510 Richmond Road, Marsden Park

Heads of Consideration 79C	Comment	Complies
<p>a. The provisions of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Any environmental planning instrument (EPI)</li> <li>(ii) Any development control plan (DCP)</li> <li>(i) The regulations</li> </ul>	<p>The provisions of the relevant EPIs relating to the proposed development are summarised under Section 6 of this report. The proposal is considered to be consistent with the relevant SEPPs, including SEPP (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006 (Growth Centres SEPP), SEPP (State and Regional Development) 2011, SEPP No. 55 (Remediation of Land) and SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007.</p> <p>The proposed development is a permissible land use in the R2 Low Density Residential zone, R3 Medium Density Residential zone, SP2 Infrastructure (Drainage), SP2 Infrastructure (Classified Road) and RE1 Public Recreation and satisfies the zone objectives outlined under the Growth Centres SEPP. The development complies with lot size and lot width requirements under the Growth Centres SEPP.</p> <p>The Growth Centres DCP applies to the site. The proposed development is compliant with all of the numerical controls established under the DCP, with the exception of minor internal road pattern variations being sought from the Marsden Park Indicative Layout Plan. The variations are discussed in detail under Section 9 and are considered acceptable by Council officers. Given that the non-compliances are considered minor, it is recommended that the development be supported in its current form.</p>	Yes
<p>b. The likely impacts of the development, including environmental impacts on both the natural and built environments, and social and economic impacts in the locality</p>	<p>A thorough site analysis was undertaken to ensure that the proposed development will have minimal impacts on surrounding properties.</p> <p>An assessment of the key issues relating to the proposed development is provided under Section 9. It is considered that the likely impacts of the development, including traffic and access, site contamination, stormwater quality, salinity, Aboriginal archaeology, European heritage, and construction noise impacts have been satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>In view of the above it is believed that the proposed development will result in beneficial social and economic impacts in the locality, and will not have any unfavourable environmental impacts.</p>	Yes

Heads of Consideration 79C	Comment	Complies
c. The suitability of the site for the development	<p>While the existing area is currently large lot rural residential living, the site and surrounding area have been identified under the Marsden Park rezoning for urban development.</p> <p>The subject development is considered satisfactory in terms of the likely impacts of the development and, as such, the subject site is considered suitable for the proposed development.</p>	Yes
d. Any submissions made in accordance with this Act, or the regulations	<p>The DA was notified to adjoining and neighbouring owners and advertised in the local newspapers for a period of 14 days from 30 November to 14 December 2015, during which time <b>no submissions were received</b> by Council. In addition, it is noted that a copy of the DA (as amended) was forwarded to NSW Roads and Maritime Services who did not raise any objections to the proposed development.</p>	Yes
e. The public interest	<p>The proposed development is for the purpose of residential subdivision within the Marsden Park release area, which will provide opportunity for housing diversity whilst addressing the demand for additional housing in Sydney. The proposal will encourage economic activity and growth in the Blacktown LGA and represents an orderly development of the land. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal is in the public interest.</p>	Yes