

<b>Exhibition 1 – October 2024</b>				
<b>No. of Submissions October 2024</b>	<b>No. of Submissions June 2025</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Applicant response (where provided in the SIA)</b>	<b>Council response</b>
27	15	Flood Risk	<p>Use of River Road to service DA stage 1 and additional Gosforth Residents during flood events which restrict access to Anambah Road.</p> <p>River Road is not intended to function as a designated evacuation route. Its role is to provide a reliable secondary means of access and egress for both existing and future residents during localised flood events that temporarily isolate the area. This will provide a public benefit to other, beyond the development site, including residents in Gosforth.</p>	<p>Council, SES and RFS are not supportive of the impeded (gated) access to River Road. Furthermore, TfNSW have highlighted issues with traffic modelling and subsequent impact on the River Road / NEH intersection.</p> <p>The proposal involves amending the intersection access at the River Road / NEH intersection, having a broader impact on residents of Wyndella Estate.</p> <p>Council concurs with submissions raising concern with flood risk and subsequent evacuation access.</p>
11	6	Bushfire Risk	<p>Amended design introduces continuous perimeter road to address bushfire concerns.</p> <p>The additional emergency egress route to the south along River Road is being provided as an alternate access for flooding. It will therefore still be provided to ensure connectivity and an alternate evacuation path and will effectively act as a third point of access for bushfire. We do not consider the River Road alignment is necessary to achieve compliance with PBP 2019.</p>	<p>GTAs from the NSW RFS remain outstanding subject to provision of information to satisfy non-perimeter road design, emergency access and slope assessment.</p> <p>Council, SES and RFS are not supportive of the impeded (gated) access to River Road. Furthermore, TfNSW have highlighted issues with traffic modelling and subsequent impact on the River Road / NEH intersection.</p>

31	18	Provision of Public Infrastructure/Amenities. Capacity of existing social infrastructure to support the proposed population.	Increased number and size of open space and playgrounds.	The increase in the number and size of the proposed recreation areas / playgrounds is noted. Whilst this goes some way to address the concerns raised in submissions, the SIA notes there is a lack of other social infrastructure (commercial premises, schools, doctors, community facilities, etc) within the immediate locality, and the proposal does not propose or reserve any part of the site for these purposes.
25	18	Emergency Services and evacuation during flood events.	Revised subdivision and road layout improves access for emergency service vehicles for bushfire purposes.  Use of River Road to service DA stage 1 and additional Gosforth Residents during flood events which restrict access to Anambah Road.	Noted, the revised layout improves emergency service vehicle access, however various non-perimeter roads remain non-compliant and RFS has not expressed support of the proposal nor issued GTAs.  Council, SES and RFS are not supportive of the impeded (gated) access to River Road. Furthermore, TfNSW have highlighted issues with traffic modelling and subsequent impact on the River Road / NEH intersection.
38	21	Roads, Traffic and Transport. Car dependency due to lack of public transport. Impacts on Anambah Road.	Adoption of traffic management measures on long road segments. Improved movement hierarchy and consideration of future integration with the broader AURA.  Inclusion of second watercourse crossing to improve transport network and connectivity to the south.	The amendment to subdivision and road layout is acknowledged.  The concerns raised by submissions relate predominantly to the road access and infrastructure immediately external to the site. Council concurs with the concerns raised.  TfNSW acknowledge that a conditional threshold would be required for the Anambah Road / NEH intersection, however TfNSW have not indicated what that threshold would be. The impacts on the River Road / NEH

				intersection requires revised modelling to demonstrate capacity and impact.
27	15	Risk to Natural Environment/Pol lution including stormwater drainage, vegetation removal and impacts to local wildlife.	Revised layout to retain greater number of trees and vegetation surrounding riparian and public reserves.	<p>The applicant has prepared a BDAR which has been assessed by Council's ecologists and deemed consistent with legislative requirements. Where vegetation has not been avoided or minimised, removal will be offset in accordance with BAM-C.</p> <p>The amendments made to the location and size of parks are acknowledged. Whilst this retains some areas of valued vegetation, there are some key ecological features which Council's ecologists would like to see retained to improve level of avoidance. DPI Fisheries and DPE Water have both issued GTAs acknowledging permits are required for works within watercourses.</p>
1	0	Aboriginal heritage	Revised ACHAR.	The revised ACHAR has not been received by Council or DPE Heritage. It is anticipated this report would address Aboriginal heritage concerns raised in public submissions, however without an updated ACHAR, Council concurs that the impact on Aboriginal cultural heritage cannot be comprehensively understood based on the information at hand.
23	15	Social Impact	<p>Reduction and relocation of small house housing typology. Removal of Build-to-Rent component of Concept subdivision.</p> <p>Improved road network, lot orientation, and public domain designed in line with CPTED recommendations.</p>	Council acknowledges that a social impact assessment was prepared as part of the amended application (June 2025) which assists to address social impact concerns raised in submissions. It is also noted that several of the social impacts still have a negative residual impact even after mitigation measures are identified and applied. Subsequently Council concurs with submissions in that social impacts require further consideration and mitigation before the application could be supported.

				<p>It should be noted that the SIA has relied on Council's DA exhibition and community consultation in lieu of an independent process.</p> <p>Numerous recommendations in the CPTED Report could be adopted to address potential and perceived crime issues. The CPTED fails to apply principles to public reserves and parks, which would need to be addressed before Council could support the application.</p>
17	17	Scale of Development & Land use Conflict	<p>It is noted that several submissions raising concerns about integration with the rural character of the area appear to have been based on the assumption that the site remains zoned RU2 Rural Landscape. In fact, the land subject to this proposal forms part of the Anambah Urban Release Area and is already zoned for urban purposes under the Maitland LEP 2011. Although a portion of the proponent's broader landholding remains zoned RU2, it is not included in the current application. This distinction may have contributed to some community misunderstanding regarding the zoning context of the proposed development. Nonetheless, issues relating to rural character were already considered as part of the rezoning process.</p> <p><u>Quarry</u> It noted that the quarry was not considered during the 2020 rezoning of the Anambah URA, likely because the southern edge of its approved</p>	<p>The subject site is split zoned R1 and RU2. Whilst the proposed residential subdivision is consistent with the zone objectives and land use for the development in which it relates, the proposal is still required to acknowledge the RU2 portion of land and address any potential or perceived land use conflict between the two zones. The proponent has acknowledged that minor development (APZ clearing and perimeter road) is proposed in the RU2 portion of the site to support the development on the R1 zoned land. It is considered that despite these minor works, the RU2 portion of land will remain to function in accordance with zone objectives. Whilst it is Council's preference that the subdivision wholly reside in the R1 portion of land, the location of the road and clearing has been carefully considered to ensure environmental impacts are mitigated. Subsequently, works within the rural portion of the allotment is acceptable upon merit.</p> <p><u>Quarry</u> The amended application (June 2025) provides an assessment against <i>State Environmental Planning</i></p>

			<p>extraction footprint lies approximately 1 km from the URA boundary. The correspondence also noted that the original environmental impact assessment for the quarry (prepared in 2000) anticipated an operational life of approximately 25.7 years, with no subsequent modification applications lodged to extend its consent. While Hunter Quarries did not respond further to the invitation for consultation, the SIA recognises the importance of appropriately managing land use transitions adjacent to extractive operations. Should quarry operations continue beyond their originally projected timeframe, future development stages will consider appropriate design measures and interface mitigation in line with Council's emerging planning controls for the URA.</p> <p><u>Compositing Facility</u> As development progresses, future applications will incorporate interface treatments such as vegetated buffers and landscaping, and ensure that purchasers are informed of the nearby rural industry through Planning Certificates where appropriate. Ongoing engagement with Riverbend Organics is encouraged to support long-term land use compatibility.</p>	<p><i>Policy (Resources and Energy) 2021.</i> Whilst quarry life and extraction volumes pursuant to DA 95-127 is acknowledged, the applicant does not make concerted effort to avoid or minimise land compatibility with the current quarry operations, pursuant to Clause 2.19(c) of the beforementioned instrument. Instead, the applicant advises that this can be addressed for future staged DAs, that of which would likely require modification to the Concept DA for which consent is currently sought.</p> <p><u>Composting Facility</u> Stage 1 of this application is the area in closest proximity to the composting facility on Anambah Road. Subsequently, Council expects mitigation measures be implemented in the stage 1 design, not under future staged subdivisions.</p>
		Sequencing and orderly development, utilities and servicing.	<p>SIA does not include direct commentary to this issue.</p>	<p>Under the draft Anambah Area Plan, circulated to land holders in July 2025, and anticipated to be reported to Council for exhibition in September 2025, the subject site is in the fourth and final stage of the URA. Despite this, there are provisions in the Draft DCP that would</p>

				<p>enable development out of sequence, so long as it can be demonstrated that infrastructure and servicing can be provided to later stages without impeding on orderly economic development. Council has concerns that the subject development application has not adequately demonstrated orderly economic development principles in its current form.</p> <p>The development is supported by HWC (water and sewer) and Ausgrid (electricity). Despite this, the location of infrastructure extension and provision raises questions and concerns about orderly economic development, noting the provisions are to be provided from the south. It has not been adequately demonstrated how the provision of these works will be sufficiently integrated with provision of services throughout the southern portion of Anambah URA. Particularly, trunk sewer and water along River Road, and known works required within this corridor for the remaining portion of the URA.</p>
--	--	--	--	---