

Exhibition – 13 November 2025 to 10 December 2025	
Number of unique submissions: 17	
Issue	Council Response
Road safety, Traffic and Transport, Car dependency due to lack of public transport. Impacts on Anambah Road	<p>The concerns raised in submissions regarding road safety, traffic generation, reliance on private vehicles, and the adequacy of Anambah Road and River Road are well-founded and remain unresolved. The proposal relies heavily on Anambah Road – an already constrained, flood-affected rural road – as the sole primary access. The development does not propose any substantive upgrades to address known capacity, safety or flooding limitations.</p> <p>The use of River Road as a secondary or emergency access intensifies these concerns.</p> <p>Submissions correctly identify that the proposal would increase traffic pressure on River Road, particularly during flood events, where residents south of the site would be adversely affected. These issues are compounded by the proposal’s reliance on restricted or gated access arrangements, which Council and SES do not support.</p> <p>TfNSW’s advice confirms that the New England Highway / Anambah Road intersection cannot be demonstrated to operate safely or efficiently with the additional traffic generated by the proposed development. Insufficient and inconsistent modelling has been provided, and there is no committed or feasible upgrade pathway identified. As such, the consent authority cannot be satisfied that the State or local road network is capable of supporting the increased traffic volumes associated with either Stage 1 or the broader concept yield.</p>

	<p>Given the absence of public transport services and the lack of walkable pedestrian access to services or facilities, the development would result in high levels of car dependency and increased traffic impacts on a constrained and flood-affected local road network.</p> <p>These issues remain unresolved.</p>
Flood Risk	<p>The concerns raised in submissions regarding flood risk and safe evacuation are substantiated and remain unresolved. Anambah Road becomes inaccessible during major flood events, and the proposal provides no reliable flood-free primary access for residents or emergency services. The development instead relies on River Road as a secondary evacuation route; however, River Road is an unformed, substandard public road that does not meet Council's minimum standards and is not supported by SES as a safe or dependable evacuation option.</p> <p>Council and SES do not support any arrangement involving restricted, gated or privately managed access to River Road. Such an arrangement is operationally incompatible with flood evacuation protocols and cannot be relied upon during rapidly evolving flood conditions.</p> <p>Accordingly, the flood risk and evacuation concerns raised in submissions are supported by the available evidence and remain unresolved.</p>
Bushfire Risk	<p>Submissions regarding bushfire risk are acknowledged. Although the applicant has amended the Bushfire Assessment to show secondary access to Anambah Road rather than River Road, this revision does not resolve the broader bushfire issues affecting the proposal.</p> <p>Key matters remain outstanding. The Bushfire Assessment continues to rely on vegetation and canopy assumptions that are inconsistent with the riparian restoration outcomes required under the VMP, resulting in unresolved conflicts between environmental rehabilitation objectives</p>

	<p>and APZ requirements. In addition, the most recent GTAs issued by the NSW RFS (26 November 2025) require the proposed perimeter road (MC02 / River Road) to achieve an 8-metre carriageway if it is to function as an access route. The feasibility of delivering this standard within the constrained road corridor – given topography, design requirements and land-tenure limitations.</p>
<p>Scale of Development, amenity impacts and Land use Conflict</p>	<p>Concerns relating to scale, visual impact and land-use conflict are partly supported. In terms of visual and built-form impacts, the development is located approximately 2 kilometres from the established R5 community of Windella Estate. The southern interface of the site is largely buffered by existing riparian vegetation and open space corridors, which provide a reasonable degree of visual separation between the proposed residential lots and the rural-residential allotments to the south. Given the site’s R1 General Residential zoning and its strategic identification for urban development, the visual impacts arising from the proposed subdivision are considered acceptable.</p> <p>The site is split-zoned R1 and RU2. Minor enabling works are proposed within the RU2 portion of the site – primarily APZ establishment and a perimeter road – to support the residential development within the R1 zone. On merit, these works do not undermine the rural zone objectives and the RU2 land would continue to function in an appropriate rural capacity.</p> <p>However, broader land-use compatibility issues raised in submissions remain unresolved. The development has not adequately demonstrated compatibility with two key surrounding land uses:</p> <p>Extractive industry – Gosforth Quarry</p> <p>The application still lacks a comprehensive assessment of impacts associated with the nearby Rhyolite Quarry, including blasting, vibration, dust and heavy-vehicle movements. Without this analysis,</p>

	<p>Council cannot be satisfied that future residents will not experience significant amenity impacts or that the proposal avoids or minimises conflict as required by Clause 2.19 of the Resources and Energy SEPP. This issue remains unresolved.</p> <p>Composting facility – potential odour and amenity impacts Submissions also highlight the proximity of the proposal to the existing composting facility to the west. The Section 8.2 Review does not include any odour or air-quality assessment to quantify potential impacts on future residents. Given the scale of the proposed subdivision and its location downwind of a known odour-generating activity, the absence of technical assessment is a significant gap.</p> <p>Accordingly, while visual impacts may be manageable, the development has not demonstrated that land-use conflict with the adjoining quarry or composting facility can be avoided or mitigated. These outstanding matters continue to raise concerns regarding amenity, compatibility and the suitability of the land for the scale of development proposed.</p>
<p>Sequencing and orderly development, utilities and servicing (water and sewer, and electricity)</p>	<p>Concerns relating to sequencing and the timely delivery of essential services are well-founded and remain unresolved. The proposal relies on extending water and sewer infrastructure northwards via River Road; however, Hunter Water has not issued an updated Notice of Arrangements or endorsed any site-specific servicing strategy. Without this confirmation, the development cannot demonstrate that adequate, coordinated or timely water and sewer services will be available.</p> <p>Council’s engineering review also identifies significant issues with the applicant’s proposal to locate major water and sewer infrastructure within the River Road corridor. River Road does not meet Council’s minimum public-road standards and will require substantial widening, reconstruction and likely realignment as the URA develops. Installing critical utilities within an undersized and ultimately transitional corridor</p>

	<p>introduces a high risk of premature asset redundancy, costly future relocation and potential servicing constraints for the southern URA. This is inconsistent with orderly and economical development.</p> <p>These unresolved servicing matters remain determinative constraints and reinforce concerns about the proposal proceeding out of sequence. While Ausgrid has issued conditions of connection for electricity supply, this does not resolve the fundamental deficiencies in water and sewer servicing nor the broader staging issues affecting the URA.</p>
<p>Provision of Public Infrastructure/Amenities. Capacity of existing social infrastructure to support the proposed population</p>	<p>The recreation areas and local open space are acknowledged; however, these facilities alone do not address the broader concerns raised in submissions. The Social Impact Assessment confirms that there is no existing provision of schools, neighbourhood centres, medical services, community facilities or public transport within the immediate locality, and the proposal does not reserve land or commit to delivering any of these essential services.</p> <p>As the development proceeds out of sequence relative to the surrounding URA, early residents would rely heavily on distant facilities in Lochinvar and Rutherford, placing additional pressure on already constrained infrastructure. Without committed staging or delivery pathways for social infrastructure across the wider URA, the proposal cannot demonstrate that the needs of the incoming population will be met in a timely or coordinated manner.</p> <p>Accordingly, concerns about insufficient social infrastructure remain valid and unresolved.</p>
<p>Risk to natural environment, pollution including stormwater drainage, vegetation removal and impacts to local wildlife</p>	<p>Concerns raised in submissions regarding biodiversity, vegetation removal, riparian disturbance and impacts to local wildlife are well-founded. The Section 8.2 Review does not resolve the environmental deficiencies identified in the original assessment. No revised BDAR has been provided, and claimed improvements to vegetation avoidance</p>

	<p>have not been substantiated through updated plans or consistent supporting documentation.</p> <p>There also remain unresolved conflicts between APZ requirements, riparian restoration objectives and the subdivision layout, with inconsistencies between the bushfire assessment, VMP and landscape plans still evident.</p> <p>With respect to stormwater, Council’s Development Engineer is generally satisfied that the overall stormwater strategy is acceptable at concept/DA stage and can be resolved through detailed design during subdivision works. While this mitigates concerns regarding drainage and pollution control, it does not address the broader biodiversity and riparian impacts identified above.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal has not adequately demonstrated avoidance and minimisation of environmental impacts, and key ecological concerns raised in submissions remain unresolved.</p>
Undersized lots	<p>The subject land is zoned R1 General Residential with a minimum lot size of 450m². Within the Anambah URA, the MLEP 2011 expressly allows lots smaller than 450m² under Clause 7.8, subject to meeting prescribed design and amenity criteria. The small-lot product proposed in Stage 1 has been assessed against Clause 7.8 and is permissible with consent.</p> <p>While concerns regarding lot size are acknowledged, the proposed lot areas are consistent with the planning framework applying to the URA.</p>
Social Impact	<p>Submissions raised concerns that the development would create an isolated community lacking access to schools, neighbourhood centres, medical services, public transport and other essential community facilities. These concerns are concurred with by Council’s assessing officer.</p>

	<p>The proposal relies heavily on future social infrastructure across the wider URA that is neither committed nor sequenced to support early occupation of this site. The Social Impact Assessment acknowledges that early residents will be highly dependent on private vehicles, that Anambah Road does not provide safe walking or cycling conditions, and that River Road – an unsealed road intended solely for emergency egress – is nevertheless “expected” to function informally as a pedestrian and cycling route.</p> <p>These matters reinforce that the development, in its current out-of-sequence position and without secured access, transport or community infrastructure, would result in significant geographic and social isolation for early residents. Accordingly, the social impacts identified in submissions remain valid and are not resolved.</p>
Emergency Services and evacuation during flood events (River Road)	<p>Submissions raised concerns about the safety and reliability of evacuation arrangements, particularly the proposal to use River Road as a gated emergency access. Council and the NSW SES share these concerns. River Road is an unformed road, with the applicant proposing substandard road design that will be unreliable in flood events and is not supported by SES as an appropriate evacuation route. The proposed private gate controlling access cannot be practically relied upon once roads are dedicated, and does not align with SES operational requirements.</p> <p>Similarly, the NSW RFS GTAs require an 8-metre carriageway for any perimeter road relied upon for emergency purposes. The proposed design does not meet this standard, and the location of the gate conflicts with expected public road functionality. As a result, safe evacuation cannot be demonstrated for either flood or bushfire events, and the concerns raised in submissions remain valid and unresolved.</p>