

**APPLICATION FOR ASSESSMENT  
OF A LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE  
CONTRIBUTIONS PLAN  
BLACKTOWN CITY COUNCIL  
SECTION 7.11 CONTRIBUTIONS PLAN  
NO.24 – SCHOFIELDS PRECINCT**

---



## Contents

<b>1. Instructions</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Preliminary information</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Assessment criteria</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4. Quality assurance</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>5. Application checklists</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>6. Resources to assist councils</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>7. Example works schedule</b>	<b>25</b>



## Instructions

Section 7.11 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 allows councils to levy contributions towards the cost of providing local infrastructure. Contributions plans set out the local infrastructure required to meet the demand from new development, and the contributions a council can levy on developers to fund the essential land and works.

IPART assesses contributions plans that propose contributions above \$30,000 per lot or dwelling in identified greenfield areas and \$20,000 per dwelling in other areas.



### Who should fill out this application form?

This form is for NSW councils that are submitting a local infrastructure contributions plan to IPART for assessment. A separate application must be submitted for each contributions plan.

Councils are encouraged to discuss information requirements or other queries relating to the contributions plan assessment process with IPART prior to submitting an application.

Call IPART on **02 9290 8400** to speak to the Local Government Contributions Plan Team.



### How should a council submit an application?

Councils should complete this Application Form and submit it to IPART, along with the contributions plan and all relevant supporting documentation (see Checklist in section 5). We prefer all information is submitted electronically to:  
[localgovernment@ipart.nsw.gov.au](mailto:localgovernment@ipart.nsw.gov.au).

We can provide applicant councils with access to our cloud-based file management system to submit large files. When submitting information please clearly label any information that is commercial-in-confidence and not suitable for publishing.

## How to complete this application?



IPART assesses whether the contributions plan meets the criteria set out in the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment's (DPIE) Local Infrastructure Contributions Practice Note, January 2019 (the Practice Note).

This application form is structured around the criteria we assess and prompts councils for information to support their application.

Please provide answers to all relevant questions. Your responses to the questions in this application form will help us understand how the plan, including the proposed cost of land and works, has been prepared. Comprehensive applications save councils time in the long run as they reduce the number of requests for information we need to send during our assessment. Please contact us before submitting an application and we can provide examples of strong applications.

When preparing your application, please note:

- ▼ Where your response to a question relies on information that is clearly outlined in a supporting document.
- ▼ That any referenced reports and documents must be submitted with an application.



### What other information is available?

Please refer to IPART's website [Local Infrastructure Contributions Plans](https://www.ipart.nsw.gov.au/local-infrastructure-contributions-plans) for further information on our assessment process, including current and completed assessments. The website also has resources that may assist in contributions planning and includes the current Practice Note and IPART Fact Sheet and Information Papers, and current and completed assessments. There is an index of these resources in the Resources to assist councils section of this application.

## 2. Preliminary information

### Council information

<b>Council name</b>	Blacktown City Council
<b>Council contact details</b> (Provide more than one - include names, positions, phone numbers, and email addresses of council officers and/or consultant contacts)	Jenny Rodger – Co-Ordinator Contributions [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Dennis Bagnall – Manager Developer Contributions [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

### Information about the plan

<b>What is the name of the plan?</b>	Section 7.11 Contributions Plan No. 24 Schofields Precinct
<b>What is the name of the catchment (precinct or release area) covered by the plan?</b> * please specify any sub-catchments if applicable	Schofields Precinct <u>Catchments</u> Stormwater Quantity - Eastern Creek Stormwater Quality - Eastern Creek Stormwater - Sub Catchments Eastern Creek - West 1 Eastern Creek - West 2 Traffic Management - Schofields Open Space - Eastern Catchment Schofields (District Facility) Community Facilities -Schofields Combined Precinct Facilities Conservation Zone (Riverstone) Aquatic Facility (Marsden Park)
<b>What is the base period of the plan? (e.g. June 2018)</b>	June 2022



Which clause of the section 94E Ministerial Direction for Local Infrastructure Contributions (Ministerial Direction) applies to this plan (ie, clause 6, 6A, 6B or 6C)?	The Schofields Precinct is listed in 6A of the July 2017 Direction					
What is the current maximum contribution amount (per lot or dwelling) for this plan under the Ministerial Direction?	No maximum contribution					
In the absence of any cap imposed by the Ministerial Direction, what are the indicative contribution amounts (per lot or dwelling) for each type of residential development in the catchment area?						
Indicative contributions per dwelling						
Density (dwellings per hectare)	12.5	15	25	30	40	45
Occupancy (persons per dwelling)	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
Eastern catchment	\$131,057	\$116,787	\$80,065	\$73,707	\$65,829	\$63,173
Western catchment 1		\$84,505				
Western catchment 2		\$45,542				
When was the plan publicly exhibited? And, how many submissions were received during exhibition?	The plan was published on Council’s website with supporting documents 15 August to 11 September 2022. Major developers, Defence Housing Australia and Stockland Developments Pty Ltd were also advised of the exhibition.  No submissions were received.					
Has the council adopted the plan? If so, when was it adopted and when did it come into force?	No. Council will not adopt this revised plan until we receive the Minister’s advice following IPART’s assessment.					
Who are the key stakeholders (e.g. Council, Department of Planning, Industry & Environment (DPIE), or developers) involved in planning for the area covered by the plan?	The Department of Planning and Environment were responsible for the precinct planning for the Schofields					

	<p>Precinct in consultation with Blacktown City Council.</p> <p>There was also joint involvement in planning proposals by Stockland and Defence Housing Australia.</p> <p>Both developers were not involved with the review of the contributions plan.</p>
<b>Over what period will development in the catchment area of the plan occur?</b>	15-20 years.
<b>What planning instruments (SEPPs, LEPs, or DCPs) apply to land in the catchment area of the plan?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006 (Appendix No.7)</li> <li>• BCC Growth Centre Precincts DCP 2010</li> <li>• BCC Growth Centre Precincts DCP 2010 (Schedule 5).</li> </ul>
<b>Has the Minister referred this contributions plan to IPART for review?</b> If so, provide details.	<p>The Minister required that certain IPART recommendations of its 2018 CP 24 assessment be addressed within 24 months of his letter dated 1 June 2020. The review of this plan complies with those requirements.</p>

## For existing contributions plans where development has progressed

Councils only need to complete these questions for plans that have already been adopted and where development in the catchment area covered by the plan has progressed.

### Information about existing plans

#### 1. What proportion of the total projected development in the catchment area of the plan has been approved and/or constructed?

89%.

**2. Briefly explain if, and how the plan has been revised in response to any changes in the catchment area covered by the plan.**

i.e. Has the council considered the impact of revised population estimates or dwelling yields, and how?

Yes. The 2022 version of CP 24 Schofields Precinct has updated historical land acquisition and construction costs. It provides new cost estimates for land it is yet to acquire using independent valuer rates, and for works that are yet to be provided, using an independent quantity surveyor.

Population estimates have been amended, based on a recent planning proposal.

**Additional requirements**

Please include the contributions register for the plan as an attachment to your application.

If costs in the plan are based on Works in Kind Agreements (WIKs) or Voluntary Planning Agreements (VPAs), please provide details in the works schedule of:

- ▼ The works items covered by the agreements
- ▼ The total cost (land and works), including any indexation up to the base period of the plan
- ▼ The name, date and applicable page numbers in the agreements

**3. Explain any other revisions to the plan such as updated costings, revised apportionment of costs, or amended delivery timeframes.**

In addition to explaining any revisions below, please clearly identify any updated costings in the plan's works schedule

We have for the first time, introduced a new Land Value Index (LVI) from Corelogic that assists in addressing some of the steep rises in land acquisition costs for the Schofields Precinct. The new LVI will be applied to the base land rates only for payment of the contributions. Council has had preliminary discussions already with IPART concerning a land value index.

## For contributions plans previously reviewed by IPART

Councils only need to complete these questions for plans that IPART has previously reviewed.

### Information about revisions to the plan

#### 4. Why is the council submitting the revised plan for IPART's review?

So that Council can impose a S7.11 contribution higher than \$30,000 per lot/dwelling threshold in the Schofields Precinct, and to achieve the status of an 'IPART reviewed contributions plan' in accordance with the DPE *Secretary's Practice Note: Local Infrastructure Contributions* | January 2019.

#### 5. Briefly explain how the plan has been revised in response to:

- ▼ Recommendations made in IPART's assessment report on the previous version/s of the plan
- ▼ Any directions from the Minister for Planning or Minister's Nominee in relation to IPART's assessment.

Please note any instances where a recommendation from the Minister for Planning has not been implemented/addressed.

All previous IPART recommendations from CP24's last assessment by IPART, that were required by the Minister for Planning have been have been incorporated into this review of CP 24.



### 3. Assessment criteria



#### Criterion 1 Essential works list

We assess whether the land and works in the plan is consistent with the essential works list (EWL) in the Practice Note. Please refer to the latest version of the Practice Note for the latest EWL.

#### 6. If the plan includes costs for land and/or works not on the EWL:

- ▼ List these items below
- ▼ Indicate how their costs will be met.

All land and works costs accord with the EWL.

#### 7. List the community services that will be provided on the land that is to be acquired for community services (eg, youth centre, library) and indicate the floor space area allocated to each.

Only land for community services is on the essential works list, works are not. However, we require details of the community services that are intended to be provided, so we can determine the proportion of the land costs that can be recovered through development contributions.

A local Community Neighbourhood Centre of 1,000<sup>m2</sup> using our Community Resource Hub model, will be provided on the land that the contribution plan collects for, with elements of:

- neighbourhood & community centre
- cultural development facilities
- children and family services facilities



## Criterion 2

### Nexus

We assess whether there is nexus between the proposed land and works and the increased demand generated by development identified through the contributions plan. In assessing nexus we consider supporting evidence such as technical studies, modelling or internal council analysis and reports that establish the need for the proposed land and works.



**Providing comprehensive answers**  
will minimise the likelihood of further questions from IPART

#### 8. Explain the process used to determine the need for all land and works in the plan.

- ▼ List any supporting studies relied on and explain any deviations from recommendations in those studies. Please also identify who commissioned the study (i.e. DPIE or council).
- ▼ Show the link between the supporting studies and the land and works in the plan. This can be shown against each item in a separate table or in the plan's works schedule (see example works schedule).

##### Transport land and works

The Schofields Transport & Access Study (2011) by Aecom Australia Pty Ltd – commissioned by DPE.

##### Stormwater land and management works

J. Wyndham Prince Schofields Precinct – Water Cycle Management Strategy Report Incorporating Water Sensitive Urban Design Techniques dated May 2012 – commissioned by DPE.

Opus International Consultants Schofields Precinct Review of Water Cycle Management Strategy 09 November 2012 – commissioned by DPE.

**Open space land and works (embellishments)**

Blacktown City 2036 – Delivering the Vision (Blacktown City Council, 2017).

Elton Consulting – Social Infrastructure and Open Space Report – Schofields (2011) – commissioned by the (then) Growth Centres Commission.

Northwest Growth Centres Recreational Framework (Blacktown City Council, 2009).

Wellness Through Physical Activity Policy (Blacktown City Council, 2008).

Blacktown City Council Social Plan (2007).

Recreation and Open Space Strategy (Blacktown City Council, 2017).

**Community services land**

The Informal Indoor Recreation Needs Assessment and the Section 94 Community Facilities Report, undertaken by Council 2008.

**9. Were any supporting studies prepared for the catchment area but not relied on? If yes, explain why they were not used.**

No.

**10. How has non-residential development been considered in determining the need for infrastructure in the plan?****Water Management**

Demand for stormwater management infrastructure is generally driven by the amount of impervious area. There are controls in the DCP that allow the upper limits of impervious area to be estimated. This was then used in the numerical modelling to size the required stormwater management infrastructure.

In terms of stormwater treatment, on-lot treatment is the adopted strategy for all land uses other than low density residential land zoned R2. Provision is made in CP24 to provide supplementary treatment for public roads in land uses other than low density residential land zoned R2. Roads generally occupy approximately 25% of the gross development area and this has been used in apportioning stormwater treatment costs.

**Traffic Management**

In this CP the costs associated with the roads servicing the precinct have been allocated over an area basis for the non-residential.

#### 11. In determining the need for infrastructure in the plan, what consideration was given to:

##### ▼ The existing population in the catchment area

#### **Traffic Management & Water Management facilities**

Typically, the only existing stormwater infrastructure in the precincts are rural standard culverts under existing roads. These do not have the capacity to manage the increased flows resulting from development and must be replaced to comply with current design standards. Therefore, there is no surplus capacity in the existing stormwater management infrastructure.

Existing roads are generally rural roads that do not comply with current road design standards and requirements. Therefore, the existing road network does not have any surplus capacity and the full cost of upgrades is included in the CP.

#### **Open Space facilities**

There was no existing open space within the precinct when it was first planned, that could meet the needs of the new population.

Overall, and because higher densities than planned densities are being realised, there is a shortage of open space provision in North West Growth Area. The new incoming population will not be able to rely on open space outside the precinct. Open space in adjacent precincts does not have the capacity to serve additional out of precinct population.

Therefore, open space works included in the CP are essential to meet the needs of the new incoming population.

#### **Community Facilities**

There is no existing community facility infrastructure and capacity in the precincts relating to this CP plan.

##### ▼ Any existing or projected population outside the catchment area

See above

▼ The capacity of existing infrastructure in the catchment area, and/or

See above

▼ Any existing or proposed infrastructure outside the catchment area.

See above



### Criterion 3

#### Reasonable costs

IPART must advise whether the proposed development contributions are based on a reasonable estimate of the cost of the proposed public amenities and public services. This includes how the base costs of land and each item of infrastructure are derived and the method used to calculate the contribution rates and escalate them over time.



**Providing comprehensive answers**  
will minimise the likelihood of further questions from IPART

## 12. Explain the process used to estimate costs for works for each infrastructure category.

Refer to matters such as:

- ▼ Use of consultant or QS estimates
- ▼ Use of council costs
- ▼ Use of benchmark costs
- ▼ Any allowances included, such as professional fees and contingencies
- ▼ Details of any indexation of cost estimates to the base period of the plan, including the index used

Show the link between the supporting cost sources and the land and works in the plan. This can be shown against each item in a separate table or in the plan's works schedule (see example works schedule).

### Transport works

An independent quantity surveyor was engaged for current transport costs yet to be provided.

### Stormwater management works

An independent quantity surveyor was engaged for stormwater management costs yet to be provided.



**Open space works (embellishments)**

An independent quantity surveyor was engaged for current open space costs yet to be provided.

**13. Explain the process used to estimate the cost of plan preparation and administration.**

An administration cost of 1.5% of construction costs has been included. This % has previously been endorsed by IPART.

**14. What, if any, land has the council already acquired to provide local infrastructure for development in the catchment area? How has the cost of this land been included in the plan?**

- ▼ For land that the council has acquired in the plan, the works schedule should show:
  - Date of acquisition
  - Agreed market value
  - Any other acquisition costs
  - Indexation of the total acquisition cost to the base year of the plan.
- ▼ For land that the council has agreed to acquire or have dedicated through a VPA, the works schedule should show:
  - Date of agreement
  - Agreed value
  - Indexation of the value to the base year of the plan.
- ▼ For council-owned operational land, the works schedule should show:
  - Market value at the time the land was rezoned for public infrastructure
  - Indexation to the base year of the plan.

The excel spread sheet attached to this application provides the above-mentioned information.

**15. Explain the process used to estimate the cost of land yet to be acquired by the council.**

- ▼ Include details of any inclusions for other costs associated with a council's land acquisitions, such as conveyancing, legal, survey and other costs payable to landowners under the *Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991*.

New cost estimates for land yet to be acquired, have been updated using our independent panel valuer to provide average land values for the various underlying zonings. These values have been used to provide an average acquisition rate for each of the public purpose zoning in CP24.

A 5% allowance has been applied to the average rate for the conservation zone in the Riverstone precinct, and a 2% allowance of the average rates in the Schofields Precinct. This has been used to cover other associated acquisitions costs. This approach was supported by IPART in its CP24 August 2019 assessment report.

#### 16. If contribution rates in the plan are calculated using an NPV model,

- ▼ Does the model use real or nominal values?
- ▼ If the model uses nominal values, what indexation assumptions are applied to costs and revenue?
- ▼ What discount rate does the model use, and why?

The contributions plan does not use an NPV model.

#### 17. What measures have been taken to minimise costs in the contributions plan (eg, adjustment to design or alternative engineering solutions)?

##### Open Space

Necessary landscape design principles are adopted to reduce the cost in the contribution plan:

- Level of embellishment is minimised for basin parks.
- Level of embellishment is minimised for open spaces under the constrained land and open space affected by future NWRL corridor works.
- A minimum of 2 playing fields at any 1 site is proposed to reduce cost duplication of amenities building, car park and associated infrastructure.
- Where land has a dual drainage and open space function, separate costings have been identified within the respective sections of the plan to avoid unnecessary duplication
- All open space works proposed and costed are from the 'Essential Works List.'

##### Stormwater Management

During the precinct planning we requested that trunk drainage channels replacing first order watercourses were minimised.

As part of the concept designs we tried to minimise surplus excavation where possible and subject to the planning constraints of the land zoning allocated.

Disposal costs account for different classes of material. As the bulk of the material is expected to be VENM (clean material) the overall disposal costs are reduced.

We have completed the NWGA Stormwater Management Strategy Review. This study identifies the opportunity to remove the detention component from the majority of basins in this precinct.

### 18. Explain the method/s used to index the contribution rates for both land and works.

The historical cost of land and works have been indexed from the date of acquisition or work expenditure, by the “Sydney All Groups CPI” respectively.

We have introduced a **new unimproved land value index**. We propose to introduce a new index for land values replacing the CPI, which will help to mitigate the effects of rising land values in the North West Growth Area.

If approved by IPART, we will use this new index in the future for all our North West Growth Area contributions plans. The CPI will still be used for works, until an appropriate ‘works’ index can be established and approved.

Clause 212 (2)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021 states:

(2) If a contributions plan authorises the imposition of a development levy condition, the plan must contain—

(b) the method, if any, of adjusting the proposed cost of carrying out the development, after being determined by the consent authority, to reflect quarterly or annual variations to readily accessible index figures adopted by the plan between the day of the determination and the day by which the levy must be paid.

#### Example -

A contributions plan may adopt the **Consumer Price Index**.

The Regulation allows a council to include land value indices within a contributions plan (although not specifically mentioned), provided they are published quarterly or annually, and are readily accessible.

Although the CPI is used as an example in the Regulation and is ‘recommended’ by the Department of Planning and Environment as a suitable index for contributions plans, the CPI does not measure the rise in land value costs, particularly in a greenfield or growth context. It is non-volatile and does not assist councils.

The CPI measures quarterly changes in the price of a ‘basket’ of goods and services which account for a high proportion of expenditure by the CPI population group (i.e. metropolitan households). This ‘basket’ covers a wide range of goods and services, arranged in the following eleven groups:

- Food and non-alcoholic beverages
- Alcohol and tobacco

- Clothing and footwear
- Housing
- Furnishings, household equipment and services
- Health
- Transport
- Communication
- Recreation and culture
- Education
- Insurance and financial services.

As such, we engaged Corelogic to produce and publish on its website quarterly, a readily accessible bespoke 'Unimproved Land Value Index'. The index is a measure of the change in underlying land values for detached housing, specifically for the North West Growth Area and the Blacktown Local Government Area.

Unimproved land value (also referred to as Unimproved Capital Value) is the estimated value of the underlying land which a property is built upon, excluding any improvements on the land such as the dwelling itself and other structures (e.g., swimming pools, carports, etc.). This is distinct from the market value of the property which accounts for both the improvements as well as the unimproved land.

Leveraging the same hedonic methodology as Corelogic's Home Value Index, the Unimproved Land Value Index is derived from a statistical analysis of observed market transactions of residential houses. The model is optimised to control for the contribution of various attributes to changes in observed market sales prices by factoring only the land area and location attributes to the hedonic model.

We compared the unimproved land value index against the CPI using 10 years of data and the unimproved land value index provided a much better return than the CPI.

As this new index will now be assessed by IPART, Corelogic in-turn, engaged (at no cost to Council) Glenwood Capital to evaluate (peer review) its Unimproved Land Valuation Index for the geographic region of Blacktown-NorthWest Growth Area; provisioning an opinion of the methodology described in the model documentation *Unimproved Land Valuation Index-Methodology 2020* for the purposes of indexation in local council contribution planning.

In its opinion, the CoreLogic Unimproved Land Value Index utilises a comprehensive dataset of high integrity to construct real estate price indices. The Unimproved Land Value Index utilises a materially larger number of observations of property sales than would be used in a repeat-sale or median price index. The index tracks properties beyond those

that sold, to consider all properties in a geographic region. The implication is that reliable indices for bespoke geographies such a Blacktown North West Growth Area can be estimated.

Glenwood Capital's full report is provided to IPART as part of this application.



## Criterion 4

### Reasonable timeframe

We assess whether the proposed public amenities and public services can be provided within a reasonable timeframe.

#### 19. How has the council determined the timing of infrastructure provision?

Provide details of the program for delivery of infrastructure in the contributions plan and explain its underlying rationale.

Timing of stormwater and transport infrastructure is based on expected development progress. This is influenced by land ownership and utility and other infrastructure servicing. Council also monitors development interest and applications. Infrastructure delivery is then planned to suit expected development rates. Typically, where major landowners have initiated the precinct planning, development in these areas is expected to proceed first as they are also required to bring in the facilitating utility services. Timing of works will be updated to reflect trends as part of the regular CP reviews.

The delivery of infrastructure is also prioritised on work types that facilitate orderly development. The order of priority is stormwater management, traffic and transport, open space and land for community services.

Council has provided an estimate of staging and timing in 5-year thresholds. This is a requirement of the EP&A Regulation. It is noted however, that the timing of most facilities will be driven by the utility servicing of the Precinct and development trends.





## Criterion 5

### Reasonable apportionment

We assess whether the proposed development contribution is based on a reasonable apportionment of costs between existing and new demand. We also assess whether the apportionment of costs reflects the demand generated by different types and stages of development.

Apportionment is about ensuring the allocation of costs equitably between all those who will benefit from the infrastructure or create the need for it. While nexus is about establishing a relationship between the development and demand for infrastructure, apportionment is about quantifying the extent of the relationship.

#### 20. How does the plan apportion costs?

Provide details of supporting calculations and explain how the apportionment takes into consideration demand arising from (as relevant):

- ▼ New and existing development in the catchment area
- ▼ Different stages of development
- ▼ Different sub-catchments
- ▼ Residential and non-residential development
- ▼ Different residential development densities
- ▼ New and/or existing development outside the catchment area

Please provide additional information in this section if any development is exempt from paying contributions.

#### Transport land and works

Transport costs are levied over the developable area of the Schofields Precinct. The developable area has been apportioned over residential and non-residential development, initially between zonings. The apportionment to residential zoned developable areas has then been adjusted to be levied on a per person basis.

Non-Residential zoned developable areas continue to be levied on a developable area basis.

**Stormwater management land and works**

Stormwater management costs have been apportioned over 3 separated catchments, based on their drainage typography. Both residential and non-residential are levied on a developable area basis.

**Open space land and works (embellishments)**

Open Space costs are levied over the incoming population of the Schofields Precinct and levied on a per person basis.

**Community services land**

Community Facility (land) costs are levied over the incoming population of the Schofields Precinct and levied on a per person basis.

**Plan preparation and administration**

An administration cost of 1.5% of construction costs has been included in the rates for each of the abovementioned contributions.



## Criterion 6

### Appropriate community liaison

We require evidence that the plan has been exhibited and publicised in accordance with the statutory requirements and that the council has considered submissions received during the exhibition period. The post-exhibition version of the plan should not differ so significantly from the exhibited version that it requires re-exhibition.

It is not necessary to include information about consultation in the contributions plan.

#### 21. In developing the contributions plan, was any publicity and community liaison undertaken outside the mandatory exhibition period?

No

#### 22. How has the council taken into account submissions received on the draft plan placed on exhibition?

CP24 was exhibited on Council's 'Have your say' page on its website. [This link](#) should still be valid. We also included the technical studies that support the plan.

We also emailed the 2 large developers in the Schofields Precinct, Stockland Developments Pty Ltd and Defence House Australia.

No external submissions were received.

An internal submission identifying a formula error for Reserve 980 which omitted \$722,033.00 of current funding for exhibition was received.

This has been amended for the IPART assessment resulting in a minor increase to the Open Space (District Facility) base contribution rate of \$68.00.

#### 23. Does the council intend to undertake any further publicity or community liaison?

No.



## Criterion 7

The plan complies with other matters  
IPART considers relevant

IPART may take into consideration other matters relevant to our overall assessment of the contributions plan.

These matters may include compliance with the statutory requirements for making local infrastructure contribution plans and with the Practice Note, whether the plan uses up-to-date information, as well as issues of transparency and accountability in the council's proposed arrangements for the levying and collection of contributions under the plan.

### 24. Is there any other information relating to the contributions plan which may assist us to assess it against this criterion?

No.

### 25. Is the council aware of possible changes to any underlying assumptions used in preparing the plan which may be relevant to our assessment?

Such matters could include:

- ▼ Revised population projections
- ▼ Potential rezoning or changes to dwelling yields
- ▼ Other changes to the applicable LEP, SEPP or DCP
- ▼ Changes to NSW government policy for infrastructure delivery

The Schofield Town Centre is under investigation by Department of Planning & Environment. It is also subject to a planning proposal by Stockland. Neither of these have advanced significantly to be considered by this review of CP 24

### 26. Please provide any other information which you consider would assist or expedite our assessment.

This revision has combined the previous two distinct contributions plans 'CP24L – Schofields Precinct (Land)' and 'CP24W – Schofields Precinct (Works)' into one document.

It also updated historical costs for both completed land and works.

We have also included for IPARTs information, a copy of *CP17 Quakers Hill Commercial Precinct* as 50% of item SR4.5 has been apportioned to this precinct. The plan itself is not submitted for IPART assessment.

## 4. Quality assurance

We also request that council undertake a quality assurance (QA) check of the contributions plan before it is submitted to IPART for review.

The purpose of the council's QA check is to identify and address any errors or inconsistencies within the work schedules and also between the contributions plan and relevant supporting information to ensure that the plan, as submitted, is accurate. This will reduce the risk of delay in our assessment and the need for recommendations for the council to correct errors.

### Checklist for quality assurance of contributions plan and works schedule

Has the contributions plan been checked for	Yes	No
Typographical errors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Calculation errors (including checking infrastructure and land cost calculations)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of the most up-to-date data and information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 27. Explain the quality assurance process undertaken for the contributions plan prior to submitting it to IPART for review.

Plan was cross checked by staff and reviewed by senior staff



## 5. Application checklists

Please complete Checklist A to confirm the contributions plan contains all information requirements of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*.

Please complete Checklist B to ensure that all information necessary for IPART's assessment is submitted.

Councils should also complete and provide IPART with spreadsheets that:

- ▼ Detail all infrastructure items included in the plan, with references to the studies (including the specific sections or page numbers), that support their inclusion in the plan as relevant
- ▼ Detail the cost of each infrastructure item (including source and date of costings, and any indexation of cost estimates)
- ▼ List the cost and area for all parcels of land required for infrastructure in the plan
- ▼ Detail the cost of any land that has already been acquired and land that the council is yet to acquire
- ▼ Show how the total cost of land and works for each infrastructure category (or subcategory) have been apportioned
- ▼ Show how the contributions rates in the plan have been calculated (including net present value modelling if this approach is used)
- ▼ Show indicative contribution amounts for each type of residential dwelling.

IPART provides a works schedule template that councils can use to show information and calculate contribution rates (see Resources to assist councils). The template is available on our website or can be viewed at the end of this document.

## Checklist A – for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan:	Yes	No	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Outline the purpose of the plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
Incorporate a map showing:			4, 43 to 68
▼ Geographical catchment area of the contributions plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
▼ Specific infrastructure to be provided under the plan (may include multiple maps)			
Include details about how the need for land and works to support new development was determined	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	14 to 33
Include information about:			
▼ Existing population in the catchment area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6
▼ Projected residential population and/or workforce	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6
Include a schedule of the contributions rates (eg, \$/ha, \$/person, \$/dwelling)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	70
Include assumptions made in the modelling of costs and revenue (if using a Net Present Value (NPV) approach).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-
Include details of the anticipated rate of development in the catchment area and how this was determined	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-
Include a program for infrastructure delivery and explain how it relates to the anticipated timing of development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	43 to 68
Include a statement regarding potential revision of the scheduled timing for infrastructure delivery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8
Include the formulas used for determining the section 7.11 contributions for each infrastructure category	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	14 to 33
Explain how the proposed cost of works was derived (eg, quantity surveyor or other consultant advice, standard costs used by the council)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-

Does the contributions plan:	Yes	No	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Explain how the proposed cost of land was derived	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	12
Include a works schedule that shows an estimate of the cost and the expected timing of infrastructure delivery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	43 to 68
Include details of apportionment calculations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	32
Explain how the contribution rates will be adjusted for inflation/ changes in costs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	38 to 40
Outline the base period for costs in the plan (eg, June 2018)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	39
Address the council's position on the following policy matters:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
▼ Provide details of accounting arrangements for contribution funds (eg, is pooling of funds permitted, will internal borrowings be used to deliver infrastructure projects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	11
▼ Show how it will satisfy each condition requiring the payment of monetary contribution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	37
▼ Consider the conditions that may be imposed under section 4.17(6)(b) of the Act or section 97(1)(b) of the Local Government Act 1993.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-

## Checklist B – for the council's application

Please complete the checklist below to ensure that all information necessary for IPART's assessment is submitted.

	Yes	No	N/A
<b>Works schedules and calculation of contribution rates</b>			
Spreadsheets must include a clear link between	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
▼ The listed infrastructure and the evidence which supports nexus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
▼ The cost of land/infrastructure and the cost source	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Contributions plan</b>			
Version of contributions plan incorporating any post exhibition changes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Version of contributions plan publicly exhibited	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Version of contributions plan previously submitted to IPART for review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Public consultation</b>			
Copy of all submissions to publicly exhibited contributions plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Summary of submissions and council's response	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Technical studies and consultant documents</b>			
Land valuation report/s	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting studies for stormwater management infrastructure (eg, Flooding and Water Cycle Management report)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting studies for transport infrastructure (eg, Traffic and Transport Assessment report)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting studies for open space infrastructure (eg, Demographic and Social Infrastructure report)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting studies for community services (eg, Demographic and Social Infrastructure report)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Maps and shape/spatial files</b>			
Plan catchment map/s	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Final Indicative Layout Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Zoning map/s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Land acquisition map/s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Constrained land map/s (flooding and transmission lines)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Other documents</b>			
VPAs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Details of other funding agreements for state or local infrastructure in the area covered by the plan (including draft agreements)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Council business papers or meeting minutes related to the preparation of the contributions plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Any other documents that you think could be useful in IPART's assessment of the contributions plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 6. Resources to assist councils

The following documents and resources are available to assist councils preparing a contributions plan.

Please refer to IPART's website [Local Infrastructure Contributions Plans](#) for further information on our assessment process.

Policy Documents	Description
Section 94E Ministerial Direction for Local Infrastructure Contributions 2012, as amended (Ministerial Direction)	The Ministerial Direction sets out the role of IPART in reviewing local government contributions plans
Local Infrastructure Contributions Practice Note, January 2019 (the Practice Note)	Provides guidance to IPART and to assist councils to understand the role of IPART in the review of contributions plans.
Terms of Reference – Reviewable Contributions Plans – Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, dated 14 November 2018	IPART's Terms of Reference for the review of local government contributions plans

Fact Sheets and Information Papers	Description
Fact Sheet – Contributions plans assessment	Explains why and how we assess contributions plans
Fact Sheet – Local Government discount rate	Every six months IPART publishes the local government discount rate
Fact Sheet – Inclusion of roads in contributions plans	Provides advice and guidance on the inclusion of roads in contributions plans
Information Paper – Contributions plan assessment: land costs	Sets out IPART's approach to assessing land costs in contributions plans
Information Paper – Guidance for contributions plans: Local Infrastructure Benchmark Costs	Sets out IPART's position on using our 2014 benchmark cost report
Information Paper – Indexation of contribution rates	Provides advice and guidance on the indexation of contribution rates
Technical Paper – Modelling local infrastructure contributions	A technical paper that outlines our recommended approach to calculating the discount rate and other aspects of modelling local infrastructure contributions using a net present value approach

Other documents	Description
IPART Works Schedule Template	An example works schedule that councils can use when developing a contributions plan

---



## 7. Example works schedule

Plan 1 - Works Schedule

Reference	Item description	Land area (m2)	Cost of land	Works (unit)	Quantity required	Cost of works	Total cost land and works	Total cost (indexed to base period of plan)	Cost apportioned to plan	Total cost apportioned to plan	What establishes nexus?	Cost source (land)	Cost source (works)	Indicative timing
X01	collector road 1	5,500	\$ 2,000,000	linear metres	1,200	\$ 4,200,000	\$ 6,200,000	\$ 7,130,000	85%	\$ 6,060,500	Arup, Precinct Transport Study, July 2015, page 35	KD Wood Land Valuation Report, 2017	WTP, road costs report, December 2015	2022-2023
B05	bus shelters	1,500	\$ 545,455	item	7	\$ 140,000	\$ 685,455	\$ 788,273	100%	\$ 788,273	Arup, Precinct Transport Study, July 2015 & see note (a), page 38	KD Wood Land Valuation Report 2017	IPART benchmark cost	2020-2025
S01	sub-arterial road 1	14,000	\$ 4,500,000	linear metres	2,300	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 16,500,000	\$ 18,975,000	100%	\$ 18,975,000	Arup, Precinct Transport Study, July 2015, page 36	VPA 001, p25-31. Ownership has not yet been transferred.	Specific cost based on tender rates, see note (b)	2022-2023
<b>Total in plan</b>		<b>21,000</b>	<b>\$ 7,045,455</b>		<b>3,507</b>	<b>\$ 16,340,000</b>	<b>\$ 23,385,455</b>	<b>\$ 26,893,273</b>		<b>\$ 25,823,773</b>				

Note: a council investigation and analysis has identified the need for 2 additional bus stops, above what is identified in the technical study.

b see attached evidence in Document A1

An example works schedule can be found on the IPART website.