



Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal
New South Wales

Application for assessment of a section 94 development contributions plan – Part A

Contributions Plan No. 22W Rouse Hill (works)



Contents

1	Instructions	1
1.1	Who should fill in this application form?	1
1.2	How should a council submit an application?	1
2	Preliminary Information	2
2.1	All applications	2
2.2	For contributions plans previously reviewed by IPART	3
3	Assessment Criteria	4
3.1	Criterion 1 – the Essential Works List	4
3.2	Criterion 2 – Nexus	6
3.3	Criterion 3 – Reasonable costs	9
3.4	Criterion 4 – Reasonable timeframe	12
3.5	Criterion 5 – Reasonable apportionment	13
3.6	Criterion 6 – Appropriate community liaison	15
3.7	Criterion 7 – The plan complies with other matters IPART considers relevant	16
4	Quality assurance	17
5	Attachment checklist	18

1 Instructions

1.1 Who should fill in this application form?

This form is for NSW councils that are submitting a **section 94 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.

1.2 How should a council submit an application?

Councils should complete this Application Form Part A and submit it to IPART, along with the contributions plan and all relevant supporting documentation (see Checklist in section 5) by email, post or in person. We require an electronic copy of all documents.

Email	Post	In Person
Attention: Local Government Contributions Plan Team	Attention: Local Government Contributions Plan Team	Attention: Local Government Contributions Plan Team
localgovernment@nsw.gov.au	Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal PO Box K35 Haymarket Post Shop Sydney NSW 1240	Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal Level 15 2-24 Rawson Place Sydney NSW 2000

1.3 What other information is available?

Please refer to IPART's website <<https://www.ipart.nsw.gov.au/Home/Industries/Local-Government/S94-Contributions-Plans>> for further information on our assessment process, including current and completed assessments. The website also has copies of:

- ▼ Application Form Part B (optional)
- ▼ *Section 94E Ministerial Direction for Local Infrastructure Contributions 2012*, as amended (s94E Ministerial Direction), and
- ▼ *Local Infrastructure Contributions Practice Note*, January 2018.

2 Preliminary Information

2.1 All applications

A. Council information

Council name	Blacktown City Council
Primary council contact details (Provide name, position, phone number, and email address)	Jenny Rodger - Section 94 Officer ([REDACTED])
Secondary council contact details (Provide name, position, phone number, and email address)	Dennis Bagnall – Coordinator Contributions ([REDACTED])

B. Information about the plan

What is the name of the plan?	Contributions Plan No. 22W Rouse Hill (works)																								
Which clause of the <i>section 94E Ministerial Direction for Local Infrastructure Contributions</i> (s94E Ministerial Direction) applies to this plan (ie, clause 6, 6A, 6B or 6C)?	The Area 20 Precinct is listed in 6A of the July 2017 Direction. The Riverstone East Precinct is included in Clause 6D of the February 2018 Amendment Direction.																								
What is the current maximum contribution amount (per lot or dwelling) for this plan under the section s94E Ministerial Direction?	\$35,000.00																								
In the absence of any cap imposed by the s94E Ministerial Direction, what are the indicative contribution amounts (per lot or dwelling) for each type of residential development in the catchment area?	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Density</th> <th>First Ponds Creek</th> <th>Second Ponds Creek</th> <th>Killarney Chain Of Ponds Creek</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>12.5</td> <td>\$54,763</td> <td></td> <td>\$66,014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15</td> <td>\$50,290</td> <td>\$49,158</td> <td>\$59,669</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20</td> <td></td> <td>\$43,824</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>25</td> <td>\$34,442</td> <td>\$30,558</td> <td>\$39,528</td> </tr> <tr> <td>45</td> <td>\$30,656</td> <td>\$28,500</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Density	First Ponds Creek	Second Ponds Creek	Killarney Chain Of Ponds Creek	12.5	\$54,763		\$66,014	15	\$50,290	\$49,158	\$59,669	20		\$43,824		25	\$34,442	\$30,558	\$39,528	45	\$30,656	\$28,500	
Density	First Ponds Creek	Second Ponds Creek	Killarney Chain Of Ponds Creek																						
12.5	\$54,763		\$66,014																						
15	\$50,290	\$49,158	\$59,669																						
20		\$43,824																							
25	\$34,442	\$30,558	\$39,528																						
45	\$30,656	\$28,500																							
When was the plan publicly exhibited?	20 December 2017 to 20 January 2018																								
Has the council adopted the plan? If so, when was it adopted and when did it come into force?	Adopted 28 February 2018 In force 7 March 2018																								
To what extent was the Department of Planning & Environment (DPE) involved in the development of this plan?	The Department of Planning and Environment were responsible for the precinct planning for the Area 20 and Riverstone East Precincts in																								

	<p>consultation with Blacktown City Council.</p> <p>They had no direct involvement with the preparation of the contributions plan, except for providing various information that informs the Plan.</p>
Over what period will development in the catchment area of the plan occur?	25 years
What proportion of the total projected development in the catchment area of the plan has been approved and/or constructed?	Approximately 7%
What planning instruments (SEPPs, LEPs, or DCPs) apply to land in the catchment area of the plan?	<p>State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006</p> <p>Blacktown City Council Priority Growth Area Precincts Development Control Plan</p>
Has the Minister referred this contributions plan to IPART for review? If so, provide details.	No – Council refers it to IPART to be eligible for funding under the Local Infrastructure Growth Scheme.

2.2 For contributions plans previously reviewed by IPART

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

C. Information about revisions to the plan

Why is the council submitting the revised plan for IPART's review?	This revision has combined the Riverstone East and Area 20 Precincts as the land to which each plan applies (Rouse Hill), and has created two distinct contributions plans 'CP22L – Rouse Hill (Land)' and 'CP22W – Rouse Hill (Works)'.
<p>Briefly explain how the plan has been revised in response to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – recommendations made in IPART's assessment report on the previous version/s of the plan, and – any directions from the Minister for Planning in relation to IPART's assessment. 	The 2013 adoption of "CP 22 - Area 20 Precinct" incorporated the directions from the Minister for Planning in relation to IPART's assessment.
Briefly explain any other revisions to the plan such as updated costings, revised apportionment of costs, or amended delivery timeframe.	The plan provides or updates details on the costs of land acquisition to the Riverstone East and Area 20 precincts in the North West Priority Growth Area. It also provides the Section 94 contribution rates proposed under each plan.

3 Assessment Criteria

We will assess the contributions plan against the criteria listed in the *Local Infrastructure Contributions Practice Note*, issued by the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) in January 2018 (Practice Note).

Your responses to the questions in this section will assist us in understanding how the plan, including the proposed cost of land and works, has been prepared.

- ▼ If the information in your proposed response is clearly set out in the contributions plan or a separate report or document, it is sufficient to refer to the appropriate sections/pages.
- ▼ Any referenced reports and documents will need to be attached to this application (see Checklist in Section 5).

3.1 Criterion 1 – the Essential Works List

The public amenities and public services in the plan are on the Essential Works List

We are required to assess whether the land and works in the contributions plan are on the Essential Works List (EWL). Refer to the Practice Note for the most recent version of this list, including a definition of base level embellishment of open space.

Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Include land or works not on the EWL	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Include costs for any land or works not on the EWL in the calculation of contribution rates	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1. If the plan includes costs for land and/or works not on the Essential Works List:
 - a) list these items below, and
 - b) indicate how their costs are to be met.

NA

Only the land component for community services is on the Essential Works List. However, we require details of the community services that are intended to be provided on this land, so we can determine what proportion of the land costs can be recovered through development contributions.

- 2. 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.**

No community services costs are funded from CP22W – Rouse Hill (works) as they are not included on the Essential Works List.

3.2 Criterion 2 – Nexus

The proposed public amenities and public services are reasonable in terms of nexus (the connection between development and the demand created).

Nexus ensures that the land and works included in the contributions plan are required to meet the increased demand for facilities generated by the anticipated development.

Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Incorporate a map showing the geographical catchment area of the contributions plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Appendices A to D Pages 33 to 50
Detail the types of development that will occur in the catchment area(s) of the plan, and the approximate area of each land use	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Section 1.13 Page 7
Include information about:			Section 1.12
▼ the existing population in the catchment area	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Page 7
▼ the projected residential population and/or workforce	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Appendix E Page 51
Include details about how the need for land and works was determined	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Sections 2 to 5 Pages 11 to 25
Refer to design and construction standards used in determining the works in the plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Sections 2 to 5 Pages 11 to 25

3. 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.

The land required for public purposes was determined as part of the Area 20 and Riverstone East Precinct Planning by the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE). DPE commissioned technical studies to determine the quantum of additional facilities required to serve the planned increased population. The land required to provide these facilities is gazetted in the SEPP land acquisition and reservation map. Where Council is the nominated acquisition authority, the cost of the land has been included in our contributions plans. The technical studies that support the precinct planning are listed below:

a) Transport land and works

- ARUP, Riverstone East Precinct, Transport Study, Final Draft, April 2015, prepared for NSW Government, Planning & Environment
- ARUP, Riverstone East Precinct, Transport Study, Post Exhibition report, 3 November 2015, prepared for NSW Government, Planning & Environment
- Urbanhorizon Pty Ltd, Area 20 Transport and Access Study Final report, October 2010, prepared for the Department of Planning
- Road Delay Solutions, North West Growth Centre Area 20, Post Exhibition Assessment Transport and Access, 'End State' Year 2036, August 2011, prepared for NSW Government Department of Planning

b) Stormwater land and management works

- Mott MacDonald, Riverstone East Precinct Water Cycle Management Plan, 19 March 2015, prepared for NSW Government, Planning & Environment
- Mott MacDonald, Riverstone East Water Cycle Management Report, April 2015, prepared for NSW Government, Planning & Environment
- Mott MacDonald, Riverstone East Water Cycle Management Report, May 2016, prepared for NSW Government, Planning & Environment
- J Wyndham Prince, Area 20 Precinct, Rouse Hill Water Cycle Management Strategy Report incorporating Water Sensitive Urban Design Techniques, October 2010, prepared for the Department of Planning
- J Wyndham Prince, Area 20 Precinct, Rouse Hill Water Cycle Management Strategy Report incorporating Water Sensitive Urban Design Techniques, July 2011, prepared for the Department of Planning

c) Open space land and works (embellishments)

- LFA (Pacific) Pty Ltd, Area 20 Precinct, Public Domain & Landscape Strategy, August 2011, prepared for the NSW Government, Planning & Infrastructure
- Elton Consulting, Social Infrastructure and Open Space Report Area 20 Precinct, 10 May 2010, prepared for Department of Planning
- Elton Consulting, Social Infrastructure Assessment Riverstone East Precinct, Final Report, 24 April 2015, prepared for Department of Planning
- Place Planning Design Environment, Riverstone East, Landscape & Visual Assessment, September 2014, prepared for NSW Government, Planning & Environment
- Blacktown City Council, Sporting Code Allocation, Playing Fields and Courts in New Release Areas 2015
- Recreation and Open Space Strategy (Blacktown City Council, 2018)

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

No

5. 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 non-residential uses. Provision is made in the CP to provide supplementary treatment for public roads in non-residential areas. 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.

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

- a) the existing population in the catchment area
- b) any existing or projected population outside the catchment area
- c) the capacity of existing infrastructure in the catchment area, and/or
- d) any existing or proposed infrastructure outside the catchment area.

Traffic & Water Management

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.

In the Area 20 precinct Second Ponds Creek catchment, Sydney Water has provided stormwater detention basins that cater for the detention requirement of this precinct. No stormwater detention costs are included in our plan for this catchment as the works were funded and delivered before gazettal of this precinct.

In the First Ponds Creek catchment additional detention capacity is included to supplement that provided in the Riverstone and Alex Avenue precincts (CP20) and by the North West Metro stabling yards development.

In the remaining catchment areas 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

There is no existing open space within the precinct that will meet the needs of the new population.

Overall, there is a shortage of open space provision in North West Growth Centre. The new incoming population will not be able to rely on open space outside the precinct. Open spaces in adjacent precincts do 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.

3.3 Criterion 3 – Reasonable costs

The proposed development contribution is based on a reasonable estimate of the cost of the proposed public amenities and public services.

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.

Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...	Yes	No	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Explain how the proposed cost of works was derived (eg, quantity surveyor or other consultant advice, standard costs used by the council)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sections 2 to 5 Pages 11 to 25
Explain how the proposed cost of land was derived	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Include a schedule of the contributions rates (eg, \$/ha, \$/person, \$/dwelling)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Appendix F Page 52
Explain how the contribution rates will be adjusted for inflation/ changes in costs	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Sections 7.3 Pages 30
Provide details of accounting arrangements for contribution funds (eg, is pooling of funds permitted, will internal borrowings be used to deliver infrastructure projects?)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Sections 1.21 Pages 9
If using a Net Present Value (NPV) approach, include assumptions made in the modelling of costs and revenue	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

7. What is the base period for costs in the plan (eg, June 2017)?

Base CPI – All Groups Sydney - September 2017

8. 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

a) Transport works

Concept designs were prepared for the major infrastructure works to generate a bill of quantities for the main works items. These were then priced using council's design estimate rates for civil construction for the 17/18 financial year. These rates are based on Council's schedule of rates contract for roads and drainage works. Estimates were completed in November 2017. Where works items are not included in Council's contract, then industry rates such as Rawlinson's are used.

b) Stormwater management works

Concept designs were prepared for the major infrastructure works to generate a bill of quantities for the main works items. These were then priced using council's design estimate rates for civil construction for the 17/18 financial year. These rates are based on Council's schedule of rates contract for roads and drainage works. Estimates were completed in November 2017. Where works items are not included in Council's contract, then industry rates such as Rawlinson's are used.

c) Open space works (embellishments)

The estimation process used is consistent with adjacent precincts open space works costing, previously endorsed by IPART:

- Initial concept design has been prepared, identifying approximate lengths and areas off aerial map. This is due to the absence of detailed site information, unknown site constraints and limitations and with the assumption that all reserves will be clear and free from any contamination.
- An independent quantity surveyor's July 2016 rates are used. These estimates are finalised on Sep 2017 and indexed to Nov 2017 using the Producer Price Indexes, Australia.
- The construction costs include: Preliminary (12%), Margins & Overheads (4%) and Contingency (15%). These allowances are included to accommodate for any cost increase due to unknown site constraints such as, site condition, flora and fauna, contamination and heritage issues.
- Design fees considered is 10%. This allows us to undertake the design of open space and recreation facilities, including relevant planning approvals.

9. 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 in CP 22W Rouse Hill (works)

10. 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?

NA

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

Refer to:

- Details of any inclusions for just terms compensation
- Details of any indexation of cost estimates from the base period of the plan, including the index used

NA

12. If contributions rates in the plan are calculated using an NPV model,

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

NA

13. 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:

- Playing fields are proposed for a minimum of 2 fields at any 1 site to reduce cost duplication of amenities building, car park and associated infrastructure.
- Level of embellishment is minimised for open spaces under the transmission easements.
- Level of embellishment is minimised for open space that are most likely to be affected by future NWRL corridor works.
- All CP costs are compared to the current market and contract rates to ensure that proposed costs are reasonable.

Stormwater Management

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

Our detailed design work for basins in the Alex Avenue precinct and the private basin provided the North West Metro means that Mott MacDonald's proposed Basin 1 is not required for detention purposes and this has been removed. However the land where Basin 1 was proposed is still zoned for public purpose due to flood affectation and other planning reasons.

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. The previous plan only had a single rate for all classes of materials. As the bulk of the material is expected to be VENM (clean material) the overall disposal costs are reduced.

3.4 Criterion 4 – Reasonable timeframe

The proposed public amenities and public services can be provided within a reasonable timeframe

Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...	Yes	No	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Include details of the anticipated rate of development in the catchment area and how this was determined	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 1.15 Page 8
Include a program for infrastructure delivery and explain how it relates to the anticipated timing of development	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 1.20 Page 9
Include a statement regarding potential revision of the scheduled timing for infrastructure delivery	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 1.18 Page 8

14. 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.

Traffic & Stormwater Management

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.

3.5 Criterion 5 – Reasonable apportionment

The proposed development contribution is based on a reasonable apportionment of costs between existing and new demand, and also demand generated by different types 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.

Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Include details of apportionment calculations	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 5 Page 25

15. How does the plan apportion costs?

Provide details of calculations made, 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

a) Transport land and works

Transport costs are levied over the developable area of both Area 20 and Riverstone East Precincts. 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 continues to be levied on a developable area basis.

b) Stormwater management land and works

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

Stormwater management – Quality costs have been apportioned over 3 separated catchments, based on their drainage topography. The Stormwater Quality cost of each catchment has been apportioned between the R2 Residential zone and 25 % of all other developable area zones. A separated contribution rates is used for R2 Residential zones and all other zones and levied on a developable area basis.

c) Open space land and works (embellishments)

Open Space costs are levied over the incoming population of both Area 20 and Riverstone East Precincts and levied on a per person basis.

a) Community services land

Na

b) Plan preparation and administration

An administration cost of 1.5% of construction costs has been included in CP 22W Rouse Hill (works)

3.6 Criterion 6 – Appropriate community liaison

The council has conducted appropriate community liaison and publicity in preparing the contributions plan.

We require evidence that the plan has been exhibited and publicised in accordance with the statutory requirements and that submissions received during the exhibition period have been taken into account. 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 that the relevant information is included in the contributions plan itself.

16. When was the plan publicly exhibited?

20 December 2017 to 20 January 2018.

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

No

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

We received 3 identical submissions concerning 1 property from:

The submissions mainly object to the rezoning of the property and adequate compensation for sections of the property that will be acquired. These objections did not warrant any change to the contributions plan.

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

No.

3.7 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 section 94 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.

20. Is there any other information relating to the contributions plan (such as use of VPAs) which may assist us to assess it against this criterion?

Riverstone East Precinct Stage 3

The costs in this plan include stages 1, 2 and 3 of the Riverstone East Precinct. However, as only stage 1 and 2 have been rezoned, the location of items in the stage 3 area are not identified in this plan as this information is confidential until stage 3 has been rezoned.

VPA's

Approximately 8 VPA's were executed prior to the CP coming in force. These VPA were to facilitate the payment of a capped contribution towards the provision of local public infrastructure in the Riverstone East Precinct.

21. 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

No.

22. Provide any other information which you consider would assist or expedite our assessment.

NA

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 should reduce the risk that our assessment is delayed by the need for corrections to be made, or our report unnecessarily include recommendations to correct what are, in essence, calculation errors.

Checklist for the contributions plan

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

23 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 Attachment checklist

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

Councils should complete and attach Application Form Part B,¹ or provide IPART with spreadsheets (.xls files) that:

- ▼ detail all infrastructure items included in the plan, with references to the studies 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 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), and
- ▼ show indicative contribution amounts for each type of residential dwelling.

Checklist for council application

Application attachment			
Work schedules and calculation of contribution rates			
Application form Part B or	Yes	No	
spreadsheets that provide the information listed above	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Contributions plan			
Version of contributions plan incorporating any post exhibition changes	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Version of contributions plan publicly exhibited	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Version of contributions plan previously submitted to IPART for review	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Public consultation			
Copy of all submissions to publicly exhibited contributions plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Summary of submissions and council’s response	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Technical studies and consultant documents			
Land valuation report/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting studies for stormwater management infrastructure (eg, Flooding and Water Cycle Management report)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>

¹ Application Form Part B is available on IPART’s website.

Application attachment

Supporting studies for transport infrastructure (eg, Traffic and Transport Assessment report)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting studies for open space infrastructure (eg, Demographic and Social Infrastructure report)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting studies for community services (eg, Demographic and Social Infrastructure report)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>

Maps

Plan catchment map/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Final Indicative Layout Plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Zoning map/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Land acquisition map/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Constrained land maps/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>

Other documents

VPAs	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Details of other funding agreements for state or local infrastructure in the area covered by the plan (including draft agreements)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Council business papers or meeting minutes related to the preparation of the contributions plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Any other documents that you think could be useful in IPART's assessment of the contributions plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>