



Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal
New South Wales

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

Contributions Plan No. 24W Schofields Precinct (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	5
3.1	Criterion 1 – the Essential Works List	5
3.2	Criterion 2 – Nexus	7
3.3	Criterion 3 – Reasonable costs	10
3.4	Criterion 4 – Reasonable timeframe	14
3.5	Criterion 5 – Reasonable apportionment	15
3.6	Criterion 6 – Appropriate community liaison	17
3.7	Criterion 7 – The plan complies with other matters IPART considers relevant	18
4	Quality assurance	21
5	Attachment checklist	22

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 – Manager Developer Contributions [REDACTED]

B. Information about the plan

What is the name of the plan?	Contributions Plan No. 24W Schofields Precinct (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 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 section s94E Ministerial Direction?	\$40,000.00																																										
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><tr><th colspan="7">Indicative Contributions Per Dwelling</th></tr><tr><th>Density (Dwellings Per Ha)</th><th>12.5</th><th>15</th><th>25</th><th>30</th><th>40</th><th>45</th></tr><tr><td>Occupancy (No. Persons Per Dwelling)</td><td>2.9</td><td>2.9</td><td>2.7</td><td>2.7</td><td>2.7</td><td>2.7</td></tr><tr><td>Eastern Catchment</td><td>\$56,732</td><td>\$50,105</td><td>\$32,112</td><td>\$29,364</td><td>\$25,960</td><td>\$24,811</td></tr><tr><td>Western Catchment 1</td><td></td><td>\$46,046</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Western Catchment 2</td><td></td><td>\$29,548</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	Indicative Contributions Per Dwelling							Density (Dwellings Per Ha)	12.5	15	25	30	40	45	Occupancy (No. Persons Per Dwelling)	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	Eastern Catchment	\$56,732	\$50,105	\$32,112	\$29,364	\$25,960	\$24,811	Western Catchment 1		\$46,046					Western Catchment 2		\$29,548				
Indicative Contributions Per Dwelling																																											
Density (Dwellings Per Ha)	12.5	15	25	30	40	45																																					
Occupancy (No. Persons Per Dwelling)	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7																																					
Eastern Catchment	\$56,732	\$50,105	\$32,112	\$29,364	\$25,960	\$24,811																																					
Western Catchment 1		\$46,046																																									
Western Catchment 2		\$29,548																																									
When was the plan publicly exhibited?	27 June 2018 to 24 July 2018																																										
Has the council adopted the plan? If so, when was it adopted and when did it come into force?	Adopted 12 September 2018 In force 10 October 2018																																										
To what extent was the Department of Planning & Environment (DPE) involved in the development of this plan?	<p>The Department of Planning and Environment were responsible for the precinct planning for the Schofields Precinct in consultation with Blacktown City Council.</p> <p>They had no direct involvement with the</p>																																										

	preparation of the contributions plan, except for providing various information that informs the Plan.
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 50%
What planning instruments (SEPPs, LEPs, or DCPs) apply to land in the catchment area of the plan?	State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006 Blacktown City Council Priority Growth Area Precincts Development Control Plan
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?	<p>This revision has created two distinct contributions plans 'CP24L – Schofields Precinct (land)' and 'CP24W – Schofields Precinct (works)'.</p> <p>Since the adoption of the initial plan it is evident that land values have increased significantly compared to the consumer price index. To ensure Council collects sufficient funds to acquire the remaining land need to acquire, we have had the land costs' re-valued"</p> <p>Our works costs which were adjusted to accord with IPART's previous recommendations have simply been adjusted by the CPI. We believe this is a reasonable approach.</p>
<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 	The 2015 adoption of CP 24 Schofields Precinct incorporated the directions from the Minister for Planning in relation to IPART's assessment.

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.	<p>The plan provides or updates details on the costs of works to the Schofields Precinct in the North West Priority Growth Area. It also provides the Section 7.11 contribution rates proposed under each plan.</p> <p>Further information regarding the review is in Section 22.</p>

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.

N/A

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 – Schofields Precinct (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 ...			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 C Pages 31 to 55
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 type="checkbox"/>	Section 1.13 Page 5
Include information about:			Section 1.12
▼ the existing population in the catchment area	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Page 5
▼ the projected residential population and/or workforce	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Appendix E Page 56
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 9 to 24
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 9 to 24

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 Schofields 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

- The Schofields Transport & Access Study (2010) by Urbanhorizon Pty Ltd

b) Stormwater land and management works

- J. Wyndham Prince Schofields Precinct, Rouse Hill – Water Cycle Management Strategy Report Incorporating Water Sensitive Urban Design Techniques dated July 2011.
- Opus International Consultants Schofields Precinct Review of Water Cycle Management Strategy 09 November 2012.

c) Open space land and works (embellishments)

- Blacktown City 2025 – Delivering the Vision (Blacktown City Council, 2008).
- Elton Consulting – Social Infrastructure and Open Space Report – Schofields (2010), undertaken by the 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, 2009).

d) Community services land

- Community Infrastructure Report (Social Infrastructure and Open Space Report Schofields Precinct 2010, undertaken by the Growth Centres Commission.
- Riverstone and Alex Avenue Precincts Demographic Profile & Community Infrastructure Report 2007), undertaken by the Growth Centres Commission.
- The Informal Indoor Recreation Needs Assessment and the Section 94 Community Facilities Report, undertaken by Council.

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 all land uses other than low density residential land zoned R2. Provision is made in the CP 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.

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

- e)** the existing population in the catchment area
- f)** any existing or projected population outside the catchment area
- g)** the capacity of existing infrastructure in the catchment area, and/or
- h)** 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. 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

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.

Community Facilities

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

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 ...			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 type="checkbox"/>	Sections 2 to 7 Pages 9 to 24
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 57
Explain how the contribution rates will be adjusted for inflation/ changes in costs	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Sections 7.4 Page 28
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 Page 8
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 - March 2018

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 13/14 financial year. These rates are based on Council's schedule of rates contract for roads and drainage works. Estimates were completed in July 2013. Where works items are not included in Council's contract, then industry rates such as Rawlinson's are used.

Contingencies of 5% have been applied to transport cost estimates. Investigation and design fees are based on a lump sum investigation plus 5% of the estimated capital works cost. The lump sum varies depending of the scale of the project. The contingency and design allowance is applied separately to the works lump sum (contingencies aren't applied to the design cost) as per the spread sheets.

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 13/14 financial year. These rates are based on Council's schedule of rates contract for roads and drainage works. Estimates were completed in March 2013. Where works items are not included in Council's contract, then industry rates such as Rawlinson's are used.

Contingencies of 5% have been applied to stormwater cost estimates. Investigation and design fees are based on a lump sum investigation plus 5% of the estimated capital works cost. The lump sum varies depending of the scale of the project. The contingency and design allowance is applied separately to the works lump sum (contingencies aren't applied to the design cost) as per the spread sheets.

c) Contract Rates

The Road and Drainage Contract is a Schedule of Rates contract called by Open Tender.

The Contract is awarded to a panel of Contractors for a 3+1+1 term. This means that the Contract can be extended by 1 year at a time for an additional 2 years. The extensions are awarded based on Contractor performance and Rise and Fall (determined by the appropriate index published by the Bureau of Statistics).

Council had Tender submissions from 8 companies when we called last and signed contracts with a panel of 4 contracts.

The rates from the contract are collated and the Manager Construction prepares the design estimating rates used in the preparation of the Contribution Plans.

d) Open space works (embellishments)

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

- Site specific concept designs are prepared, identifying approximate lengths and areas off aerial map. This is due to the absence of detailed site survey / information, unknown site constraints and limitations and with the assumption that all reserves will be clear and free from any contamination.

In 2014 an independent quantity surveyor's December 2012 rates were used. These estimates were indexed to March 2013.

- 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.
- Allowances are a % of the base cost excluding any other allowances.

e) Indexation

The review of CP24 was predominantly a land value review; as such any works not yet constructed were indexed from the base date of the 2015 version of CP24, being March 2013 (102.7) to March 2018 CPI (113.6), using the Sydney All Groups CPI.

This has the same effect as indexing the base contributions from the 2015 version of CP24 to the March 2018 CPI, when the contributions are imposed on a consent.

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 Schofields Precinct (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?

N/A

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

N/A

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?**

We do not use the NPV model.

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:

- 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 costing have been identified within the respective sections of the plan to avoid unnecessary duplication
- All open space works proposed and costed are from '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 NWGC Stormwater Management Strategy Review. This study identifies the opportunity to remove the detention component from the majority of basins in this precinct. we are waiting for final sign off from OEH before this strategy can be implemented which will reduce drainage infrastructure costs.

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 ...			Contributions plan page reference(s)
Include details of the anticipated rate of development in the catchment area and how this was determined	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 1.15 Page 6
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 8
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 7

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 ...		Contributions plan page reference(s)
Include details of apportionment calculations	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 5 Page 23

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 works

Transport works 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.

b) Stormwater management works

Stormwater management – Quantity works 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.

c) Open space works

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

d) Plan preparation and administration

An administration cost of 1.5% of construction costs has been included in CP 22W Schofields Precinct (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?

27 June 2018 to 24 July 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?

No submissions were received.

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?

No new VPA have been executed since the 2015 adoption of CP 24

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.

This revision has created two distinct contributions plans 'CP24L – Schofields Precinct (Land)' and 'CP24W – Schofields Precinct (Works)' and incorporated new land acquisition rates. It also updated historical costs for both completed land and works.

We believe that this is an efficient way to ensure that we can quickly review land values which are escalating ahead of CPI in the North West Growth Area. As mentioned earlier, we have only adjusted the works costs by the CPI to try and facilitate a quicker review.

As the original contributions plan (CP24) was assessed by IPART in August 2014, approved by the Minister for Planning in March 2015, and amended in accordance with IPART's assessment of our reasonable costs, only those items that have changed have been provided to IPART for review.

These include revised land valuations (CP24L) and a minor planning proposal.

Council considers that as IPART's comprehensive assessment of our first plan found our works costs to be reasonable (when adjusted), that reassessing those costs again will only delay the review and disadvantage the Council. For this reason we believe it is reasonable that these costs not be reassessed until the works costs are comprehensively reviewed. We also believe that increasing the costs by the CPI is more than reasonable.

We note that 50% of the Schofields precinct is either developed or has development applications approved. It is a precinct that has 2 major developers as its key stakeholders, Stockland and Defence Housing Australia make up around two third of the precinct. The developers require certainty for works costs for planning agreements or works-in-kind agreements which they have with us. Increasing our approved works costs by an approved index continues that certainty for them.

History

The first iteration of CP 24 was exhibited in September to October 2013. It was then submitted to IPART for assessment (prior to adoption).

IPART completed its assessment in August 2014 and the Minister's advice was received in March 2015.

Draft CP24 was amended as per the Minister's advice so it could be eligible for LIGS. It was adopted by Council and came in force in May 2015.

We have since been receiving LIGS funding based on this "IPART approved plan", which complies with Minister's advice.

This review addresses the following things;

- Splitting one plan into two plans - Land and Works
- New land value estimates were used to update any land yet to be acquired
- Actual land and works costs were updated for all land acquired & works completed since the adoption of the initial CP
- Remaining work estimates were indexed from the base date of the 2015 plan (March 2013) to the current index (June 2018) using the Sydney All Groups CPI
- An additional 1.6992ha and 73 persons were included in the catchments, for a partial rezoning of the Nirimba Education Precinct to residential. The planning proposal resolved that the addition area and dwellings would not impact on the infrastructure provision in the plan, so no changes to infrastructure were needed.
- Catchment areas were re-measured using the zoned areas, which resulted in a net decrease to the Eastern Creek Stormwater Quantity Catchment of 1.5084ha. This is the same method used for CP 21 Marsden Park and CP 22 Rouse Hill.
- The Stormwater Quality Contribution was amended to have separate rates for R2 zoned development and all other development. This was an IPART recommendation and has been used in the CP 22 Rouse Hill review.
- The Traffic Management Contribution was amended to have separate rates for residential development and non-residential development. This was an IPART recommendation and has been used in the CP 22 Rouse Hill review.

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
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 type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Summary of submissions and council's response	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" 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"/>