

File no: F13/2182

13 December 2013

Independent Pricing and  
Regulatory Tribunal  
PO Box Q290  
QVB Post Office  
SYDNEY NSW 1230

Attention: Nicole Haddock

By email: [localgovernment@ipart.nsw.gov.au](mailto:localgovernment@ipart.nsw.gov.au)

Dear Nicole,

**Application for Assessment of new Contributions Plan - Blacktown City Council**

In accordance with the instructions provided on the IPART website, Blacktown City Council submits its new *Draft Contributions Plan No. 24 – Schofields Precinct* for assessment by IPART. It is noted that contributions in the Precinct will exceed \$30,000 per lot/dwelling.

Council's application form has been completed in accordance with the advertised instructions and IPART's revised application form and is attached to this letter for your consideration.

Due to their size, attachments and technical documents that inform the Draft Plan will be mailed to IPART (on disk) today.

Should you require any further information regarding this matter, please contact Council's Co-ordinator Contributions & Economic Development, Dennis Bagnall on 9839 6461 or Section 94 Officer, Jenny Rodger on 9839 6463.

Yours faithfully,

Kerry Robinson  
General Manager

Per: 

# **Application for assessment of a section 94 Development Contributions Plan**

**Blacktown City Council**  
**Section 94 Contributions Plan No. 24 – Schofields Precinct**

## Preliminary Information

Council name	<a href="#">Blacktown City Council</a>
Name of Contributions Plan	<a href="#">Section 94 Contributions Plan No. 24 – Schofields Precinct</a>
Key council contact details (please provide name, phone number, and email address)	<a href="#">Dennis Bagnall</a> <a href="#">(02) 9839 6461</a> <a href="mailto:dennis.bagnall@blacktown.nsw.gov.au">dennis.bagnall@blacktown.nsw.gov.au</a>
Secondary council contact details (please provide name, phone number, and email address)	<a href="#">Jenny Rodger</a> <a href="#">(02) 9839 6463</a> <a href="mailto:Jenny.rodger@blacktown.nsw.gov.au">Jenny.rodger@blacktown.nsw.gov.au</a>

Please complete the sections on the following pages as part of your application, and submit it with the contributions plan attached. A separate application must be submitted for each Contributions Plan.

When you have completed your application, you should submit it to IPART in person, via email or via post (details below). We require an electronic copy of all documents. Where these are too large to email, they can be posted to us on a disk or USB stick.

In person	Via Email	Via post
Attention: Michael Seery, Local Government Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal Level 8 1 Market Street Sydney NSW 2000	Attention: Michael Seery Local Government Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal  <a href="mailto:localgovernment@ipart.nsw.gov.au">localgovernment@ipart.nsw.gov.au</a>	Attention: Michael Seery Local Government Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal PO Box Q290 QVB Post Office Sydney NSW 1230

In order for us to assess your plan please provide the following preliminary information. (Provide a page reference to plan or text addressing the following questions.)

## Preliminary information

---

What is the period over which the plan is valid?	From when the Plan comes into force after adoption by Council until the Plan is repealed. Approximately 20 – 25 years subject to development activity.
How long has the contributions plan been in place? If this is a new plan, when was it drafted and exhibited?	This is a new Plan. It was drafted in July 2013 and exhibited from 11 September 2013 to 9 October 2013.
When did council last review this plan?	N/A
To what extent has the Department of Planning and Infrastructure been involved in the development of this plan?	The Department of Planning and Infrastructure were responsible for the Precinct Planning for the Schofields Precinct in consultation with Blacktown City Council. They had no direct involvement with the preparation of the Contributions Plan except for providing various information that informs the Plan.
How much development has yet to occur under this plan?	This is a Greenfield area. There are some established areas that are subject to this Plan but it is mainly undeveloped.
What is the relationship of the plan with any State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs) Local Environmental Plans (LEP) and/or Development Control Plans (DCP)?	SEPP (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006 (Appendix No.7). BCC Growth Centre Precincts DCP 2010; and BCC Growth Centre Precincts DCP 2010 (Schedule 5).
Is there any programmed review of the above instruments which may affect the underlying assumptions within the plan?	No. However, there has been, and there will be Planning Proposals that are in various stages of preparation/assessment, that if made will alter density and population projections.
What is the maximum residential contribution? Please break this down by category (as per the Essential Works List).	<b>Refer Attachment 1</b>

---

## **We also require the following maps (if they are not included in the plan, please attach them to this application):**

- ▼ Indicative Layout Plan (ILP)

**Refer Attachment 2**

- ▼ zoning map(s)

**Refer Attachments 3a – 3d**

- ▼ map/s showing the location of land and facilities included in the contributions plan

**Refer Appendices A – F of the Draft Plan.**

- ▼ land acquisitions maps, distinguishing any acquisitions already made by the council for the purposes of the plan and any acquisitions yet to be made by the council for the purposes of the plan.

**Refer Attachment 4 & Attachment 11**

Note - there have been no land acquisitions already made in the Schofields Precinct see attachment 4. Several properties have been acquired for Reserve 867 (Local Conservation Zone) which has been apportioned over all current and future Northwest Growth Centre Precincts in the Blacktown LGA. The reserve is located in the Riverstone Precinct and is levied for under Combined Precinct Facilities in the Draft Plan.

- ▼ map/s showing the contributions catchment/s

**Refer Appendices A – F of the Draft Plan.**

We also require a list of technical studies that were prepared to inform the development of the plan. These include studies prepared or commissioned by the council, the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, or the former Growth Centres Commissions. Please list them here:

Page 62 of the Draft Plan lists the Supporting Technical Documents and Reports that were used to inform the development of the Plan. In preparing this application it was discovered that some of the documents listed were earlier versions than the ones used to inform the Plan. The correct list will be amended when the Plan is adopted by Council. The correct documents are listed below:

- J. Wyndham Prince Schofields Precinct – Water Cycle Management Strategy Report Incorporating Water Sensitive Urban Design Techniques Post Exhibition Report dated May 2012. **(Attached)**
- Opus International Consultants Schofields Precinct Review of Water Cycle Management Strategy 09 November 2012. **(Attached)**
- Schofields Precinct Transport & Access Strategy dated 24 June 2012 by Aecom. **(Attached)**

- Blacktown City 2025 – Delivering the Vision (Blacktown City Council, 2008). **(Attached)**
- Elton Consulting – Social Infrastructure and Open Space Report – Schofields (2011), undertaken by the Growth Centres Commission. **(Attached)**
- Northwest Growth Centres Recreational Framework (Blacktown City Council, 2009). **(Attached)**
- Wellness Through Physical Activity Policy (Blacktown City Council, 2008). **(Attached)**
- Blacktown City Council Social Plan (2007). **(Attached)**
- Recreation and Open Space Strategy (Blacktown City Council, 2009) **(Attached)**
- Growth Centres Commission - Riverstone Demographic Profile and Community Infrastructure Report – October 2007 **(Attached)**
- Riverstone and Alex Avenue Precincts Demographic Profile & Community Infrastructure Report 2007), undertaken by the Growth Centres Commission. **(Attached)**
- Schofields Precinct Post-Exhibition Planning Report - 8 May 2012. **(Attached)**

We will assess the contributions plan against the criteria listed in the Department of Planning and Infrastructure's *Local Development Contributions Practice Note For the Assessment of Local Contributions Plan by IPART*, November 2010 (or the most recent version).

To ensure we receive all the relevant information and correctly understand the plan, please address the questions on the following pages. If the information is already contained in a separate report or in the plan, include references as appropriate. Any referenced reports will need to be attached to this application.

## 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 items in the plan are on the Department of Planning and Infrastructure's Essential Works List (and definition of base level embellishment). For the most recent version of this, please refer to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure's Practice Note.

Council understands that IPART are required to assess whether the items in the Plan are on the DPI's Essential Works List. Council understands that this list is as follows:

- land and facilities for transport (e.g., road works, traffic management and pedestrian and cycle facilities), not including car parking;
- land and facilities for stormwater management;
- land for open space (e.g., parks and sporting facilities) including base level embellishment (see below); and
- land for community services (e.g., childcare centres and libraries).

For the purposes of assessing land for open space, base level embellishment may include:

- site regrading;
- utilities servicing (water, sewer, electricity and gas supply);
- basic landscaping (turfing, asphalt and other synthetic playing surfaces,
- planting, paths and cycle ways);
- drainage and irrigation;
- basic park structures and equipment (park furniture, toilet facilities and change rooms, shade structures and play equipment);
- security lighting and local sports field floodlighting;
- sports fields, tennis courts, netball courts and basketball courts;

Base level embellishment does not include infrastructure such as skate parks and BMX tracks.

Council notes that in correspondence dated 23 March 2011, the Department of Planning advised IPART that "asphalt" includes car parks to the extent that they service the recreation area only and does not include multi-storey car parks – that is, they are to be at ground level.

As such, Council has prepared the Contributions Plan to accord with this list. The Plan contains the following items within Infrastructure Categories:

#### Water Cycle Management Facilities

The Draft Plan contains facilities and land required for the management and treatment of stormwater. These facilities include:

- Landscaped Open Channels
- Culverts (under roads and runway)
- Detention Basins
- Detention Basin outlet flow pipes
- Basin Outlet Channels
- Trunk Drainage Lines
- Bio-retention including Gross Pollutant Traps
- Treatable Flow diversion lines

#### Traffic and Transport Management Facilities

The Plan contains facilities and land required for the management of transport and traffic management. These facilities include:

- Collector Roads
- Local Roads
- Bus Shelters
- Roundabouts
- Traffic Signals
- Foot bridge and shared pathway

#### Open Space & Recreation Facilities

The Plan contains facilities and land required for the provision of open space and recreation facilities. These facilities include:

- Playing fields
- Amenities
- Field Lighting
- Netball Courts
- Tennis Courts
- Car Parks
- Playgrounds
- Picnic Areas (basic park structures and equipment)
- BBQ Areas (park furniture)
- Paths
- Cycle ways
- Exercise Trails (including basic park structure and equipment)
- Signage
- Fencing
- Landscaping
- Site Services

- 1 For open space, please provide a list of the types of embellishments that are included (be specific, eg, park benches, footpaths, art works, sports fields, bush regeneration). Are all the



works and facilities on the Essential Works List? If not, are they clearly distinguished in the plan?

All items above are within the Essential Works List

- 2 Only the land component for community services is on the Essential Work 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 developer contributions. Please list the community services and facilities that will be provided on the land (eg, youth centre, family services etc), and include the floorspace area committed to each.

#### Riverstone Swimming Centre

Riverstone Swimming Centre is the only swimming pool situated in the North West Growth Centre. It is a small rural outdoor pool and will not be able to accommodate the leisure needs of the incoming population of the North West Precincts. As such, land has been planned within the Marsden Park Precinct for a new aquatic/leisure facility to cater for the needs of the Marsden Park, Shanes Park, Marsden Park Industrial, Marsden Park North, West Schofields and Schofields Precincts.

A total land area of 3ha is required for the aquatic/leisure facility that is being proportioned across the above mentioned precincts. This size has been based on a benchmark of existing aquatic/leisure facilities within Blacktown such as Emerton Leisure Centre (3ha) and Blacktown Aquatic Centre (3ha). The exact fit out and facility provision of the centre will be finalised at a later stage to ensure that it meets the needs of the population through a community engagement process and is reflective of evolving industry trends noting that the plan does not currently levy for embellishment works for such facilities as it is not within the Essential Works List.

#### Community Facility (Land only)

The Plan contains .45 hectares of land required for the management of 1 Multipurpose Local Community Neighbourhood Centre. The centre will have the following activities and functions:

- Neighbourhood Centre, community and cultural development facilities
- Children and family services and facilities

Further information regarding this facility is in chapter 5 the Draft Plan pages 20 to 23.

The land area required was based on floor space and requirements to provide adequate parking based on Council's DCP Parking requirements. Parking is based on number of occupants / floor space requirements.

The Floor Space required is 800sqm.

Council's model is the Community Resource Hub model that argues for multipurpose facilities with diverse functions based on the demographic profile and service needs of the population. Whilst this is the framework, Council would still be looking at the facility delivering approximately 450sqm for the Neighbourhood Centre, community and cultural development facilities and 350sqm for the Children and family services and facilities.

## 2 Criterion 2 – Nexus

**There is nexus between the development in the area to which the plan applies and the kinds of public amenities and public services identified in the plan.**

Nexus ensures that there is a connection between the infrastructure included in the plans and increased demand for facilities generated by the anticipated development.

Checklist		Reference
Does the plan incorporate a map or plan showing the geographical area(s) covered by the plan	Yes	Page 3
Does the plan detail the kinds of development that will occur in the precinct, and the approximate land area dedicated to each?	Yes	Page 4 (1.12)
Does the plan state the existing and expected populations for which the plan has been developed?	Yes	Page 4 (1.11)
Does it explain how the expected population was calculated( including assumptions)?	Yes	Page 5 (1.13)
Does the plan include a schedule of land acquisitions required for the proposed infrastructure?	Yes, the schedules of works shows the acquisition areas required for each item.	Also, Refer Attachment 5 for a list of each property that Council needs to acquire.
Does the plan include a complete list of infrastructure?	Yes	Pages 34 - 58
Does the plan include details of demand calculations for proposed infrastructure? eg, benchmarks used.	Yes	Page 5 (1.15) Page 21 (5.1)
Does the plan include a statement regarding design and construction standards that were used in determining the infrastructure included in the plan?	No	Page 9 (2.2) makes reference to Council's engineering guide and DCPs but not specific.

- 1 Please explain how the need for the provisions was determined including details of underlying demand calculations where appropriate. For example, is the demand and nexus based on recognised information such as infrastructure studies, census data, flood modelling? To what standards/ benchmarks has the council referred?
  - Stormwater management

The provision of stormwater management works is based on the numeric modelling conducted as part of the precinct planning, with adjustments as outlined in the draft CP24. The numeric modelling included flood modelling, hydrologic and hydraulic

modelling and water quality and waterway stability modelling. The modelling generally takes into account the existing development present within the precinct in determining the existing flow rates and therefore assesses only the increased demand resulting from development within the precinct is sizing the stormwater detention requirements. In relation to water quality, where significant areas of existing development are present, such as the area along Bridge Street south of Grange Avenue, these have generally been excluded from the sizing of new water quality treatment measures included in the draft CP24.

The standards for stormwater management measures are defined in the SEPP and associated DCP for the Growth Centres. For stormwater detention the controls are generally to ensure no increase in peak flows and no adverse flooding impacts (section 2.3.1 of DCP). For stormwater quality and waterway stability the DCP sets the minimum targets to be achieved (section 2.3.1 table 2-1 of DCP). The infrastructure sizing is based on satisfying the stormwater management objective targets specified and not the “ideal” stormwater outcome targets listed in the DCP.

#### – Traffic management

The demand for traffic management facilities is generally based on the transport and access strategy prepared for the precinct planning, with adjustments as outlined in the draft CP24. This strategy is based on numeric modelling that determines the increase in traffic volumes and the changes in the road network that impact the traffic flow within the precinct. The objective is to ensure an acceptable level of service for traffic flow is achieved based on industry standards (RMS (formerly RTA) guidelines). The demand generated by the precinct warrants road classifications up to collector standard. The proposed network increases traffic volumes beyond the collector standard for several major roads to subarterial and arterial standard. These higher class roads are generally listed in the SIC and have therefore not been included in the draft CP24. There is one section of sub-arterial road (Veron Road extension south of Schofields Road extension) that has not been included in the SIC. This section of road is levied as a collector standard under the draft CP24 with the extra cost to sub-arterial standard to be sourced from other funds.

The existing road network is limited in scope and comprises generally rural roads with some urban roads with kerb and gutter constructed as part of earlier development near the old Schofields railway station. As such the existing road network is generally not capable of supporting increased traffic volumes and loads. Therefore the full cost of any road upgrades and new roads is apportioned to the precinct. This includes the provision of additional traffic management facilities such as roundabouts and traffic signals to ensure safe operation of the overall road network.

#### – Open space and recreation facilities

Provision levels of open space and recreation facilities were determined through a collective use of various studies such as the Growth Centre Development Code, Elton Consulting – Demographic and Social Infrastructure Report and Council’s Northwest Growth Centres Recreation Planning Framework. Collectively these studies provide

the rationale for a set of benchmarks for the adequate provision of open space and recreation opportunities.

Council has applied a demographic / needs based approach to open space and recreation provision levels using demographic analysis information supplied as part of the Elton Consulting – Demographic and Social Infrastructure Report. Additionally, Council has considered various case examples of other newly developed suburbs.

– Community facilities

The demand and nexus is based on the technical study “Elton Consulting – Demographic and Social Infrastructure Assessment- Schofields Precinct.(2011)”. This infrastructure study references include, Census and Growth Centres Development Code Precinct Development Parameters.

- 2 Does the infrastructure in the contributions plan diverge from recommendations in technical studies? Please provide the details of any discrepancies, along with explanations.

Stormwater Management – there are several significant changes from the design concepts prepared as part of the precinct planning study. These changes are described in Section 2.3 of draft CP24.

Traffic Management facilities – there are some changes from the precinct planning strategy and these are described in Section 3.2 of draft CP24

- 3 Were there other studies prepared during the course of planning, which weren’t used in the development of the Contributions Plan? Please list them here, and explain why they were not used.

All relevant studies were considered / used in the preparation of the CP.

- 4 How have neighbouring precincts and non-residential development been considered in demand assessment?

### Stormwater Management

Strategies are developed on a precinct by precinct basis to deal with demand of each precinct and are generally independent. Upstream precincts of Alex Avenue and Riverstone are providing their own facilities to deal with the demand generated from these precincts. This ensures that there is no increase in size of channels and drainage lines within the Schofields Precinct. On line basins are not permitted on Eastern Creek so there is no opportunity for sharing of facilities with future Schofields West Precinct. Demand for non-residential areas has been assessed on a catchment area basis as the level of demand is similar to that for residential areas. The demand for water quality is less for non-residential areas as on lot treatment is required and the

demand included in the draft CP24 is for the future roads only required to service these areas (typically approx. 25% of the area).

#### Traffic Management

The major shared demand will occur on the higher order roads such as arterial and sub-arterial roads, which are generally excluded from the CP and funded elsewhere. The precinct demand is generally managed on local and collector roads. While there may be some sharing of demand on collector roads, it is difficult to accurately determine the demand arising from each precinct and this level of traffic modelling has not been provided. For consistency of approach, the full cost of local and collector roads within each precinct have been included in the CP for that precinct as they are required for the orderly development of that precinct. The demand has been assigned on a total area basis and there is no differentiation between land use types.

#### Open Space and Recreational Facilities

Council had requested that the Department of Planning and Infrastructure take a regional planning approach to the North West Growth Centres in respect to the provision of open space, recreation and community facilities. Despite this, the current planning process for the North West Growth Centres has been delivered through a piecemeal precinct by precinct approach.

Neighbouring precincts include West Schofields (which is yet to be released), Alex Avenue (which is located on the eastern side of the railway corridor and Quakers Hill to the south-east.

These surrounding precincts are delineated from Schofields through major barriers such as riparian and railway corridors as well as major roads.

Council in the planning process considered the existing recreation and open space facilities with analysis of existing capacity and access to assess any potential synergies and cost savings.

#### Community Facilities

The technical study “Elton Consulting – Demographic and Social Infrastructure Assessment- Schofields Precinct.(2011)” (pages 18 – 24) reviewed all neighbouring precincts to undertake a demand assessment of Social Infrastructure to identify their capacity to absorb demand by the future residential population of the Schofields Precinct. This included education, child care, community centres, emergency services, library services, recreation services, tertiary institutions and places of worship.

Each of these were examined separately with the findings that the existing infrastructure did not have the capacity.

- 5 How have existing infrastructure and surplus capacity been taken into account?

As identified above, consideration of existing recreation, open space and community facilities was given in planning for this precinct with analysis of existing capacity and access.

### 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.

Reasonable costs may be based on estimates that have been provided by consultants or the council's experience. They should be comparable to the costs required to deliver similar land and facilities in other areas.

Checklist		Reference
Does the plan include a statement about how costs have been derived and when these costs estimates were prepared (eg, Quantity Surveyor, standard costs)?	No	For Open Space and Recreation Facilities Council uses QS Rates. Stormwater and traffic costs based on BCC contract rates (sections 2.2 & 3.2), Doesn't provide date though, could add text to make more explicit.
Does the plan explain how and when the land has been valued?	No	Refer Attachment 5 which shows properties to be acquired. See 2b below for the valuation process.
Does the plan include full costs of each item of infrastructure?	Yes	Appendices A - E
Does the plan explain how the council will respond to cost fluctuations and inflation?	Yes	Page 30 (8.3)
Does the plan include a schedule of the contributions rates charged under the plan (for example, this could be presented as \$/ha, \$/person, \$/dwelling)?	Yes	Page 61 (Appendix H)
Does the plan provide details of accounting processes for s94 funds – eg, does council 'pool' funds from other s94 accounts or use internal borrowings to deliver infrastructure projects)?	Yes	Page 7 (1.20)
If using the NPV model, does the plan provide details of the calculations used for costs and contributions receipts?	N/A	



- 1 We require an itemised schedule of the infrastructure costs and land purchases (shown as lots) included in the plan. Please include or attach them to this application (preferably in an excel format).

Refer Appendices A – F of the Draft Plan for Schedules of the infrastructure costs. Attachment 5 provides a list of all properties subject to land acquisition under the draft plan.

- 2 Please explain the process used to estimate the costs of the following categories. For each, please include
  - separate statements for specific types of infrastructure if different processes were used
  - details of any indexation of costs (including the index used)
  - the date when estimated costs were finalised.

a. Land already acquired or owned by the council?

**Attachment 6** lists all properties currently acquired for the Combined Precinct Facilities - Reserve 867 (Local Conservation Zone), which has been apportioned over all current and future Northwest Growth Centre Precincts in the Blacktown LGA and shows the date of purchase. The historical costs have been indexed by the All Groups Sydney CPI.

b. Land not yet owned by the council?

Council applies an “averaging” technique as the most effective way of estimating likely acquisition costs. With regard to CP24 valuation estimates were undertaken by Council’s Property Acquisition Officer and Senior Property Officer and were reviewed by Council’s Property Services Co-ordinator. All these officers are Registered Valuers.

A spread sheet was provided to Property Services by Council’s Land Information Services Section identifying each individual parcel of land affected by a public purpose zoning under the ILP. The spread sheet also identified an acquisition area for each property. The spread sheets were also broken into categories ie Public Recreation, Local Roads, and Drainage.

Aerial plans with identified acquisition parcels and flood affectation as provided by Council’s engineers were also provided to Property Services.

Each parcel was then looked at and an estimated acquisition rate applied considering the inherent features of the land ie topography, location, flood affectation or unconstrained, although in some circumstances other factors such as large improvements/business uses may have been considered.

The total estimated acquisition costs were then divided by the total acquisition area by category and an average estimated rate (rounded) per category was determined.

No additional allowance was made for valuation and conveyancing charges.

c. Facilities already constructed?

There is no Open Space, Stormwater or Traffic Facilities already constructed that have been used in the Plan. In terms of community facilities, the technical study “Elton Consulting – Demographic and Social Infrastructure Assessment- Schofields Precinct.(2011)” (pages 18 – 24) reviewed all neighbouring precincts to identify Social Infrastructure (of which there was minimal in the precinct – being education, places of worship and a child care centre) already constructed but not the cost.

d. Facilities not yet constructed?

Stormwater and Traffic Facilities

Costs are estimated using Council’s internal design estimating rates which are based on Council’s schedule of rates contracts for the 2013/2014 financial year. The date for the preparation of these estimates is July 2013.

Open Space & Recreation Facilities

Costs are estimated using 2008 Quantity Surveyor Rates. These costs were indexed to March 2013 (Base date of Draft Plan) by the PPI Non Residential index, as previously recommended by IPART.

Combined Precinct Facility (Riverstone Conservation Zone)

Costs were estimated using *Guideline Schedule of Rates for Landscape works - the Landscape Contractors Association of NSW* and the current orders (at 2008). These costs were indexed to March 2013 (Base date of Draft Plan) by the *Producer Price Indexes Australia - Non Residential*, for the works and the *Wages Price Index Australia* for the Plan of Management, as previously recommended by IPART.

Council notes that the Combined Precinct Facility was reviewed by IPART when assessing CP’s 20 and 22.

- 3 What allowances have been included in the estimated costs in the plan?(eg, professional fees, cost contingencies). Please detail allowances for each category of infrastructure and provide an explanation for the chosen figures.

Water Cycle Management

Detention Basins:

Site Establishment and management = 5% of works cost, typical industry margin

Design = \$20,000 + 5% of works cost. \$20,000 lump sum for specialist sub-consultant investigation cost, plus 5% as general design allowance. These are consistent with previous plans reviewed and considered reasonable by IPART. Note that for first two basins currently being design in CP20 the investigation studies and REF costs are approximately \$60,000 for each basin.

Contingency = 5% of works cost. At low end of typical range (normally 10-15%) to reduce overall cost to CP.

Bio-retention (Raingardens):

Site Establishment and management = 5% of works cost, typical industry margin

Design = \$20,000 + 5% of works cost. \$5,000 lump sum for specialist sub-consultant investigation cost, plus 5% as general design allowance. These are consistent with previous plans reviewed and considered reasonable by IPART. Lump sum cost assumes that investigations studies conducted with associated infrastructure eg detention basin or channels.

Contingency = 5% of works cost. At low end of typical range (normally 10-15%) to reduce overall cost to CP.

Trunk Drainage Channels:

Site Establishment and management = 5% of works cost, typical industry margin

Design = \$20,000 + 5% of works cost. \$20,000 lump sum for specialist sub-consultant investigation cost, plus 5% as general design allowance. These are consistent with previous plans reviewed and considered reasonable by IPART.

Contingency = 5% of works cost. At low end of typical range (normally 10-15%) to reduce overall cost to CP.

Culverts:

Site Establishment and management = 5% of works cost, typical industry margin

Design = \$5,000 + 5% of works cost. \$5,000 lump sum for specialist sub-consultant investigation cost, plus 5% as general design allowance. These are consistent with previous plans reviewed and considered reasonable by IPART. Lump sum cost assumes that investigations studies conducted with associated infrastructure eg detention basin or channels.

Contingency = 5% of works cost. At low end of typical range (normally 10-15%) to reduce overall cost to CP.

Gross Pollutant Traps (GPTs):

Design = \$1,000 + 5% of works cost. Nominal design allowance, works generally assumed to be constructed with other related infrastructure and no additional allowances as construction period is generally short.

Traffic and Transport Management

Design = \$20,000 + 5% of works cost. \$20,000 lump sum for specialist sub-consultant investigation cost, plus 5% as general design allowance. These are consistent with previous plans reviewed and considered reasonable by IPART.

Contingency = 5% of works cost. At low end of typical range (normally 10-15%) to reduce overall cost to CP.

#### Open Space & Recreation Facilities

Design Fees: 10%- Required to undertake the design of open space and recreation facilities including relevant planning approvals.

Contingency: 15%- Required to allow for various items of embellishment that could result in cost increases. For example, site contamination.

#### Community Facility and Aquatic Facility (land)

Land Valuations only

#### Combined Precinct Facility (Riverstone Conservation Zone)

15% contingency and 10% design.

- 4 Do the costs in the plan differ from those in any consultant reports/council tenders used? If so, please explain why.

For Stormwater and Traffic Facilities, costs differ from those listed in precinct planning reports, however, consistent with Council internal cost estimating rates.

- 5 Has the council used an NPV model to calculate the contributions rate? If so, what assumptions have been used? (Please attach a copy of the model for our assessment.)

Council has not used an NPV model.

- 6 Will the council use internal borrowings to deliver infrastructure projects? What rate of return will be applied to the internally borrowed funds?

Council generally borrows from pooled Section 94 accounts and some internal reserves once the CP is adopted to forward fund early land acquisitions (usually claims for Hardship) but does not borrow eternally. Council does not apply a rate of return to these borrowings.

- 7 What measures have been taken to reduce costs in the plan (eg, adjustment to design or alternative engineering solutions)?

#### Community Facilities

The Community Resource Hub model seeks to consolidate requirements into a single site therefore increasing efficiencies and reducing costs.

#### Stormwater and Traffic Facilities

Allowances and contingencies are at low end of expected cost range. For stormwater management, where works are on single owner large land holdings, some allowance has been made for on-site disposal assuming there will be works in kind agreements as development will not be possible or cost effective without constructing associated stormwater infrastructure.

## 4 Criterion 4 – Reasonable timeframe

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

Checklist		Reference
Does the plan include details of the anticipated growth rates of the development, and how this was calculated?	Yes	Draft Plan page 5 (1.14).
Does the plan include a program for infrastructure delivery and explain how it relates to the anticipated growth rates?	Yes	An estimate of the cost and timing of delivery is provided in Appendices A – F of the Draft Plan.  Draft Plan Page 5 (1.14) discusses the anticipated growth rate and Infrastructure delivery.  Draft Plan Page 6 (1.18) discusses Council's prioritisation of delivery due to the Section 94 Cap.
Does the plan include a statement regarding revision of the scheduled infrastructure timing?	Yes	Draft Plan page 6 (1.17)
Does the plan include the projected timings of expenditure of funds?	Yes	An estimate of the cost and timing of delivery is provided in Appendices A – F of the Draft Plan.

- How has the council determined the timing of facility provision? Please provide us with all the details if these are not included in the plan (eg, are there population numbers used as trigger points for provision of certain items and what is the rationale behind selecting these population numbers?).

There are 3 major land holders/developers who will be responsible for the progressive serving and development of the Precinct. Whilst it is anticipated that

most of the local infrastructure will be provided in-kind by these developers (upon request). Notwithstanding, Council is required to give an estimate of when it would deliver or provide the local infrastructure itself.

Similar to the Riverstone, Alex Avenue, Area 20 and Marsden Park Industrial Precincts 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.

## 5 Criterion 5 – Reasonable apportionment

**The proposed development contribution is based on a reasonable apportionment between existing demand and new demand for the public amenities and public services.**

The concept of apportionment is based on ensuring that developers pay only for the portion of demand that results from their new development. While nexus is about establishing a relationship between the development and demand for infrastructure, apportionment is about quantifying the extent of the relationship.

Checklist		Reference
Does the plan include details of apportionment calculations?	Yes	Draft Plan pages 24 and 25
Does the plan explain the relationship between the facilities and any existing population?	Yes	Draft Plan page 4 (1.11)

- 1 How has the council considered any existing development when apportioning costs in the plan? (this may include existing development within the area covered by a plan or existing development outside of the area covered by the plan)

Similar to the Riverstone, Alex Avenue, Area 20 and Marsden Park Industrial Precincts, the Schofields Precinct is a Greenfield Area and requires Precinct development to fund the demand it creates for Precinct local infrastructure. There is a small established residential area in the north of the Precinct, but it is already serviced by basic rural infrastructure. This is explained further in Paragraph 1.11 on page 4 of the Draft Plan.

- 2 How has the council considered different land uses (eg, recreational, industrial, commercial) when apportioning costs in the plan? Please provide details of any calculations made.

Council does not differentiate between levying for different types of land uses. Council only levies for facilities that have a per person rate for Open Space, Community Facilities and Combined Precinct Facilities.

- 3 How has the council considered other precincts when apportioning costs in the plan? Please provide details of any calculations made.

### E2 Conservation Zone (Reserve 867 Local Conservation Zone)

Council has apportioned the costs of the Conservation Zone (located in the Riverstone Precinct) across all residential Precincts within the Blacktown LGA component of the North West Growth Centre. 6.9% of these costs are to the Schofields Precinct (refer 6.1 page 24 of the Draft Plan).



### Aquatic Facility

Council has apportioned the cost of the land for the Aquatic Facility (to be located in the Marsden Park Precinct) across six Precincts (refer 6.2 page 25 of the Draft Plan).

## 6 Criterion 6 – Appropriate community liaison

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

Councils are required to publicly exhibit their plans and make any changes in response to submissions received before submitting the plan to IPART.

Checklist		Reference
Has the plan been publicly exhibited?	Yes	Attachment 7
Does the plan or the supporting information include details of community liaison undertaken?	Yes	Attachment 7 Council also wrote to every landowner in the Precinct advising of the exhibition.
Does the plan or supporting information include a summary of submissions received and the council's response?	Yes	Attachment 8?

1 What publicity and community liaison has been undertaken in developing this plan? (Please attach any submissions received during these processes)

- Council publicly exhibited the Draft Plan from 11 September 2013 to 9 October 2013.
- Council wrote to every property owner in the Precinct notifying them of the exhibition.
- Council advertised the Plan's exhibition in the Local Papers.
- Submissions and Council's response to each issue raised in submissions is provided as **Attachment 8** to this application.

2 What actions did the council take in response to the submissions?

Council will amend the exhibited Plan with the following changes:

- Additional text to clarify Council's treatment of half-width roads.
- Deletion of SR 2.2 half width road which will now be provided by a developer as a condition of consent.
- Apportion 50% of the cost of intersection upgrade Quakers Hill Parkway and Eastern Road to the Schofields Precinct Traffic Management Facilities (refer Council submission).

- Amendment to the estimated population to reflect the Post Planning Report (January 2013) density yields.
- Amendment to the estimated population and net developable area to more accurately reflect the Transit Corridor requirements.
- The Project Mix of Land Uses for the Schofields Precinct (1.12) will reflect the Post Planning Report (January 2013) correct areas of land use zones.
- The Minister's most recent Section 94E Direction will be referenced in the Plan.

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

No.

## 7 Criterion 7 - The plan complies with other matters IPART considers relevant.

- 1 Is there anything you wish to explain that may help/speed up our assessment?

Council has attached the exhibited CP24 (**Attachment 9**).

As a result of submissions and other changes, Council will send to IPART a further Marked-Up Version of CP24 showing all changes to the exhibited CP. Council will also provide any relevant supporting documentation at that time. Council considers that this is more efficient than waiting to send one application at a later date and will allow IPART to consider the initial information, identify any missing information and commence/plan its assessment.

- 2 Is there any other information relating to the development of the precinct or the plan (such as VPAs) that we should be informed about?

There are two VPA's that currently relate to the Schofields Precinct:

- Burrawa Rise Planning Agreement - executed 29 November 2013 (**Attachment 10**)
- Skylands Stage 1 Planning Agreement - expected to be executed in March 2014.