



Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal
New South Wales

Application for assessment of a local infrastructure contributions plan – Part A

**Hawkesbury City Council
Vineyard Contributions Plan**



Contents

1	Instructions	4
1.1	Who should fill in this application form?	4
1.2	How should a council submit an application?	4
2	Preliminary Information	5
2.1	All applications	5
2.2	For contributions plans previously reviewed by IPART	6
3	Assessment Criteria	9
3.1	Criterion 1 – the Essential Works List	9
3.2	Criterion 2 – Nexus	11
3.3	Criterion 3 – Reasonable costs	22
3.4	Criterion 4 – Reasonable timeframe	31
3.5	Criterion 5 – Reasonable apportionment	32
3.6	Criterion 6 – Appropriate community liaison	35
3.7	Criterion 7 – The plan complies with other matters IPART considers relevant	37
4	Quality assurance	39
5	Attachment checklist	40



1 Instructions

1.1 Who should fill in this application form?

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

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

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

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/Local-Infrastructure-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 (Ministerial Direction), and
- ▼ *Local Infrastructure Contributions Practice Note*, January 2018.

2 Preliminary Information

2.1 All applications

A. Council information

Council name	Hawkesbury City Council
Primary council contact details (Provide name, position, phone number, and email address)	Nicole Haddock, GLN Planning (consultants commissioned by Council to prepare the application and manage the process) [REDACTED]
Secondary council contact details (Provide name, position, phone number, and email address)	Andrew Kearns, Manager – Strategic Planning [REDACTED]

B. Information about the plan

What is the name of the plan?	Vineyard Precinct Section 7.11 Draft Contributions Plan
Which clause of the <i>section 94E Ministerial Direction for Local Infrastructure Contributions</i> (Ministerial Direction) applies to this plan (ie, clause 6, 6A, 6B or 6C)?	Clause 6
What is the current maximum contribution amount (per lot or dwelling) for this plan under the Ministerial Direction?	\$30,000 per dwelling/lot
In the absence of any cap imposed by the Ministerial Direction, what are the indicative contribution amounts (per lot or dwelling) for each type of residential development in the catchment area?	Average contributions per dwelling/lot: \$70,789 - Environmental living (E4) \$70,789 - Low density residential (R2) \$54,590 - Medium density residential (R3)
When was the plan publicly exhibited?	18 May 2018 to 18 June 2018 inclusive

Has the council adopted the plan? If so, when was it adopted and when did it come into force?	No, it hasn't adopted the plan yet.
To what extent was the Department of Planning & Environment (DPE) involved in the development of this plan?	DPE has had extensive involvement at the precinct planning stage, leading the planning for the Vineyard Precinct. It commissioned each of the technical studies underpinning yields, population projections, infrastructure requirements and costs (including a subsequent review of some costs) and recommended later changes to NDA calculations and infrastructure requirements (mainly related to the road network). It also commissioned a consultant (GLN Planning) to draft the initial contributions plan, prior to the precinct's final rezoning.
Over what period will development in the catchment area of the plan occur?	2018 to 2033
What proportion of the total projected development in the catchment area of the plan has been approved and/or constructed?	Council has received five development applications (DAs) proposing altogether 200 residential lots (at the time of the submission of this application to IPART).
What planning instruments (SEPPs, LEPs, or DCPs) apply to land in the catchment area of the plan?	<i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006</i> Growth Centres Development Control Plan (DCP) 2017
Has the Minister referred this contributions plan to IPART for review? If so, provide details.	No, it is being submitted voluntarily by Council.

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?	The contributions rates exceed the maximum amount of \$30,000 permitted by the Ministerial Direction and Council intends to levy development the full contribution under the plan to fund the essential infrastructure requirements.
--	--

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

- recommendations made in IPART's assessment report on the previous version/s of the plan, and
- any directions from the Minister for Planning in relation to IPART's assessment.

This is the first time that IPART has assessed the plan formally. However, IPART had reviewed a draft version of the plan on an informal basis in February 2018 and advised Council to review the following issues:

Contributions plan main document:

- Land Value Index (LVI). More information to be provided about how the Land Value Index is calculated.
- Apportionment of collector road design costs. Need to indicate apportionment of some roadwork costs to Riverstone Precinct.
- No levies on non-residential land use. Useful to include a statement about why non-residential development will not contribute to the cost of infrastructure (noting this is a very small area within the precinct).
- Inconsistency in tables 1 and 3. Table 3 includes rate for works only, not works and land.
- P 9 ref to section 1.5 correct to section 2.5
- Section 4.3. Consider adopting the wording of the 94 Ministerial Direction (eg, the Minister may advise council to amend the plan)

Excel worksheets:

- Contingency allowances. The Cost Assumption worksheet had said that the costing included a contingency allowance of 10%, but the allowances applied are 20% for social infrastructure and 30% for transport and stormwater infrastructure.

Council has made amendments to the plan and/or schedule, which address these issues, as follows:

- More information is provided about the calculation and timing of the LVI (**Section 6.3.2**)
- More information is provided about the Otago St/Windsor Rd intersection, for which a share of costs are apportioned to the Riverstone Precinct



	<p>(rather than collector road design costs) (Section 3.2.1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• More information is provided about why non-residential development is exempt from contributions under the plan (Section 2.5),• Cost assumption worksheet has been amended to reflect the actual contingencies assumed, and• Other minor corrections and rewording are included, as necessary.
<p>Briefly explain any other revisions to the plan such as updated costings, revised apportionment of costs, or amended delivery timeframe.</p>	<p>Since then, Council also decided to include collector road costs (including land) in the plan, rather than just design costs. This is considered to be an equitable approach with the cost of collector roads being shared amongst all residential development in the precinct, consistent with shared demand for the roadwork.</p> <p>It has also included the cost of a loan to fund collector road design costs and certain stormwater facility costs, to bring forward the delivery of this critical enabling infrastructure.</p> <p>Council has applied for a 50% interest subsidy for the loan costs via the NSW Government's Loan Cost Loan Initiative (with its applications due 1 July), and pending the outcome of this application, will amend the plan to reflect the actual interest costs to Council.</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.

Only essential works are included in the plan.

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.

The plan includes community infrastructure to be co-located with other commercial and residential development on a 6,000m² site along Boundary Road, east of the precinct. The community infrastructure is required to partially meet the demand from both the Vineyard and Vineyard West populations. The proposed community centre has a gross floor area of 800m².

As recommended by Elton (in its draft and final reports), the centre will be multi-purpose with a range of flexible spaces capable of meeting multiple needs and delivering a range of community activities and services.

The Vineyard West Precinct is expected to be rezoned for urban development in the future, at which time any additional community infrastructure needs and relevant apportionments (if required) will be considered. However, there are too many unknowns concerning the possible rezoning to undertake this task at this stage.

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"/>	Figure 1, p 4.
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"/>	Table 4, p 11.
Include information about:			p 12.
▼ the existing population in the catchment area	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
▼ the projected residential population and/or workforce	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Include details about how the need for land and works was determined	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	p 13-22
Refer to design and construction standards used in determining the works in the plan	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	But these are in the supporting infrastructure studies.

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.

DPE has led the precinct planning process for Vineyard (Stage 1) and commissioned the technical studies. It also commissioned a consultant (GLN Planning) to draft the contributions plan, prior to the precinct's final rezoning.

The technical studies (also available on DPE's website) which have informed the infrastructure needs and costs of the Vineyard Precinct are:

- SGS Economics and Planning, Housing Study for Vineyard Stage 1 - Final Report, November 2016 (SGS final report).
- Elton Consulting, Social Infrastructure Assessment for Vineyard Precinct, Draft Report, 25 September 2014 (Elton draft report).
- Elton Consulting, Social Infrastructure Assessment for Vineyard Precinct, Revised Final Report, 16 November 2016 (Elton final report).
- Elton Consulting, Strategic Review of Social Infrastructure for the North West Growth Centre, Draft Report (only version provided) 22 September 2014
- Mott MacDonald, Water Cycle Management Report, Vineyard Precinct, July 2015 (MM draft report).
- Mott MacDonald, Water Cycle Management Report, Vineyard Precinct, October 2016 (MM final report).
- Mott MacDonald, Appendices A-D to Water Cycle Management Report, October 2016 Vineyard Precinct (A - Drawings, B - XP-RAFTS Model Data, C - Peak Flows from XP-Rafts and D Tuflow Results)
- Arup, Vineyard Precinct Transport Study, Draft Report, August 2014 (ARUP draft report).
- Arup, Vineyard Precinct Transport Study, Rev B, November 2017 (ARUP final report).
- Arup, Boundary Road, Chapman Road, Commercial Road and Menin Road Cost Estimates, 8 July 2015.
- AECOM, Boundary Road Strategic Concept Design Study, 26 February 2013 (AECOM study).
- WT Partnership, Vineyard Precinct Stage 1 – Section 94 Contribution Construction Cost Estimate – Estimate for GLN Planning - Draft Report, 9 September 2015 (note that a final report was never provided so this is the latest version available) (WTP report)

The precinct planning reports incorporate the main adjustments from these plans (and associated reasons):

- DPE, Vineyard Precinct Stage 1 Planning Report, 2016 (DPE finalisation report).
- DPE, Vineyard Precinct Stage 1 Finalisation Report, November 2017 (DPE exhibition planning report).

The main deviations from the technical studies are:

- Inclusion of a new intersection at Windsor Road/Otago Street - During precinct planning, RMS advised that all new properties in the area between the Killarney Chain of Ponds and Windsor Road should be accessed via a new intersection aligned with Otago Street (see Table 4 of DPE finalisation report). This work wasn't recommended in the original ARUP study.
- Commercial/Chapman Road (Corner) Half Width Upgrade. After the release of the Final Indicative Layout Plan (ILP), DPE suggested that Council include this upgrade in the contributions

plan because it was likely to be needed for alignment with other roadwork, the fact that collector roads needed to be 20.8m, and that RMS was not undertaking this section of work. This upgrade wasn't explicitly recommended in the original ARUP study, noting the specific needs of the collector road network, as reflected in the final ILP and contributions plan, have been determined through precinct planning involving DPE, RMS and Council, rather than by ARUP.

- Additional open space land – post-exhibition of the ILP, the open space areas in the precinct were adjusted and increased to accommodate the retention of an additional 3.72ha of environmental land (ENV) across the precinct. This has resulted in an overall retention of 16.1ha of ENV, and it affects the rate of open space provision in the plan, such that it is higher than what Elton recommended. There were also other changes to open space in the final ILP for road alignment needs (see Table 4 in the DPE finalisation report).
- Other adjustments to land acquisition area needs for infrastructure to align with refined measurements based on the final ILP (including for drainage, open space and roadwork). The adjustments to land areas are explained in relevant sections in more detail below.

a) Transport land and works

ARUP undertook strategic traffic modelling of the impact of the greenfield development in Vineyard to inform its recommended road network hierarchy and future public transport network (see ARUP final report). The aim of the proposed transport network is to (p 25):

- Provide a coherent, legible transport network that supports movement both to, and within, the Vineyard precinct.
- Provide a road network that allows for good access to all modes of transport, particularly public transport, walking and cycling;
- Design a physical site layout which encourages walking and cycling, particularly to key land uses and public transport nodes;
- Ensure the road network for Vineyard provides suitable connections to adjacent development precincts in the North West Growth Area;
- Integrate transport and land use planning so that high intensity land uses have strong accessibility to public transport;
- Provide high quality access to public transport stops to reduce the dependence on private vehicles;
- Ensure that future residents of Vineyard are located within at least a 400m radius of a bus stop;
- Develop an appropriate road hierarchy which provides adequate carrying capacity on higher order roads to meet reasonable community expectations; and
- Protect residential areas from through traffic intrusion, particularly heavy vehicles.

To achieve these aims, ARUP (in its final report) identified a need for numerous new roads, upgrades to existing roads and new traffic management facilities. The network needs were 'tested' through exhibition of the ILP and final adjustments considered to best achieve the access and standards required for new development in the precinct were incorporated into the contributions plan. In particular, the specific requirements of the collector road network and associated upgrades were determined through this precinct planning process (as reflected in the draft contributions plan commissioned by DPE) but finalised through follow up liaison between DPE and Council.

Appendix B of the plan provides the list of transport infrastructure items, land acquisition needs and the location map for these items, consistent with the final ILP and follow up liaison between DPE and Council.

The final road network

The DPE finalisation report explained the needs of the final road network (p 23) as follows:

“There are a number of roads that require upgrading to support the future population. Chapman Road, Commercial Road, and Menin Road have been identified as part of the regional road network for the North West Growth Area. These roads will be upgraded to a sub-arterial status and form part of the Bandon Road corridor. When complete the route will function as a regional traffic connection between Boundary, Windsor and Richmond Roads. The portion within the Vineyard precinct will require upgrading from a 20 metre road reserve, to a 35 metre road reserve which will be extended wholly to the south within the Vineyard Precinct. RMS will be undertaking the land acquisition and widening / upgrade.”

Regarding the specifications for collector roads, the finalisation report stated (p 24) that:

“Transport for NSW has requested that a 13m wide carriageway be provided to allow for bus movements, therefore widening the total road reservation to 20.8m. An extra 0.8m of road reserve is required to accommodate the land use types within the reserve to achieve the widened carriageway of 13m. This will require minor land acquisition for some properties that front Commercial Road (internally within the Precinct) and Harkness Road. This land will be acquired by Council.”

Boundary Road

Boundary Road is an unclassified regional road on the eastern boundary of the Vineyard Precinct. It is under the control of Hawkesbury and the Hills Shire Councils, and currently configured with one traffic lane in either direction (ARUP final report, p 12). Despite no formal classification at present, the plan assumes it is to be upgraded to sub-arterial status, as it requires a higher standard upgrade than other collector roads in the precinct.

With the anticipated growth in the Vineyard Precinct, Boundary Road needs to be upgraded from two rural lanes to four lanes, suitable for speeds up to 80 km / hour, with intersection improvements. Upgrading of the current intersections at Commercial Road and Menin Road are also required.

AECOM was engaged by the DPE (then DP&I) to prepare a strategic concept design for the proposed upgrade of Boundary Road (AECOMD study) and this informed the nature of the work required. (ARUP used this in preparing its costing, which was then reviewed by WTP.)

Traffic modelling prepared by ARUP has estimated that development within the Vineyard Precinct will be accountable for 43% of future vehicle movements along Boundary Road (**Attachment 8**). The balance of the traffic will be attributable to developments in the adjoining Box Hill Precinct (48%), and in areas outside of the Vineyard and Box Hill Precincts (9%).

Based on the ARUP modelling, the plan apportions 43% of the cost of the Boundary Road upgrade to new development in the Vineyard Precinct. The remainder of the cost of the upgrade will need to be met from other funding sources.

Collector road network needs

A new collector road network has been identified to accommodate increased traffic flows in the Precinct. Where possible, this network relies on the existing road reserves (such as Commercial Road and Harkness Road) to reduce acquisition costs. Three new collector roads are included in the plan (CR1, CR3 and CR7), together with upgrades of O'Dell Street (CR2), Commercial Road (CR4 and CR5) and Harkness Road (CR6) to the required collector road standards. DPE's finalisation report and explain the positioning of some of these roads in more detail.

A half road upgrade will be required at the northern border of the Precinct where Commercial Road meets Chapman Road (CR8), and in consultation with DPE, it was determined that this section of roadwork is not being provided by RMS. (See **Attachment 6** for reference to the conversation between DPE and Council about this.)

A loan will fund the design costs of collector roads to ensure timely delivery of roads with development and the interest costs are included in the plan.

Intersection of Windsor Road/Otago Street

As stated, this intersection work was added to the plan after the exhibition of the draft ILP. RMS advised DPE that all new properties in the area between the Killarney Chain of Ponds and Windsor Road should be accessed via a new intersection aligned with Otago Street.

The four-way Windsor Road/Otago Street intersection will facilitate local traffic movements and form a pedestrian and cyclist link between the Riverstone and Vineyard precincts.

The costs of the intersection are apportioned equally (50% each) to Vineyard precinct and the adjoining Riverstone precinct respectively, excluding the cost of the new tie in road to Vineyard Precinct, which is apportioned 100% to Vineyard. Refer to **Attachments 10** and **11** for the source information.

Other works

- Local roads are expected to be provided by developers, as required by conditions of consent.
- Formal cycleway network – Most of this network is included within the cross sections for major roads, however a major east-west cycleway following the Killarney Chain of Ponds is also required. The need for this cycleway is established in the ARUP study and DPE exhibition planning and finalisation reports. The land area needs were first determined by GLN, on behalf of DPE, and checked by Council (see **Attachments 13-15**).
- Creek crossings – four creek crossings are required across the waterways for cycleway and pedestrian access.
- Public transport facilities - bus stops are required to support increased bus services and allow for most residents to be within walking distance of a bus stop. This need is as established in the ARUP study. There are 12 bus stops proposed (see **Attachment 12**).



Land area requirements

The measurements for land acquisition requirements in the plan were originally provided by Cox, on behalf of DPE (**Attachment 17**). Updates were required to address the needs of the wider road reserve which were then refined by Council, on request of DPE (see **Attachment 16**). More detail on the determination of land costs is provided below.

b) Stormwater land and management works

At present, there is limited stormwater drainage and floodplain management infrastructure within the Precinct. Mott MacDonald prepared a Water Cycle Management Strategy (as presented in the draft and final reports), on behalf of DPE to inform the stormwater network needs for Vineyard. This strategy identified a network of trunk stormwater drainage facilities to manage flood events up to the 1 in 100-year event, and to ensure stormwater is discharged to the existing creek network at pre-development flows, as well as being treated for pollutants.

Key components of the stormwater drainage network within the Vineyard Precinct reflect the “treatment train” approach (p 43 of MM final report), and include:

- The inclusion of rainwater storage tanks in new dwellings to store rainwater for re-use and reduce discharge to the creek system (infrastructure not included in the plan);
- Two new detention basins to store, treat and control the rate of stormwater collected from the private domain and road network, prior to being discharged into the existing creek system;
- Five new bio-retention areas (termed “Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) facilities” in the plan) with 2 embedded in the land footprint of detention basins, and gross pollutant traps (5) to treat stormwater prior to discharge into the creek system; and
- Drainage corridor works, including bank stabilisation, which uses the capacity of the existing creek system to manage flood events.

There were two main changes to the stormwater network post-exhibition of the Vineyard ILP (as reported in the Finalisation Report):

- The WSUD facility at 3 Putland Place was relocated to a lot in the vicinity (9 O’Dell Street) that will not require the demolition of any existing dwellings; and
- The drainage corridor width was reduced in width from 46m to 25m (to maximise developable area).

The infrastructure dimensions and land needs in the plan reflect:

- The recommended principles (and design features) of the basins as in p 24 of the MM final report.
- The proposed basin locations as in Figure 4.5 in the MM final report, and the list of basins and indicative areas in Table 4.2 (on p 25).
- Mott MacDonald’s recommended WSUD facility (bioretention “raingarden”) positions, as shown in drawing 0221. The proposed areas for the facilities are in Table 6.8, p 45.
- Further refinement to the assessment of land acquisition area needs for each item post-exhibition of the ILP by Cox, on behalf of DPE (**Attachments 18 and 19**).

A loan will fund the land acquisition and design costs of the basins, as well as the design costs for the drainage corridor, to ensure enabling infrastructure for development is delivered in a timely fashion. Interest costs are included in the plan.

Appendix B of the plan provides the list of final stormwater infrastructure items and the location map for these items, consistent with the final ILP.

c) Open space land and works (embellishments)

A Social Infrastructure Assessment for the Precinct has been prepared by Elton Consulting. The Social Infrastructure Assessment included a review of existing demographics within the Hawkesbury LGA to determine a household and community profile to forecast the profile of the anticipated community.

It also included an inventory of all social infrastructure in and surrounding the Vineyard Precinct, including active and passive open space facilities and community infrastructure. This inventory also identified the existing facilities' current capacity and their ability to support future increases in population anticipated by development in the Precinct. Except for child care centres and high schools, Elton found that the existing open space and community infrastructure were inadequate to meet demand of the future precinct population.

Based on an estimated population of around 7,400 people, the assessment identified the need for a variety of social infrastructure including:

- An overall quantum of 31 hectares of open space facilities with 23.6 hectares to be provided in the Vineyard Precinct with the remainder to be provided in the Vineyard West Precinct. This recommended supply equated to 3.19 hectares per 1,000 residents.
- Local and district passive open space facilities including parks, playgrounds, picnic areas and cycleways.
- Linear open space along the creek corridors to provide walking and cycling trails.
- Local active open space facilities including sporting fields, sporting courts, amenities buildings, outdoor exercise equipment, etc. The assessment identified the need for at least three (3) double playing fields. However, due to the location of the proposed playing fields in flood prone land, the assessment supported the provision of four (4) double playing fields (in both Stage 1 and 2 of Vineyard including Vineyard West) because of the reduced ability for operation during / following storm events. Two (2) of these double playing fields are to be provided in the Vineyard (Stage 1) Precinct.

The open space areas in the precinct were adjusted post-exhibition (of the ILP and associated planning report):

- The amount of open space was increased to protect more Existing Native Vegetation; and
- Two pocket parks were relocated for easier access.

Appendix C of the plan provides the list of final open space facility items and the location map for these items. Only base level embellishment is incorporated into the relevant facilities, as evident in the breakdown in the costings by WTP.

The total quantum of open space land amounts to a provision of approximately 3.5 hectares per 1,000 residents. This is higher than the standard benchmark of 2.83 but reflects the recommended provision for the precinct by the Elton study and DPE's adjustments to provision in light of the overall land use needs of the precinct.

d) Community services land

The social infrastructure draft assessment, 2014, by Elton (p 40) established the need for the community facility:

".. the closest community facility to Vineyard is the McGraths Hill Community Centre, located about 3 kilometres along Windsor Road to the north. However, this facility provides only a simple community hall and small meeting room for hire, and will not be adequate to meet the variety of social, leisure, learning and support needs of a population of over 11,000 people.

To the south, Blacktown City Council has plans to develop a district level community hub within the town centre of Riverstone. However, this facility has been planned to serve the populations of Riverstone and Alex Ave Precincts, forecast to reach around 45,000, and it will not have capacity to service Vineyard Precinct as well, especially as it lies within a separate LGA. At present The Hills Shire Council has not proposed any community centres for the Box Hill Precinct, forecast to have a population of around 30,000 people. Thus there will be no community centres to the south which might meet the needs of Vineyard residents.

For these reasons, it is felt that a community centre should be provided within the Vineyard Precinct, as there will be no alternative facility to address the needs of this area. This should be a multi-purpose centre with a range of flexible spaces capable of meeting multiple needs and delivering a range of activities and services."

The final report by Elton, November 2016, discussed various options for staging, location and sizing and noted that (p 42):

".. a site for a community centre should be located in Stage 1. As Council has expressed reluctance to manage small facilities, it is recommended that it be designed in stages, with the option of expanding the facility once details of the Stage 2 population are clear. The Stage 1 ILP identifies an indicative site of 6,000m² for mixed use / social infrastructure adjacent to the proposed village retail centre on Commercial Road. While not ideal, this size is more than adequate for a community facility and this location would have some benefits for the Stage 1 residents. However, Council will need to further consider the suitability of this location and the longer term needs of the precinct population, before committing to acquiring this specific site."

The DPE Vineyard Precinct Planning (Stage 1) Report, 2016, identified that (p 51):

"Elton's analysis and the outcome of discussions with Hawkesbury Council identified that the western portion of the Precinct, which is outside the Stage 1 development area, would be a better location for a community centre. However, as there is not timeframe for the planning of the western portion of the Precinct, land is to be allocated within Stage 1 for a 'Social Infrastructure Facility' (6,000m²) which could contain a community centre."

The contributions plan includes community infrastructure to be co-located with other commercial and residential development on a 6,000m² site on the eastern side of the Precinct, to meet the demand from both the Vineyard and Vineyard West populations. Only 50% of the costs are apportioned to the Vineyard Precinct (with the remainder of costs to be apportioned to Vineyard West). The Vineyard West Precinct is expected to be rezoned for urban development in the future, at which time any additional community infrastructure needs will be considered.

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

The ARUP traffic study established nexus for much of the proposed road network but the DPE commissioned a review of its road costings by WTP, and the WTP cost rates, which were generally lower than the ARUP costings, were adopted in the plan

Otherwise, the supporting studies commissioned by DPE to establish nexus for each category of infrastructure and DPE's finalisation report for the Vineyard Precinct, which resulted in a few adjustments to the initial infrastructure proposed, have been relied upon to determine the local infrastructure needs in the precinct.

5. How has non-residential development been considered in determining the need for infrastructure in the plan.

The Vineyard Precinct will predominantly yield residential development. While there will be a small proportion (1.4 ha) of non-residential development within the precinct on land zoned B2 Local Centre or B4 Mixed Use, this is not expected to generate material demand for public amenities or services addressed by the plan.

Non-residential development is not likely to generate much demand for social infrastructure (if any), it will be required to provide on-site stormwater detention facilities (and so will not demand the network drainage infrastructure), and the demand for roadwork is primarily generated by the precinct's residents who will access the village centre.

Therefore, non-residential development is included as an example of development that is exempt from paying s7.11 contributions in **Section 2.5** of the plan.

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.

a) The existing population in the catchment area

In calculating the net additional population of 7,489, DPE, in consultation with Council, allowed for its estimates of the existing population for the Vineyard Precinct.

Council estimated (**Attachment 6**) that the existing dwellings numbered 92. Applying the assumed occupancy rates in the plan, this translated into 285 existing residents. This estimate is relatively consistent with the population reported by SGS of 328 in 2011 (p 19 of SGS final report).

The works schedule provides the breakdown of the demand credits (see 'Demand credits' and 'Dev_Assump' worksheets), and the aggregates are also presented in **Table 5** in the plan.

The estimate of existing development has also informed the expected demand credits that would be payable to existing development.

b) The existing population outside the catchment area

Elton found in its social assessment study that there are no regional or district level facilities planned for within the Vineyard Precinct that would service the broader local government area (LGA). The only infrastructure for which there is assumed to be shared demand from outside the precinct is the multi-purpose community facility, for which land costs are included in the plan.

It is not possible yet to quantify the impact of the Vineyard West precinct on demand including for the community infrastructure because this has not yet been rezoned (and so yields and demand cannot be determined). Council intends for the plan to be updated as necessary to cater for any impacts on demand from the Vineyard West precinct in the future, once this is determined.

Likewise, Mott MacDonald and ARUP studies found that the proposed stormwater and road networks are needed from within the growth precinct only. The exceptions are the upgrade of Boundary Road on the boundary of the Box Hill precinct, and the new Otago Street/Windsor Road intersection, where demand is shared with adjoining precincts.

c) The capacity of the existing infrastructure in the catchment area

The area is semi-rural and infrastructure is limited to cater for the anticipated growth within the precinct.

As the Mott MacDonald and Arup studies found, the existing road and drainage networks will not meet the needs of the anticipated development and new road and drainage networks will need to be designed and built to meet those needs. In calculating the contribution for a development, no allowance has been made for the demand for these types of infrastructure that is attributable to any existing development.

There is an established social infrastructure network (within and external to the precinct), as identified by Elton in its final report, however there is also a need for new and upgraded social infrastructure to be provided to accommodate the new residential population anticipated for the precinct.

In calculating contributions under the plan, an allowance has been made for the demand for social infrastructure attributable to development that existed at the time the plan was prepared. In this regard, each existing residential property has been granted a social infrastructure demand credit equivalent to a single dwelling.

d) Any existing or proposed infrastructure outside the catchment area.

There is no proposed infrastructure outside the catchment area included in the contributions plan.

Regarding the proximity of and demand for district and regional level community infrastructure from within the Vineyard Precinct, Elton stated (p 69 of the final report):

“Analysis undertaken for this report shows that the Stage 1 precinct will be too small in its own right to generate demand for district and regional level community facilities, and will instead rely on those in Windsor, Riverstone and Rouse Hill. However, these have not taken account of population growth in

Vineyard in their development and sizing and are quite distant from this precinct. The future development of a town centre in Box Hill Precinct may help address some of these needs.”

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"/>	Sources are contained in appendices.
Explain how the proposed cost of land was derived	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Sources are contained in Appendices.
Include a schedule of the contributions rates (eg, \$/ha, \$/person, \$/dwelling)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Tables 1-3
Explain how the contribution rates will be adjusted for inflation/ changes in costs	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 6.3
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"/>	Section 6.4
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)?

The base period in the plan is March 2018.

(Although the land valuations were undertaken in October 2017, these have been indexed by CPI to align works and land costs to the March 2018 quarter, since the LVI has not yet been established by Council. From March 2018, land costs will only be indexed by the LVI, consistent with the provisions in the plan.)

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

ARUP provided the initial costings for roadwork but DPE commissioned a review of these costs by WT Partnerships (WTP report). The WTP costs have been adopted in the plan (also refer to the Works Schedule). The costings were based on the same cross sections and conditions adopted by ARUP originally.

Boundary Road – the total cost of the road upgrade including contingency is \$35,983,802 and \$15,473,035 equates to 43% of cost so this amount has been included in the contributions plan. The total cost is made up of:

- \$891,966 for 2 roundabouts funded by Box Hill Contributions Plan (\$429,536 each), indexed.
- \$1,038,290 for Menin Road and Pitt Town Road Crest improvements under Box Hill North VPA, indexed.
- \$1,127,677 for road resurfacing funded by Box Hill Contributions Plan, indexed.
- \$7,734,614 for the Killarney Bridge funded by Box Hill Contributions Plan, indexed.
- \$25,191,255 for the remaining works based on the WTP reviewed ARUP costing, indexed. Note that only the upgrade of the existing Windsor Road intersection (\$700,000) is included in the WTP review costing; the other intersection work is excluded.

The cost sources for various elements, as above, are contained in the Box Hill Contributions Plan and the Box Hill North VPA. The Works Schedule provides the WTP reviewed costing, indexed to December 2017 for the remaining works which is also available in the WTP report. The Minutes of 2015 between Hawkesbury and The Hills Council, as presented by DPE, indicate the agreement regarding the different works required and who will pay (**Attachment 9**).

The final cost estimate included in the plan is indexed to March 2018 dollars.

Windsor Rd/Otago St intersection - DPE provided the Otago intersection costs and apportionment method, based on advice from ARUP (**Attachment 11**).

Supplementary costing sources - Where there were gaps in the estimates (from WTP, ARUP), the Camden and Box Hill contribution plans were used as an appropriate recent cost source from which to adopt unit rates for similar work (i.e. for similar road upgrade work, creek crossings and bus shelters).

Contingencies were excluded from WTP's estimates. Therefore, contingencies have been included to align with IPART benchmarks for the 'business case' stage (20%).

WTP (in its final report) advised that (p 4):

"WTP have not included contingency within the estimates but would assume a rate of 10% would be reasonable for new roads and a range between 20%-30% would be reasonable for upgrading all existing roads. The IPART contingency benchmark of 20% is generally considered high for new works but reasonable for upgrading existing roads due to a higher amount of contingent risks such as staging, erosion and sediment control, property adjustments, traffic and pedestrian management, and relocating and upgrading existing authority mains."

For consistency across the plan, and to ensure enough funding is available for Council to meet the cost of the work, a contingency of 20% has been applied to the base cost estimates. This is considered reasonable in the context of WTP's advice above (given the ranges identified) and the aggregate cost rates for the roadwork in the plan. Further reasoning for the adopted contingency amounts in the plan is contained in the open space cost section below.

b) Stormwater works

The stormwater infrastructure costs were first estimated by Mott MacDonald and then reviewed by WTP, and the WTP costs have been adopted (WTP final report), as reflected in the Works Schedule. The relevant areas for the items are as advised in the finalised estimates by Cox (**Attachments 18 and 19**), and more detail on land costing is provided below).

Regarding the costing of basins and WSUD facilities, WTP advised (p 3) that “Some areas and volumes measured by WTP differ from those included by Mott McDonald. Generally, WTP measured off a set of drawings that is one revision after that used by Mott McDonald. This may explain the difference in the measured areas. ”

Contingencies were excluded from WTP’s estimates. These were included in the plan to align with IPART benchmarks for projects at the ‘business case’ stage. It is acknowledged that WTP stated that, “WTP have not included contingency within the estimates but would assume a rate of 10% would be reasonable for new works. The IPART contingency benchmark of 20% is generally considered high for works of this nature.”

It is also important to note that Council might need to deliver these works directly and cannot rely on works in kind by developers. Council does not have the same economies of scale or established pool of greenfield contractors available to it as other North West Growth Centre councils, where significant greenfield development has already occurred. Therefore, it is particularly important that adequate funding is available to meet the cost of this work (and any unforeseen costs such as contaminants in the soil being encountered on disposal).

c) Open space works (embellishments)

WTP was commissioned by GLN on behalf of DPE to prepare the costs (unit rates) for the social infrastructure as recommended by Elton (WTP Draft Report, 9 September 2015). Pages 1 and 2 provide the cost rates adopted in the plan (\$82/m² for local parks; \$80/m² for district parks; and \$110/m² for active sporting fields).

WTP noted (p 2) that "Preliminaries, erosion and sediment control and design have been allowed on a percentage basis. These percentages could reduce if parks, roads, basins and raingardens were constructed concurrently."

It is unlikely that these facilities will be constructed concurrently owing to the fragmented nature of development in Vineyard, so the percentages are retained, as advised.

The plan adopts a 15% contingency rate for open space embellishment works costs. The 15% contingency is based on IPART's 2014 Benchmark Report and the recommended allowance for open space embellishment work at the Business Case stage.

WTP noted that "WTP have not included contingency within the estimates but would assume a rate of 10% would be reasonable for new open space works (p 2)."

The IPART contingency benchmark based on the "strategic review" project stage of 20% appears high for works of this nature.

The Plan adopts a lower rate than 20% of 15%, noting that WTP did not specifically estimate the contingency of 10% but just provided very general advice about what could be reasonable. The 15% is more consistent with the contingency sourcing across the plan for different infrastructure items (being the IPART "business case" rate). The 15% contingency allowance also represents the middle ground between the IPART 'strategic review' stage estimate and the WTP estimate.

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

The estimated plan administration costs are based on the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (IPART) benchmark of an allowance equivalent to 1.5% of the cost of capital works identified in the plan.

This amount is expected to fund the following activities:

- Deployment of Council staff (over at least a 15 year period) to:
 - prepare and review the contribution plan;
 - account for contributions receipts and expenditure; and
 - coordinate the implementation of the contributions plan and works, including involvement in negotiating works-in-kind, planning agreements and material public benefit agreements.
- Consultant studies which are commissioned by Council from time to time to determine the value of land to be acquired, the design and cost of works, as well as to review the development and demand assumptions in the plan. Council is also required to engage the services of legal professionals from time to time to assist in the administration of this plan.

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?

No land has been acquired to date. However, Council will seek to acquire land for basin and drainage corridor needs with a loan within the first five years of the plan to facilitate expedited development.

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

Land valuations - unit rates

Ken Wood provided valuations of the land in the Vineyard Precinct, as commissioned by GLN on behalf of DPE during precinct planning. The final report, dated October 2017, is attached.

The rates adopted in the plan are as recommended by Ken Wood:

- R2/R3 land - \$300/m²;
- Commercial land - \$500/m²
- Transmission line easement land - \$150/m², and
- Constrained land below the 100-year flood level - \$100/m².

Ken Wood recommended a possible rate range of \$120-150/m² for the transmission line easement land (p 18 of the final report), acknowledging that:

"This is always subjective but the land within the easement area is virtually sterilised save for roadways and Open Space purposes, whilst land within close proximity to the easement generally suffers a decrease in value because of the visual blight which is usually not compensable. We have adopted a rate of 50% to 60% of the 'unaffected' or 'unconstrained' rate, i.e. \$120/m' to \$150/m' for land within a transmission line easement."

Conservatively (and given that no further allowances have been provided for in the land costings) a rate of \$150/m² is adopted in the plan to acquire transmission easement land for drainage corridor purposes in the southeast corner of the precinct.

The recommended rate of \$300/m² for R2 and R3 land was explained in the final valuation report as follows (p 14):

"Recent 'R2'/'R3' sales within the North-West growth precincts of East Riverstone, Marsden Park, Rouse Hill and Schofields release areas range from \$275/m² to \$453/m² with the predominance of sales within the \$335/m² to \$370/m² range."

"We have also researched recent sales of small acreage properties within the Vineyard release precinct. At this stage there would not appear to be any uplift in value which is generally evident when the infrastructure sewer and water becomes available. We do not consider residential englobo land would attract as high a rate within the Vineyard precinct because of its further distance from both Parramatta and Sydney CBD's, accordingly I have ascribed a value of \$300/m² to both the 'Open Space' and 'Community Use' lands where the 'underlying' or 'alternative' zoning would be either 'R2' Low Density or 'R3' Medium Density Residential zonings."

Ken Wood has recommended the same unit rate of \$300/m² to apply to low density and medium density zoned areas, and that this rate is adopted for both land areas in the plan. This approach was adopted in the plan because *the SEPP (Growth Centres) 2006* provides that in certain zones, the minimum lot size for low density and medium density development is the same (see Part 4 and Clauses 4.1, 4.1AB and 4.1 AC of the SEPP). Further, the valuer has estimated the *average unit rate based on an assessment of the land (with the underlying residential zonings) to be acquired* (i.e. for open space or community use).

The valuation final report identified the following reasons for the commercial rate of \$500/m² (p 17):

"We have adopted a rate of \$500/m² for a commercial site within a new release precinct. This is because the area to be acquired is small "Community Centre" 2,500m² and have applied a rate of \$500/m². This is a significant increase on our previous advising but reflects the current competitive nature of competition between the major food distributors - ALDI, Coles and Woolworths, each wishing to establish their outlets in recently developed master planned estates.

It is of note that once the estate develops, i.e. roaded and serviced, the rate would increase to approx. \$1,000/m² (see sales 4 and 5) within the Windsor commercial centre."

There are no additional costs added for just terms compensation in the plan at this time.

Land area needs - measurements

DPE commissioned Cox to provide measurements of the required land areas for infrastructure items, and relevant supporting information from Cox is provided as part of this application (**Attachments 17-19**).

These measurements were supplemented with advice from Council concerning the land required for roads, on DPE's recommendation for Council to finalize these measurements internally. It is acknowledged that these land areas can differ from the land acquisition map and reflect the refinement of the actual road area needs by Council.

Council's measurements are based on the dimensions for roads incorporated in the plan and as recommended in the supporting studies (e.g. 20.8 m wide collector roads for bus routes).

To clarify, the land areas for roads are based on Council's internal estimates, whereas the land areas for open space and stormwater are based on Cox's recommendations (on behalf of DPE).

Application of unit rates to land areas

Cox, on behalf of DPE, provided the estimates of the land areas for each infrastructure item which are unconstrained, flood-affected or in a transmission easement.

Indexation of land costs

The Ken Wood valuation was dated October 2017 so to bring land costs into line with the base date for the plan (March 2018), the land costs have been indexed by CPI for one quarter. It is not practical to commence implementation of the land value index (LVI) ahead of IPART's assessment and plan adoption, and in the absence of an LVI, the CPI is the most practical option to index land costs. This is also an indexation option for land costs which applies in many other contributions plans.

Once the plan is adopted, the LVI will be published quarterly, with the derivation of the LVI as noted in **Section 6.3.2** of the plan.

Valuations for land acquisition requirements will be undertaken at least annually, such that the LVI will be published quarterly aside the updated CPI (which would apply to the contributions for works costs, and not land costs).

Council intends to publish its method for calculating the LVI on its website.

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?

Not applicable.

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

The measures taken to minimise costs when making infrastructure and land use decisions are as follows:

- WSUD are located within basins, reducing the overall footprint of the stormwater facilities, and online in flood-affected land, where possible.
- Half of the open space fields are located in flood-affected (and less expensive) land.

Other measures or actions to reduce the cost estimates in the plan are:

- WTP reviewed the cost estimates by ARUP and Elton for transport and open space embellishment respectively, on request of DPE. These revised cost estimates by WTP have been adopted in the plan.
- WTP was also requested to review Mott MacDonald's stormwater costings to ensure the reasonableness of these costs.
- The land costs do not include an additional allowance for just terms compensation payments, over and above the adopted unit rates.
- Council has applied for the low cost loan initiative to reduce interest costs in the plan.

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"/>	Pp 14-15.
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"/>	Pp 14-15 and appendices.
Include a statement regarding potential revision of the scheduled timing for infrastructure delivery	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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.

The plan has prioritised infrastructure provision within five year tranches (as indicated in the attached schedules of lands and works for each infrastructure category to the plan). This indicates that the program of infrastructure delivery will occur over a 15 year period from 2018 to 2033, to align with the expected timeframe for development in the precinct.

Delivery of the infrastructure items has been prioritised to align with essential utility servicing and the expected development sequencing (see **Section 3.1.6** in the plan), noting that development is highly fragmented in Vineyard and so actual development might require variations to this program, depending on the nature and timing of DAs received.

Council has sought to bring forward enabling infrastructure provision through a loan for some key stormwater items (including both land and capital costs) and the design costs associated with certain collector roads (where delivery is expected as works-in-kind by developers, for the most part, within the first five years of the plan).

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"/>	Pp 15-22 & Appendices.

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 apportioned on a per person basis to residential development, shared equally among all such (new) development in the precinct. The ARUP transport study did not suggest particular traffic work would be demanded by certain sub catchments only, rather, the new traffic network has been planned to service the anticipated cumulative development of the precinct. The single contribution rate (per person) simplifies implementation for both Council and developers. An exemption from contributions for non-residential development applies (see the reasons in **Section 2.5** of the plan).

Most transport items are apportioned 100% to the Vineyard Precinct.

However, a smaller share of the cost to address certain roadwork needs on the boundary of the precinct are apportioned to Vineyard, to reflect the shared demand with the adjoining precinct, as follows:

- **Boundary Road** - The upgrade will be needed largely to serve the traffic that will be generated by development in the adjoining urban release areas. Traffic modelling prepared by ARUP has estimated that development within the Vineyard Precinct will be accountable for 43% of future vehicle movements along Boundary Road (**Attachment 8**). The balance of the traffic will be attributable to developments in Box Hill Precinct (48%), and in areas outside of the Vineyard and Box Hill Precincts (9%).
- **Otago Street/Windsor Road intersection** - The four-way Windsor Road/Otago Street intersection will facilitate local traffic movements and form a pedestrian and cyclist link between the Riverstone and Vineyard precincts.

The costs of the intersection are apportioned equally (50% each) to Vineyard precinct and the adjoining Riverstone precinct respectively, excluding the cost of the new tie in road to Vineyard Precinct, which is apportioned 100% to Vineyard. (Note that these proportions are not based on relative populations of the precinct, but the estimated relative usage of the intersection from both precincts and need for the tie in road primarily driven by Vineyard development).

The apportionment approach for this intersection was specifically recommended by DPE, and we understand that this was based on its liaison with RMS regarding the need for the intersection during precinct planning (advice from DPE contained in **Attachments 10 & 11**).

b) Stormwater management land and works

Stormwater costs are apportioned on a per hectare of NDA basis to residential development, shared equally across development in the precinct in a single catchment. This reflects the interconnected nature of the various features of the drainage network and the 'treatment train' approach. An exemption to non-residential development applies.

Demand for the infrastructure is considered to arise from development within the precinct, with any additional demand incidental. The proposed apportionment approach adopted in the contributions plan is consistent with the following factors:

- The detention strategy was developed by comparing precinct flows generated within the Vineyard precinct only and Mott MacDonald did not include externally contributing precincts in its assessment of the impacts directly attributable to the development (p 24 of the MM final report);
- Even though .no detention basins have been provided immediately downstream of the proposed development adjacent to the north-eastern precinct boundary, compensatory storage and flow attenuation has been provided in other locations within the precinct (p 21 of MM final report); and
- The proposed non-residential development zone will be required to provide its own on-site detention and will not be allowed for in the regional detention requirement (p 21 of the MM final report).

c) Open space land and works (embellishments)

Open space costs are apportioned on a per person basis to residential development, across the whole precinct.

All open space land and embellishment costs in the plan are apportioned 100% to the Vineyard Precinct, consistent with the findings in the Elton study that demand for the new infrastructure will arise from new development internal to the precinct.

a) Community services land

Community services land costs are apportioned on a per person basis to residential development, across the whole precinct. This reflects shared access to the facility within the precinct, particularly given its location near the village centre.

The multipurpose community facility land cost is apportioned 50% to the Vineyard Precinct only, with the remaining 50% of the costs to be apportioned to future development in the Vineyard West Precinct. This reflects an indicative estimate of the relative demand from each precinct only because the forecast population for Vineyard West is not yet known.

b) Plan preparation and administration

Contributions for plan preparation and administration are levied on a per hectare of NDA basis across all residential development in the plan.

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?

The plan was exhibited from 18 May to 18 June 2018 inclusive (**Attachment 2** provides a copy of the exhibited plan).

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

Council considered that DPE had already undertaken extensive community consultation to inform the rezoning of the precinct. This consultation has included:

- Community workshops and follow up newsletter updates on planning progress
- Discussion paper (June 2014) and other consultation material (fact sheet, FAQs etc)
- Exhibition of Draft Indicative Layout Plan (ILP) and planning controls and responses to issues raised incorporated in the final ILP, planning finalization report and rezoning.

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

The Council's response to the submissions (**Attachment 3**) is provided in the "Summary of submissions and Council response" document at **Attachment 4**. Changes to the plan post exhibition are listed in **Attachment 5**.

The main issues raised concerned:

- The quantum of contributions, and the potential negative impact on land values and development progress (primarily raised by landowners); and
- The timing of the rezoning and that the area is no longer LIGS-funded, particularly when neighbouring precincts such as Box Hill are still being LIGS subsidized during the program phase-out period.

In response, Council considers that the contributions are reasonable to ensure enough funding is available to provide the essential infrastructure to allow development to occur. If the contributions were reduced, given current State Government policy settings, this would mean Council would have to direct resources away from other programs. Ratepayers outside of the Vineyard Precinct would then be subsidising Vineyard development.

Nonetheless, Council has considered ways to reduce the contributions (and still deliver the infrastructure). It has reduced the term of the proposed loan to 10 years, which together with other revisions to the draft plan (including for minor land acquisition area changes and adjustments to the cost of land for drainage items), has reduced average contributions to \$70,789 for low density dwellings/lots.

Council is applying for subsidised interest costs for this loan through the State Government's Low Cost Loan Initiative. This has resulted in further minor adjustments to the infrastructure costs to be funded from the loan to align with the criteria which prioritises infrastructure to be delivered by 2021.

If the loan assistance is granted, this would reduce the interest costs payable under the loan and further reduce contributions (although by a relatively marginal amount only).

Council also fielded phone inquiries during the submission period about the calculation of actual contribution rates payable, and in response, has adjusted the plan for greater clarity with an example rate calculation, and additional information about the land value index derivation and implementation.

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

No, development is imminent and Council intends to adopt the IPART-assessed plan as soon as possible to facilitate development and timely infrastructure provision. Council also notes that IPART will be accepting submissions on this draft plan, in addition to Council's exhibition of an earlier version.

Therefore, notwithstanding major changes to the plan advised by the Minister, and so long as total contributions are below those already exhibited for all developers, Council considers that its recent exhibition of the draft plan provides for reasonable consultation.

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

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?

Council is exploring interim VPA arrangements with developers to ensure that development can still progress prior to the final contributions plan being adopted, post-IPART assessment and Council's receipt of the Ministerial advice.

Under the VPA, Council intends for contributions to be based on the rates in this draft plan, with a clause within the agreement that allows future reconciliation of the contributions based on any amendments required as a result of the IPART review and the Minister's advice.

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

Council has primarily relied on the expected yield, population and infrastructure need and cost information from DPE's precinct planning process to inform this contributions plan.

DPE provided an updated NDA estimate in January 2018, before the draft contributions plan was exhibited by Council, in light of the reduced development potential of a number of E4 lots.

DPE also recommended that the NDA definition include internal roads. This was to align with the SEPP density definition, as follows:

density means the ratio of the number of dwellings to the area of the land to be occupied by the residential development, including internal streets and half the width of any roads adjoining the development that provide vehicular access to the development but excluding land that is not zoned for residential purposes.

Copies of the relevant emails from DPE are provided with this application (**Attachment 7**).

Also, Council has applied for the NSW Government's Low Cost Loan Initiative for the full amount of the proposed loan in the plan. If granted, this would reduce the loan interest costs (based on a 50% interest rate subsidy). Council anticipates a response from the NSW Government before its final adoption of the plan so that it can apply the reduced interest costs.

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

Council has already received a number of DAs and so the timing of plan adoption is critical.

Council has acted quickly on the rezoning of the precinct, which occurred in December 2017. Council submitted an earlier version of the plan for IPART informal review in February 2018 to help expedite this assessment.

Council is seeking a second-best VPA interim arrangement option with developers, without the adopted contributions plan yet in place. This is to avoid facing a shortfall of funding for infrastructure requirements with capped contributions (at \$30,000 per dwelling/lot).

GLN Planning has been engaged to assist with the plan finalization and IPART assessment process and, together with Council staff, are equipped to respond quickly to any follow up questions from IPART. This should help ensure the process is as streamlined and efficient as possible.

We request that these factors be considered in the planned schedule for IPART's assessment.

4 Quality assurance

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

The purpose of the council's QA check is to identify and address any errors or inconsistencies within the work schedules and also between the contributions plan and relevant supporting information to ensure that the plan, as submitted, is accurate. This 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.

The draft contributions plan has been prepared by GLN Planning, on behalf of Council. GLN has undertaken a number of internal checks of the information contained in the plan and work schedule.

Council's finance and planning teams have undertaken further checks of the costs, including the loan costs, in the plan.

The plan and works schedule were also checked by a DPE planning officer.

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 checked="" 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 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 type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input checked="" 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

VPA's	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 type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input checked="" 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"/>