



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

Wollongong City Council
West Dapto Development Contributions Plan (2020)



Contents

1	Instructions	1
1.1	Who should fill in this application form?	1
1.2	How should a council submit an application?	1
2	Preliminary Information	2
2.1	All applications	2
2.2	For contributions plans previously reviewed by IPART	3
3	Assessment Criteria	5
3.1	Criterion 1 – the Essential Works List	5
3.2	Criterion 2 – Nexus	6
3.3	Criterion 3 – Reasonable costs	9
3.4	Criterion 4 – Reasonable timeframe	15
3.5	Criterion 5 – Reasonable apportionment	16
3.6	Criterion 6 – Appropriate community liaison	18
3.7	Criterion 7 – The plan complies with other matters IPART considers relevant	20
4	Quality assurance	23
5	Attachment checklist	1

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 1) 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@ipart.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	Wollongong City Council
Primary council contact details (Provide name, position, phone number, and email address)	David Fitzgibbon Urban Release Manager [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Secondary council contact details (Provide name, position, phone number, and email address)	Melissa Ballinger Strategic Project Officer – Development Contributions [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

B. Information about the plan

What is the name of the plan?	West Dapto Development Contributions Plan (2020)
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)?	6A
What is the current maximum contribution amount (per lot or dwelling) for this plan under the Ministerial Direction?	\$45,000
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?	Standard rate - per lot/dwelling \$52,950.94 Multi-unit rate - 4+ bedrooms \$47,986.80 - 3 bedrooms \$41,367.93 - 2 bedrooms \$36,403.77 - 0-1 bedrooms \$28,130.19
When was the plan publicly exhibited?	Saturday 29 June to Friday 2 August 2019. Late submissions accepted to 16 August.
Has the council adopted the plan? If so, when was it adopted and when did it come into force?	The Draft 2020 Plan was adopted on 24 June 2019 where Council supported public

	<p>exhibition. On 2 September 2019 Council again adopted the Draft 2020 Plan for submission to IPART including copies of all public submissions.</p> <p>The <i>West Dapto Section 94 Development Contributions Plan (2017)</i> was adopted by Council on 11 December 2017 and came into force on 18 December 2017.</p> <p>A minor amendment to the 2017 Plan was adopted by Council on 2 September 2019 and came into force on 11 September 2019.</p>
To what extent was the Department of Planning & Environment (DPE) involved in the development of this plan?	DPE has had limited involvement in the preparation of this Plan. Department staff were also informed of the exhibition period.
Over what period will development in the catchment area of the plan occur?	Approximately 50 years - between 2010 and 2060
What proportion of the total projected development in the catchment area of the plan has been approved and/or constructed?	<p>Approximately (as at July 2019):</p> <p>DA approval issued for 1,839 lots</p> <p>Subdivision Certificates issued for 1,517 lots</p>
What planning instruments (SEPPs, LEPs, or DCPs) apply to land in the catchment area of the plan?	<p>Wollongong LEP 2009</p> <p>Wollongong DCP 2009</p> <p>State-wide SEPP's</p>
Has the Minister referred this contributions plan to IPART for review? If so, provide details.	The Plan is being referred to IPART for review in accordance with the Ministerial Direction.

2.2 For contributions plans previously reviewed by IPART

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

C. Information about revisions to the plan

Why is the council submitting the revised plan for IPART's review?	<p>Recommendation 40 of the IPART October 2016 report on the 2017 Plan requires Council to review the plan every 2 years. This application is the first review of the 2017 Plan.</p> <p>The Draft 2020 Plan proposes a contribution rate over the relevant cap of \$30,000 and therefore needs to be reviewed by IPART.</p>
<p>Briefly explain how the plan has been revised in response to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recommendations made in IPART's 	Attachment 2 of the 24 June 2019 Council Report addresses the IPART previous recommendations. Copy available at the

<p>assessment report on the previous version/s of the plan, and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - any directions from the Minister for Planning in relation to IPART's assessment. 	<p>following link:</p> <p>https://wollongong.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0021/37137/Draft-West-Dapto-Development-Contributions-Plan-2020-for-Exhibition.pdf</p>
<p>Briefly explain any other revisions to the plan such as updated costings, revised apportionment of costs, or amended delivery timeframe.</p>	<p>The Plan has been updated in line with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the revised West Dapto Structure Plan which was adopted by Council in December 2018 as part of the West Dapto Vision 2018 - Wollongong LEP, 2009 as updated through Planning Proposals - Wollongong DCP 2009 as updated through adopted Neighbourhood Plans - Other strategy or policy updates. <p>Construction cost estimates have either been updated or indexed to December 2018.</p> <p>Land acquisition costs have been updated based on a September 2018 valuation report.</p> <p>Each infrastructure item has been given a unique 4 digit reference that is used consistently in tables, schedules and maps.</p> <p>Infrastructure item descriptions and estimated delivery timeframes have been updated.</p> <p>Legislative references have been updated.</p> <p>The apportionment methodology for residential and non-residential development was revised.</p> <p>Please also refer to the 24 June 2019 Council Report for further detail:</p> <p>https://wollongong.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0021/37137/Draft-West-Dapto-Development-Contributions-Plan-2020-for-Exhibition.pdf</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 ...	Yes	No	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Include land or works not on the EWL	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Clause 4.2 (pg 26) and Schedule 2 (pg 55) - Community Centres.
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"/>	The construction costs for community centres are not included in the plan or the calculation of contribution rates (Schedule 2 - page 55).

1. If the plan includes costs for land and/or works not on the Essential Works List:

- a) list these items below, and
- b) indicate how their costs are to be met.

N/A

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

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

Please refer to Table 10 on page 28 of the Draft 2020 Plan.

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 on page 7
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"/>	Part 3 (from page 15). Text and tables within clauses 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4
Include information about:			
▼ the existing population in the catchment area	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Clause 3.1 on page 15
▼ the projected residential population and/or workforce	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Clause 3.2 from page 15
Include details about how the need for land and works was determined	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Clause 3.5 on page 17, clause 3.8 on page 19, Part 4 (from page 21)
Refer to design and construction standards used in determining the works in the plan	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This level of information is generally not included in the Plan. For transport infrastructure design details such as road width and length, bridge types, lengths and widths is included in tables 12-14 on pages 34-43.

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.

Transport land and works

- West Dapto Vision 2018 (Wollongong City Council, 2018)
- Illawarra-Shoalhaven Regional Plan (NSW Government, 2015)
- Road Infrastructure (Section 94) Estimates Review (GHD, 2010)
- Marshall Mount and Yallah Road Upgrade – Strategic Concept design (SMEC, 2015)
- TRACKS Land Use/Transport models
- West Dapto Urban Release Area – Integrated Transport Plan (Aecom, October 2010)
- West Dapto Urban Release Area Stages 1 & 2 – Road Network Infrastructure needs Study – Transport Modelling & Analysis (WCC, Oct 2010)
- Yallah Marshall Mount Precinct Draft Structure Plan and Infrastructure Costs Report (WCC, 2015)
- West Dapto Masterplan Traffic & Transport Review (Urbanhorizon Pty Ltd, 2008)

- West Dapto Transport Link Review (Cardno, 2008)
- West Dapto Release Area Access Review (Cardno, 2008)
- Peer Review (Urbanhorizon Traffic & Transport Report (Northrop, 2008)
- West Dapto Local Environmental Study (Wollongong City Council, 2007).
- Transport Management and Access Plan (KBR Pty Ltd, 2007)
- West Dapto T-Map extension Study (Connell Wagner 2008)

Stormwater land and management works

- West Dapto Vision 2018 (Wollongong City Council, 2018)
- Mullet Creek Flood Model Update (BMT WBM, 2018)
- Illawarra-Shoalhaven Regional Plan (NSW Government, 2015)
- Duck Creek Flood Study (BMT WBM, 2012)
- Mullet and Brooks Creek Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan (Bewsher, 2010)
- Mullet Creek, West Dapto Extension of Flood Model (Bewsher, 2011)
- West Dapto Development Area Mullet Creek Flood Modelling (Bewsher December, 2009)
- West Dapto Review – Flooding & Stormwater Strategy (Bewsher Consulting Pty Ltd, 2008)
- Flood Access Strategy for West Dapto (Molino Stewart Pty Ltd, 2008)
- West Dapto Local Environmental Study (Wollongong City Council, 2007).
- Water Cycle Management Study (URS, 2004)

Open space land and works (embellishments)

- West Dapto Vision 2018 (Wollongong City Council, 2018)
- Illawarra-Shoalhaven Regional Plan (NSW Government, 2015)
- Social, Cultural and Recreation Needs Study (Elton Consulting, 2007)

Community services land

- West Dapto Vision 2018 (Wollongong City Council, 2018)
- Places for People: Wollongong Social Infrastructure Planning Framework 2018-2028 (Wollongong City Council, 2018)
- Illawarra-Shoalhaven Regional Plan (NSW Government, 2015)
- Social, Cultural and Recreation Needs Study (Elton Consulting, 2007)

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

N/A

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

At a category level:

- Open Space & Recreation – It was identified that only residential development will create the demand for open space & recreation (based on population), and therefore non-residential development was not considered when determining the required open space & recreation infrastructure (see clause 4.1.4 on page 22).
- Community Facilities – It was identified that only residential development will create the demand for community facilities, and therefore non-residential development was not considered when determining the need for community facilities (see clause 4.2.4 on page 27).
- Transport – It was identified that all land uses, including both residential and non-residential development, will create the demand for transport infrastructure Council’s strategic “TRACKS” traffic modelling factors in all land uses and traffic generation when determining transport requirements.
- Stormwater Management – It was identified that all land uses, including both residential and non-residential development, will create the demand for stormwater management infrastructure. This has been done on a developable land area basis.

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 suburb of Horsley was largely developed between 1993 and 2010 and infrastructure was provided for under a previous contributions plan. Only the expected remaining development from this area (mainly infill) is included in the Plan’s dwelling projections and infrastructure requirements. Although there are some other small pockets of existing residential development within the WDURA, the remaining catchment is largely rural and undeveloped.
 - b) The WDURA sits to the west of the existing suburb of Dapto (which includes an established town centre), to the north of the greenfield Calderwood development site, to the south of the existing suburb of Kembla Grange and to the east of the escarpment. Therefore, the site is generally self-contained in terms of its development and infrastructure requirements. Notwithstanding, there are three road items in the Plan that have a nexus with the Calderwood development, and two open space items that will serve a broader catchment.
 - c) There is generally no existing infrastructure within the catchment that will accommodate the future population.
 - d) Other than existing external transport networks that will be accessed from the WDURA, there is generally no infrastructure outside the catchment area that will service the future population.

3.3 Criterion 3 – Reasonable costs

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

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

Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Explain how the proposed cost of works was derived (eg, quantity surveyor or other consultant advice, standard costs used by the council)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	General commentary is provided at clause 3.6 on page 18. Further detail is provided in Part B .
Explain how the proposed cost of land was derived	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Tables in Part 4 include land area and cost of land.
Include a schedule of the contributions rates (eg, \$/ha, \$/person, \$/dwelling)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Part 1, Tables 1 to 3 on page 5
Explain how the contribution rates will be adjusted for inflation/ changes in costs	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Clauses 2.23 and 2.24 on page 12
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"/>	Clause 2.20 on page 11 and clauses 2.27 and 2.28 on page 13
If using a Net Present Value (NPV) approach, include assumptions made in the modelling of costs and revenue	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A

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

December 2018

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

Refer to matters such as:

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

- **Transport works**

Please refer to Application Part B for detailed workings.

Each transport item (i.e. TR##) includes road sections, intersections and bridges. Each of these sub-items is costed based on the type (i.e. number of lanes, roundabout or traffic lights), length and width of the item. Please refer to the "Transport" tab for details on each transport item.

In regards to unit rates, a number of options and factors were considered during the preparation of the Plan. As the majority of the roads have not been designed concept based estimates were generally not available. The detailed estimate for one road which is currently being constructed was considered, however as this is a site-specific detailed estimate it was not considered reasonable to apply this across the whole of the WDURA. The use of IPART's 2014 benchmark costs was also considered, however these rates were significantly higher than the existing base rates (even with indexation) so it wasn't considered that this significant increase could be sufficiently justified.

It was therefore considered most reasonable to continue to use the existing base rates, indexed to December 2018 using Producer Price Index (Road & Bridge Construction) ABS Index Number #3101, as suggested by IPART.

Please refer to the "Variable Inputs" tab for details on unit rates and indexation.

The following items are based on actual construction costs:

- B28 – Smiths Lane bridge (constructed through a Planning Agreement)
- Intersection 25 – Shone Ave & Horsley Drv (constructed through a Planning Agreement)

The following items are based on tender construction costs or specific estimates:

- TR23 Fowlers Road Extension
- Bridge 52 – Huntley Rd (rail bridge) (part TR15)
- Bridge 61 – Western Ring Rd (part TR25)
- Bridge 62 – Western Ring Rd (part TR25)

For transport items a contingency of 20% has been applied where the unit rate is used and 10% for project management.

e) Stormwater management works

Stormwater management costs are based on the following:

SM01 Detention basins – a per cubic metre rate, based on the Bewsher 2007 Report and indexed to 2018 using Producer Price Index (Road & Bridge Construction) ABS Index Number #3101, as suggested by IPART.

SM01 GPT's – The per unit cost estimate for GPT's was updated based on the IPART 2014 Benchmark cost report Item 2.1.4 – see (g) below.

SM02 to SM06 ESA's – The cost estimate has not been updated from the URS 2004 Report used in the previously plan versions and indexed to 2018.

SM07 Trunk drainage – The cost estimate for this item has not been updated from the previous plan. The rate is based on a per square metre rate (2016) and indexed to 2018.

All Stormwater Management estimates have been indexed to December 2018 using Producer Price Index (Road & Bridge Construction) ABS Index Number #3101, as suggested by IPART.

A contingency of 30% has been applied.

f) Open space works (embellishments)

Except where actuals costs are known, the cost for open space embellishment has not been updated from the previous plan. Standard unit rates have been used, indexed to December 2018. A comparison was carried out between the existing rates and the IPART 2014 benchmarks and the current rates were found to be generally consistent (depending on the assumed level of embellishment).

NEW ROW:

(g) Use of IPART Benchmark costs (2014)

TR30 Bus Shelters

The IPART 2014 benchmark unit cost of \$17,515 (indexed to 31 December 2018) was not amended (other than indexation) from CP2017 where it was used. The use of the benchmark costs for bus shelters was supported in both IPARTs 2016 review of CP2017 and the 2018 Information Paper:

IPART Assessment of WCC's Draft West Dapto S94 Plan (2016 report)

Bus infrastructure cost estimates

WCC has based the cost of bus shelters in the plan on IPART's local infrastructure costs benchmark report. We consider that this approach is reasonable.

IPART Information Paper: Guidance for contributions plans – Local Infrastructure Benchmark Costs (2018)

Box 1.1 Past findings on the use of benchmark costs

In our assessments, we have found the use of benchmark costs to be reasonable in several contexts:

- *West Dapto CP – for bus shelters, which were of a relatively low/insignificant value*

In this instance is it considered reasonable to use a benchmark cost for the following reasons:

- There is insufficient information to inform a site-specific cost estimate, for example at the early stages of infrastructure planning (prior to the preparation of concept designs).
- No bus stops have been constructed within the WDURA upon which to compare, verify or update the estimate.

TR32 – TR35 Shared use pathway

IPART Information Paper: Guidance for contributions plans – Local Infrastructure Benchmark Costs (2018)

In this instance is it considered reasonable to use a benchmark cost for the following reasons:

- *There is insufficient information to inform a site-specific cost estimate, for example at the early stages of infrastructure planning (prior to the preparation of concept designs).*
- *The shared use pathways that have been constructed within the WDURA were delivered through works in kind at the value in the 2017 CP. No specific estimates were sought as the amount was minor and insignificant.*

SM01 Detention Basins (including GPTs)

The cost estimate for part of this item – being the Gross Pollutant Traps (GPTs) but not the basins – are based on the IPART 2014 benchmark Item 2.1.4 Proprietary GPT system – design flow 370l/s.

In this instance is it considered reasonable to use a benchmark cost for the following reasons:

IPART Information Paper: Guidance for contributions plans – Local Infrastructure Benchmark Costs (8 October 2018)

- *There is insufficient information to inform a site-specific cost estimate, for example at the early stages of infrastructure planning (prior to the preparation of concept designs).*
- Actual costs for this item were sought internally from previous Council projects, however no firm costs could be provided due to access issues into historic financial records and also no recent installations within last 10 years by Council.
- Previous DAs were reviewed to help identify the type of unit proposed for new developments within West Dapto – the majority being CDS or Ecosol types. From previous site inspection observations, the units installed on these sites have been multiple Ecosols being equivalent to sub-item 2.1.4 of the IPART benchmark datasheets.
- *The cost of the infrastructure item is likely to be insignificant in the context of the total cost of infrastructure in the contributions plan and relying on benchmark costs is therefore unlikely to result in a significant overstatement or understatement of costs.*
- Stormwater Management represents less than 1% of the total Plan (or about \$9m of \$959m).

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

This cost has been calculated based on the total cost of works at the IPART recommended rate of 1.5%. This was compared to the expected costs over the life of the Plan and found to be generally accurate.

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?

Where land has been acquired through a previous version of the contributions plan the actual cost has been used.

For land already owned by Council for the purpose of providing infrastructure no cost is included - for example, Item CF02 is an upgrade to the existing Wongawilli Hall. Council already owns the land which is used for a community purpose, and no additional land is required to support the upgrade. Therefore no land value is included in the Plan for this item.

Where Council owned land for operational purposes the cost of land has been included at the standard rate (i.e. Item OS01 City wide sports park is partly on Council owned operational land and has been valued based on the standard open space rates used throughout the plan).

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

Council obtained an updated land acquisition valuation report. This report is titled West Dapto Urban Release Area Section 94 Contribution Policy (MMJ, 2018) and is included as an attachment to this application. The relevant land value (i.e. open space, riparian) has been applied on an item by item basis, including split values where relevant.

The August 2018 land values have not been indexed.

It is noted that the Plan does not include any costs associated with the process of land acquisition (in addition to the land value). The IPART Information Paper was reviewed (post exhibition) and it may have been reasonable for additional on costs such as legal, conveyancing and valuation fees, to be included in the Plan.

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?

N/A

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

This has been an overarching consideration and aim throughout the preparation of the Plan. Efficiencies were also a consideration during preparation of the West Dapto Vision 2018 which is the most contemporary policy document that has informed the Draft 2020 Plan preparation.

For example the transport network, in particular roads, were revised as part of the West Dapto Vision 2018 preparation. The Vision document's Structure Plan replaced Council previous 2009 version. This Draft 2020 Plan implements those efficiencies. A couple of specific roads where efficiencies were achieved through the Vision Document process and are now included in the Draft 2020 Plan include TR19 Northcliffe Drive extension west and TR24 Eastern Link Road (Bong Bong Road to Fowlers Road). Page 36 of the West Dapto Vision outlines key road network changes which is summaries as follows:

- TR19. Referred to as Northcliffe Drive in the Vision now extends along existing Reddalls Road and west to connect with West Dapto Road just east of Shone Avenue. This road location is the most efficient & direct main route with flood reliability to service the release area. Council identified a significant strategic cost saving with this route compared to the previous policy position of relying on upgrading West Dapto Road for the same purpose.
- TR24. The West Dapto Vision removed the North-South Link Road (between Darkes Road and Bong Bong Road) This previous connection would have connected at the intersection

of Bong Bong Road and TR24. This change has resulted in reduced transport network costs.

WDURA is a physically constrained greenfield development site. As a result, there can be higher costs for essential infrastructure works such as roads, bridges and drainage infrastructure which are designed to ensure accessibility and safety in flood events.

See also response to outstanding IPART recommendations 10, 15 and 18 at Attachment 2 of the 24 June 2019 Council Report.

3.4 Criterion 4 – Reasonable timeframe

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

Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	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"/>	Clause 3.2 on page 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"/>	Expected timing of delivery is discussed at clause 3.7 on page 18 and at an item level in Tables 9, 10, 11 and 17.
Include a statement regarding potential revision of the scheduled timing for infrastructure delivery	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Clause 3.7 on page 18.

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 timeframes for infrastructure delivery that were established through previous plan versions were reviewed and updated to account for:

- Updated Neighbourhood Plans (i.e. likely order of development)
- Revised zoning, including introduction of more urban zoned land in the WDURA, via Planning Proposals (i.e. likely order of development)
- Completed works (i.e. update with actual timeframe)
- Staging of development and required infrastructure provision
- TRACKS modelling used to determine when roads are required

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"/>	Clause 3.4 on page 17

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

The WDURA is transitioning from rural to urban development. Whilst some development had occurred prior to the adoption of this Plan in 2010 the required infrastructure was provided under previous and since repealed contributions plans, therefore the development anticipated in this Plan is wholly generating the demand for the infrastructure in the Plan (as opposed to a site that includes infill development). That is, had the WDURA development not progressed, the infrastructure items within this Plan would not be required as the existing population is adequately serviced.

The only exception to this is:

- Two open space items that will be provided at a broader level:
 - OS01 City wide sport park (50%);
 - OS13 Community leisure and recreation centre (50%).
- Three road items that provide connectivity from the Calderwood development to the M1 via the WDURA
 - TR16 Yallah Road (75.75% apportioned to Plan)
 - TR17 Marshall Mount Road (44.27% apportionment to Plan)
 - TR29 Marshall Mount Town Centre By Pass (24.66% apportionment to Plan)

Between land uses, the Plan apportions the total cost of infrastructure between residential and non-residential development based on an adjusted land area. For this purpose non-residential development includes the development of Business and Industrial zoned land, as well as other

non-residential development, for example SP2 land. The methodology used to calculate the adjusted land area and apportionment is shown at Tables 7 and 8 on page 17 of the Plan.

The Plan also considers the demand on infrastructure from various types of dwellings and the contributions rates are structured accordingly. The methodology is that the total cost of infrastructure apportioned to residential development (from the calculation outlined above) is first divided by the expected population to give a 'per person' contribution rate. This 'per person' rate is then multiplied by the assumed occupancy rate for each type of dwelling, resulting in a per lot/dwelling contribution rate which is used to calculate the contribution amount payable. This is shown at clause 4.6 on page 53.

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 publicly exhibited between Saturday 29 June and Friday 2 August 2019 (35 days). The exhibition included:

- An advertisement in the local newspaper 'The Advertiser' on Wednesday 3 July 2019.
- An advertisement in the local newspaper 'Illawarra Mercury' on Saturday 6 July 2019.
- The Draft Plan was available online through councils community engagement page "Have Your Say".
- Hard copies of the Draft Plan were made available at Councils Administration Building and at all libraries.

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

Yes. A number of briefings were provided to Neighbourhood forums and industry groups. These included:

- July 2019 a presentation was provided to the Illawarra-Shoalhaven Urban Development Program Committee meeting.
- 10 July 2019 a presentation was provided at the Neighbourhood Forum 8 meeting.
- 24 July 2019 a presentation was provided at the UDIA meeting.
- 12 August 2019 the General Manager and Director Planning & Environment (Acting) met with the Property Council and UDIA.

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

The submissions have been recorded in a register that includes a summary of key issues raised.

This summary table was reported to Council at the 2 September 2018 meeting – see Attachment 1 of that report.

At this meeting Council resolved that:

- 1 *The key issues raised in submissions be noted.*
- 2 *The Draft West Dapto Development Contributions Plan (2020) be submitted to IPART (as exhibited) along with full copies of all submissions received for independent review.*
- 3 *A report be presented back to Council with the IPART recommendations and NSW Minister for Planning's advice in relation to the finalisation of the 2020 Plan. The report will clearly outline how all public submissions have been considered and responded to during preparation of the final 2020 Plan.*

The reasons for submitting the Draft Plan (as exhibited) along with submissions to IPART are discussed in the council report. Essentially, as a number of the submissions referred to a perceived conflict of interest by council (as council is a land owner in Stages 1-3). It was therefore considered important to have the submissions considered independently through IPART's independent and transparent processes.

Notwithstanding, Council officers are in the process of considering and collating technical responses to each of the submissions and these can be provided to IPART upon request to assist with the review process.

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

No.

The council reports have outlined the process from here and opportunities for further comment, including the exhibition of IPART's draft report and the matter being reported back to council for finalisation.

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 has previously entered into Planning Agreements to facilitate the implementation of the West Dapto contributions plan. Our more recent practice is to utilise 'works in kind' (sections 7.11(5) and 7.11(6) of the EP&A Act).

Where an infrastructure item has been constructed, or land dedicated, through a Planning Agreement the value in the Plan has been updated accordingly.

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

The population and dwelling projections in the plan remain unchanged from the current plan. These have been calculated using an in-house land use density model which considers a full WDURA development scenario.

There is a risk connected to the uncertainty of the proposed Illawarra- Shoalhaven Special Infrastructure Contributions (proposed SIC), which is being progressed by the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment. Council staff understands that DPE intend for the proposed SIC to replace the previous draft West Lake Illawarra SIC 2010. The State currently secures contributions from development at West Dapto through voluntary planning agreements based on the contribution rate identified in the draft West Lake Illawarra SIC (\$73,219 per hectare).

The Draft 2020 Plan does not propose collection of contributions for key regional / state significant infrastructure identified in the draft West Lake Illawarra SIC 2010 such as the Northcliffe Drive Extension (Regional), which is the major bridge required to ensure Northcliffe Drive extends into West Dapto via a grade separated rail crossing.

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

Response to IPART preliminary feedback received by Council during the exhibition period:

IPART preliminary feedback (a): In instances where IPART's 2014 benchmarks are used, please explain why these are suitable with reference to IPART's October 2018 Guidance on Local Infrastructure Benchmark Costs

Council officer response:

Please refer to response at Item 8 (g) above.

IPART preliminary feedback (b): Council's memo accompanying the draft plan indicates that it has done significant work to investigate the impact of the 2 scenarios presented in IPART Rec 29... As part of your application can you please provide the analysis/calculations (if you have them) that informed the council's conclusion that dividing the release area by stages does not create more cost reflective contribution rates?

Council officer response:

Initial investigation work included a review of the infrastructure items and relevant nexus to each stage on a demand (not location) basis. This process found that the majority of infrastructure has a shared nexus demand - as discussed further in the 24 June 2019 Council Report. Attachment 2 of that Council report provides the reasoning.

We then considered the impact of making a fundamental change to the plan's application part way through its operation and found that this would create an inconsistency and inequity between timing of development. For example, the majority of development to date has been within stages 1&2 so if additional cost was apportioned to these stages this would create an immediate shortfall to the plan for each development already levied.

IPART preliminary feedback (c): Transport - Section 4.3.4, Nexus and Apportionment (page 31), if not already included, please indicate the basis that informed the percentage of apportionment for transport infrastructure to the Calderwood development precinct. In addition, as a general rule, when infrastructure items are not apportioned 100% to West Dapto, please indicate the information that informs the apportionment.

Council officer response:

TRACKS strategic transport modelling was used to inform apportionment of transport infrastructure to the Calderwood development. This was undertaken using Council's ultimate development model for West Dapto and Calderwood (circa 2060, but referred to as the '2036+' model). Essentially the model was used to determine the percentage of traffic on road links in Yallah-Marshall Mt that is related to Calderwood land use zones.

Traffic Design Group (TDG) in NZ (previously Gabites Porter) have reviewed this process and have agreed it is appropriate to calculating the apportionment of costs to a particular development, and provides an absolute nexus between trips generated by the development and their contribution to the improvements needed on the network links that are used.

IPART preliminary feedback (d): Please explain the basis for the occupancy rates. Have occupancy rates been updated based on the 2016 Census?

Council officer response: The assumed occupancy rates have not been updated from the 2017 Plan. They are based on assumed occupancy rates for a range of dwelling types specific to West Dapto. A range of other assumptions were considered as part of the review including ABS, .id forecast and SGS, however the current assumptions were found to be reasonable and there was not sufficient justification to warrant changing them (noting that this would impact the contribution rates and overall financial sustainability of the Plan).

IPART preliminary feedback (e): It appears from the works schedule that the council has not included any allowance for additional costs associated with land acquisitions (for legal, valuation and other costs the council may have to pay to dispossessed owners under the provisions of the *Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991*. If the council intends to include such an allowance, it should ensure that the basis of the allowance is clearly justified. You may wish to review our [Information Paper on assessment of land costs](#) in contributions plans for further information.

Council officer response:

This is discussed at item 11 above - It is noted that the Plan does not include any costs associated with land acquisition. The IPART Information Paper was reviewed (post exhibition) and it may have been reasonable for additional on costs such as legal, conveyancing and valuation fees, to be included in the Plan.

IPART preliminary feedback (f): In the works schedule can you please clearly identify instances where the council has incurred actual expenditure against each infrastructure item. Our assessment may include a reconciliation between actual and estimated expenditure.

Council officer response:

Please refer to Part B. The actual cost is shown as the difference between any “planned” costs and the cost which is used to calculate the contribution. For example, the planned pavement cost for TR08 Shone Ave is different to the actual pavement cost. There are also columns reflecting the actual expenditure within the work schedules (columns CZ to DP in transport work schedules).

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 spread sheets used to calculate costs and contribution rates are held by a Finance Officer who has sole access to the file. This process ensures that all data entered and any changes to the spread sheets are done by one person.

The spread sheet data was informed by a number of different officers in different departments. For example, the Transport schedule information was provided by the Urban Release Transport Officer (who had also liaised with traffic, design, project delivery and infrastructure teams), the Stormwater Management came from the Stormwater Development Engineer and so on.

An officer in Land Use Planning checked all of the data and the contribution rate calculations.

The schedules (Part 5) have been inserted into the Plan document as a picture to ensure data integrity.

The EP&A Regulation requirements have been reviewed to ensure that the Plan complies with all requirements.

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 spreadsheets that provide the information listed above	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Spreadsheet attached to email application.
	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"/>	File Drop
Version of contributions plan publicly exhibited	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	See above (no post exhibition changes)
Version of contributions plan previously submitted to IPART for review	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	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"/>
	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"/>
	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

Drop for full copies. The 2 September 2019 Council report explains Council's current response.

Technical studies and consultant documents

Land valuation report/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>	File Drop
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"/>	File Drop
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"/>	File Drop <i>Note: Additional documents to be sent on 23/9/19 when Transport Engineer returns from leave.</i>
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"/>	File Drop
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"/>	File Drop

Maps

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

Other documents

VPAs	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>	File Drop
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"/>	The value of any grant funding received for a project is not included in the Plan Cost.
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"/>	See links to website provided at Attachment 1 below.
Any other documents that you think could be useful in IPART's assessment of the contributions plan	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Council Attachment 1 Links to relevant documents

- 11 December 2017 Council Report – Draft West Dapto Section 94 Development Contributions Plan 2017 for Adoption
https://wollongong.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/38414/Item-3-Draft-West-Dapto-Section-94-Development-Contributions-Plan-2017-for-Adoption.pdf
- 27 May 2019 Council Report – West Dapto Development Contributions Plan (2017) - Minor Amendment
https://wollongong.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/37172/West-Dapto-Development-Contributions-Plan-2017-Minor-Amendment.pdf
- 24 June 2019 Council Report - Draft West Dapto Development Contributions Plan 2020 for Exhibition
https://wollongong.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0021/37137/Draft-West-Dapto-Development-Contributions-Plan-2020-for-Exhibition.pdf
- 2 September 2019 Council Report – West Dapto Development Contributions Plan (2017) Minor Amendment for Adoption
https://wollongong.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/42021/West-Dapto-Development-Contributions-Plan-2017-Minor-Amendment-for-Adoption.pdf
- 2 September 2019 Council Report – Draft West Dapto Development Contributions Plan (2020) Post Exhibition
https://wollongong.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/42022/Draft-West-Dapto-Development-Contributions-Plan-2020-Post-Exhibition.pdf