

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**ORDER OF BUSINESS – DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

APOLOGIES.....	2
DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY OR CONFLICT OF INTEREST.....	2
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE PUBLIC ADDRESSES .....	2
1. Three-Lot Torrens Title Subdivision, No 67 (Lot 214 DP 27602) Chisholm Rd, Catherine Field.....	3
2. Additions to Dwelling, Lot 116 DP 31406 No 29 Pindari Avenue, Camden .....	9
3. Petition Re: DA 1096/2003 - Proposed Mount Annan Christian Church (Auditorium and Car Parking), 347 Narellan Road, Currans Hill.....	15
4. Unauthorised Building Works at No 53 Engesta Avenue, Camden.....	16
5. Local Development Taskforce Report .....	18
6. Mayoral Delegation over the Christmas Period.....	29
7. Appeal Against Camden Council’s Decision to Issue Wesco Concrete Company With a Penalty Infringement Notice .....	30
8. Construction of a New Building and Car Park for the purposes of a New Library, Associated Car Parking, Community Centre, Plaza and the Removal of Seventeen (17) Trees at Lot 12 DP 839849 and Lots 5 and 6 DP 214690 No 15 Queen Street, Narellan.....	32
9. Extensions to Macarthur Anglican School - Proposed Junior School .....	47
10. Camden Local Plan.....	58
11. Draft Development Control Plan No. 124 - Elderslie Release Area.....	60
12. Elderslie Release Area Link Road - Local Environmental Plan No. 132...	62
13. Draft Development Control Plan No. 126 – Narellan Township.....	63

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**Present:** Cr Anderson (Mayor/Chairman), Cr Patterson, Cr Corrigan, Cr McFadden, Cr Fekete, Cr Batros.

**Staff:** General Manager, Acting Director Works & Services (Manager Community Services), Director Governance & Outcomes, Director Development & Environment, Manager Outcomes, Manager Environment, Senior Governance Officer.

**APOLOGIES**

An apology was received from Cr Senise, Cr Campbell and Cr Winn from this meeting.

*Resolved on the Motion of Cr Corrigan, seconded Cr Batros that leave of absence be granted to Cr Senise, Cr Campbell and Cr Winn for this meeting.*

DC001/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**  
\*\*\*\*\*

**DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY OR CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations.

**DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE PUBLIC ADDRESSES**

Pam Browne addressed the Committee in relation to Item 13.

**MOTION**

*Moved Cr Batros, seconded Cr McFadden that an extension of time for 2 minutes be granted.*

DC002/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**  
\*\*\*\*\*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**1. Three-Lot Torrens Title Subdivision, No 67 (Lot 214  
DP 27602) Chisholm Rd, Catherine Field**

**File No:** 1650.230-2 (Director, Development &  
Environment Division)

**DA No:** 6/2003

**Owner:** M, E & A Camileri, and D & M Nocera

**Zoning:** Rural 1(c) LEP 48

**Purpose of Report**

This report seeks Council's determination of a development application for a 3 lot Rural/Residential subdivision.

The application for a three-lot subdivision at 67 Chisholm Road, Catherine Field has been submitted to Council with an objection under the provisions of State Environmental Planning Policy 1 (SEPP 1). The objection proposes to vary the minimum lot size requirement for the Rural C (0.4ha minimum) zone.

**Summary of Recommendation**

It is recommended that Development Application 6/2003 be approved subject to conditions of consent.

**Background**

On 21 December 2000 Council approved a four-lot subdivision of Lot 214 DP 27602 (the subject property) under application DA 1831/2000. The approved subdivision plan forms **Tabled Documents "DC 1"**. To date the applicant has not acted upon DA 1831/2000 and the proposed lots have not been registered. The consent is operative for a five year period and would not lapse until 21 December, 2005. The current application (DA 6/2003) proposes to subdivide proposed Lot 4 of DA 1831/2000; however because this lot does not currently exist, the application will in fact create 3 new lots.

**The Proposal**

It is proposed to subdivide proposed Lot 4, being No 67 Chisholm Road, Catherine Field into two lots generally in accordance with the requirements of LEP 48. The proposed lots, being Lots 2144 and 2145, have areas of 3794m<sup>2</sup> and 4441m<sup>2</sup> respectively. The minimum lot size required by LEP 48 is 0.4ha (4000m<sup>2</sup>). Proposed Lot 2145 complies with this requirement while proposed Lot 2144 is 5% below the area required by LEP 48. A SEPP1 objection has been lodged to vary this standard and is addressed further in this report. The proposed subdivision plan forms **Tabled Documents "DC 2"**.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**The Site**

The site is on the corner of Deepfields Rd and Chisholm Rd Catherine Field. The current site area is 2.023ha. However upon registration of DA 1831/2000, proposed Lot 4 (the subject site) will be 0.82ha (8235m<sup>2</sup>). A locality plan forms **Tabled Documents “DC 3”**.

Proposed Lot 4 is traversed by 2 easements. The first is an easement for transmission lines 30.48m wide currently benefiting Integral Energy. The second is an easement to drain water 6m wide currently benefiting Camden Council.

The land falls to Deepfields Road and contains a stand of Casuarina in the front northern corner of the property which are to be retained as part of this subdivision.

**Notification**

In accordance with Development Control Plan 116 (DCP 116) this application was notified to adjoining neighbours. One submission was received, however this submission related to the noise of trail bikes riding on the vacant site rather than objecting to the proposed subdivision. **A copy of this submission was provided to Councillors separately with the business paper.**

**Planning Controls**

The relevant planning instruments and development control plans are:

- Camden 2025
- Camden Development Control Plan 119
- Camden Local Environmental Plan 48
- State Environmental Planning Policy No 1 (SEPP1)

**Assessment**

The application has been assessed in accordance with section 79C of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act. The following comments are provided with respect to the critical aspects of Council’s assessment.

**(a) The provisions of any environmental planning instrument/ development control plan**

Camden 2025

Camden 2025 has a number of key areas for Council to consider in the development of the Camden LGA. The strategies applicable to this development are Managing

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

Urban Growth, Accessibility and Environmental systems. Each strategy has outcomes and actions

In relation to Managing Urban Growth, the proposed development meets the objectives in terms of development occurring in a planned and orderly manner, including appropriate service infrastructure provision and adverse stress on the natural environment is minimised.

The Accessibility strategy requires issues of public transport and connectivity to existing areas to be provided and maintained. The subdivision provides direct access to Deepfields Road and Council's transport network.

The Environment strategy considers such matters as protecting and restoring water quality of creeks and rivers; introduction of rainwater tanks; protection of riparian zones and minimising the impacts of salinity. The applicant will undertake certain works to meet these requirements, including a requirement on the 88B Instrument for the installation of rainwater tanks. A landscape plan will be submitted to Council detailing works to be carried out within the subdivision.

Camden Development Control Plan No 119

The relevant aims and objectives of DCP 119 are:

- To provide a planning strategy which is broadly focused on achieving the vision for the Catherine Field village, as reflected in the "Statement of Desired Future Character".
- To ensure the development achieves a sustainable outcome that protects and enhances the environment.
- To comprehensively identify physical constraints to the development of the land, particularly in regard to drainage and flooding and ensure future development reflects such constraints.
- To ensure the riparian zone associated with South Creek and its tributaries are protected and salinity issues are acknowledged and appropriately managed.

Clearly, the proposed development is consistent with the aims, objectives and desired future character of DCP 119.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

Camden Local Environmental Plan No 48

The subject site is zoned 1(c) (Rural “c” (0.4ha) Zone) pursuant to LEP 48. The relevant aims of the zone are:

- To provide small holding rural residential living opportunities on land not being of prime crop or pasture potential and having ready access to urban areas and facilities.
- To ensure development is carried out in a manner that minimises risk from natural hazards, particularly bushfires and flooding and does not detract from the scenic quality of the rural area.

The proposed development satisfies the aims of LEP 48 and therefore is permissible with the consent of Council.

**(b) Utilities**

- Water supply must be connected to all lots.
- Waste water will be connected to an approved on site sewerage management system.
- Telecommunication service must be connected to all lots.
- Underground electricity services must be connected to all lots.

**(c) Flora and Fauna**

There is an existing stand of Casuarina in the front northern corner of the subject property, which are to be retained as part of this subdivision. There are no other significant stands of vegetation on the site. It is apparent that past clearing for agricultural purposes has removed this community. No existing threatened species habitat is known on the subject site in its present state.

**(d) State Environmental Planning Policy 1 (SEPP1)**

The applicant has lodged an application under State Environmental Planning Policy 1 (SEPP1) and seeks to modify the minimum lot size as required by LEP 48.

The SEPP1 objection states:

- The land has sufficient area and frontage for the creation of two complying lots.
- Both proposed lots would comply with the development standard if it were not for Integral Energy’s objection to the proposal to create a new lot boundary within the easement. Integral Energy’s

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

concerns can be overcome by the location of the proposed lot boundary on the easement boundary which results in proposed lot 2144 being 306m<sup>2</sup> less than the required development standard of 4,000m<sup>2</sup>.

- No additional potential is created by supporting this objection
- The reduced area of proposed lot 2144 will accommodate wastewater treatment.

The SEPP1 objection is justified by correspondence from Integral Energy confirming their objections to dividing the easement, whilst raising no objections to the subdivision in principal.

In addition, the applicant has satisfied Council that on-site effluent disposal to the undersized allotment can be accommodated.

It should also be noted that Council has been delegated assumed concurrence from the Director of the Department of Infrastructure Planning & Natural Resources for such an application. This is because only one allotment is below the minimum lot size requirement and that allotment is not below 90% of the minimum lot size (the proposed lot being 95% of the minimum lot size). On this basis, Council can approve SEPP1 applications where the Council is satisfied that the proposed development will not undermine the aims and objectives of LEP 48.

**Conclusion**

The proposed allotments satisfy the requirements of LEP 48 and DCP 119 for building envelopes and setbacks. The proposed subdivision is consistent with the aims, objectives and desired future character statements of both DCP 119 and Camden 2025.

On this basis, approval of Development Application No 6/2003 for a 3 Lot subdivision is recommended subject to appropriate conditions of development consent.

Recommended: That

- (i) Development Application No 6/2003 to create a Torrens Title subdivision comprising of 3 rural residential lots at Lot 214 DP 27602 Chisholm Rd, Catherine Field be approved subject to conditions as detailed in **Tabled Document “DC 4”**.
- (ii) Those persons who made submissions be advised of Councils decision.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

*Resolved on the Motion of Cr Corrigan, seconded Cr Fekete that*

(i) *Development Application No 6/2003 to create a Torrens Title subdivision comprising of 3 rural residential lots at Lot 214 DP 27602 Chisholm Rd, Catherine Field be approved subject to conditions as detailed in **Tabled Document “DC 4”**.*

(ii) *Those persons who made submissions be advised of Councils decision.*

DC003/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED**.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**2. Additions to Dwelling, Lot 116 DP 31406 No 29  
Pindari Avenue, Camden**

**File No:** 6325.310 (Director, Development & Environment  
Division)

**DA No:** 1332/2003

**Owner:** M & MK Gorst

**Zoning:** 2(a) Residential pursuant to Camden LEP 46

**Purpose of Report**

To enable Council to make a determination on an application for additions to a dwelling on a site affected by flooding from the Nepean River.

**Summary of Recommendation**

That the application be approved subject to conditions of consent.

**The Site**

The site has an area of approximately 835m<sup>2</sup> and is located on the western side of Pindari Avenue, with direct frontage to the road (refer to **Tabled Document “DC 5”**). A single storey dwelling currently occupies the site with similar dwellings adjoining the northern and southern boundaries. The property slopes down from the road to the rear boundary which adjoins open, undeveloped rural land.

The rear half of the land is affected by the 1% AEP flood event, located at RL 71.2m AHD. The impact of flooding and the level of inundation is assessed and discussed further in this report under the section entitled Upper Nepean River Floodplain Management Study and Plan.

**The Proposal**

The proposed addition is a timber framed, hardiplank construction with a flat metal roof, containing a bedroom, family room and a timber deck.

The intended work will be constructed adjacent to an existing bedroom and concrete patio located at the rear of the dwelling. The floor of the new habitable area will be raised to be level with the habitable floor area of the existing building, which is situated at RL 72.93m, 1.73m above the 1% flood level and 1.13m above the Probable Maximum Flood. The present floor level of the patio will be maintained and is intended as a storage area adjoining the existing laundry (refer to **Tabled Document “DC 6”**).

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

The development is designed to maintain all habitable floor areas in accordance with the requirements of the Upper Nepean River Floodplain Management Study and Plan. The sub floor area will maintain an open aspect for the unrestricted flow of floodwater. The provisions for evacuation and the flood compatible construction of the addition are discussed further in this report.

The proposed addition does not require the removal of any trees.

**Notification**

Adjoining neighbours have provided documentation stating that they have no objections to the proposed development.

**Planning Controls**

The following documentation has been considered with respect to Council's assessment of the subject application:

- Camden 2025
- Camden Local Environmental Plan No 46
- Sydney Regional Environmental Plan 20-Hawkesbury-Nepean river
- Residential Development Control Plan No 58
- Upper Nepean River Floodplain Management Study and Plan
- Draft Flood Risk Management Policy

**Assessment**

The subject application has been assessed in accordance with section 79C of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979. The following points are provided in relation to the critical aspects of Council's assessment:

**(a) The provision of any planning instrument, development control plan or matter prescribed by the regulations**

Camden 2025

The Strategic Plan aims to retain the traditional quality of Camden while meeting the needs of local communities.

The submission proposes a development sympathetic to the locality and conserves the identity of the 'place' while effectively utilising the site.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

Camden Local Environmental Plan No 46

The land is zoned Residential 2(a) under Camden Local Environmental Plan 46. The development meets the aim of the LEP, which seeks to 'promote development suitable to particular localities' and also takes into consideration the traditional, urban character of the locality. The proposed development is permissible in the zone and meets the provisions of the LEP, relevant to the proposal.

Clause 21 in the LEP, which refers to flood prone land, states that Council may refuse an application to carry out any development that is subject to flooding if in the opinion it will:

- affect the flood level at any point above or below the development;
- increase, to a substantial degree, the flow of water on any adjoining flood liable lands;
- cause soil erosion, siltation or destruction of river bank vegetation;
- affect the water table of any adjoining land; or
- adversely affect river bank stability.

This is discussed further in this report under the Upper Nepean River Floodplain Management Study and Plan.

Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No 20

The provisions of Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No 20 (SREP 20) apply to the property as it falls within the Hawkesbury-Nepean River Catchment.

The SREP provides an overall direction for the protection of the environment of the river. Sediment and erosion control measures shall be implemented during construction to minimise erosion and soil loss from the site.

Residential Development Control Plan No 58

The submission meets the development guidelines of the Residential Development Control Plan No 58 (DCP 58) with regard to form and scale.

The design of the building reflects the character of the area and maintains the traditional, residential aspect of the locality.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

Upper Nepean River Floodplain Management Study and Plan

The rear half of the site is effected by the 1% flood event, located at RL 71.2m AHD, and is categorised in accordance with the Upper Nepean River Floodplain Management Study and Plan (FMP) as high hazard – flood fringe (refer to **Tabled Document “DC 7”**).

The ground level at the southwestern corner of the proposed addition is estimated to be RL71.0m AHD and is subsequently affected by the 1% flood line. The depth of flooding below the addition during the 1% AEP, may be expected to reach a depth of up to 200mm with minimal velocity. The floor level of the timber deck is located at RL72.88 with the new habitable rooms situated at RL72.93m AHD. Overall, the new work maintains a minimum clearance of 1.68m above the 1% flood level and 1.08m above the PMF.

The submission maintains the flood free access afforded to the site and does not increase any potential hazard to adjoining properties or demand on emergency services.

The applicant has engaged a Structural Engineer to certify that the existing house and the design of the new building work is capable of withstanding the impact of floodwater, debris and buoyancy.

Thorough evaluation of the proposal has determined that the development complies with the objectives of the Floodplain Management Plan, which are:

- to reduce the social and economic impact of flooding on individual owners and occupiers of flood prone property; and
- to reduce private and public losses resulting from floods,

while allowing the continuation of the locality as a residential area.

Draft Flood Risk Management Policy

Consideration of the Draft Flood Risk Management Policy has determined that the proposal can be carried out in a reasonable and responsible manner. In accordance with the criteria of the policy, the development is considered to be compatible with the

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

indicated flood hazard of the land and minimises financial and personal risk to the community.

**(b) Likely impacts of the development, including impacts on both natural and built environment including social and economic impacts**

The proposed development is consistent with the zoning and amenity of the locality. The application demonstrates that the proposal is of a type which could be reasonably expected in the development of the local area. Conditions shall be imposed on the consent to reduce site disturbance and minimise the potential for impact on the environment.

**(c) The suitability of the site for the development**

Despite the level of flood affectation, the management plan adopted by Council suggests that the risk to occupants does not warrant inclusion of the property in any acquisition or house-raising program. The site is fully serviced (i.e. water, electricity, sewer and phone) and is in close proximity to the Camden town centre. Similar development can be found in the general area.

**Summary**

The proposed development complies with Council's LEP 46 and DCP 58, with the flooding constraints of the land addressed in accordance with the criteria of the Flood Plain Management Study and draft Flood Risk Management Policy. In particular, the submission demonstrates safe evacuation and habitable floor levels are more than 600mm above the flood level.

Certification by the applicant's Structural Engineer confirms that the proposed development can be carried out in a structurally sound manner and not increase the flood hazard or risk to adjoining properties

The application satisfactorily addresses the impacts of the development associated with conservation and enhancement of the area and the amenity of neighbouring properties. It is considered that the proposed development will make a positive contribution to development in the locality and is therefore recommended for conditional approval.

**Recommended:** That Development Application 1332/2003 for additions and alterations at No 29 Pindari Avenue, Camden, be approved subject to the conditions which form **Tabled Document "DC 8"**.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN - 5.30PM**

---

*Resolved on the Motion of Cr McFadden, seconded Cr Corrigan that Development Application 1332/2003 for additions and alterations at No 29 Pindari Avenue, Camden, be approved subject to the conditions which form **Tabled Document "DC 8"**.*

DC004/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED**.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**3. Petition Re: DA 1096/2003 - Proposed Mount Annan  
Christian Church (Auditorium and Car Parking), 347  
Narellan Road, Currans Hill**

(File DA 5800.686-19) (Director, Development & Environment)

Council is in receipt of a petition regarding the proposed church/auditorium for the Mount Annan Christian Life Centre at Currans Hill, which is in support of a submission objecting to the above DA proposal. In accordance with Council policy, this report brings the petition before Council for information purposes.

The petition forms **Tabled Document “DC 9”** and states in part:

*... strongly object the proposed development in its entirety,... DA raises the (following) immediate concerns: traffic; noise; landscape and scenic quality; lighting; neighbourhood concerns; other points of concern;... consider the site unsuitable for the proposed development and on the above ... believe the local public would be well served by having this development declined.*

The petition contains 16 signatories plus the accompanying submission. Following the assessment of the proposed development application the matter will be brought to Council for determination.

Recommended: That

- (i) The concerns expressed by the residents in relation to DA 1096/2003 proposed Mount Annan Christian Church (auditorium and car parking) at 347 Narellan Road, Currans Hill be noted.
- (ii) The petitioners be provided with a copy of this report.

Resolved on the Motion of Cr Fekete, seconded Cr Batros that

- (i) *The concerns expressed by the residents in relation to DA 1096/2003 proposed Mount Annan Christian Church (auditorium and car parking) at 347 Narellan Road, Currans Hill be noted.*
- (ii) *The petitioners be provided with a copy of this report.*

DC005/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**  
\*\*\*\*\*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**4. Unauthorised Building Works at No 53 Engesta Avenue, Camden**

(File No DA2850.550) (Director, Development & Environment Division)

**Purpose of Report**

To update Council of action in relation to the unauthorised works in accordance with Council's resolution of 24 November, 2003.

**Background**

The issue of unauthorised building works at the subject property has been the subject of two site inspections and a number of reports to Council. The most recent report was considered at the 24 November, 2003 meeting when it was resolved that:

- (i) *The matter be referred to Council's solicitors so that court proceedings can be instigated against Mr Raymond & Mrs Patricia Ann Burnett of 53 Engesta Avenue, Camden (Lot 69 DP 230494). The proceedings relate to an offence committed by the above persons pursuant to Section 125 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.*
- (ii) *In the event the work required under the order is carried out at any time leading up to the proceedings the court action be withdrawn.*
- (iii) *The matter be brought back to Council at the January 2004 Development Committee Meeting reporting on progress achieved.*

**Main Report**

In accordance with Council's resolution of 24 November, 2003 arrangements were made with Council's solicitors to commence the necessary legal action. Such action needed to be filed with the Court by 12 January, 2004. On 9 January, 2004 Mr Burnett advised Council that the unauthorised outbuilding had been demolished and that he intended to remove the requisite section of wall over the coming weekend. Site inspections carried out on 9 and 12 January, 2004 confirmed that all work required to be completed to comply with Council's order had been conducted and the owner was requested to infill sections of the wall to tidy up the levels of the site. Agreement to cap the wall to prevent water penetration was reached.

The works required to comply with Council's Order have now been satisfied, despite being conducted after the time limit imposed had lapsed. In view of the objective of Council, ie. to

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

have all unauthorised structures demolished, having been achieved, legal proceedings have now been discontinued.

**Conclusion**

It has always been the intention of Council to ensure that all unauthorised structures on the land were removed and this has now been achieved.

Recommended: That Council note compliance with the Order issued for unauthorised building work at 53 Engesta Avenue, Camden was satisfied on 12 January, 2004 and that legal action in relation to the failure of the owners to comply with the time frame specified in the order has been discontinued.

*Resolved on the Motion of Cr Batros, seconded Cr Fekete that Council note compliance with the Order issued for unauthorised building work at 53 Engesta Avenue, Camden was satisfied on 12 January, 2004 and that legal action in relation to the failure of the owners to comply with the time frame specified in the order has been discontinued.*

DC006/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**  
\*\*\*\*\*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**5. Local Development Taskforce Report**

(File No 4755/1) (Director, Development & Environment Division)

**Purpose of Report**

To inform Council of the recommendations contained in the Local Development Taskforce's Report and to recommend that Council make a submission to the Department.

**Introduction**

On 3 July 2003, the Minister Assisting the Minister for Infrastructure and Planning (Planning Administration), the Hon Diane Beamer MP, announced a taskforce into the local development approval process. A Taskforce was established with representatives from the development industry, academia, the Department and local government. The Chair of the Taskforce is Neil Bird.

On 17 November 2003, a report titled "Improving Local Development Assessment in NSW" from the Local Development Taskforce was released. The implications and recommendations of the report are addressed in detail in the following sections of this report.

**The Taskforce's Report**

The report from the Taskforce is a comprehensive document of 109 pages and contains 61 recommendations. Copies of the report can be provided to Councillors should they require them and the recommendations are contained in **Tabled Document "DC 10"**.

The report criticises local government for being too involved in the detail of "simple" development applications such as dwelling houses. It also alleges local government is too restrictive in the setting of controls for dwelling houses. These factors are argued to contribute to excessive development assessment times and extra cost to homebuyers.

The solution to the perceived problems of cost and delay, as proposed in the report, is the broadening of complying development to the point where almost all single and two-storey dwellings throughout NSW can be assessed under complying development provisions. The recommended way of achieving this is to mandate a common set of housing standards across the State. These recommended standards are also contained within **Tabled Document "DC 11"** and in no way reflect the form of development that is acceptable anywhere in Camden. For this reason many of the recommendations that suggest a 'one size fits all' approach

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

should be opposed. It is imperative that each Council retains the right to control the form of development that meets its community's expectations.

There is no specific objection to the broadening of complying development, providing the quality of housing that is developed as complying development is satisfactory in terms of bulk and scale, residential amenity, environmental impact, urban design and local character.

The report developed by the Taskforce considers the question "are complying development certificates or local development approvals the best delivery mechanism for appropriate housing standards". In considering this question, the Taskforce reviewed the processes for both complying development and local development applications, with a particular focus on dwelling house approvals.

The report argues that dwelling houses are "simple" developments that should be expedited to minimise additional costs to homebuyers. Further, the report suggests that the community are more concerned with the costs and standards for housing rather than the approval mechanism.

These fundamental principles underpin the conclusions reached by the Taskforce, that the community's main concerns about the development of dwelling houses will be addressed if the majority of dwelling houses can be developed as complying development. Further, to avoid confusion about what controls must be met, the Taskforce proposes that the community's concerns will be met by the mandating of a common set of minimum housing standards in New South Wales.

Whilst the main focus of the Taskforce's report is dwelling houses, it attempts to address other issues such as advertising and notification, state agency consultation and concurrence, the role of certification, governance, the use of assessment panels, training and system management. The disappointing aspect of the report's recommendations is that it does not acknowledge the good work some Councils are doing and rather than address the issue of under-performance, seeks to implement blanket controls which effectively remove the rights of each Council to adopt place specific controls. This is particularly so in the case of Camden Council which is delivering its community a good product at a reasonable cost in good time.

**Concerns with the Taskforce's Report**

The primary concern with the Taskforce's report is that it does not adequately justify the conclusions it reaches. Throughout the report are numerous statements about council operations

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

that are unqualified. For example, the report states that in NSW the development process does not start with the standards. It also states that some council developed standards without any reference to a state standard. Also, there is an assumption that the current complying development LEPs are not working as they are too inflexible. The most concerning conclusion is that all councils take too long to determine the development applications they receive. A large number of the conclusions drawn are not substantiated and are in fact hearsay. This is a considerable concern and is likely to be the result of the composition of the task force, which comprised three representatives of the development industry and only one local government employee.

It is concerning that a report from a Ministerial Taskforce relies so heavily on perceptions and anecdotes in justifying its position. There has been minimal research to qualify various claims made and only brief recognition is given to the concerns of local government with the existing system. A number of other unqualified statements are specifically addressed below, the taskforce comments shown in italics and a response follows.

- *The community is more concerned with the cost and standards for housing, not the approval mechanism.*

The “community” referred to by the taskforce appears to be limited to those who seek to build a house. The community at large should be recognised as being concerned with the quality of housing, the transparency and accountability of the development process and the cost and standards for housing. It is also evident from comments received from a number of residents who have had problems associated with dwellings privately certified that there are many people who prefer the council of their area to determine and inspect their dwelling houses.

- *Those Councils who have embraced complying development have not experienced any diminution in the quality of development outcomes for their local government areas.*

This statement is not backed up with any particular analysis or measurement. The reason that current exempt and complying development LEPs are so complex is that each council attempts to address all likely scenarios that may arise in particular circumstances. Camden Council has embraced exempt and complying development, and process around 30 applications per month for complying development. Two storey houses are permitted under the provisions of Camden’s plan and therefore it is considered the report should explore avenues of addressing those councils which have not embraced the concept rather than targeting all areas with a common plan

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

that will not address the special issues relevant to different places.

- *The anecdotal data, as well as the general support for the principle of complying development, indicates that it should not be discounted as a means to provide a quick and simple process to provide single dwelling house approvals.*

This statement ignores the concerns raised by local government of the accountability of the complying development process. Those councils that process development applications in a timely fashion are again potentially disadvantaged with the cost being the individuality of areas.

- *It is not clear whether our assessment officers are adequately skilled to assess developments in the changed assessment environment since 1998.*

It is also not clear whether private certifiers are adequately skilled to assess complying development certificate applications. A study of the skill level of assessment officers and private certifiers would have been useful in informing the recommendations of the Taskforce. All councils are required to have training plans for employees under the provisions of the Local Government Award, however there is no similar requirement for certifiers to meet agreed professional development criteria.

- *Figures provided from one project home company is an indication of the impact of the changes to the legislation in 1998.*

Figures provided from one project home company is no indication of the broader planning system. Such a statement is misleading in the extreme as there is no breakdown of the figures and no explanation of the root causes behind the additional costs.

- *An analysis of conflicts over development applications would likely identify that the principal source of conflict is the compliance with local housing standards and the adequacy of those housing standards.*

An analysis of the conflicts might also likely identify that they arise because developers commonly push the boundaries of the standards to maximise development of land. In any case such an analysis should have been undertaken to inform the recommendations of the Taskforce.

Camden Council has improved the time it takes to determine the full range of development applications it receives and has an effective fast track approval system that turns around the

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

less complex applications in good time, usually in less than a week when all information is submitted with the application. Similarly applications for houses receive favourable determination in relation to time where the applications meet Council's standards. The most recent Comparative Data issued by the Department of Local Government relating to the 2001-2 year shows that Camden Council performs better than the State average in terms of processing times and in fact the median time taken to determine the full range of the 2,132 development applications was only 20 days. It should be noted that these figures do not include 'stop the clock' provisions, which were not available in Council's IT package at the time and therefore the true times would be significantly less than this.

Furthermore, Council receives a number of applications for complying development, averaging around 30 per month.

As mentioned above, the report inadequately resolves a number of concerns raised by local government. Whilst the report recognises that local government has valid concerns about the complying development process, there is no real attempt to resolve these concerns before recommending the broadening of complying development.

The concerns of local government about the existing complying development system included the following:

- The "one size fits all" approach does not work as what may be perfectly acceptable in one local area may be unacceptable in another.
- The speed with which development assessment is carried out is not the only consideration. The quality of development outcomes is crucial.
- A common set of housing standards will result in monotony and building design of the lowest common denominator.
- Private certifiers are not sufficiently accountable.

Education of private certifiers, principal certifying authorities, councils and the wider community on the roles and responsibilities in the development process must be instigated.

Rather than a serious attempt to resolve these concerns, the Taskforce proposes that complying development should be permitted in environmentally sensitive areas, that private certifiers should be able to impose conditions to correct a non-compliance, that private certifiers should be able to consider environmental impact on merit and that a common set of housing standards should apply across the State.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

The suggestion that private certifiers should be able to consider some matters on merit is of particular concern. In the planning process discretion is used when a question of merit is raised. Whilst Assessment officers are generally qualified or experienced to make such judgement calls, in most cases the planning instruments provide some guidance in making the call through the use of objectives or matters for consideration. It is important that questions of merit remain with local government because the process provides a level of transparency and accountability that does not exist in the private certification process.

The principal unanswered concern in the report relates to the issue of the quality of complying development outcomes. The Taskforce seem to be satisfied that a set of common housing standards, providing they are “tested” against good urban design principles, will not result in dwelling design of the lowest common denominator.

Whilst the development of any set of housing standards should have regard to urban design principles and environmental outcomes, there can be no guarantee that what is built will be appropriate to the context of the locality. This becomes a major concern when a community holds a particular value on the urban quality of their place, such as areas of heritage conservation and environmentally sensitive areas.

For this reason housing standards for complying development should be tailored to suit the particular place, with the level of detail in the standards reflecting the relative value of the desired urban outcomes.

Clearly some of the common housing standards proposed by the Taskforce will not pass the tests relating to urban design and environmental outcomes. For example, the minimum area of a lot that must be permeable is 20% (this equates to 90m<sup>2</sup> on a 450m<sup>2</sup> block). The building platform allowed by these minimum standards is considered excessive and will not satisfy environmental objectives such as water sensitive design, salinity, minimising stormwater runoff, maximising tree planting opportunities and encouraging landscape connections along property boundaries.

The Taskforce might be satisfied that the maximum building platform is not achievable because the standards include controls relating to privacy and solar access that will limit the extent of development. However despite the inclusion of these standards, the taskforce cannot guarantee that the private certifier will adequately assess the impact of the proposed development on adjoining properties. Solar access controls are particularly open to “creative” assessment.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

Further, there is no avenue with complying development for a peer review of an assessment of amenity impacts. Who will check that no more than 50% of the private open space of the subject site and adjoining properties will be overshadowed by the proposed development. In fact the future resident of the dwelling and existing adjoining residents will not be aware of the impacts until the development is built, at which time remedy for non-compliance with the standards is difficult.

**Conclusion**

The impacts of the report on local government's ability to ensure that the expectations of its communities are met through the adoption of appropriate standards and controls are significant and of great concern. This is evident from the good attendance at a meeting arranged by the Local Government and Shires Association which was attended by the Mayor and Director, Development and Environment on 1 December, 2003. Mayors, Councillors, General Managers and senior staff from both metropolitan and rural councils were in attendance and there was unanimous consensus that the findings and recommendations of the Taskforce were unsatisfactory and should, in the main, be opposed.

Whilst there is agreement that things can be done better, the retention of local government's role in assessing the form of development that can take place in its area is paramount.

There is general acknowledgment that the private certification system is not working and requires review, however the report does not go far enough in this regard.

The major area that is deficient is the delivery of quality outcomes, and therefore the unsatisfactory areas of concern should be highlighted and addressed in a submission to the Minister.

Recommended: That Council forward a submission to DIPNR in relation to the recommendations of the Local Development Taskforce in accordance with the following:

- (i) Camden Council strongly objects to Recommendations 1,2,3 and 7, as Camden has embraced the provisions of Complying Development and determines development applications in a timely manner. Camden Council supports the rights of individual Councils to maintain the ability to determine the form of development that occurs in its area to ensure community expectations are met.
- (ii) Camden Council agrees that there is a need for a template for LEPs, however such template must be flexible to reflect

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

local conditions and therefore Recommendations 4 and 5 need to take this into consideration.

- (iii)* Recommendation 6 is not supported. Any proposal which relies on amended plans for Complying Development may result in confusion to builders who may not be aware of the changes made. It is appropriate that the application be amended and resubmitted to address the areas of non-compliance.
- (iv)* Council supports Recommendation 8 as any system which simplifies the planning process is welcomed, however Council and not private certifiers must determine these applications. No objection would be raised for certifiers to continue their inspection role in these situations.
- (v)* Council supports a review of current complying development LEPs so that DIPNR can determine whether there is really a problem. Camden Council would be willing to participate in any review of the process. Recommendation 9 would then become superfluous.
- (vi)* Council supports the monitoring of Complying Development as espoused in Recommendation 10, however the monitoring must measure quality as well as compliance. It is noted that this is an enormous task for the Department of Local Government.
- (vii)* Council supports Recommendations 11,12 and 13.
- (viii)* Council welcomes the introduction of a standard format for LEPs, however does not support mandatory requirements as this does not allow for variety in places and outcomes. Subject to this flexibility Council supports Recommendations 14, 15 16 and 17.
- (ix)* Recommendation 18 is supported subject to the prohibition of amending complying development certificates by conditions (see 3 above).
- (x)* Council supports Recommendations 19, 20, 21, 22,23,24, 25, 26 and 27.
- (xi)* Council supports Recommendations 28 and 29 as similar provisions currently exist in Council's plans. Concern is however expressed at the suggested timing of the introduction, as this may not be sufficient to allow proper training of all staff and certifiers who will be assessing compliance with BASIX.
- (xii)* Council supports Recommendations 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 37.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

- (xiii) Council strongly objects to any erosion of its ability to determine what form development should take place in its local area. For this reason objection is raised to Recommendation 38.
- (xiv) Whilst Council supports the principals of Recommendations 39, 40 and 41, such training must be able to be readily available in each council's local area.
- (xv) Council supports in principle the concept of panels described in Recommendations 42, 42, 44 and 45, however strongly objects to these being mandatory.
- (xvi) That the benchmarking referred to in Recommendation 46 be clarified, particularly in the means of measuring quality outcomes.
- (xvii) Council supports Recommendations 47, 48, 49, 50, 51 and 52.
- (xviii) Council supports Recommendations 53, 54, 55, 56 and 57.
- (xix) Council supports the principle of fast track fees as discussed in Recommendation 58, however objects to these being mandatory.
- (xx) Council supports Recommendations 59, 60, 61, provided quality of outcomes is measured and the review includes private certifiers.

*Resolved on the Motion of Cr Batros, seconded Cr McFadden that Council forward a submission to DIPNR in relation to the recommendations of the Local Development Taskforce in accordance with the following:*

- (i) *Camden Council strongly objects to Recommendations 1,2,3 and 7, as Camden has embraced the provisions of Complying Development and determines development applications in a timely manner. Camden Council supports the rights of individual Councils to maintain the ability to determine the form of development that occurs in its area to ensure community expectations are met.*
- (ii) *Camden Council agrees that there is a need for a template for LEPs, however such template must be flexible to reflect local conditions and therefore Recommendations 4 and 5 need to take this into consideration.*
- (iii) *Recommendation 6 is not supported. Any proposal which relies on amended plans for Complying Development may*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

*result in confusion to builders who may not be aware of the changes made. It is appropriate that the application be amended and resubmitted to address the areas of non-compliance.*

- (iv) Council supports Recommendation 8 as any system which simplifies the planning process is welcomed, however Council and not private certifiers must determine these applications. No objection would be raised for certifiers to continue their inspection role in these situations.*
- (v) Council supports a review of current complying development LEPs so that DIPNR can determine whether there is really a problem. Camden Council would be willing to participate in any review of the process. Recommendation 9 would then become superfluous.*
- (vi) Council supports the monitoring of Complying Development as espoused in Recommendation 10, however the monitoring must measure quality as well as compliance. It is noted that this is an enormous task for the Department of Local Government.*
- (vii) Council supports Recommendations 11,12 and 13.*
- (viii) Council welcomes the introduction of a standard format for LEPs, however does not support mandatory requirements as this does not allow for variety in places and outcomes. Subject to this flexibility Council supports Recommendations 14, 15 16 and 17.*
- (ix) Recommendation 18 is supported subject to the prohibition of amending complying development certificates by conditions (see 3 above).*
- (x) Council supports Recommendations 19, 20, 21, 22,23,24, 25, 26 and 27.*
- (xi) Council supports Recommendations 28 and 29 as similar provisions currently exist in Council's plans. Concern is however expressed at the suggested timing of the introduction, as this may not be sufficient to allow proper training of all staff and certifiers who will be assessing compliance with BASIX.*
- (xii) Council supports Recommendations 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 37.*
- (xiii) Council strongly objects to any erosion of its ability to determine what form development should take place in its local area. For this reason objection is raised to Recommendation 38.*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

- (xiv) Whilst Council supports the principals of Recommendations 39, 40 and 41, such training must be able to be readily available in each council's local area.*
- (xv) Council supports in principle the concept of panels described in Recommendations 42, 42, 44 and 45, however strongly objects to these being mandatory.*
- (xvi) That the benchmarking referred to in Recommendation 46 be clarified, particularly in the means of measuring quality outcomes.*
- (xvii) Council supports Recommendations 47, 48, 49, 50, 51 and 52.*
- (xviii) Council supports Recommendations 53, 54, 55, 56 and 57.*
- (xix) Council supports the principle of fast track fees as discussed in Recommendation 58, however objects to these being mandatory.*
- (xx) Council supports Recommendations 59, 60, 61, provided quality of outcomes is measured and the review includes private certifiers.*

DC007/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**  
\*\*\*\*\*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**6. Mayoral Delegation over the Christmas Period**  
(File No: 2757) (Director, Development & Environment Division)

**Purpose of Report**

The purpose of this report is to advise Council of the use of Mayoral Delegation for determination of Development Applications over the Christmas period.

**Main Report**

Council, at 15 December 2003 Meeting resolved that Delegated Authority be granted to the Mayor for the approval of Development Applications during the period 16 December 2003 to 26 January 2004, under Sections 226 and 377 of the Local Government Act, 1993 subject to where objections are received, and not reconciled, the matter be reported to the next Council Meeting for information.

During the above-mentioned period, all applications determined could be processed under normal staff delegations and therefore the Mayor was not called on to exercise the delegation granted.

Recommended: The information be noted.

Resolved on the Motion of the Cr Corrigan, seconded Cr Batros the information be noted.

DC008/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**  
\*\*\*\*\*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**7. Appeal Against Camden Council's Decision to Issue  
Wesco Concrete Company With a Penalty  
Infringement Notice**

(File No. DA4872.250-2) (Director Development & Environment)

**Purpose of Report**

To advise Council of the outcome of an appeal made by Wesco Concrete Company against Council's issue of a Penalty Infringement Notice for causing/permitting waters to be polluted under the provision of S120 of the PoEO Act.

**Background**

As the result of a complaint on 5 June 2003, an inspection was carried out in the vicinity of Campbell Avenue and Pearson Crescent, Harrington Park.

The inspection revealed that at the rear of a building site, at the end of Campbell Avenue, a concrete truck was bogged with several trucks in the process of towing the bogged vehicle out. When the bogged truck was pulled out, the trucks left the building site without cleaning the mud from the tyres, leaving a large quantity of mud on the roadways. A Penalty Infringement Notice was issued to Wesco Concrete Company for causing/permitting waters to be polluted.

**Appeal**

Wesco Concrete Company elected to have the matter heard before the local Court.

On the 9 December 2003 the matter was heard at Camden Court. The company pleaded not guilty. During presentation of evidence the company admitted to dragging the mud onto the roads and that they had attempted to clean up the pollution.

The magistrate found in favour of Camden Council on the grounds Council had provided effective evidence that they had committed the offence. Such evidence predominantly relied on photographs of the site and the trail of mud on the road.

Wesco Concrete was ordered to pay a fine of \$1000 and Court costs.

**Conclusion**

The magistrate's finding in favour of Camden Council in relation to the matter of causing/permitting pollution to the water system was positive. This will assist in raising awareness in the community that Council requires the proper

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

management of erosion and sediment control on development sites in Camden.

Recommended: That the successful defence of Council's Penalty Infringement Notice in an appeal to the local court be noted.

Resolved on the Motion of Cr Fekete, seconded Cr McFadden that the successful defence of Council's Penalty Infringement Notice in an appeal to the local court be noted.

DC009/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**8. Construction of a New Building and Car Park for the purposes of a New Library, Associated Car Parking, Community Centre, Plaza and the Removal of Seventeen (17) Trees at Lot 12 DP 839849 and Lots 5 and 6 DP 214690 No 15 Queen Street, Narellan**

**File No:** DA6425.125 (Director, Development & Environment Division)  
**DA No:** 1467/2003  
**Owner:** The Council of Camden  
**Zoning:** Part 3(a) General Business and Part 3(b1) Business Support under LEP 46

**Purpose of the Report**

The purpose of the report is to allow Council to consider the merits of an application for the construction of a new library, car parking, community centre, plaza and removal of 17 trees at 15 Queen Street, Narellan. The report has been prepared by an independent town planner, Paul Hume of Hume Planning Pty Ltd to ensure that the application was assessed in an appropriate manner and all probity issues addressed. Council's standard report format has been used by the consultant.

**Summary of Recommendation**

The report recommends that Council approve Development Application 1467/2003, subject to conditions.

**The Site**

The site is located on the south eastern corner of Queen Street and Elyard Street. A locality plan forms **Tabled Document "DC 12"**. The subject site has an area of 2.979 ha. This allotment has a Reduced Level (RL) of 91.25m AHD at the south-eastern corner of the lot and an RL of 88m AHD at the north-western corner.

The site currently contains a bitumen sealed car parking area and access driveway (exit driveway), servicing staff and patrons of the adjacent Council Administration Centre and Library. This will be removed to allow for the construction of the new car park. The existing car spaces will be reinstated in the new car park.

**The Proposal**

The Development Application seeks consent for the following:

- (a) Construction of a two-storey building comprising 3 main sections. The main section, which contains the library is a storey and a half steel frame structure with three sides

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

enclosed by clear glazing, shaded by a raking metal eave overhang. The west wing of the building, where the community offices, youth centre and café are located, is of two storey construction with masonry walls at the ground floor level and colour-backed red glazing at Level 1. The section connecting the two is largely the masonry service/support area, wrapping around the glazed naturally lit and ventilated main entrance foyer. The main entrance foyer services the library, youth centre and multi-purpose space and is accessible from Queen Street and across a main plaza from Elyard Street. The community offices having a separate entrance foyer off the main plaza. The proposed building has a roof ridge height of approximately 11.22 m above the ground. The combined floor space is approximately 3045m<sup>2</sup>.

- (b) Construction of a Plaza area of approximately 1600m<sup>2</sup>, bounded by the community offices and café to the west, the library to the south and Narellan Township Park to the east. The Plaza is to be articulated by landscape elements, including terracing, ramping, paving, planting, wall seats and public art. The area will be fully accessible to the public.
- (c) Construction of a car park and internal service road and loading zone off Queen Street. This will replace that part of the existing car park and service road to be built over by the proposed building and provide additional car parking to service the new development. The car park and service road are located between the proposed building and the existing administration building, integrating with the remaining administration building car park and service road. Combined with existing car parking to be retained, total car parking provided will be 143 car spaces, including 6 disabled car parking spaces. The internal service road is a one-way system, with vehicles entering from the new section of service road described above and exiting via the existing service road south of the existing administration building (the reverse of the current situation).
- (d) Associated landscaping.

A plan of the proposed development forms **Tabled Document “DC 13”**.

Disabled access will be provided to the building via a lift within the building. Four (4) of the six (6) disabled car parking spaces have been provided in the car park close to the proposed building entrances for their patrons. The remaining 2 spaces have been provided in close proximity to the existing Administration Centre to benefit their disabled users. Bus

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

stops are located on both sides of Elyard Street and Queen Street, within 100 m of the site.

The western portion of the proposed building is over part of an existing watercourse/drainage swale, which is to be modified (relocated). A separate development application has been assessed and development consent for these works has been granted.

The proposed hours of operation for the library are the same as those for the existing Narellan Library, that is:

Monday: 9.30am to 8.00pm  
Tuesday: 9.30am to 5.00pm  
Wednesday: 9.30am to 8.00pm  
Thursday: 9.30am to 5.00pm  
Friday: 9.30am to 5.00pm  
Saturday: 9.00am to 3.00pm

It is understood that the Community Space will operate within the hours of existing Council community facilities such as the Narellan Community Hall opposite the site which is from 8.30am to midnight. As yet, no hours of business have been nominated for the café.

**Notification**

The application was notified to adjoining residents and owners of affected premises between 1 December 2003 and 15 December 2003. Notification of the application was also forwarded to Narellan Action Group(NAG), Wilson Richardson Area Residents Group (WARAG), Narellan Chamber of Commerce & Industry Inc, Camden Residents Action Group (CRAG) and Camden Historical Society. Notification was also placed in the local newspapers for the same period. A public information night was also held on 3 December 2003 at the existing Narellan Library. This evening provided the community with information about the proposal and gave attendees the opportunity to discuss the proposal with the consulting architects, GSA. At the close of the exhibition period two (2) submissions were received. These are provided as **Tabled Document “DC 14”**. One supports the concept of the library and makes suggestions in relation to development of the fore court area and provided areas to display local youth art. The second stated that a scale model of the facility would have assisted in giving the community a better understanding of the community space.

**Planning Controls**

The following planning provisions have been considered in the assessment of this application:

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

- Camden 2025
- Camden Local Environmental Plan No 46 (CLEP 46)
- Development Control Plan No 94 (DCP 94)
- Development Control Plan No 97 (DCP 97)
- Designing Safer Communities – Safer by Design Guidelines.
- Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No 20 Hawkesbury-Nepean River (SREP 20).

Consideration has also been given to Council's Energy Efficiency Policy and Draft Development Control Plan No. 126 – Narellan Township (Draft DCP 126).

**Assessment**

The application has been assessed in accordance with Section 79C of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979. The following comments are made with respect to the critical aspects of the application.

**(a) The provision of any environmental planning instrument**

Camden 2025

Council has identified five [5] key areas for the purpose of achieving the vision of Camden by the year 2025. Aspects of the development relate to managing urban growth and environmental systems. The proposed development is consistent with the planning document which encourages 'growth in a planned and orderly way' with appropriate 'service infrastructure provisions'.

Camden LEP No 46

The subject site is zoned part Business 3(a) and part 3(b1) Business Support, with the development proposal being sited within the 3(a) zoned portion of the site. The proposal is consistent with the definition for a "Public Building", "Recreation Facility", "Place of Assembly" and "Refreshment Room" in CLEP 46 and is permissible with Council consent

The relevant aims of CLEP 46 are:

- (c) *to achieve a high quality of development by:*
  - (i) *Encouraging a high design quality, which will provide a pleasant living environment; and*
  - (ii) *Promoting development suitable to particular localities; and;...*
- (d) *to achieve sustainable development by:*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

- (i) maintaining the existing quality of life;*
- (ii) encouraging development that efficiently uses and makes a feature of natural environmental factors; and*
- (iii) minimising waste and harm to the environment in the use of land, energy and material resources; and*
- (iv) ensuring that services and facilities will be adequate to support additional development.*
- (e) to achieve development which is designed, sited and constructed, using passive solar principles, so as to maximise energy efficiency by reducing the consumption of non-renewable forms of energy for heating and cooling purposes.*

Having regard to the comments provided in this report concerning draft DCP 126, DCP 94, DCP 97, built environment impacts, social impacts and site suitability, it is considered that the proposed development is consistent with the above aims.

The objectives stipulated for the 3(a) General Business zone are:

- (a) to provide sufficient opportunities for the development of retail and commercial activities designed to satisfy the needs of the community in an environmentally sensitive manner;
- (b) to encourage the development and expansion of business activities which will contribute to the economic growth of, and the creation of employment opportunities within, the Municipality of Camden; and
- (c) to encourage a wide range of retail, commercial and recreational activities.

It is considered that the development proposed by this application is a reflection of the outcomes sought by the above objectives.

Clause 20A(1) of CLEP 46 sets a two storey height limit for buildings. The proposal does not exceed two storeys.

Clause 21 of CLEP 46 (Flood Prone Land) provides that Council may refuse consent to the carrying out of any development on land subject to periodic inundation by floodwaters where the development, in its opinion, will relevantly:

- (a) affect flood levels above or below the development;

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

- (b) substantially increase the flow of water on any adjoining flood liable lands;
- (c) cause soil erosion or siltation; or
- (d) affect the water table of any adjoining land.

A separate development application has been submitted for the proposed drainage swale relocation to facilitate this development (DA 1568/2003). After consideration of the provisions of clause 21, conditional development consent was granted to DA 1568/2003. It is recommended that conditions of approval for the subject application require completion of works in accordance with the development consent granted for DA 568/2003 prior to the issue of an occupation certificate for this development.

Clause 26 of CLEP 46 (together with the integrated development provisions of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979) requires the concurrence of the Mine Subsidence Board to the development. The conditional approval of the Mines Subsidence Board has been obtained by way of letter dated 2 December 2003.

Development Control Plan No. 94 – Building Energy Conservation (DCP 94)

The development application was accompanied by an energy efficiency report for mechanical and electrical building services, prepared by Simpson Kotzman Pty Ltd (Report 9493 dated 19 November 2003). The report has been reviewed by Council officers. The review indicates air conditioning and lighting adequately meet Council requirements for building management systems. The review notes that in the absence of the final selection of glass elements and films, comment on the building facades cannot be provided. The officer's conclusions are that the imposition of Council's standard conditions regarding energy efficiency will appropriately manage the energy performance of the building having regard to DCP 94. It is recommended that such conditions be included as part of any consent granted.

At this point the proposed development does not include works for the collection and recycling of water. It is recommended however that the approved design should make provision for such equipment to be added at a later date. This would involve planning the location of the collection tank and associated electricals and installing cold water plumbing in such a manner that it may be connected to the tank at minimal cost and difficulty.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

Development Control Plan No 97 – Car Parking

Car parking requirements for the proposed development fall within the categories of *public buildings* and *restaurants* as defined by DCP 97. The car parking requirements for public buildings are one space per 35sqm of net floor area (NFA) plus one space per 500sqm for courier/service vehicles. The car parking requirements for restaurants are one space per 30sqm of NFA in the General Business Zone.

For the public building component of the development (proposed library and community facilities/offices) the required number of spaces is 76 (including 5 spaces for courier/service vehicles). The proposed café, which is to be located on land zoned General Business 3(a), requires 2 spaces. Thus the aggregate of parking spaces required for this development under DCP 97 is 78 spaces, including 5 spaces for couriers/vehicles.

The development proposal involves the removal of part of the existing car park currently servicing Council's Administration Building and Library. Therefore the assessment of the adequacy of the now proposed car park, to service both the Council Administration Building and the new development, needs to take into account the parking requirements for the existing Administration Building. DCP 97 provides that the existing Administration Building requires 50 parking spaces, including 4 parking spaces for courier/service vehicles.

Based on DCP 97, the revised car park to service both the required amount of parking to service the existing Administration Building and the proposed library, community facilities/offices and café is 128 spaces, including 9 spaces for couriers/vehicles.

The proposed car park layout plan accompanying the development application provides 138 car parking spaces. The plan also provides for a 13m wide (approximate) loading zone at the western rear corner of the building and extending from the deliveries dock and garbage room. The parking area includes 4 disabled spaces nearest to the building's main entry point with a further 2 disabled spaces intended to service patrons/users of the existing Administration Building.

Having regard to the provisions of DCP 97 and the proposed parking it is considered that the amount of parking spaces provided for both patron and servicing needs is satisfactory.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

The dimensions of parking spaces required by DCP 97 is based on classes of users. The predominant user class of patrons of the new building is likely to be *class 3* (short term town centre parking). DCP 97 requires the dimensions of parking spaces for class 3 users to be 2.6m wide and 5.4m long. The predominant user class of patrons of the existing Administration Building (following the relocation of the library) is likely to be a combination of *class 1* (all day parking) and class 2 (medium term) parking. DCP 97 requires the dimensions of parking spaces for class 1 users to be 2.4m wide and 5.4m long and for class 2 users to be 2.5m wide and 5.4m long.

The proposed car park layout plan accompanying the development application provides parking space dimensions (excluding the disabled spaces) of 2.5m wide and 5.5m long. The width of the spaces is not considered appropriate for the new library building and it recommended that conditions of approval require parking spaces servicing patrons of the proposed library and community facilities/offices and café (73 spaces) to have a minimum 2.6m width. The proposed disabled parking space dimensions of 3.2m wide and 5.5m long complies with DCP 97.

Car park aisle widths and lengths comply with the requirements of DCP 97. As the proposed car park is a one-way system, the entry driveway crossing is restricted to 4.0m in order to discourage drivers taking a quick exit against the flow of traffic. The exit driveway crossing is proposed to be 5.0m wide. It is recommended that its width be reduced to 4.0m.

Designing Safer Communities – Safer by Design Guidelines

Council officers and the NSW Police Service have considered the application under Safer by Design principles and Council policy. Concerns were raised in regards to the following aspects of the design:

- A cantilevered section at the eastern end of the building creates an area 0.5m to 0.75m in height which potentially could be used for criminal or anti-social behaviour. Should this remain it was recommended that the area be access denied by way of an open style barrier rather than by way of suitable landscaping. The use of an open style barrier is considered a more appropriate solution.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

- The design of the fire exit on the western side of the library was assessed as being a potential entrapment area. Following discussions with the architect, a proposed solution of amending the design of the fire exit door and adjoining interview room window (placing both at a 45° was suggested. The proposed amendment successfully overcomes the concern raised.
- The fire exit on the southern side of the library and adjacent to the loading dock area was considered to have some entrapment potential. This could be overcome by reducing the depth of the recess from 1.3m to 0.3m and still allow a degree of articulation to the loading dock area. The suggested design solution is agreed with.
- Concerns were raised as to whether proposed lighting met the appropriate Australian Standard (AS 1158) which applies to roads, outdoor shopping precincts and outdoor car parking areas where the visual requirements of pedestrians are dominant. Special consideration was recommended for both foyer entrances, public plaza, balcony, fire exits and after hours book return to include movement sensitive sensors for some of these areas. Further, correspondence received from the applicant's lighting consultant has confirmed that the proposed external lighting solution complies with AS 1158. It is recommended however that the design also include after hours movement sensitive lighting for both foyer entrances, loading dock area (which includes the adjoining fire exit) and after hours book return.
- After hours book return. The majority of concerns regarding the after hours book return are overcome by the design solutions recommended for the fire exit on the southern side of the library and movement sensitive lighting and the 2 hour fire rating design for the facility. It was considered desirable to have a direct link for the smoke alarms to a security firm for quick response times. This is considered to be an appropriate design measure.
- Skylights – Security measures to prevent illegal entry from skylights was considered appropriate. The project architect has advised that reinforcing mesh will be included in the design of the skylights and this is considered to be an acceptable solution.
- Landscaping – It was considered that care regarding landscape selection to public areas (Plaza area), is required to ensure external

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

surveillance is not restricted and that the design and materials in the plaza be carefully selected to discourage skateboarding. The landscape plan submitted appears to follow the above considerations in terms of tree and shrub plantings. The location of nominated paving types is not clear and it is recommended that a condition be imposed to ensure the design and materials of the plaza area actively discourage skateboarding.

- The original positioning of the sub-station was considered undesirable, presenting a potential entrapment area. This has since been relocated to what is considered to be an appropriate location in terms of safety and security.

Regional Environmental Plan No 20

SREP 20 provides that Council shall not grant consent to any application to carry out development which drains to the Hawkesbury-Nepean River system, unless it has taken into account the effect that development will have on the river system.

The development will be connected to Sydney Water's sewerage system. The proposed drainage system provides for onsite detention and ultimate connection to the stormwater drainage system. It is considered that the development will have no significant impact on the Hawkesbury-Nepean River. Suitable controls will be required at the construction phase to prevent erosion and sedimentation of the waterways.

Conditions should be imposed to ensure that environmental measures are employed during construction to prevent sediment from leaving the site.

Draft Development Control Plan No 126 – Narellan Township (Draft DCP 126)

The subject site is located within the *Elyard Civic* Precinct identified by draft DCP 126. The proposal is consistent with the Statement of Desired Future Character for Elyard Civic as it relates to the subject site being a key civic building visually anchoring the Elyard and Queen Street corner and containing space for community uses and library supported by a café. The ground floor of the building integrates with the proposed plaza which provides opportunities for public art, as is sought by the draft DCP.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

The draft DCP seeks the integration of the plaza with the adjoining town park wherein significant stands of remnant Cumberland Plain Woodland are to be retained and embellished, as well as the creation of an attractive creek system along the existing water course to meander through the woodland. Tree removal required to construct the proposed library building and car park does not impact on the existing remnant Cumberland Plain Woodland. As mentioned previously in this report the diversion of the existing watercourse was the subject of DA 1568/2003. It is considered that the design of the proposed plaza successfully integrates with the approved watercourse diversion works.

External Concurrence

Council has received advice from the Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources (letter of 3 November, 2003) that it does not require the application to be referred to its Natural Resources section. No approvals are required from the Department as Councils are exempt from requiring permits under the Rivers and Foreshores Improvement Act 1948.

Traffic Committee Referral

The development application was referred to the Special Traffic Advisory Committee meeting of 4 December, 2003. The minutes of that meeting provide that the Committee raised no objection to the proposal subject to the following:

1. Provision of access ramps from the proposed disabled car parking spaces for safe and convenient access to the proposed facilities;
2. Provision of raised entry treatment at the entrance off Queen Street to slow vehicles and improve safety;
3. Provision of footpath network from the car park to the proposed facilities. In particular, footpaths along the existing Council building and within the median strip outside the existing library.

The proposed car park incorporates the above recommendations from the Special Traffic Advisory Committee. It is also noted that plan provides for wheel stops.

- (b) Likely impacts of the development, including impacts on both natural and built environment and social and economic impacts in the locality**

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

Natural Environment

The impact on the natural environment has been discussed. It is proposed to include conditions on the consent relating to the abatement of noise, air and water pollution together with completion of drainage works in accordance with the consent granted for DA 1568/2003.

Whilst the application proposes the removal of 17 trees, these are recent plantings. The significant trees are located along the drainage swale and will be incorporated into the landscape design for the site.

The impact of garbage generation will be mitigated by the adequate provision for garbage storage, recycling and collection at the garbage storage room, which adjoins the loading dock. Recommended conditions from Council's Environment and Health Branch include:

- The garbage room to be ventilated in accordance with Australian Standard AS 16682.
- If a forced ventilation/air conditioning system is used it should not be connected to the same system for the main building.
- The garbage must be suitably drained to enable washing/cleaning. All waste water must drain to the sewer and not to the stormwater system. Floors are to be constructed of a smooth and impervious material.
- An air lock is to be provided between the garbage room and the foyer.

It is recommended that the above conditions be included as part of any consent granted.

The applicant has provided a concept drainage plan for the site, which will collect surface/roof water from the building and adjoining paved areas by a stormwater pipe system, which is then piped to a stormwater/OSD system. Stormwater will then be discharged to the Elyard Street kerb. A water quality structure (oil separator) is to be provided for the car park discharge.

Built Environment

The proposed two storey building has been designed to visually address both street frontages and the plaza area. The overall building design, including the proposed colour scheme and proposed use of large graphic lettering at its Elyard and Queen Streets corner will serve to visually anchor the corner with a landmark building. The positioning of the building elements is

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

generally consistent with that sought by draft DCP 126, being that of the library set in a civic plaza providing a focal point for the community and anchored by a café. Building height and scale is also generally in keeping with that sought by draft DCP 126 for the site.

The use and fit out of the proposed café will be the subject of a further development application.

Social and economic impact

In general terms, the proposed development will deliver a community social benefit by reason of an opportunity for community interaction being provided.

Safety and security issues have been discussed earlier in this report and can be adequately addressed subject to the implementation of the recommendations made.

It is not anticipated that the proposed development will adversely affect the amenity of the residential area opposite the site in Queen Street. The edge and activity of the building interfacing with this residential area is unlikely to present unacceptable amenity loss by reason of noise or light spill. The most active edge of the café is generally focused towards Elyard Street and the civic plaza, with the building providing some level of visual and acoustic screening. Nonetheless, some care will need to be exercised in regards to the management and operation of the café, particularly during late night trading hours, to ensure the amenity of the neighbourhood is not unreasonably affected. As stated above, the use and fit out of the proposed café will be the subject of a further development application. The identified hours of operation for the Library, Community Offices and Youth Centre are considered unlikely to cause an amenity problem for nearby residents.

In terms of disability access, a review of the drawings by *Disability Access Consultants* has been conducted. The review contained in their report dated 9 December 2003 is quite detailed and draws attention to a number of design aspects of the development. These include: the accessible car spaces and kerb ramps, handrails of stairs and ramps, access to the café, foyer entry door and internal door design, access ramps, accessible toilets, access to the Pre School area, design of the after hours return slot, separation of stacks and provision of desks suitable for people who use a wheelchair. It is recommended that conditions of consent be included that requires compliance with Australian Standards AS 1428.1 and AS 1428.2 and that a compliance report be

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

provided prior to the issue of an occupation certificate. It is also considered that the recommendations of the report regarding stack separation and provision of desks suitable for people who use a wheelchair be included as conditions of consent.

**(c) Suitability of the site**

The site is fully serviced [ie water, electricity, sewer and telephone] and has been specifically identified in draft DCP 126 for the construction of a library, community offices and café.

The site enjoys good access to the public road system and public transport. Traffic generated by the development is considered to be within the environmental capacity of the surrounding road network.

Aspects of site suitability regarding stormwater management, flooding and potential land use conflict have been discussed earlier in this report.

**(d) Any submission made in accordance with the Act or the Regulation**

As stated earlier in this report, Council has received two (2) submissions as a result of the notification process. Neither of these object to the proposed development. The suggestions provided will be considered when determining final fit-out and use of particular spaces.

**(e) Public interest**

The development on this site of a high quality development that will serve the people of Narellan and provide social benefit and community interaction opportunities, sufficient car parking, access and improved streetscape is considered to be in the public interest.

The proposal serves the need within the community for this type of development and affords a social benefit to the wider community.

**Conclusion**

The proposed development of a library and community office, youth centre and cafe at No. 15 Queen Street, Narellan will contribute to satisfying community needs by delivering a high quality community asset. The scale of the proposal is compliant

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

with that envisaged for the site and the civic location. The development is consistent with the objectives of the Local Environmental Plan and the particular zone. The resulting development will not detract from the amenity of the area. It will add a social benefit for the community.

Recommended: That consent to Development Application 1467/2003 at Lot 12 in DP 1035665 and lots 5 and 6 in DP 214690 (15) Queen Street, Narellan, being, for the construction of a new library, associated car parking, community centre, plaza and removal of seventeen (17) trees at 15 Queen Street, Narellan be approved subject to the conditions of development consent which form **Tabled Document “DC 15”**.

*Resolved on the Motion of Cr Corrigan, seconded Cr McFadden that consent to Development Application 1467/2003 at Lot 12 in DP 1035665 and lots 5 and 6 in DP 214690 (15) Queen Street, Narellan, being, for the construction of a new library, associated car parking, community centre, plaza and removal of seventeen (17) trees at 15 Queen Street, Narellan be approved subject to the conditions of development consent which form **Tabled Document “DC 15”**.*

DC010/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED**.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**9. Extensions to Macarthur Anglican School - Proposed Junior School**

**File No:** DA 1800.2160 (Director, Development & Environment Division)  
**DA No:** 948/2003  
**Property:** 605 Cobbitty Road, Cobbitty  
Lot 100, DP 1050999  
**Applicant:** Malone Campbell & Allan P/L  
**Owner:** The Macarthur Region Anglican Church School  
**Zoning:** Rural "A" (40ha) Zone – CLEP 48

**Purpose of Report**

This report advises of an application to amend the masterplan for the Macarthur Anglican School to include the proposed junior school and to make a determination on the building of the first stage of the junior school, and extensions to the science and music buildings.

**Summary of Recommendation**

The report recommends the application be approved subject to compliance with conditions of consent.

**Background**

On 1 June 1995, conditional consent was issued for Development Application No. 42/95 submitted by Macarthur Anglican School for an Educational Establishment – New Secondary School on proposed lot 10 in the subdivision of Lot 1, DP774425 (No. 421) The Northern Road, Cobbitty.

The original determination limited the student and staff numbers to a total of 712 students, 58 teachers and 13 administration staff.

An amendment to the development application was determined on 5 August 1998, where approval was given to the relocation and redesign of the following buildings: General Learning Areas (GLA) classrooms; library; staff study and meeting rooms; pavilion; music classrooms, gymnasium and games court.

**The Proposal**

The Macarthur Anglican School is seeking an expansion to their existing school at Cobbitty. This includes:

- the completion of the Science Wing – two laboratories with a central seminar area;



**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**The Site**

The site has been extended with the acquisition of the adjoining Lot 3 DP 599327 (approximately 3ha) providing a total area of 47.478ha (refer to the locality plan which forms **Tabled Document “DC 17”**). It has frontage to both The Northern and Cobbitty Roads, although access is only from Cobbitty Road.

The site consists of substantially cleared farmland and has a watercourse traversing it, falling from east to west. Remnant Cumberland Plain Woodland is located at two parts of the site, one adjacent to the school’s entrance and the second near the watercourse, adjacent to the existing school buildings (refer to **Tabled Document “DC 18”**) for the original masterplan approved in 1995.

The senior school has been built since 1995 with associated infrastructure: internal access roads; car parking; landscaping; stormwater and sewage treatment facilities; playing fields and agricultural facilities.

**Notification**

The application was sent to all the adjoining landowners, local community groups and advertised in the local paper. No submissions were received.

**Planning Controls**

The following plans and policies have been considered in the assessment of this application.

- SREP 20 Hawkesbury-Nepean River System
- SEPP 11 Traffic Generating Developments
- Camden LEP 48
- NSW Rural Fire Services – Bushfire Prone Land Map
- DIPNR – Permit under Part 3A
- Draft Camden Scenic and Cultural Landscapes Study
- Camden 2025
- Camden Draft Flood Risk Management Policy December 2003

**Assessment**

**Section 79C Consideration**

- (a) **The Provision of Any Environmental Planning Instrument**

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

The application is not inconsistent with any SEPP or REP.

Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No 20

The land is affected by SREP 20 (No. 2 –1997) which states that Council shall not grant consent to an application to carry out development which drains to the Hawkesbury/Nepean River, unless it has taken into account the effect the proposed development will have on:

- (a) the water quality of the river;
- (b) the recreational opportunities of the river;
- (c) the economy of the river;
- (d) the agricultural potential of the river;
- (e) the significant vegetation and wildlife habitats of the river valley;
- (f) the environmental heritage of the river valley;
- (g) the scenic quality of the river and river valley;
- (h) whether the proposed development will be capable of connection to a Sydney Water Corporation or Council sewerage system, either now or in the future.

With implementation of appropriate erosion controls during construction, together with the proposed water quality management and on-site sewage treatment, the impact of the proposed development on the river system is expected to be negligible.

State Environmental Planning Policy No 11

The land is affected by SEPP 11, which states that the Traffic Authority is to be made aware of the development and given the opportunity to make representations. Council staff and the applicant attended a meeting of the Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee (SRDAC). Comments from the SRDAC included:

“... give consideration to the adequacy of the Cobbitty Road/Access Road intersection and in particular the existing right turn (into the school) and the left turn lane out of the school needs to be extended or improved.

In this regard it is recommended that the applicant be requested to submit detail intersection performance analysis on the Cobbitty Road/Access Road intersection, taking into consideration the cumulative impact of the proposed Primary School and the existing High School ... and any recommendation considered prior to the determination of the development application.”

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

The applicant's consultant has provided the required additional information and their analysis showed the intersection will operate satisfactorily.

Camden Local Environmental Plan No 48

The subject land is zoned Rural "A" (40Ha) (refer to locality plan which forms **Tabled Document "DC 17"**). Within the Rural "A" zoning of LEP 48, a school is not prohibited development.

The relevant zone objective is as follows:

"... to enable compatible forms of development ... if they are in keeping with the rural character of the locality, and carried out in an environmentally sensitive manner;

... to ensure that development does not detract from the existing rural character of the area or create unreasonable or uneconomic demands for provision or extension of public amenities and services."

The proposal as submitted satisfies these objectives of this zone.

Integrated Development – NSW Rural Fire Services –  
Bushfire Prone Land Map

The site is identified as bushfire prone land and therefore the application is an integrated development proposal and must be referred to the NSW Rural Fire Service. They have replied indicating a Bush Fire Safety Authority can be granted with no specific conditions.

Integrated Development – Department of Infrastructure,  
Planning and Natural Resources (DIPNA) – Permit under  
Part 3A

The proposed development will impact on an identified natural watercourse and therefore the application is an integrated development proposal and must be referred to DIPNR. They have replied, providing Council with a set of the Department's 'General Terms of Approval', which are to be included within the conditions of consent. An application will be required from the applicant to obtain a Part 3A permit from the Department for any works within 40m of the natural watercourse.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

Draft Camden Scenic and Cultural Landscapes Study

The draft Camden Scenic and Cultural Landscapes Study does not identify the subject site as having any specific cultural or scenic significance.

Camden 2025 – A Strategic Plan for Camden

Camden 2025 has a number of key areas for Council to consider in the development of the Camden LGA. The strategies applicable to this development are 'Managing Urban Growth' and 'Environmental Systems'.

The proposal meets the outcomes and objectives of these strategies by ensuring that the development has appropriate service infrastructure provision and that stresses on the natural environment are minimised and areas rehabilitated. Also, issues of water quality, building energy conservation and additional areas of Cumberland Plain Woodland provided as part of Council's Natural Asset Policy will contribute to the strategies of Camden 2025. The siting of the school away from major residential areas is not consistent with the managing urban growth principles and therefore, it is necessary to ensure that good bus access to the school is available so that reliance of the motor car is minimised.

Camden Draft Flood Risk Management Policy -  
December 2003

The subject property is not affected by flooding from the Nepean River/Cobbitty Creek up to the PMF. Although, Cobbitty Road to the west of the development is affected to a minor degree by flooding, both 1% AEP and the PMF from Nepean River, adequate flood free access to the development is available to The Northern Road.

Further assessment of the local flooding due to the catchment upstream of the subject site indicates that all the proposed buildings are well outside the estimated 1% AEP flood level. As such there is no impact due to local or mainstream flooding of Nepean River as on site detention is planned for the development.

**(b) Likely Impact on Both Natural and Built Environment**

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

Flora and Fauna

The revised masterplan identifies an area of existing Cumberland Plain Woodland (CPW) that will require part removal. A detailed 'assessment of significance' report was prepared by local environmental consultants, Wirrimbirra Consultants, which included an 'eight part test' for the removal of part of CPW.

The report addresses all the issues raised by Council officers and the requirements of Council's Natural Assets Policy. An existing remnant CPW area at the school's entrance is to be further rehabilitated and fenced as part of the required 'off-setting' in Council's policy. Also a new area will be required for the restoration of CPW within the school site. This will include the drainage area to the north of the school and in the area of the playing fields up to The Northern Road (refer to the Landscape Masterplan which forms **Tabled Document "DC 19"**). There will be an opportunity for this work to be part of an education programme. A vegetation management plan will be required as a condition of consent identifying an environmentally qualified person to supervise the project with annual benchmarks to be set for the project to be completed. An annual audit report will be required to be submitted to Council.

Traffic

The application was reported to both the Development Traffic Committee and as it is a SEPP 11 – Traffic Generating development, and to the RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee (SRDAC). Comment was made by the SRDAC on the adequacy of the Cobbitty Road/School Access Road intersection, in particular the existing right turn bay. The applicant's consultant has provided information on these issues and it has been shown that this intersection will operate satisfactorily.

The school's internal traffic and car parking have been reviewed and comments discussed with the applicant. It was agreed that amendments will be required to be made and these have been marked on the revised masterplan for inclusion in the conditions of consent.

Car Parking

The previous determination in 1995, conditioned the development with the minimum on-site car parking as follows:

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

Stage 1-2	Stage 3	
25	34	permanent staff car parking spaces;
19	29	overflow staff car parking spaces;
34	45	student car parking spaces;
1	1	delivery space;
1	1	courier space;
2	2	disabled car parking space;
5	8	bus spaces
Total 63	112	car parking spaces + 8 bus spaces

Note: Stage 1-2    534 students and 52 staff;  
          Stage 3        712 students and 71 staff.

Based on Council's DCP 97 – Car Parking the current application proposal will require 100 car parking spaces, which is less than originally planned for without the junior school. However, the school has taken a more pragmatic basis because of the special transport needs dictated by the school's relatively remote location. Parking demands were surveyed at both this site and the Narellan Junior School during the set-down and pick-up periods before and after school as well as the daily static demands.

The Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment prepared by the applicant's consultant has determined the following requirements for car parking:

Existing school	
- teachers, staff and visitors	90
- year 11 and 12 students	100
Junior school	
- teachers and staff	35
- set-down and pick-up areas	125
Total car parking spaces	350
Buses	6

The applicant has indicated that the school intends to hard pave the roads and parking areas over a period of time as funds permit. In the meantime it is intended that compacted road base be used as they come into use.

It is proposed that the first stage of the Junior school be conditioned that the school provide fully sealed roads

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

with appropriate stormwater drainage and car parking areas as follows:

Existing school development	
- staff, gymnasium and chapel	66
New stage 1 development	
- Junior school stage 1, new demountable and completion of Science wing	94
Total car parking spaces	160
with 8 bus spaces as originally approved	

This will leave the remaining 190 car spaces to be provided over the future building stages of this application. In this respect the school will be required as part of the determination to provide Council a programme for the provision of these extra car parking spaces to allow for the construction to be extended over the school building programme. However, the type of construction for the future roads and car parks will need to be fully sealed and drained and not compacted road base as proposed by the applicant.

Stormwater and Water Quality Management

The hydraulic consultant who modelled the catchment of the proposed development indicates that excess stormwater generated from the development will be detained on-site. Existing water storage facilities, detention pond and sedimentation basin will be modified to accommodate the excess run-off from the development. Detail plans will be requested to be submitted with the Construction Certificate application as part of the conditions of consent. Water quality management is also to be addressed using 'Water Sensitive Urban Design Principles', which will include management of oil and grit in the car park/bus bays, sedimentation basin, grass swales and wet basin. Appropriate conditions will be incorporated in the development consent conditions so that plans are submitted with the Construction Certificate application.

Landscaping

A landscape masterplan has been submitted and is generally satisfactory. However, the applicant will be requested for a schedule of works to enable reasonable time frames for the completion of the landscaping works in conjunction with the staged building and car parking.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

The broad landscape objectives of the proposal are to provide introduced tree species, deciduous and evergreen for sun and shade control, planted in association with the buildings and high use areas. Australian native species are to be planted in the larger open space recreational areas. Indigenous native species will be planted in the riparian areas and the existing and proposed Cumberland Plain Woodland areas.

Energy Efficiency

An energy assessment has been prepared for the proposal, which approaches the issue of energy conservation with passive design features such as: building design layout and orientation; building materials; insulation; window orientation and shading; external vents/louvres and skylights. A detailed energy efficiency report will be requested for the Construction Certificate stage of all the proposed buildings.

Sewage Management

The existing school is being serviced by a Biocycle sewage treatment plant. The school is proposing to upgrade this facility for it to be capable of catering for the projected school population.

**(c) The Suitability of the Site for the Development**

Context and Setting

The proposal is an extension of an existing education facility that is located in a rural setting. The revised masterplan for the school site, which has been extended with the acquisition of an adjoining 3ha property, will be maintaining the rural setting outside the building precinct. In particular the areas of Cumberland Plain Woodland and the school's agricultural plot.

Access and Traffic

The current access to Cobbitty Road was resolved in the original application. The increase of vehicular traffic with the proposed school expansion has been reviewed by the RTA and Council's Development Traffic Committee with no outstanding issues.

Services

All services are currently available to the school, with treatment of sewage being provided on-site.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

Natural Hazards

No objection was received from the NSW Rural Fire Service to this proposal.

Three earth-retaining storage facilities exist for on-site stormwater storage. These include a dam, detention pond and a sedimentation basin. It is proposed that the sedimentation basin will be enlarged to cater for the increase in stormwater run-off. The proposed development is above the 1% AEP flood level of the natural watercourse that traverses the site.

**(d) Any Submissions Made in Accordance with this act or the Regulations/Public Interest**

Nil

**Conclusion**

The proposed expansion of the Macarthur Anglican School as indicated on the revised masterplan and the proposed first stage of the Junior School have been fully assessed and all issues, such as traffic and car parking; Cumberland Plain Woodland areas; bush fire prone land; sewage treatment; and stormwater drainage have been satisfactorily resolved and/or appropriately conditioned.

On the basis of the above assessment the proposed development application is recommended for approval.

Recommended: That Development Application No.948/03 to revise the masterplan for the Macarthur Anglican School and for the first stage of the Junior School be approved subject to the draft conditions that form **Tabled Document “DC 20”**.

*Resolved on the Motion of Cr Corrigan, seconded Cr McFadden that Development Application No.948/03 to revise the masterplan for the Macarthur Anglican School and for the first stage of the Junior School be approved subject to the draft conditions that form **Tabled Document “DC 20”**.*

DC011/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED**.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**10. Camden Local Plan**

(File 4475/5) (Director Governance & Outcomes)

**Background**

A report was considered by Council at its meeting held on 15 December 2003 in relation to the progress of the Camden Local Plan. Council resolved at that meeting:

- (i) *To note the amendments made to the structure and format of the Local Plan.*
- (ii) *To exhibit the LEP component of the Local Plan.*
- (iii) *To exhibit the DCP component as integrated into the Local Plan.*
- (iv) *Upon receipt of a section 65 certificate, Council proceed to exhibit the draft LEP and Local Plan from 30 January 2004 until 30 March 2004.*
- (v) *That an extensive public consultation strategy be implemented as established in the report to be thoroughly advertised from the beginning of the exhibition period.*
- (vi) *A formal Council workshop with Councillors be conducted at the beginning of the exhibition period in respect of the Draft Plan.*
- (vii) *An informal meeting be held with community reference groups and interested parties before going on public exhibition.*

**Certificate to Enable Public Exhibition**

At the time of writing the abovementioned report it was expected, having regard to detailed dialogue with the Deputy Director General of DIPNR, that the Department would be issuing a Section 65 certificate, to enable the exhibition of the Plan, in early January 2004. The Department and Parliamentary Counsel have, however, sought further clarification on a number of matters relating to the Plan and it is now expected that the certificate will be issued either in late January or early February 2004. Accordingly the Plan will not commence exhibition on the 30 January 2004.

**Public Exhibition**

Upon the issuing of the Section 65 certificate the exhibition will proceed for a two month period as previously requested by Council. It should be noted that there will be approximately a one month period between the issuing of the Certificate and the

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

commencement of the exhibition. This period is to enable sufficient time to arrange venue dates and printing and distribution of the exhibition material to the community.

A complete timetable for the exhibition, including the timing of a Councillors workshop, will be distributed to Councillors shortly after the issuing of the Section 65 certificate.

Recommended: That Council note the delay in the implementation of Council's resolution of 15 December 2003.

*Resolved on the Motion of Cr Batros, seconded Cr Corrigan that Council note the delay in the implementation of Council's resolution of 15 December 2003.*

DC012/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**  
\*\*\*\*\*

**11. Draft Development Control Plan No. 124 - Elderslie  
Release Area**

(File 3345/21)(Director Governance and Outcomes)

**Purpose of Report**

This report discusses procedural issues associated with the adoption of Draft Development Control Plan 124 - Elderslie Release Area (DCP 124) and the coming into effect of the DCP. The report recommends that the Council adopt the Draft DCP 124 to come into effect upon the date of the gazettal of Draft LEP 117 – Elderslie.

**Background**

Council at its meeting held on the 15 December 2003 resolved inter alia to:

- (ii) *Adopt the amended draft DCP 124 and establish an operational date in accordance with the regulations as soon as possible after gazettal of LEP 117 – Elderslie.*

**Discussion**

The draft DCP was exhibited together with the Draft LEP 117 – Elderslie, submissions considered and amendments made to the plan. The Plan was adopted by Council on the 15 December 2003. For the DCP to come into effect a public notice of Council's decision to adopt the draft DCP and the date that it is to come into effect has to appear in a local newspaper within 28 days after the decision has been made.

Public notification of the Spring Farm DCP occurred, however, unfortunately public notice of the adoption of the DCP did not occur within the 28 days as required by the Regulations to the EPA Act 1979. For this reason it is necessary for Council to again adopt the amended Draft DCP 124 – Elderslie and for a public notice of the Council's decision to appear in the local newspaper.

Copies of the Draft DCP have previously been circulated to Councillors and no further changes have been made to the document.

Despite the prior urgency by DIPNR neither the Elderslie or Spring Farm LEP's have been gazetted by the Department at this time.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

Recommended: That Council resolve to

- (i) Adopt the amended draft DCP 124 – Elderslie Release Area;
- (ii) Give public notice of the commencement of DCP 124 – Elderslie Release Area upon the date of the gazettal of LEP 117 – Elderslie.

Resolved on the Motion of Cr Corrigan, seconded Cr McFadden that Council resolve to

- (i) Adopt the amended draft DCP 124 – Elderslie Release Area;
- (ii) Give public notice of the commencement of DCP 124 – Elderslie Release Area upon the date of the gazettal of LEP 117 – Elderslie.

DC013/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**

(Cr Batros voted against the Motion).

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**12. Elderslie Release Area Link Road - Local Environmental Plan No. 132**

(File 3345/22) (Director Governance & Outcomes)

The purpose of the subject Local Environmental Plan (LEP) is to reclassify a portion of land from “community” to “operational”. The land, which is situated on Kirkham Park, is to be used for a sewerage pumping station.

The Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources (DIPNR) has advised Council that the LEP was recently made and proclaimed in the Government Gazette of 9 January 2004.

Recommended: That Council resolve to

- (i) Note the recent gazettal of LEP No. 132
- (ii) Advise the Users of Kirkham Park of the gazettal.

Resolved on the Motion of Cr Corrigan, seconded Cr Batros that Council resolve to

- (i) Note the recent gazettal of LEP No. 132
- (ii) Advise the Users of Kirkham Park of the gazettal.

DC014/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**  
\*\*\*\*\*

**13. Draft Development Control Plan No. 126 – Narellan Township**

(File 4711) (Director Governance & Outcomes)

**Purpose of Report**

The purpose of this report is to advise Council of the exhibition of Draft Development Control Plan No. 126, (Narellan Township), outline the submissions received and to recommend a course of action to progress the matter.

**Background**

Council considered a report at its Development Committee Meeting of 26 May, 2003 in respect of the planning initiatives associated with the Narellan Township which culminated in the preparation of Draft Development Control Plan No. 126 (Narellan Township). A copy of the subject report has been **provided to Councillors as a separate handout.**

In 2001 Council received a grant under the State Planning administered Urban Improvement Program. A Strategic Plan was prepared for the Narellan Township under the guidance of a community reference group which was established for that purpose through a process of expressions of interest. The Strategic Plan established a vision for Narellan and a series of strategies and actions to realise such vision.

To progress the Plan and in order to condense the timeframe for preparing a response to the series of strategies and actions an “Enquiry by Design” exercise was undertaken.

The “Enquiry by Design” process, an internationally acclaimed planning technique, assembled national and international planners and support personnel to test, by design, a series of options in respect of the Narellan township. The exercise was closed to the public given the sensitive landuse issues needing to be tested and the inherent potential for land speculation. The owners of some key development sites (both public and private) were consulted to establish if the options being tested were at all feasible, before energy was expended examining different design scenarios. These owners were not part of the “Enquiry by Design” group.

At the conclusion of the design exercise an annotated, indicative development plan was produced and supported by some contextual background reports. The Indicative Development Plan essentially represents a Masterplan.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**Draft Development Control Plan No. 126 – Narellan Township**

The annotated, indicative development plan provided the framework for preparation of a Development Control Plan for the Narellan Township; namely, DDCP No. 126 – Narellan Township. The overarching vision for Narellan established in the Strategic Plan was refined to more closely reflect the indicative development plan and was produced in the form of a Statement of Desired Future Character for the Narellan Township. Such statement represents a word picture of the new Narellan.

Statements of Desired Future Character (word pictures) were in turn prepared for the places that were seen to comprise the township. The place boundaries were determined having regard largely to a commonality of issues. Alternative suggestions for some of the place boundaries have some degree of merit and will be addressed later.

The DDCP, was never intended to be a rezoning document. General development principles – together with place specific controls were prepared to guide development so as to realise the place specific and ultimately overarching vision. A more detailed commentary in respect of the DDCP is provided in the report considered by Council at the previously referenced Development Committee meeting of 26 May, 2003.

**Exhibition/Public Consultation**

Council, at its meeting of 26 May, 2003, resolved to exhibit the DDCP for 12 weeks and adopted the following exhibition/consultation strategy:

- Establishment and resourcing of a shop front
- Conduct of meetings for each place
- Distribution of a leaflet or postcard to each property and business in the area

Additionally Council requested that specific interest groups be invited to make a final verbal submission at the conclusion of the exhibition period.

The exhibition period extended from 3 July to 26 September, 2003. A shop front was established at the highly accessible Narellan Town Centre and provided access to information over the following spread of hours and days:

- Thursdays from 10.30am to 7pm;
- Fridays from 10.30am to 6pm; and
- Saturdays from 10.30am to 2.30pm

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

for the duration of the exhibition period.

Some 1100 people visited the shopfront with 450 copies of the Draft Plan being distributed. The staffing of the shopfront always included a senior planning resource with a detailed understanding of the Draft Plan, its development and context.

The shopfront provided not only a forum for obtaining information but it also promoted opportunities for informal comment by way of a “Visitors Book”, response sheets and “hands” which were displayed on panels at the shop for the exhibition period.

A total of 120 comments were recorded in the Visitors Book and these are reproduced as **Tabled Document “DC 21”**. A total of 69 “hand” comments were made and these are reproduced as **Tabled Document “DC 22”**. There were also a total of 59 response sheets completed and a review of these is reproduced as **Tabled Document “DC 23”**. Copies of the response sheets have been **provided to Councillors under separate cover**. The comments provided above, where applicable, have been addressed in the report.

In addition, outline exhibition material was included in statutory newspaper advertising and a specially designed (and individually distributed) brochure, a mail out to all affected property owners/occupiers and on Council’s website.

Four community meetings were held at Studley Park Golf Club on 1, 2, 3 and 10 September, 2003 and were attended by over 100 people in total. The meetings considered several places on each evening and although there was a specific focus on each evening, as was promoted, no one was precluded from making comment about another place of the Draft Plan in general. Mr John Mullane led the meetings in the capacity of an independent facilitator. Further, Mr Mullane provided an independent report in respect of such meetings. A copy of the report is reproduced as **Table Document “DC 24”**.

**Submissions Received**

A total of 62 formal written submissions were received in response to the exhibition/consultation. In addition, informal comments were received via the “visitors book”, green response sheets and “hands” as outlined previously. Copies of all formal and informal submissions have been made available under separate cover to Councillors.

The submissions in summary comprised:

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

- 54 responses from residents, landowners and community groups. A schedule of these submissions has been prepared and forms **Tabled Document “DC 25”**.
- 8 submissions from State Government Agencies. A schedule of these submissions has been prepared and forms **Tabled Document “DC 26”**.

**Issues Raised**

The issues raised in the submissions included:

- ◆ Traffic & transport/accessibility
- ◆ Car parking
- ◆ Medium density housing
- ◆ Infrastructure provision
- ◆ Open space
- ◆ Heritage and view corridors
- ◆ Amount of retail/commercial floor space
- ◆ Environmental
- ◆ Site specific issues (key sites)
- ◆ Process
- ◆ Other concerns

The principal elements raised in respect of each issue and a response is produced below. An individual response to the specific matters raised in each submission is produced in **Tabled Documents “DC 25”** and **“DC 26”**.

Note: It should be noted, each concern is preceded by a bullet point and the responses are shown in italics.

**Traffic/Transport/Accessibility** (Concerns and Responses)

- Existing road network inadequate.

*Council continues to lobby state government for an improved road network and public transport. The new State Government Transport Levy will provide funds for improvements to the District and Regional Level road network. Local network improvements were tested in the “Enquiry by Design” process and are promoted in the Masterplan. Richardson Road ramps to the By Pass are not seen as fundamental to the traffic management scheme and are likely to prove difficult to implement in terms of residential amenity.*

- Existing public transport inadequate.

*Transport levy and submission to the bus enquiry are evidence of Council action in this regard. Bus stops / routes need to be more clearly highlighted on the Masterplan.*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

*Enhanced bus services are only achievable through negotiation and route planning provision. Negotiations are ongoing with bus companies as part of broader public transport negotiations.*

- State Government commitment to upgrade of road network and improved public transport a pre-requisite to increased levels of development.

*RTA has commenced design for the upgrade of Narellan Road, whilst DIPNR is committed to the transport levy and improvements to public transport.*

- RTA are concerned with impacts upon regional transport network of the proposed traffic management scheme.

*Regional transport requirements need to be balanced with local access requirements. These matters are being resolved at State Government level.*

- RTA are concerned with the removal of the grade separation at By Pass and Narellan Rd.

*Alternative schemes for enhancing the integration of the By Pass with Narellan Road may not necessitate removal of the grade separate intersection.*

- Opposition to Somerset Avenue extension to the Narellan Road extension.

*The Somerset Avenue extension to the Narellan Road extension and its continuation to “Struggletown” is fundamental to “unlocking” the traffic congestion in central Narellan and providing enhanced accessibility to “Struggletown” and parts of Harrington Park. The traffic modelling shows that this is the preferred option that will have the optimal traffic result. This is supported by reports by ESD P/L produced in **Tabled Document “DC 27”** and Patrick Partners are reproduced in **Tabled Document “DC 28”**.*

- Concern with traffic congestion on Somerset Avenue particularly near access to the Narellan Town Centre.

*The Carparking Options Paper, reproduced in **Tabled Document “DC 29”**, recommends that Council consider a widening of Somerset Avenue to incorporate a passing lane and on street parking.*

- Concern with general traffic movements in the Somerset Avenue area including carparking on Slade Street, limited sight lines and conflicts at the intersection of Somerset Avenue and Elyard Street. Also concern with the location of

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

the new road link from Doncaster Avenue to Eastlewood Street.

*It has been proposed that Council consider an extension of Elyard Street to Eastlewood Street. This option would see the partial closure of Slade Street to become a car park entry only. This option will need further investigation including a cost benefit analysis.*

- Opposition to the proposed new road connection between Fairwater Drive and the Narellan Road extension as it is considered that it will result in a 'rat run' for traffic.

*The intent of the proposal is to provide better accessibility for both "Struggletown" and parts of Harrington Park. Traffic management techniques may need to be incorporated at the design stage to prevent rat running.*

- Opposition to Queen Street extension to Camden By-Pass.

*The Queen Street extension should not proceed at this time. (The option should remain for future review).*

- Opposition to Wilson Crescent/Richardson Road and/or pedestrian link.

*Wilson Crescent /Richardson Road access link to be retained as pedestrian/cycle access only.*

- Concern opening Doncaster Avenue to Camden Valley Way.

*Proposed changes to commercial floor space in this area would no longer see a need for this access to be made available in the short to medium term.*

- Concern with impact of proposed Queen Street/Coghill Street link upon the School.

*Queen Street/Coghill Street link is considered important for the permeability of the precinct. Its implementation and in particular its nature, timing and construction should be pursued in consultation with the school.*

- Concern with access to the museum and Struggletown precinct generally.

*Access to Museum and Struggletown precinct is generally considered to be enhanced by the proposed scheme.*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

- Concern with commercial impact on existing Northern Road commercial premises “By Passed” by the Narellan Road extension.

*Access will be maintained to all Northern Road premises “By passed”. Some rationalised directional signage may be necessary and should be pursued with the RTA.*

- Pedestrian and cycle network needs to be improved.

*A decision in respect of pedestrian over bridge needs to be made by way of a Development Application determination. (Capable of being addressed independently). Pedestrian / Cycle network will be reviewed as part of the preparation of a Local Area Traffic Management Scheme (including a pedestrian and cycle Access Mobility component).*

**Car Parking** (Concerns and Responses)

- Inadequate provision for convenient accessible parking.

*Timely provision of convenient, accessible parking is critical. Opportunities to maximise parking within the street network via angle parking, central median parking (inclusive of road widening) forms the basis of the parking strategy as discussed in the Options Paper (**Tabled Document “DC 29”**).*

- On-site parking provision could prejudice urban design outcomes.

*Urban design outcomes should not be compromised by parking provision. Maximum on-site provision can sometimes prejudice design outcomes. Maximum integration with expanded road reservation parking is to underpin the parking strategy generally.*

- Parking must occur concurrently with development.

*Existing spaces are to be retained where not a part of a rationalisation proposal. On-site parking is to be optimised. Parking strategy including S94 contributions are to be implemented incrementally at a commensurate rate.*

- Multi-deck car parking can impact adversely aesthetically.

*The need for decked car parking generally is to be minimised due to cost and general aesthetic challenges. Deck structures may be appropriate where they can be sensitively incorporated into a development, screened by commercial floor space and landscaping.*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

- Angle parking should be installed in Elyard Street.

*The Options Paper previously mentioned proposes the widening of Elyard Street to facilitate central parking and kerbside parallel parking.*

**Infrastructure Impacts** (Concerns and Responses)

- Burden upon existing infrastructure impacts must be fully known and a strategy prepared to ensure concurrent upgrading.

*The impacts are largely known. Section 94 plans will need to be amended to reflect requirements. Infrastructure of a more sustainable nature are inherent in planning proposals. The Local Plan's general provisions convey broad design parameters for most infrastructure together with objectives. Such provisions have a high Environmentally Sustainable Design focus.*

- Development should only occur concurrently with infrastructure upgrades.

*Strategies for upgrades are currently being finalised.*

- Concern that power should be undergrounded as part of the development strategy.

*Some rationalisation of power lines is possible. Full undergrounding may be cost prohibitive.*

**Medium Density Housing** (Concerns and Responses)

- Amount and timing of Medium Density Housing (MDH).

*Medium Density Housing (MDH) provision is a Council Residential Strategy requirement and UIP objective and is presently being monitored by DIPNR. The Residential Strategy gained Council an exemption from the blanket imposition of MDH in any residential area.*

- Siting of Medium Density Housing (MDH).

*To achieve best environmental and amenity outcomes MDH is best located within a walkable distance of major services and facilities such as shopping, transport and community services. Narellan township fulfils many of these requirements. The areas of MDH will be clearly denoted on the map to avoid confusion. The Masterplan will focus on the area within a 500 metre radius of a variable nucleus centred*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

*on the Town Centre. Boundaries are to be rationalised and interface with adjoining uses to be managed.*

- Impact on residential amenity.

*Consolidation of lots and precinct guidelines will be required to guide development in order to achieve quality outcomes.*

- Socially undesirable.

*There is no basis for the notion that medium density housing is socially undesirable. A Social Impact Statement would be required in preparation of the LES. MDH provides a range of housing choice for a broad cross section of the community meeting the needs of older people, people with disabilities, young singles, first home buyers etc.*

- Lack of market analysis/justification.

*Market and community demand exists for alternative housing products near the Centre, including housing for the elderly. Initial market analysis indicates a demand and feasibility for a variety of product.*

- Diversity of housing generally and in particular for the elderly.

*Provision for diverse housing forms is included in the plan, inclusive of elderly clientele.*

- Some of Eastlewood Street should be devoted to Medium Density Housing.

*The area referred to is located within the 500 metre radius of the town centre however it is recommended that this area not be considered for Medium Density Housing at this time, due to a staged implementation/transformation strategy.*

**Commercial Development** (Concerns and Responses)

- Amount, timing and nature of commercial floorspace.

*The amount of floorspace is justified by consultant expert. Staging may need to be controlled and is currently being investigated. Some change to location and mix of floor space to achieve outcomes desired for The Northern Rd/Camden Valley Way/Narellan Road extension triangle.*

- Focus upon “natural mass” and lack of focus upon Narellan as a place to live.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

*“Natural Mass” reference was never intended to dehumanise or devalue residents and their lifestyle. This is an individual interpretation of the term in the context used.*

- Use of Floorspace ratios as a development control.

*Floorspace ratios have limitations as a development control tool, building envelopes in conjunction with height profiles should be articulated and used wherever possible.*

**Environmental** (Concerns and Responses)

- Lack of attention to air and water quality issues.

*Expansion of the plan aims to be more holistic than its apparent commercial focus. Air and water quality concerns are addressed by trying to make it easier for people to move around the centre by vehicle and alternative means. Improved pedestrian and cycle linkages will encourage people to walk/cycle rather than drive. Water sensitive urban design policy principle will apply.*

- Concern with acoustic amenity particularly from Narellan Road.

*Acoustic amenity issues are to be addressed.*

- Concern with adverse environmental cumulative impact in Narellan and LGA generally.

*Council acknowledges that development will have a cumulative impact. The planning strategy inherent in the plan aims to ensure impacts are addressed appropriately.*

- Concern about the lack of green space retention.

*The proposed green space retention and expansion, together with the ESD nature of much of the infrastructure provision is considered to provide adequate balance.*

**Open Space** (Concerns and Responses)

- Remnant trees should be protected.

*Conservation of remnant trees will be critical to any development/redevelopment proposal. The linking of remnants with adjoining/adjacent remnants should be promoted.*

- Development will occasion a demand for enhanced levels of open space provision.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

*The Masterplan will be amended to more fully reflect open space demands. District level open space in nearby catchments may also require embellishment. The Section 94 plan will also need to be amended to reflect increased requirements.*

- Narellan generally, is poorly provided with open space.

*Local parks are to be expanded by approximately 1 hectare through expansion of existing parks as depicted on amended Masterplan. Off-site provision/embellishment of District level open space is also required. Opportunities in Narellan Creek Catchment, Harrington Park, and Spring Farm are being investigated.*

- Open space must be of high quality and accessible.

*Formalisation and embellishment of a substantial civic park focused on remnant vegetation and library plaza is central to the Masterplan for Narellan. The balance of civic precinct is a strategic community land asset capable of directly or indirectly meeting a variety of community needs.*

- Open space must cater for a diversity of needs.

*District level opportunities are being explored in nearby catchments as previously cited.*

- No development on site where library currently proposed.

*The site chosen for the library is zoned General Business under the provisions of LEP46. This zone permits the construction of the library with consent. The land was acquired by Council principally for administrative purposes and is operational land under the provisions of the Local Government Act. This classification allows Council to develop or sell the land for any use that is permitted under the zoning.*

*The site was chosen for the library and community facilities because of its proximity to the main business area of Narellan and the planned Town Centre improvements, particularly those envisaged for Elyard Street. The site is located close to transport and its use for community purposes, particularly at night will have minimal impact on residential areas. A much more active environment is appropriate in this location than on any other part of the land owned by Council. The development does not affect any of the significant trees on the land and allows for the incorporation of the main vegetated area within the Town Park.*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**Heritage and View Corridors** (Concerns and Responses)

- Inadequate heritage investigations. An expanded list of heritage items needs to be identified.

*Heritage Study Review, although not yet publicly available, has identified an expanded heritage inventory which needs to be endorsed by Council and consulted with affected persons. The review is not expected to impact greatly on the Masterplan for Narellan. Heritage items in Narellan are generally known and will be annotated on the Masterplan.*

- Important views and vistas need to be identified and conserved.

*More view analysis is currently being undertaken for broader Narellan and will be further addressed in the LES.*

- Need for a Masterplan for St. Thomas precinct including school and cemetery.

*This is not considered necessary as the Heritage Report commissioned by Council for the St Thomas' Church group establishes development principles and curtilages.*

- Council should facilitate community ownership and management of cemetery.

*Council has been informed, in a submission on behalf of the Church, that the cemetery has been sold. It is not considered necessary for Council to intervene or appropriate for Council to purchase the cemetery. Any future development of the cemetery will require preparation and commitment to a Conservation Management Plan as a pre-requisite.*

- Area between Camden Valley Way and St. Thomas be sterilised from development and a park be created.

*Development restrictions for land in front of St. Thomas are established in Council's commissioned heritage report. Reasonable open landscape requirements can be achieved without it becoming a park, either through its retention as a school or as part of a development scheme. The proposed building on the "Police Site" needs to be smaller in stature and the view corridor rationalised to more clearly reflect the Council commissioned Heritage Report.*

- The Heritage Office and the National Trust should be consulted.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

*The Heritage Office is generally aware of Council's approach to the Heritage Review and Council's engaged consultant for the St Thomas precinct. Although the National Trust is not a statutory authority it may be appropriate to consult with them at such time as an application is received.*

- Struggletown Precinct needs a Masterplan.

*A Masterplan is not considered necessary, standard comprehensive heritage provisions should apply.*

**Key Sites: Macarthur Anglican School Site/St Thomas' Precinct** (Concerns and Responses)

- Current Development Proposal is considered inadequate (notwithstanding general resident support).

*The site sensitively addressed and with full market understanding has the potential to deliver a benchmark development and achieve conservation outcomes which exceed preservation of the status quo.*

- Not considered to be creating a place, but rather mediocrity.

*Alternatives to achieve a similar yield and create a place clearly exist. The Council commissioned Heritage Report forms the basis of the development guidelines for the precinct and should be reinforced. The prospect of disposal to another school is understood to still be a possibility.*

**Key Sites: Narellan Road Extension/The Northern Road/Camden Valley Way Triangle** (Concerns and Responses)

- Replace the Indicative Development Plan with Development Principles.

*This site is important to the functioning of Narellan and requires a level of surety that an Indicative Development Plan/Masterplan can provide.*

- Remove the Somerset Avenue extension.

*This road is required to provide a greater level of connectivity through the place for both vehicles and pedestrians and is the key to unlocking under-performing intersections. Supported by reports by ESD P/L in **Tabled Document "DC 27"** and Patrick Partners produced in **Tabled Document "DC 28"**.*

- Improve consistency within the LEP and DCP.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

*Proposed amendments to the Indicative Development Plan/Masterplan and the proposed preparation of an LES/LEP will achieve this.*

**The Process** (Concerns and Responses)

- *Lack of community involvement and transparency in the process. Opportunities for involvement not interactive in nature.*

*The public exhibition and associated community consultation exercise was one of the largest and most diverse ever undertaken by Council. Whilst a minority of residents raised concerns regarding the process an overwhelmingly positive response was received to the development proposal and the opportunity for community comment. The diverse opportunities for involvement, including community forums, shop front access to staff, personal interviews and the interchange of correspondence were welcomed by a community of interest who considered Council to be encouragingly proactive.*

- Lack of underpinning studies.

*“Enquiry by Design” draws upon limited data and significant expertise and is not characterised by exhaustive studies. When the LEP is prepared, the accompanying LES will fill any existing data gaps.*

- Lack of integration with other Council planning initiatives.

*The Draft Local Plan is a consolidation of all existing planning documents and the Narellan material will be consistent with those documents. The Local Plan was not fundamental to understanding the exhibited material.*

- Lack of senior staff responsibility.

*Senior staff were kept fully briefed and have been a part of this entire process.*

- Poor structure to communicating opportunities to view and comment.

*The underlying strategy used to consult in respect of the Draft Plan is considered to be sound. The general community appreciated the extended hours, convenient location and access to staff expertise that the shopfront and other “non traditional” forums provided.*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**Other Concerns** (Concerns and Responses)

- Plan clarity and coding needs to be improved.

*Request for improved plan clarity and coding acknowledged and to be addressed.*

- Land provision for emergency and community services needs to be accurately identified.

*Sufficient land is available in satisfactory settings for the provision of emergency and community services.*

- Monitoring mechanism required.

*Council's standard development monitoring procedures including development of sustainability reporting is considered adequate.*

- Need for examples of good and bad development.

*Illustrations of good and bad development are capable of being included in the Local Plan. Clarity of plan linkages will be enhanced particularly through the Local Plan process.*

- Concern with Cinema reference until a reality.

*Cinema aspirations should be noted as a major developmental and community aspiration, however, subject to commercial realities.*

- Wilson Crescent deleted from Place J and added to Place E.

*This request can be facilitated in the Local Plan preparation process.*

- Place G and H boundary should be rationalised.

*G and H Place boundaries are positioned so that development fronting Elyard Street can be addressed cohesively.*

- Place name changes recommended to be Elyard Civic.

*This typographical error will be corrected.*

- Reference to land uses such as demolition and sub surface mining and multi-unit development considered inappropriate.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

*Both demolition and sub surface mining are permissible uses under the current LEP. The style of 'land use table' will ultimately be amended in the proposed LEP.*

- Narellan Town Centre concerned with 3 storey limitation.

*Three storey height limitation considered appropriate for Narellan Town Centre, particularly for the south facing frontage. Any development beyond three storeys would require special merit based assessment.*

- Location and funding of proposed road to rear of Narellan Hotel.

*The Masterplan has been amended and a funding mechanism is to be developed.*

### **The Way Forward**

The following strategy is proposed to finalise the planning review for the Narellan Township.

- Not proceed with DDCP No. 126 as exhibited.
- Amend the Indicative Development Plan in the manner referred to in the report and summarised below, supported by the overarching Statement of Desired Future Character (DFC) for the Narellan Township (as amended).
- Adopt the abovementioned Plan and supporting vision statement as a Masterplan, to guide future development where landuse zoning permits.
- Adopt the General Design Principles in Section 2.2 of DDCP No. 126 in concert with the Masterplan for merit based development assessment in the interim.
- Prepare an LES and DLEP to effect the zoning changes inferred in the Masterplan. (The LES shall build upon the Enquiry by Design Reports and address any data gaps. The DLEP shall be stylised on the Local Plan format and include revised Place Statements ie Statements of Desired Future Character and Local Controls to reflect the Masterplan).
- Proceed to prepare the relevant LES and DLEP forthwith.

### **Proposed Amendments to the Indicative Development Plan**

The Indicative Development Plan is essentially a Masterplan and should be described as such.

In consideration of the submissions and comments above it is proposed that the Plan be amended as follows:

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

- Alternate access to rear of Council's depot  
Proposed road to be realigned to form a crossroad with the road proposed to join Graham Hill Road to Fox Street.
- Police Site  
Plan to indicate that only limited development opportunities are available on the area between Camden Valley Way and the Old St Thomas' Church group, known as the Police site. Any such development shall be sensitive to the view corridors identified in the Design 5 April 2003 report, prepared for Council regarding the Macarthur Anglican School site.
- Proposed road through Macarthur Anglican School site  
Remove reference to future road connection between Wilson Crescent and Richardson Road with provision for a pedestrian/cycle link only to be retained.
- Additional Open Space Opportunities  
Plan to indicate additional open space
  - ◆ adjoining the park located on Eastlewood Street,
  - ◆ associated with the new proposed pedestrian link between Doncaster Avenue and Eastlewood Street
  - ◆ by widening the proposed pedestrian link between Leicester Street and the Town Park.
- Change Commercial Floor Space to Medium Density Housing  
Commercial area on the eastern side of Doncaster Ave to be a Medium Density Housing area. This will allow for better integration with the Medium Density Housing to the rear and facilitate a built form that addresses accessibility without the need for the walkway that currently exists.
- Increase amount of Medium Density Housing in particular areas  
Plan to indicate additional medium density housing opportunities
  - ◆ along the western side of Doncaster Ave to Francis Street and along Leicester Street to No 27.
  - ◆ along the length of Francis Street.
- Queen Street Extension to the Camden By Pass  
Plan to indicate that Queen Street does not extend to the By Pass at this time.
- Doncaster Avenue Extension to Camden Valley Way  
Plan to indicate that access to Camden Valley Way from Doncaster Avenue is denied.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

- Possible Widening and Extension of Elyard St through to Eastlewood Street.
  - ◆ Further investigation to be carried out into the proposal to extend Elyard Street through to Eastlewood Street.
  - ◆ Possible part closure of Slade Street to facilitate ease of entry to Council owned carpark to the rear of commercial premises on Somerset and Doncaster Avenues.
  - ◆ Possible widening of Elyard Street to facilitate centre road parking. As illustrated in the Carparking Options Paper in **Tabled Document “DC 29”**.

The above amendments are shown on the Masterplan (base plan) reproduced as **Tabled Document “DC 30”** and will also be shown on a map to be on display at the Council meeting. The detailed sheets accompanying the Masterplan (base plan) (refer to **Tabled Document “DC 31”**) will be amended to reflect the Masterplan (base plan). Following Council resolution to adopt the amendments, the plan (base plan and detailed plans) will be printed and available for public access and use as a guiding planning document.

**Masterplan**

The Masterplan (incorporating the above referenced amendments) shall also include the overarching Statement of Desired Future Character for the Narellan Township (refer to **Tabled Document “DC 32”**). The Plan shall be drafted, publicised, made available to all interested parties and used as the guiding document for development in the Narellan Township.

**Relationship to the Camden Local Plan**

It should be noted that the Narellan Plan specific statements and controls have been deferred from the Local Plan pending their resolution. Their resolution will involve the LES and DLEP process referred to previously, including a review of the proposed Place Statements (Desired Future Character Statements and Controls), within the context of the adopted Masterplan.

It should also be noted that Narellan material, when finalised, will be absorbed into the Local Plan. Further, all the general provisions containing objectives and standards/controls in the Local Plan for amongst others, heritage, stormwater management, open space provisions etc will apply ultimately to Narellan. Having these consolidated general provisions as a backdrop to the Narellan project will hopefully obviate some of the concern of the lack of attention to these aspects in the exhibited Narellan material.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

---

**Conclusion**

The Narellan Urban Improvement Program project has progressed to a point where finalisation is required in terms of the Program grant. The project has evolved over time, however, the objective of a revisioning of Narellan is nearing completion.

The “bundling together” of the planning directions in the form of Draft Development Control Plan No.126 and the extensive public consultation exercise undertaken in respect of the Draft Plan generated significant public comment.

Much of the comment, subject to minor reservations in respect of detail, has supported the general thrust of the proposal as summarised in the Indicative Development Plan (now referred to as the Masterplan). Some comprehensive submissions detailed opposition to the general planning direction, its considered narrow and piecemeal planning approach and raised major concerns with the planning process.

It is considered that the nature of concerns have been adequately responded to in this report. Some lessons have been learnt. Some recommended community policy changes are in train. The difficulties of synchronisation of all local planning initiatives has proven a management challenge and contributed in part to some community communication difficulties.

On balance it is, however, considered appropriate to move to now conclude the planning exercise and implement the emergent vision. In this regard it is recommended that the actions as summarised in “The Way Forward” be proceeded with.

**Recommended:** That Council

- (i) Not proceed with the adoption of the exhibited Draft DCP 126.
- (ii) Amend the Indicative Development Plan in the manner referred to in the report, supported by the overarching Statement of Desired Future Character for the Narellan Township (as amended).
- (iii) Adopt the Masterplan and supporting vision statement.
- (iv) Adopt the General Design Principles in Section 2.2 of DDCP No. 126 (in concert with the Masterplan) for merit based development assessment in the interim.
- (v) Resolve to prepare an LES and DLEP to effect the zoning changes inferred in the Narellan Township Masterplan.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD  
27 JANUARY, 2004, CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET  
CAMDEN - 5.30PM**

---

(vi) Advise all persons responsible for submissions of the above course of action and Council's response to their submissions as detailed in this report.

**MOTION**

*Moved Cr McFadden, seconded Cr Corrigan that further consideration of this report be deferred to the next Development Committee Meeting on the 9<sup>th</sup> February, 2004.*

DC015/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED.**  
\*\*\*\*\*

The Meeting closed at 6.15pm.