

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 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. Draft Development Control Plan No. 126 – Narellan Township3

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

Present: Cr Anderson (Mayor/Chairperson), Cr Patterson, Cr Campbell,
Cr Winn, Cr Batros, Cr Fekete.
Cr Corrigan arrived at 5.45pm, during Public Addresses.

Staff: General Manager, Director Development & Environment,
Director Works & Services, Director Governance & Outcomes,
Manager Development, Manager Outcomes, Administration
Officer, Narellan Place Manager

APOLOGIES

An apology was received from Cr Senise and Cr McFadden from
this meeting.

*Resolved on the Motion of Cr Fekete, seconded Cr Winn that
leave of absence be granted to Cr Senise and Cr McFadden.*

DC016/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED**

**DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY OR CONFLICT OF
INTEREST**

Nil

**DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE AND RESOURCES &
SERVICES COMMITTEE PUBLIC ADDRESSES**

John Wrigley addressed Council in relation to Item 1 of the
Development Committee.

Peter Lyons addressed Council in relation to Item 1 of the
Development Committee.

Leonie Kelly addressed Council in relation to Item 1 of the
Development Committee.

MOTION

Moved Cr Batros, Seconded Cr Winn that an extension of one
minute be granted

DC017/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED**

Peter Lean addressed Council in relation to Item 1 of the
Development Committee.

Ross Newport addressed Council in relation to Item 1 of the
Development Committee.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

(Cr Corrigan having arrived at the meeting after the Declaration of Interest item, now declared a conflict of interest in Item 1 “Draft Development Control Plan No 126 due to his position as the State member for Camden. Cr Corrigan took no part in discussions or voting on this matter and left the Chamber – the time being 6.00pm.)

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

(File 4711) (Director Governance & Outcomes)

This report was presented to the Development Committee meeting of the 27 January 2004, where it was resolved to defer any decision to the Development Committee meeting of 9 February 2004, to provide Councillors with additional time to review the documentation. The original report is reproduced below.

It should be noted that adopting the proposed Masterplan and design principles provides guidance within existing zonings but does not rezone any land. The LES/LEP process proposed would investigate rezoning issues and involve extensive consultation.

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.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

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.

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

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

- 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

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 1”**. A total of 69 “hand” comments were made and these are reproduced as **Tabled Document “DC 2”**. There were also a total of 59 response sheets completed and a review of these is reproduced as **Tabled Document “DC 3”**. 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

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

independent report in respect of such meetings. A copy of the report is reproduced as **Table Document “DC 4”**.

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:

- 54 responses from residents, landowners and community groups. A schedule of these submissions has been prepared and forms **Tabled Document “DC 5”**.
- 8 submissions from State Government Agencies. A schedule of these submissions has been prepared and forms **Tabled Document “DC 6”**.

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 5”** and **“DC 6”**.

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

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

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. 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 7”** and*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

Patrick Partners are reproduced in Tabled Document “DC 8”.

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

The Carparking Options Paper, reproduced in Tabled Document “DC 9”, 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 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.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

- 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.

- 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 9”**).*

- 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.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

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.

- 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

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

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 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)

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

- 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.

“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.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

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.

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.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

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.

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.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

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.

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.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

*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 7”** and Patrick Partners produced in **Tabled Document “DC 8”**.*

- Improve consistency within the LEP and DCP.

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.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

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 MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 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 MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 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:

- 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.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

- 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 MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 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 9”**.

The above amendments are shown on the Masterplan (base plan) reproduced as **Tabled Document “DC 10”** 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 11”** 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 12”**). 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 MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 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 MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 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.

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

MOTION

Moved Cr Batros, seconded Cr Campbell that Council:

- (i) Not proceed with the adoption of the exhibited Draft DCP 126.*
- (ii) Defer from the Masterplan the site on the corner of Wilson Crescent and Camden Valley Way, owned by the NSW Police, pending the outcome of representations as detailed below.*
- (iii) Convene a group consisting of the Mayor and a representative from Camden Historical Society, Narellan Chamber of Commerce and WRARG, to make representations to the Member for Camden Geoff Corrigan with a view to discussing ways the Police Site can remain undeveloped. The results of the deliberations be reported back to Council and a strategy developed for the site.*
- (iv) Remove from the Masterplan any reference to a chapel or roads on the cemetery site and amend the map to refer to “cemetery” and the accompanying key note to refer to “cemetery”.*
- (v) Reiterate its position that the cemetery will be the subject of a comprehensive Conservation Management Plan (addressing heritage issues) and detailed studies addressing threatened species, habitat and traffic constraints, as part of determining any ancillary use opportunities on the site.*
- (vi) Include in the LES process a study of ways that the endangered plant species of the area can be incorporated into the plan.*
- (vii) Include as part of the LES and Draft LEP process a specific investigation of the potential extension and widening of Elyard Street as proposed.*
- (viii) Amend the Indicative Development Plan in the manner referred to in the report and above, supported by the Statement of Desired Future Character for the Narellan Township (as amended) and include a notation on the map/s that the final nature of development may vary from that shown on the map/s provided the underlying principles are observed.*
- (ix) Adopt those items in Point (viii) as the Masterplan.*

**MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 9 FEBRUARY, 2004
CIVIC CENTRE, OXLEY STREET CAMDEN – 5.30PM**

- (x) Adopt the General Design Principles in Section 2.2 of DDCP 126 (in concert with the Masterplan) for merit based development assessment in the interim.*
- (xi) Resolve to prepare an LES and DLEP to consider the zoning changes inferred in the Narellan Township Masterplan.*
- (xii) Advise all persons responsible for submissions of the above course of action and Council's response to their submissions as detailed in this report.*

DC018/04 THE MOTION WAS **CARRIED**

(Cr Campbell voted against the Motion)

(Cr Corrigan returned to the chamber – the time being 6.35pm)

The meeting closed at 6.36pm.