LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA: The Hills Shire Council

NAME OF PLANNING PROPOSAL: Proposed The Hills Local Environmental Plan 2012 (Amendment No (#)) – to rezone land at land at 1–6 Vivien Place, 1, 3, 5 and 7 Gay Street and 12 Gilham Street, Castle Hill to R4 High Density Residential, apply a base floor space ratio of 1:1, apply an incentivised floor space ratio of 1.9:1, increase the minimum lot size requirement to 1,800m², remove the maximum height of building requirement, and apply a Key Site provision to the site to facilitate a 20% floor space bonus (2/2017/PLP).

ADDRESS OF LAND: 1–6 Vivien Place, 1, 3, 5 and 7 Gay Street and 12 Gilham Street, Castle Hill (Lots 30-32 DP 259208, Lots 5-11 DP 227212).

SUMMARY OF HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT YIELD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL YIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUPPORTING MATERIAL:

Attachment A  Assessment against State Environment Planning Policies
Attachment B  Assessment against Section 117 Local Planning Directions.

THE SITE:
The site is comprised of 11 low density residential lots with a total site area of 8,620m². The properties subject to the proposal are 1–6 Vivien Place, 1, 3, 5 and 7 Gay Street and 12 Gilham Street, Castle Hill. The concept submitted by the proponent involves the incorporation of the Vivien Place road reserve (cul-de-sac and footpaths/verge - 968m²) into the development site. The site is located on the northern boundary of the Castle Hill North Precinct and is approximately 800m from the future Castle Hill Train Station.

![Figure 1](image)

Aerial view of the site and surrounding locality.
BACKGROUND:

The planning proposal, as originally submitted to Council, sought the following amendments to LEP 2012:

- Rezone the site from R2 Low Density Residential to R4 High Density Residential;
- Increase the minimum lot size from 700m$^2$ to 1,800m$^2$;
- Increase the maximum height of buildings from 9m to 62m (18 storeys); and
- Apply a Floor Space Ratio of 3.2:1 to the site.

The original development concept submitted by the proponent included residential flat buildings comprising 270-300 residential units within three (3) buildings ranging in height from four (4) storeys along Gilham Street stepped up to 18 storeys along the Gay Street interface. The concept included incorporation of Vivien Place into the development site. The proponent submitted a preliminary VPA offer for the provision of:

- Dedication of two through site links that run north-south;
- Dedication of a ‘shareway’ that runs north-south; and
- Construction of new footpaths.

The proposed site plans originally submitted by the proponent are included below.

Following initial assessment of the application and briefing of Councillors, the proponent was advised on 12 October 2016 of a number of concerns in relation to the submitted concept. The concerns related to bulk and scale, density, overall external appearance of the design concept and its consistency with the principles of the Castle Hill North Precinct Plan. It was also noted that the construction and dedication of a link road through the site would be required, rather than the ‘shareway’ concept as proposed.

In response to the above concerns the proponent submitted a revised development concept for the site in May 2017. The revised concept provides the following:
- Consolidation of the built form into two (2) tower elements (13 and 17 storeys in height), with each tower on a 3 storey podium providing terrace style housing fronting onto Gilham Street, Gay Street and the central landscape spine;
- The provision of a new roadway along the western boundary of the site;
- Amalgamation of Vivien Place roadway and associated pathways and verge to allow for a consolidated development site;
- A total overall yield of 220 dwellings, of which approximately 30 dwellings will be terrace style housing located at ground level;
- A total permissible GFA of 21,820m², which translates to an FSR of 2.28:1 based on an effective site area (including the amalgamated Vivien Place) of 9,570m²;
- Basement car parking for approximately 265 car parking spaces for both residents and visitors in alignment with council’s incentivised car parking targets.

Proposed amendments to facilitate the above amendment would include a Base FSR of 1:1, an Incentivised FSR of 1.9:1 and an additional 20% floor space bonus incentive which would be contingent on the construction and dedication of the western road and provision of a public through site link, and the provision of a terrace each to Gilham and Gay Streets.

The site plan (including proposed setbacks from Gilham and Gay Streets) and a photomontage of the amended concept submitted by the proponent are included in the following figures.
At its meeting of 25 July 2017 Council considered a report (Attachment 3) on the revised concept and resolved as follows:

1. A planning proposal be forwarded to the Department of Planning and Environment for a Gateway Determination to amend The Hills Local Environmental Plan 2012 as follows:
   - Amend the Land Zoning Map to rezone the site from R2 Low Density Residential to R4 High Density Residential;
   - Amend the Height of Buildings Map to remove the height of buildings requirement applying to the site;
   - Amend the Lot Size Map to increase the minimum lot size requirement from 700m² to 1,800m²;
   - Amend the Floor Space Ratio Map to apply a ‘base’ Floor Space Ratio of 1:1 to the site and to mark it as ‘Area A’ (subject to Council’s housing mix and diversity local provision – Clause 7.12);
   - Amend the Floor Space Ratio Incentive Map to apply an ‘incentivised’ Floor Space Ratio of 1.9:1 to the site; and
   - Identify the site on Key Site Map and amend Clause 4.4B to allow the site to achieve the 20% bonus floor space incentive where the site is amalgamated, where terrace edges are provided along the Gilham and Gay Street frontages and where the road along the western boundary and public pedestrian through site link are delivered (this will increase the total achievable Floor Space Ratio to 2.28:1).

2. Council proceed with discussion with the Proponent to prepare a draft Voluntary Planning Agreement which secures the delivery of the proposed local road, closure of Vivien Place, provision of pedestrian linkages and resolves how the Proponent will address the increased demand for local infrastructure generated by the proposed increase in residential density.

3. Following the preparation of the draft Voluntary Planning Agreement, and prior to any public exhibition of the planning proposal, a report on the draft Voluntary Planning Agreement be submitted to Council for consideration.

4. The proponent be required to prepare an updated traffic assessment, prior to exhibition, which assesses the impact of the proposed development on the performance of the surrounding road network and key intersections, taking into account the proposed road improvements (within the Castle Hill North Precinct), the approved growth on the target site (36 Pennant Street, Castle Hill) and the additional growth resulting from the Castle Hill
North Planning Proposal. The assessment will also need to have regard to the potential impact of the new road along the western boundary of the site.

5. Draft The Hills Development Control Plan 2012 Part D Section 20 – Castle Hill North, as detailed in Attachment 1, be exhibited concurrently with the planning proposal.

A Gateway Determination was issued by the Department of Planning and Environment on 13 September 2017, which permits the planning proposal to proceed to public exhibition. A condition of the Gateway Determination requires the Proponent to prepare an amended traffic assessment. A further condition of the Gateway Determination required an amendment the planning proposal to investigate opportunities to retain any mature trees on the site, which can be incorporated into the concept layout plans. Compliance with these conditions is discussed under question 9 of this planning proposal.

Following the issue of the Gateway Determination, the Proponent submitted the amended traffic assessment in accordance with the condition of the Gateway Determination and draft Voluntary Planning Agreement in accordance with both conditions of the Gateway Determination and Council’s resolution of 25 July 2017.

At its ordinary meeting of 26 June 2018 Council considered the draft Voluntary Planning Agreement and resolved as follows:

1. The Draft Voluntary Planning Agreement, as detailed in Attachment 1, be subject to a legal review at the cost of the proponent, prior to public exhibition.
2. The Draft Voluntary Planning Agreement be updated, as required, prior to exhibition to incorporate the recommendations of the legal review.
3. The Draft Voluntary Planning Agreement be publicly exhibited concurrently with the associated planning proposal (2/2017/PLP) for a period of at least 28 days in accordance with the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
4. Draft The Hills Development Control Plan 2012 (Part D Section 20 – Castle Hill North), as detailed in Attachment 2, be exhibited concurrently with the planning proposal (2/2017/PLP).

The Voluntary Planning Agreement has since been subject to an independent legal review and has been updated prior to public exhibition, in accordance with Council’s resolution.

PART 1 OBJECTIVES OR INTENDED OUTCOME

The planning proposal would facilitate a high density residential development on the site comprising 220 dwellings, with a built form comprising a 17 storey building and 13 storey buildings with a 3 storey terrace edge.

PART 2 EXPLANATION OF THE PROVISIONS

The proposed outcomes will be achieved by:

- Rezoning the site from R2 Low Density Residential to R4 High Density Residential;
- Removing the maximum building height applicable to the site (height to be regulated through the development control plan);
- Amending the Lot Size Map to increase the minimum lot size requirement from 700m$^2$ to 1,800m$^2$;
- Applying a ‘base’ floor space ratio of 1:1 across the entire site and an ‘incentivised’ floor space ratio of 1.9:1 across the entire site.
- Identify the site on the Key Site Map and amend Clause 4.4B to allow the site to achieve a 20% bonus floor space incentive if the site is amalgamated, terrace edges are provided along the Gilham and Gay Street frontages, a new road link along the western boundary of the site is constructed and dedicated to Council, and an easement for a through site pedestrian link is provided. This will increase the total achievable Floor Space Ratio to 2.28:1.
The proposed wording for Clause 4.4B is included below.

4.4A Additional floor space ratio incentive for key sites

1. The objectives of this clause are as follows:

   (a) to promote development that does not isolate sites that will contribute to an improved built form outcome.
   (b) to ensure the provision of quality public domain and improved pedestrian and cycle connections within centres.
   (c) to facilitate development that is sympathetic to the character of heritage items.

2. This clause applies to land identified as Areas D, E, F, G, H, I, J and N on the Key Sites Map.

3. Despite clause 4.4 and 7.12, development consent may be granted for development on land to this clause applies that exceeds the floor space ratio shown the Floor Space Ratio Incentive Map only if:

   (a) The development complies with all the requirements in clause 7.12;
   (b) The development is for the entire area identified as a Key Site on the Key Sites Map;
   (c) The maximum floor space ratio, for development on land where the proposed development is permitted, does not exceed the floor space ratio allowed by the Floor Space Ratio Incentive Map by more than 20%; and
   (d) The development in an area shown in Column 1 of the table to this subclause meets the specifications shown opposite the area in Column 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area on the Key Sites Map</td>
<td>Specifications relating to the Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area N</td>
<td>The entire key site is amalgamated to form one development site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed development incorporates a three storey terrace edge along the Gilham Street and Gay Street frontages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A road link along the western boundary of the site, with a reservation of 20m is constructed and dedicated at no cost to Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An easement for a through-site link with public right of carriage for pedestrian movement is provided through the site connecting Gilham Street to 23-26 Pennant Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Hills DCP** means The Hills Development Control Plan as in force at the commencement of this Plan.

It is noted that the proposed amendments to the Land Zoning map, Floor Space Ratio map, Lot Size map and Height of Buildings map and the insertion of proposed Clause 4.4A are already proposed as part of the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal. Accordingly, if the Castle Hill North
Planning Proposal is made prior to the finalisation of this proposal (as is anticipated), then these amendment will not be necessary as part of the subject proposal. Rather the proposal for the subject site would simply seek to amend the incentive floor space ratio map, key site map and update the table within Clause 4.4A to include the specifications for the subject site (‘Area N’).

PART 3 JUSTIFICATION

SECTION A - NEED FOR THE PLANNING PROPOSAL

1. Is the planning proposal a result of any strategic study or report?

No, the planning proposal has been initiated by a private landowner. It is considered that there is strategic justification and merit for higher density residential development at this location, having regard to the site’s proximity to the future Castle Hill Railway Station Precinct. Further, it is noted that there is a significant public benefit associated with the redevelopment of the site.

2. Is the planning proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes, or is there a better way?

Yes, the planning proposal is considered to be the best way to achieve the intended outcomes for the site. The proposal utilises a base and incentive floor space ratio provision consistent with the agreed methodology for securing housing mix and diversity within the Sydney Metro Northwest Corridor. Specifically, the ‘base’ floor space ratio has been calculated having regard to the walking distance of the site from the station. A further key site incentive is proposed to give a further 20% floor space bonus for the provision of public benefits including the amalgamation of the site, provision of a western road connection and through site link.

SECTION B - RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK

3. Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions contained within the applicable regional or sub-regional strategy (including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and exhibited draft strategies)?

Yes, a discussion of consistency is provided below.

- Greater Sydney Regional Plan – A Metropolis of Three Cities

Objective 2: Align Growth with Infrastructure
The planning proposal will facilitate increased residential densities within close proximity to the future Castle Hill Station. Under the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal (16/2016/PLP) approximately 132 dwellings could be achieved on the site. This planning proposal would facilitate 220 dwellings on the site (88 dwellings more than what could be achieved through the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal). The public benefits being proposed through the planning proposal, being the western road connection, pedestrian link and monetary contribution to be allocated toward new local infrastructure will ensure that the unplanned growth can be adequately serviced.

Objective 10: Increase Housing Supply
Aims to provide an ongoing housing supply and a range of housing types in the right locations to create more liveable neighbourhoods and support Sydney’s growing population. The planning proposal seeks to facilitate the delivery of housing close to the Castle Hill Station. The delivery of a high density residential development within the walkable catchment of the future Castle Hill Station will facilitate an increase in the supply of housing to meet the housing demand of the future population.

Objective 11: Housing is More Diverse and Affordable
The development concept seeks to utilise the incentive floor space ratio provision which will ensure that an appropriate diversity of apartment types and sizes is provided. This will create housing
choice in the market and will ensure that that the housing stock appropriately aligns with the needs and expectations of the future Hills Shire demography.

- **Central City District Plan**

An assessment of the planning proposal against the following relevant Planning Priorities as listed in the revised Plan is included below:

  - **Planning for a City Supported by Infrastructure (Priority C1)**

    Objective 2 of the Plan reinforces the importance of infrastructure aligning with forecast growth. A substantial amount of infrastructure investigation has already been undertaken as part of the master planning for the Castle Hill North Precinct. This investigation is still on-going to ensure that the overall growth within the Precinct can be appropriately serviced. As mentioned previously, that planning proposal will facilitate 220 dwellings on the site, which equates to 88 dwellings more than what could be achieved under the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal, which anticipated 132 dwelling in the site.

    The address the increased demand on local infrastructure the Proponent is making a monetary contribution to be allocated to additional local infrastructure to support the growth. These funds will likely be directed to traffic and open space infrastructure, including playing fields, which will be require to support broader growth from the entirety of the Castle Hill Precinct.

    With respect to the surround road network, the Proponent has submitted an updated traffic assessment which determined that the additional 88 dwellings (over and above the 132 dwellings already planned for on the site) would result in an additional 17 trips during the AM peak and 13 additional trips during the PM peak. The assessment undertook SIDRA modelling of the surrounding intersections and found that the network improvements identified as part of the master planning for the Castle Hill North Precinct, including the roundabout upgrade at Gliham Street / Old Castle Hill Road and the north south link road to Les Shore Place, shall provide sufficient spare capacity on the key intersections to accommodate the development. Accordingly, the road improvements already identified through the master planning of the Castle Hill North Precinct are considered to be sufficient to accommodate the additional traffic generation resulting from the proposed development.

    The planning proposal is considered to be consistent with this priority as sufficient infrastructure can be provided to meet the demand generated by the additional growth on the site.

  - **Providing housing supply, choice and affordability with access to jobs, services and public transport (Priority C5)**

    The Plan sets out five-year housing targets of 8,550 additional dwellings for the Hills Shire. Whilst the growth on the subject site is not required to meet the five yearly target it will assist in providing additional housing supply for the longer term housing targets that will be established as part of the preparation of the Council’s Local Strategic Planning Statement and supporting housing strategy. As the site is located within the Castle Hill North Precinct, the site has already been earmarked for increased residential densities to contribute to increased housing supply. As mentioned previously, the uptake of the incentive floor space ratio provision will ensure that an appropriate diversity of apartment types and sizes is provided. This will create housing choice in the market and will ensure that that the housing stock appropriately aligns with the needs and expectations of the future Hills Shire demography.

- **North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy**

The NSW Government Corridor Strategy provides a vision for how the areas surrounding the eight (8) new stations of the Sydney Metro Northwest could be developed to integrate new homes and jobs.
The Structure Plan for Castle Hill indicated a total capacity for Castle Hill of an additional 7,900 dwellings and 18,500 jobs. However based on take up rates of 56% for housing and 52% for employment it was anticipated that by 2036 the projected residential growth would be 4,400 dwellings and the employment growth 9,500 jobs. The identified future character included apartment living surrounding the retail/commercial core with higher density apartment living (7-20 storeys) in areas with direct access to the new station and medium density apartment living (3-6 storeys) on the periphery with townhouses and duplexes beyond this to deliver a diversity of housing.

The Strategy identifies the subject site within the high density apartment living character area. The character statement for this area anticipates 7-20 storeys, carefully master planned around communal open spaces and incorporating landscaped setbacks to existing streetscapes. The Strategy emphasises that these sites are only appropriate for multi-dwelling housing where the sites are of an appropriate size to deliver a high level of amenity for the existing and future residents. The high density apartment living character map is included below.
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**Figure 9**
Castle Hill Precinct – High Density Apartment Living Character Map

The proposed development outcome for the site which seeks around 220 residential units within a built form ranging from 3, 13 and 17 storeys is generally consistent with the character anticipated for the site within the North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy.

4. **Is the planning proposal consistent with the local council’s Community Strategic Plan, or other local strategic plan?**

Yes, a discussion of consistency is provided below.

- **The Hills Future Community Strategic Plan**
The Hills Future Community Strategic Direction articulates The Hills Shire community’s and Council’s shared vision, values, aspirations and priorities with reference to other local government plans, information and resourcing capabilities. It is a direction that creates a picture of where the Hills would like to be in the future. The direction is based on community aspirations gathered throughout months of community engagement and consultation with members of the community.

The planning proposal seeks to promote better usage of existing land and capitalise on the strategic location of the site. The proposal will accommodate additional population close to planned and existing services and infrastructure being located within 800 metres of the future Castle Hill Rail Station. The planning proposal is considered to be consistent with the following Hills Future Community Outcomes:

- Shaping Growth - Well planned and liveable neighbourhoods that meets growth targets and maintains amenity.
- Safe, convenient and accessible transport options and a variety of recreational activities that support an active lifestyle.
- Delivering and Maintaining Infrastructure - Infrastructure meets the needs of our growing Shire.

Local Strategy

Council’s Local Strategy is the principal document for communicating the future planning of the Shire and includes the objectives of longer term planning projects of the State Government as well as responding to, and planning for, local needs such as employment, housing and transport. The draft Local Strategy was adopted principally as a land use planning document to guide local planning and reflect the following five key themes of “Hills 2026 Community Strategic Direction: Looking Towards the Future”:

- Resilient Local Leadership;
- Vibrant Communities;
- Balanced Urban Growth;
- Protected Environment; and
- Modern Local Economy.

The Local Strategy continues to provide a clear statement of the overall strategic land use management and planning objectives for the Hills Shire. However, it is noted that the dwelling and job growth targets detailed within the Local Strategy represent Council’s projected growth targets as at June 2008.

- Residential Direction

The key directions and objectives of the Local Strategy relevant to this proposal are:

- R1 Accommodate population growth;
- R2 Response to changing housing needs; and
- R4 Facilitate quality housing outcomes.

The North West Subregional Strategy set targets for the Shire to contribute additional housing to accommodate a share of Sydney’s population growth. The Residential Direction indicates that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate these targets based on the existing planning framework and current projects. In this regard, the planning proposal is not required to meet housing targets. Notwithstanding, the planning proposal is consistent with the principles of the Residential Direction as it seeks to provide additional residential accommodation in close proximity to the future Castle Hill Railway Station and existing and planned services and infrastructure. It also applies to land that is already earmarked for higher residential densities through the North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy, The Hills Corridor Strategy and Castle Hill North Precinct Plan.
Integrated Transport Direction

The subject site is located within 800m of the future Castle Hill station and is also serviced by existing transport infrastructure.

A key objective of the Integrated Transport Direction is to ensure that planning and future development supports the provision of an efficient transport network. Relevant actions include planning for a concentration of and/or intensity of land use activities around major public transport nodes and higher order centres.

Future development on the site will play a key role in supporting the operation of the Sydney Metro Northwest as it will provide a resident population within close proximity to high frequency public transport services. This transport link will ensure that the site is well connected to the surrounding residential areas and strategic centres.

- **Castle Hill North Precinct Plan**

The Precinct Plan recognises the capacity within the Precinct for higher density residential development opportunities and the strong demand that will exist for apartment and townhouse living in Castle Hill. The plan identifies density, character and streetscape typologies to guide future development outcomes. The location of the higher density housing options was informed by factors such as proximity to the future rail station and the town centre.

The exhibition of the draft Castle Hill North Precinct Plan enabled community feedback to be received based on a broad concept of redevelopment potential in the area, and for further investigations to be undertaken, including the development of The Hills Corridor Strategy to address strong interest in growth opportunities across the Rail Corridor.

The Castle Hill North Precinct Plan identified the subject site as being suitable for a residential density of 192 dwellings per hectare (which equates to an FSR of approximately 1.9:1), which is reflective of the anticipated density for the site within The Hills Corridor Strategy. Based on the area of the site (excluding Vivien Place), this would equate to around 164 dwellings. When applying this density to the overall development site, including the portion of Vivien Place that is proposed to be closed, this would equate to around 183 dwellings. The density map within the Castle Hill North Precinct Plan is included in the following figure.
The Castle Hill North Precinct Plan was adopted by Council at its meeting of 24 November 2015.

- **Castle Hill North Planning Proposal**

On 2 November 2016 a Gateway Determination was issued by the Department of Planning and Environment to enable the exhibition of the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal. Since the issue of the Gateway Determination a number of draft planning documents have been prepared to support the draft amendments to LEP 2012. These include a draft Contributions Plan to collect the necessary funds for the provision of local infrastructure required to support the additional population, draft amendments to DCP 2012 to regulate the urban structure, built form and the design of development and a draft public domain plan to guide the design for embellishment of the public realm. At its meeting of 25 July 2017 Council resolved to exhibit these draft documents in conjunction with the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal. The draft plans were subsequently exhibited from 17 August to 15 September 2017.

The proposed structure plan for the Precinct is included below. As can be seen it has been anticipated that the subject site would have a built form of 4-8 storeys across the site. The intention of this was to facilitate a transition of height and density between the taller/higher density elements within close proximity to the station and the lower and medium density development to the north of the site.
Figure 7

DCP Structure Plan – Castle Hill North Precinct Plan

Under the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal, the site has been given a Base FSR of 1:1 (consistent with the agreed methodology with the Department) and an Incentivised FSR of 1.54:1. Based on the area of the site (excluding Vivien Place), this would equate to 132 dwellings. The achievable density under the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal is lower than that originally identified within the Castle Hill North Precinct Plan as a result of further investigations and consideration of appropriate built form on the site.

It is important to note that when preparing controls planning authorities cannot anticipate, or have 100% assurance, that certain sites will be amalgamated. Where developers can create a larger master planned development site (such as the subject site), higher densities and built forms may be appropriate as larger sites allow greater flexibility with design and layout of building forms in order to maximise solar access and privacy to units and achieve an attractive future streetscape and urban design outcome.

5. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable State Environmental Planning Policies?

The planning proposal is consistent with all applicable State Environmental Planning Policies. An assessment of the proposal against applicable State Environmental Planning Policies is provided in Attachment A.

6. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions)?

Yes. The consistency of the planning proposal with the s.117 Ministerial Directions is detailed within Attachment B. A discussion on the consistency of the proposal with each relevant Direction is provided below.
• **Direction 3.1 – Residential Zones**

This Direction applies when a planning proposal will affect land within any zone in which significant residential development is proposed to be permitted. This Ministerial Direction is applicable in this instance as it proposes an intensification of residential densities within an existing residential zone. The objectives of the Direction are:

- to encourage a variety and choice of housing types to provide for existing and future housing needs,
- to make efficient use of existing infrastructure and services and ensure that new housing has appropriate access to infrastructure and services, and
- to minimise the impact of residential development on the environment and resource lands.

The planning proposal is considered to be consistent with this Direction as it will broaden the choice of building types and locations available in the housing market, make more efficient use of existing infrastructure and services, and reduce the consumption of land for housing and associated urban development on the urban fringe.

• **Direction 3.4 – Integrating Land Use and Transport**

This Direction aims to ensure that development improves access to housing, jobs and services, increase choice of available transport, reduce travel demand, and provide for the efficient movement of freight. A planning proposal must locate zones for urban purposes and include provisions that are consistent with the aims, objectives and principles of *Improving Transport Choice – Guidelines for planning and development* (DUAP 2001) and *The Right Place for Business and Services – Planning Policy* (DUAP 2001).

The proposal is considered to be consistent with this Direction as it will facilitate development which meets the following key objectives:

a) Improve access to housing, jobs and services by walking, cycling and public transport; and
b) Increase the choice of available transport and reducing dependence on cars; and
c) Reduce travel demand including the number of trips generated by development and the distances travelled, especially by car; and
d) Support the efficient and viable operation of public transport services including the Sydney Metro Northwest.

• **Direction 5.9 – North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy**

The planning proposal is considered to be consistent with the Structure Plan and Character Maps of the North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy. Consistency with the North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy is discussed in Section B Question 3 of this planning proposal.

**SECTION C - ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACT**

7. **Is there any likelihood that critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats, will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal?**

No, the land that is subject to the planning proposal is already developed and occupied by an residential development. The subject area is generally void of any significant vegetation or trees. Therefore the planning proposal is unlikely to create any adverse impacts on critical habitat or threatened species, populations or economical communities and their habitats.

8. **Are there any other likely environmental effects as a result of the planning proposal and how are they proposed to be managed?**
It is considered that the proposed amendment to *The Hills Local Environmental Plan 2012* does not result in any additional likely environment effects that would not already be anticipated under the current controls. Any future development application for the site would be assessed against the LEP provisions and the Hills Development Control Plan having regard to potential impacts of the development on adjoining and surrounding property owners.

9. **How has the planning proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects?**

- **Floor Space Ratio and Density**

  The Castle Hill North Planning Proposal anticipates a yield of 132 dwellings on the subject site. In comparison, the current proposal seeks to increase the achievable yield on the site to 220 dwellings, which equates to 88 additional/unplanned dwellings (+66%).

  It is proposed to facilitate the delivery of 220 dwellings on the site, with approximately 181 dwellings achievable at an ‘incentivised’ FSR of 1.9:1 (which is largely consistent with the outcomes originally envisaged under the Castle Hill North Precinct Plan), with the opportunity for a further 39 dwellings achievable through a 20% floor space bonus incentive, contingent on the public benefits associated with the road connection and pedestrian links. The additional 20% floor space bonus over and above the ‘incentivised FSR’ would result in an overall FSR of 2.28:1 across the site.

  As the proposal would facilitate yield in excess of what has been planned for as part of the infrastructure planning for the Castle Hill North Precinct, Council has resolved to exhibit a draft Voluntary Planning Agreement. Matters relating to content of the VPA are addressed in the following sections of this planning proposal.

- **Building Height**

  The proposed buildings are substantially taller than what was originally anticipated for the site as part of the Castle Hill North Precinct Plan and Planning Proposal, which anticipates heights of up to 8 storeys at this location. When considering the appropriate heights of development, it is necessary to consider the significance of the site in relation to overall context of the Precinct and also the relationship between the site and adjoining sensitive uses. By doing so, an appropriate maximum building height and transition of height across the site can be determined.

  The property to the south (Pennant Street Target Site) is subject to an approval for the construction of five (5) residential flat buildings ranging from 17 storeys to 23 storeys and will deliver 920 dwellings. The following site plan shows the height (in storeys) proposed on the subject site in relation to the heights anticipated on adjoining sites (through both the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal and the approved development on the Pennant Street Target Site).
The following figures show cross sections of the proposed development, including the approved Pennant Street Target Site development (on the left) and low/medium density development (on the right).
The incorporation of the 3 storey terraces along the Gilham and Gay Street frontages will provide increased buffer distances from the low/medium density development on the northern side of Gilham Street and the proposed 13 and 17 storey tower elements. The concepts that have been submitted indicate that the tower elements will be setback approximately 15 metres from the Gilham frontage. By having terraces along the frontage, with the tower elements setback, the predominant streetscape when viewed from the street will be a terrace edge.

In support of the planning proposal, draft development controls have been prepared. These controls will ensure that the built form is delivered as proposed and that draft development controls be applied to require a 3 storey terrace edge along the Gilham Street and Gay Street frontages and the application of setbacks which ensure that the tower elements are setback no less than 15 metres from the Gilham Street frontage. The proposed setback for terrace edge product is proposed to be 3 metres, which is consistent with the terrace setbacks proposed within the broader Castle Hill North Precinct.

- Overshadowing

In determining the most appropriate land use and built form for the site it is important to consider the potential impact of the development on adjoining uses. In this regard consideration needs to be afforded to overshadowing of land south of the development.

The following diagrams show the potential shadow impact of the development at 9am, 10:30am, 12pm, 1:30pm and 3pm on the winter solstice (21 June).
Figure 11
Overshadowing Diagrams – Winter Solstice
Based on the exhibited DCP for the Castle Hill North Precinct, future development on the site will be subject to the following solar access and overshadowing requirement:

- The common open space area must receive at least four hours of sunlight between 9am and 3pm on 21 June.
- Buildings must be designed to ensure that adjoining residential buildings and the major part of their landscape receive at least four hours of sunlight between 9am and 3pm on 21 June.

It is noted that further refinements to this control may occur as part of the consideration of submissions received on the draft Castle Hill North DCP.

Based on the overshadowing diagrams the proposed common open space within the development (which will be located on the western edge of the development site - adjoining the proposed new road connection) will be generally free of any overshadowing and have direct solar access from 10am to 3pm.

With respect to the overshadowing of adjoining sites, the control requires that a major part of the landscape is to receive at least 4 hours of sunlight between 9am and 3pm on the winter solstice. The information submitted indicates that at least 39% of the communal open space within the adjoining Target Site would achieve at least 4 hours of sunlight during the allocated time period. The control does not indicate what proportion of the landscape is to receive 4 hours of solar access, however standard practice would suggest that the proportion should be at least 50%. Whilst the proposal does not achieve 50% in this instance it is considered to be acceptable as:

- The southern site is subject to a development approval where a proportion of the communal open space is already proposed to be overshadowed by the buildings within the approved development;
- A significant portion (at least 39%) of the landscape will receive 4 hours of solar access;
- More than 50% of communal open space will achieve solar access during the critical lunch time period of 12pm and 2pm; and
- The adjoining communal open space would comply with the Apartment Design Guide which requires that a minimum of 50% direct sunlight to the principal usable part of the communal open space for a minimum of 2 hours between 9am and 3pm on 21 June. Based on the analysis submitted with the proposal the overall proportion of the communal open space that would receive at least 2 hours of sunlight during 9am and 3pm is 87%.

**Traffic and Transport**

As part of the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal, additional intersection improvements are proposed to ensure that the road network operates at an efficient level of service following development. Broadly, these improvements are as follows:

- Roundabouts in four (4) locations are to be provided under the Contributions Plan. The works are considered necessary to meet future demand, whilst ensuring an acceptable level of access, safety and convenience for all street and road users within the Castle Hill North Precinct. New roundabouts are proposed at the Carramarr Road/Castle Street junction, Gilham Street/Carramarr Road junction, Gilham Street/Old Castle Hill Road junction and the Garthowen Avenue/Old Castle Hill Road junction; and
- Intersection upgrade/realignment at the junction of Old Northern Road/McMullen Avenue/Brisbane Road to improve its operational efficiency.

Whilst the assessment submitted with the proposal concluded that the proposed development will have a negligible impact on the surrounding road network, it is principally focused on the subject site without full consideration of the growth that is likely to occur within the broader Castle Hill North Precinct. In recognition of this, Council resolved to require the proponent to prepare an updated traffic assessment, prior to exhibition, which assesses the impact of the proposed development on the performance of the surrounding road network and key intersections, taking
into account the proposed road improvements (within the Castle Hill North Precinct), the approved growth on the target site (36 Pennant Street, Castle Hill) and the additional growth resulting from the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal. The assessment will also need to have regard to the potential impact of the new road along the western boundary of the site. This requirement was included as a condition on the Gateway Determination.

In accordance with Council’s resolution and the Gateway Determination, the Proponent was required to prepare an amendment to the original traffic assessment, which determined that the additional 88 dwellings (over and above the 132 dwellings already planned for on the site) would result in an additional 17 trips during the AM peak and 13 additional trips during the PM peak. The assessment undertook SIDRA modelling of the surrounding intersections and found that the network improvements identified as part of the master planning for the Castle Hill North Precinct, including the roundabout upgrade at Gilham Street / Old Castle Hill Road and the north south link road to Les Shore Place, shall provide sufficient spare capacity on the key intersections to accommodate the development. Accordingly, the road improvements already identified through the master planning of the Castle Hill North Precinct are considered to be sufficient to accommodate the additional traffic generation resulting from the proposed development.

- **Public Benefit (Road Link)**

The planning proposal seeks to provide part of a new local road connection from Gilham Street to Les Shore Drive, along the boundary of the property to the south which would be constructed and dedicated to Council (at no cost to Council). In total, the future road link would be approximately 270 metres in length, of which approximately 43 metres would be provided by the subject development. It is anticipated that the remainder of the road link would be completed as part of the redevelopment of the southern property. The location of the road link and detail of the part of the road that would be provided as part of the subject proposal are identified in the following figures.
The original concept allowed for a 16.4m total road reserve width, which is consistent with that proposed for other local roads in the Precinct. This would be comprised of 2 x 3.2m traffic lanes, 1 x 3m parking lane and a 3.5m verge on both sides of the carriageway. As part of the negotiation on the draft VPA, the proponent has offered to increase the area of land for the western road connection from 750m² to 968m² (to match the area of Vivien Place that would be closed and incorporated into the development site). This will increase the width of land dedicated from 16.4m (2 traffic lanes plus 1 parking lane) to around 20m (2 traffic lanes plus 2 parking lane). The revised road profile is included in the figure below. The revised draft DCP 2012 (Part D Section 20 – Castle Hill North), which is on exhibition with the proposal, incorporates the revised road profile.
It is considered that the proposed local road (when fully connected to Les Shore Place) would allow for greater permeability through this part of the Precinct and would promote a positive development outcome in terms of the local road network. However, any additional development potential on the site, over and above what is anticipated for the site as part of the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal, should be contingent on the construction and dedication of part of this road link. Matters relating to the construction of the new road link along the western boundary and the future closure of Vivien Place are addressed in the draft VPA for the site offered by the proponent.

Dedication of the western road connection and closure and transfer of Vivien Place to the Developer will occur as part of a land swap arrangement. The will be addressed through a separate agreement between the developer and Council at the development assessment stage. As it is not a development contribution, is not addressed as part of this Voluntary Planning Agreement. Nevertheless a clause has been included in the Voluntary Planning Agreement stating that ‘the parties acknowledge that the Developer and Council will seek the closure, and land swap, of Vivien Place (owned by Council) for the dedication of the new roadway by the Developer (as shown in the Location Plan) on a like for like basis pursuant to a separate agreement as part of a future development application for the Land’.

- **Pedestrian Connectivity**

The proposed development concept, as revised by the proponent, incorporates a single pedestrian connection from north of Gilham Street to Pennant Street. This connection will provide improved pedestrian permeability through Precinct and improve access to the Castle Towers Shopping Centre and active uses proposed along Pennant Street.

Due to the change in level created by the steep retaining wall along most of Pennant Street, there is no safe or direct route for residents through the Target Site at 26 Pennant Street. However, there is potential for the pedestrian link to be provided along the eastern boundary of the property to the south (26-34 Pennant Street). The remainder of the pedestrian link would ultimately need to be completed as part of the redevelopment of the southern site.

Within the draft Voluntary Planning Agreement, which is being exhibited concurrently with the planning proposal the Proponent is offering to incorporate an easement for public right of access across the site so as to improve pedestrian connectivity within the Precinct.
• **Preservation of Trees (Condition of Gateway Determination)**

A condition of the Gateway Determination required Council to amend the planning proposal to investigate opportunities to retain any mature trees on the site, which can be incorporated into the concept layout plans.

Ultimately the determination of trees that will be retained will need to be established through the development assessment process, and would need to have regard to the final building design. Construction works including excavation, basement design and the alignment and design of the western road connection will impact on the viability of certain existing trees. For these reasons it would not be reasonable or practical to specify the trees that will be preserved through the planning proposal process.

Notwithstanding DCP 2012 incorporates a number of controls to encourage the retention and preservation of existing vegetation, as detailed below.

- **Part B Section 5 – Residential Flat Buildings – Control 3.2(a) Site Analysis:** Requires development to be designed to respect site constraints such as topography, drainage, soil landscapes, flora, fauna and bushfire hazard.
- **Part B Section 5 – Residential Flat Buildings – Control 3.3(a) Setbacks and Building Zones:** Requires that where trees are identified in the site analysis and are located within the 10 metre front setback, 8 metre rear setback and 6 metre side setback, the Building Zone boundaries will be set so that all buildings are 5 metres from the trees or clear of the drip line of the trees whichever is the greater distance. The distance must be measured from the outside of the tree trunk at ground level.
- **Part B Section 5 – Residential Flat Buildings – Control 3.6(c) Landscaped Area:** Requires that existing trees and vegetation should be preserved especially those in the front setback. The existing tree canopy should be retained and enhanced wherever possible.
- **Part B Section 3 – Landscaping – Control 3.2 Protection of Trees and Understorey:** Requires that wherever trees are removed (with consent) as a consequence of the development, an equal or greater number of replacement trees must be incorporated into the landscaping of the new development.

Any development application would be supported by a landscaping plan and an arborist report, where required, to articulate the impact of the development on the existing trees on the site. It is at this stage that the determination of tree retention can be confirmed.

- **Local Infrastructure**

Under the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal the site has been given a Base FSR of 1:1 (consistent with the agreed methodology with the Department) and an Incentive FSR of 1.54:1. Based on the area of the site (excluding Vivien Place), this would equate to 132 dwellings. Since the issue of a the Gateway Determination for the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal a draft Contributions Plan has been prepared to collect the necessary funds for the provision of local infrastructure required to support the additional population.

The population growth forecast within the draft Contributions Plan is based on a yield of 132 dwellings on the subject site. As the proposal would facilitate approximately 220 dwellings, this equates to 88 unplanned dwellings. Based on participation rates within The Hills Shire (from the 1995, 2005 and 2012 Recreation Plan household survey results), 2,000 additional dwellings within an area would typically generate the need for approximately:

- 1 (one) new sports fields;
- 1 (one) local park;
- 1 (one) netball court;
- 1 (one) tennis court; and
• 40% of a local community centre.

The 88 additional unplanned dwellings (over and above the 132 dwellings planned for as part of the draft Contributions Plan for the Castle Hill North Precinct) proposed by the current planning proposal would generate the need for approximately:

• 4.4% of a new sports field;
• 4.4% of a local park;
• 4.4% of a netball court;
• 4.4% of a tennis court; and
• 7.8% of a local community centre.

At its meeting of 26 June 2017 Council resolved to exhibit the draft Voluntary Planning Agreement submitted in support of the planning proposal. The draft VPA provides the following obligations in association with any future development on the land:

• Developer to construct the western road connection to Council’s standards;
• Provision of 1,570m² easement through the site (Public Right of Access); and
• Monetary Contribution (yield over and above the planned growth).

Matters relating to the land swap of Vivien Place and the western road connection will be addressed via a separate agreement such as a deed at the development assessment state. As this would be a land swap, it is not required within the Voluntary Planning Agreement.

Prior to public exhibition the draft Voluntary Planning Agreement was subject to legal review and was updated accordingly. However the intent of the VPA has not changed.

The locations of the western road connection, Vivien Place cul-de-sac, and the through site pedestrian link are shown in the following figure.

Figure 16
Summary of Non-monetary Public Benefits
**Vivien Place (Closure and Incorporation into Development Site)**

The proposed development concept involves the creation of an amalgamated development site, which would include the closure of Vivien Place (968m$^2$) and the incorporation of the land into the development site. The area of the proposed western road connection and Vivien Place are equivalent at 968m$^2$ and as such are proposed to occur as part of a simultaneous land transfer (land swap) arrangement.

The incorporation of Vivien Place into the development site would allow for an improved master planned development outcome as opposed to the land being developed as part of smaller and separate development applications. The critical benefits of a master planned outcome are that it will facilitate more orderly development, including the provision of larger and more consolidated areas of landscaped open space, improved traffic circulation, reduced vehicular access points, better management of interface impacts, improved communal facilities, and improved housing diversity outcomes.

As mentioned above the closure of Vivien Place and the incorporation of the road into the development site will be addressed through a separate agreement at the development assessment stage. As it is a land swap it is not a matter that should be addressed within the Voluntary Planning Agreement. However, a new clause has been included in the Voluntary Planning Agreement stating that ‘the parties acknowledge that the Developer and Council will seek the closure, and land swap, of Vivien Place (owned by Council) for the dedication of the new roadway by the Developer (as shown in the Location Plan) on a like for like basis pursuant to a separate agreement as part of a future development application for the Land’. This change was made as a result of the legal review.

**Western Road Connection (Construction and Dedication)**

The proponent is offering to dedicate 968m$^2$ of land along the western boundary of the site as part of a future road which would ultimate connect Gilham Street and Les Shore Place, once the site to the south is developed. The Proponent would also be constructing the road to Council standards as identified in the following road profile within figure 14.

The proposed local road would allow for greater permeability through this part of the Precinct and would promote a positive development outcome in terms of the local road network.

As mentioned above the dedication of the western road connection will be addressed through a separate agreement (such as a Deed of Agreement) at the development assessment stage. As it is a land swap, it is not a matter that should be addressed within the Voluntary Planning Agreement. This change was made as a result of the legal review.

**Easement for Public Right of Access**

The Proponent is offering to incorporate an easement for public right of access across the site so as to improve pedestrian connectivity within the Precinct.

**Monetary Contribution**

Under the Castle Hill North Planning Proposal (16/2016/PLP) the site has potential to accommodate 132 dwellings. A draft Contributions Plan for the Castle Hill North Precinct has since been prepared and exhibited to collect the necessary funds for the provision of local infrastructure required to support this yield. The proposal would facilitate approximately 220 dwellings, this equates to 88 dwellings more than what has been planned for through the draft Contributions Plan for the Castle Hill North Precinct.

It is proposed that the planned growth (up to 132 dwellings) would continue to be levied under the draft Contributions Plan for the Castle Hill North Precinct. A separate additional monetary contribution would be paid for the additional 88 dwellings. These funds would be allocated toward the delivery of additional infrastructure required to support the additional population.
The 132 dwellings already planned for on the site would continue to be levied under the Castle Hill North Contributions Plan as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mix</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>CP Rate (NPV)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$19,819.80</td>
<td>$654,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$20,985.67</td>
<td>$1,510,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$29,146.77</td>
<td>$786,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,951,984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of $22,363 per dwelling (PV)  
(Note: Contribution rates will be indexed)

Table 1  
Contributions payable under the draft Castle Hill North Contributions Plan

The additional yield, over and above the planned growth, would be subject to a monetary contribution in accordance with the rates specified within the VPA as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mix</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Offer (Rates within Draft VPA)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$462,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$1,104,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
<td>$558,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,124,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of $23,732 per dwelling (PV)  
(Note: Contribution rates will be indexed)

Table 2  
Voluntary Planning Agreement Offer for additional yield

The proposed additional monetary contribution would result in an average contribution of around $23,732 per dwelling which is in excess of the $22,363 per dwelling for the portion of the development which would be levied under the draft Contributions Plan for the Castle Hill North Precinct. Coupled with the capital cost of constructing the western road connection, the monetary contribution is considered to be a reasonable offer and as such would be sufficient to meet the additional demand on local infrastructure resulting from the additional population.

- Local Incentives Provision

The proponent has indicated a commitment to comply with Council's apartment size, mix and car parking requirements which will promote the housing outcomes advocated by Council to suit the needs of expected future residents.

The proposed local provision utilises an incentives framework established through the precinct planning process for the Castle Hill North Precinct which provides a ‘base floor space ratio’ and an ‘incentivised floor space ratio’. This approach is entirely consistent with the agreed housing diversity methodology between Council and the NSW Chief Town Planner. Given the uplift generated by this proposal should only be granted where the development meets Council’s requirements, it is recommended that the ‘base floor space ratio’ be set at 1:1 (allowing for approximately 95 dwellings), with an ‘incentivised floor space ratio’ of 1.9:1 (allowing for approximately 181 dwellings).
An additional 20% floor space incentive would increase the total achievable yield on the site to 220 dwellings. This floor space bonus would be granted through the key site provision, where the site is amalgamated to form a consolidated development site, the proposed development incorporates a three (3) storey terrace edge along the Gilham and Gay Street frontages and the proposed road connection and pedestrian link are constructed and dedicated to Council, at no cost. The take-up of all available incentives by the developer would allow for a total achievable FSR of 2.28:1 across the site.

**SECTION D - STATE AND COMMONWEALTH INTERESTS**

10. Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?

Yes, future development on the site would need to be supported by the necessary services including electricity, telecommunication, water and sewer. The required services are available to the site. Further consultation with utility providers will occur during the formal public consultation period.

Matters relating to social infrastructure were discussed previously within this proposal.

11. What are the views of State and Commonwealth Public Authorities consulted in accordance with the gateway determination, and have they resulted in any variations to the planning proposal? (Note: The views of State and Commonwealth Public Authorities will not be known until after the initial gateway determination. This section of the planning proposal is completed following consultation with those public authorities identified in the gateway determination.)

The Gateway Determination requires consultation with the following Government Agencies:

- Sydney Water;
- Endeavour Energy;
- Roads and Maritime Services;
- Transport for NSW; and
- Department of Education.
PART 4 MAPPING

The planning proposal seeks to amend the Height of Buildings Map, Floor Space Ratio Map and Additional Permitted Uses Map of The Hills Local Environmental Plan 2012.

Existing Land Zoning Map

![Existing Land Zoning Map](image1)

Proposed Land Zoning Map

![Proposed Land Zoning Map](image2)
Existing Lot Size Map

Proposed Lot Size Map
Existing Floor Space Ratio Incentive Map

Proposed Floor Space Ratio Incentive Map
PART 5 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

The planning proposal is being advertised in local newspapers and on display at Council’s administration building and Castle Hill Library. The planning proposal is also be made available on Council’s website. In addition, letters have been issued to adjoining and nearby property owners and stakeholders.

PART 6 PROJECT TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commencement Date (Gateway Determination)</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agency consultation</td>
<td>September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement of public exhibition period</td>
<td>September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of public exhibition period</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe for consideration of submissions</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe for consideration of proposal post exhibition</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to Council on submissions</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Proposal to PCO for opinion</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Council will make the plan (if delegated)</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Council will forward to department for notification (if delegated)</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTACHMENT A: LIST OF STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY (SEPP)</th>
<th>APPLICABLE</th>
<th>RELEVANT (YES/NO)</th>
<th>(IF RELEVANT) INCONSISTENT/CONSISTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 1 Development Standards</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 19 Bushland in Urban Areas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 21 Caravan Parks</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 30 Intensive Agriculture</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 33 Hazardous and Offensive Development</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 36 Manufactured Home Estates</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 44 Koala Habitat Protection</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 47 Moore Park Showground</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 50 Canal Estate Development</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 52 Farm Dams and Other Works in Land and Water Management Plan Areas</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 55 Remediation of Land</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 62 Sustainable Aquaculture</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 64 Advertising and Signage</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 65 Design Quality of Residential Flat Development</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>CONSISTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 70 Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Rental Housing (2009)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Sustainability Index: BASIX 2004</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Environmental Planning Policy (Coastal Management) 2018</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Environmental Planning Policy (Educational Establishments and Child Care Facilities) 2017</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt and Complying Development Codes (2008)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability (2004)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure (2007)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosciuszko National Park – Alpine Resorts (2007)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurnell Peninsula (1989)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries (2007)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Consent Provisions (2007)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith Lakes Scheme (1989)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Lands (2008)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Regional Development (2011)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Significant Precincts (2005)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Drinking Water Catchment (2011)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Region Growth Centres (2006)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Ports (2013)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal (2010)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Environmental Planning Policy (Vegetation in Non-Rural Areas) 2017</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Sydney Employment Area (2009)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY (SEPP)</td>
<td>APPLICABLE</td>
<td>RELEVANT (YES/NO)</td>
<td>(IF RELEVANT) INCONSISTENT/CONSISTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Sydney Parklands (2009)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deemed SEPPs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREP No. 8 (Central Coast Plateau Areas)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREP No. 9 – Extractive Industry (No. 2 – 1995)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREP No. 16 – Walsh Bay</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREP No. 20 – Hawkesbury – Nepean River (No 2 – 1997)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREP No. 24 – Homebush Bay Area</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREP No. 26 – City West</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREP No. 30 – St Marys</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREP No. 33 – Cooks Cove</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT B: ASSESSMENT AGAINST SECTION 117 MINISTERIAL DIRECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTION</th>
<th>APPLICABLE</th>
<th>RELEVANT? (YES/NO)</th>
<th>(IF RELEVANT) INCONSISTENT/CONSISTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Employment and Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Business and Industrial Zones</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Rural Zones</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Oyster Aquaculture</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Rural Lands</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Environment and Heritage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Environment Protection Zone</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Coastal Protection</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Recreation Vehicle Area</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Housing, Infrastructure and Urban Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Residential Zones</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Consistent – see Section B Question 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Home Occupations</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Consistent – see Section B Question 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodomes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Shooting Ranges</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Hazard and Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Flood Prone Land</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Regional Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Sydney Drinking Water Catchment</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Farmland of State and Regional Significance on the NSW Far North Coast</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Commercial and Retail Development along the Pacific Highway, North Coast</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTION</td>
<td>APPLICABLE</td>
<td>RELEVANT? (YES/NO)</td>
<td>(IF RELEVANT) INCONSISTENT/CONSISTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Consistent – see Section B Question 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Local Plan Making

| 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements | YES | NO | - |
| 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes | YES | NO | - |
| 6.3 Site Specific Provisions | YES | NO | - |

7. Metropolitan Planning

| 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney | YES | YES | Consistent – see Section B Question 3 |
| 7.2 Implementation of Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation | NO | - | - |
| 7.3 Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy | NO | - | - |
| 7.4 Implementation of North West Priority Growth Area Land Use and Infrastructure Implementation Plan | YES | NO | - |
| 7.5 Implementation of Greater Parramatta Priority Growth Area Interim Land Use and Infrastructure Implementation Plan | NO | - | - |