

SUBMISSIONS FROM GOVERNMENT AGENCIES – HUNTLEE STAGE 1 PROJECT APPLICATION - PPR

No.	Agency	Comment	Issue Summary	Department's Comments
1	Ausgrid	Require additional detailed information regarding staging and timing and further discussion to identify required infrastructure The method of connection of the development will be in line with Ausgrid's ES10 – 'Requirements for Electricity Connection to Developments' The developer will be required to make Contributions for the reticulation in accordance this policy. Ausgrid requires that due consideration be given to the compatibility of proposed development with existing Ausgrid's infrastructure, particularly in relation to risks of electrocution, fire risks, Electric & Magnetic Fields (EMFs), noise, visual amenity and other matters that may impact on Ausgrid or the development. The developer should be aware of statutory requirements regarding safety separation requirements and existing electricity easements.	• More info needed re timing • Contributions from developer required for reticulation • Consider impacts of Ausgrid infrastructure • Statutory requirements re safety and easements	• Proponent is to continue to liaise with Ausgrid to confirm that appropriate electricity services can be supplied to the site • Suggest condition of approval regarding notification that agreement reached with Ausgrid about electricity provision
2	Department of Education and Communities	Satisfied with relocation of primary school site Suggests changes to VPA	• School site OK • VPA amendments	• Noted • Noted
3	Hunter New England Health	Commends commitment to consult with HNE Health regarding provision of primary and secondary health care. Commends public transport provision, proposed bus routes /stops and access to Branxton station. Commends use of Community Reference Group	• Consultation good • PT support good • CRG good	• Noted
4	Hunter Water	As the development proceeds, the developer will need to lodge further applications with Hunter Water (Section 50 applications) to determine the formal requirements that shall apply at the time (including available capacity) Hunter Water approved a Water Servicing Strategy and a	• Section 50 applications as development proceeds • Old servicing strategy to	• Noted • Suggest condition of approval that new servicing

		Waster Water Servicing encompassing Stage 1 of the development in 2009, however, due to changes within the scope of development and the elapsing of 4 years since approval, Hunter Water sought an addendum to the strategy. The updated strategy has not yet been finalised. Of the total 1,050 ET that is available, growth projections indicate that Huntlee will constitute approximately 350 ET prior to upgrade works being undertaken. Hunter Water will continue to monitor growth over time, and adjust the timing of regional upgrade works as necessary to ensure that system performance remains acceptable as growth occurs. The developer will be required to construct the first stage of the regional Iwastewater pumping station which will discharge directly to Branxton WWTW. The developer will also be required to construct the wastewater transfer scheme that will discharge to the regional lift WWPS. Hunter Water does not reserve capacity for specific developments and as such, capacity will be allocated to new developments on a “first-come, first-served” basis	be updated and approved • Huntlee to get approximately 350ET from current available, then upgrade works required • Developer to construct wastewater pumping station and transfer scheme • HW do not reserve capacity – first come, first served	strategy to be prepared and approved by HW prior to first subdivision certificate • Noted. • Suggest condition regarding confirmation of appropriate water supply • Noted
5	Maitland City Council	Huntlee is likely to have regional impacts on roads, assets and infrastructure in the Maitland LGA. Concern regarding potential impact on New England Highway and notes other new urban release areas within Maitland will also place pressure on roads. Suggests condition to encourage use of Expressway instead of New England Highway. Concern regarding potential conflict for provision of water services to competing urban release areas.	• Regional impact on Maitland LGA • Pressure on roads • Condition to restrict use of New England Hwy • Competition for water supply	• Noted • RMS consider impact on State roads acceptable with upgrades, Department consider local road impact is acceptable • Department does not consider this necessary • Noted. Water servicing to be confirmed by Hunter Water
6	Office of Environment and Heritage	Considers the issues raised earlier by OEH have largely been addressed in PPR. Concern regarding interface with Persoonia Park (Lots 15-16 DP755211) – request a condition of approval to ensure a formed access track is provided to the boundary of the Park – in consultation with OEH.	• Issues raised largely been addressed • Request condition re access track to Persoonia Park	• Noted • Department to consider a condition of approval

		Acknowledges Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment – request appropriate management strategies to be developed to address possibility of currently undetected cultural material on the site. Encourages ongoing consultation with registered Aboriginal parties. Suggested conditions of approval provided regarding Aboriginal Cultural Heritage. Additional Email – requests condition to provide threatened species data to OEH	• Request management strategies for Aboriginal Heritage • Encourage ongoing consultation • Conditions for heritage • Provide data to NPWS	• Suggest conditions of approval to address this • Noted • Conditions will be considered • Condition will be considered
7	Roads and Maritime Services / Transport for NSW 12 September 2012	{ NB: 12 Sep 2012 letter supersedes 23 Aug 2012 letter} RMS generally satisfied with comprehensive modelling report and addendum by proponent. Transport NSW and RMS have no objection to Stage 1 subject to conditions of approval they recommend regarding staging / thresholds for provision of road works Also suggests requirements to be included in the VPA.	• Satisfied with modelling and addendum • No objection to Stage 1 subject to conditions • VPA amendments	• Noted • Conditions will be added • Noted
8	Rural Fire Service	Whole of developable part of Stage 1 shall be managed as an asset protection zone A temporary asset protection zone shall be provided on lands adjoining the town centre – until the future stages are developed. A suitable APZ is required to the north of the town centre within the boundary of the site. Public road access, provision of services, landscaping and open space and future development to be in accordance with 'Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006' Secondary access required to large lot area to the south – may be limited to emergency vehicles. Support road connection in NW of village 1.	• Manage entire Stage 1 as APZ • Temporary APZ around town centre til future stages developed • APZ north of town centre • In accordance with PBP • Secondary access in south of large lot area • Support NW road connection village 1	• Noted • Condition will be considered • Condition will be considered • Condition will be considered • Noted
9	Singleton Council – PPR	Non compliance with the DGRs (did not consult with Council in preparation of EA) App J does not explain how EA/PPR is compliant with	• Non compliance DGRs re consultation • No justification for	• Department understand there has been ongoing consultation over many years • Noted – Department will assess compliance with

	Submission 23 November 2012	DCP Proposed contributions ignore cross-boundary issues – distribution of contributions amounts needs to consider both Councils – Singleton has not agreed to method of levying contributions or the figures Draft VPA does not adversely impact on Singleton Council Do not consider meetings with DP+I to be ‘consultation’ for the purposes of resolving Council’s issues Subdivision appears to flow with topography but better DCP controls are needed.	compliance with DCP • Cross boundary contributions need consideration • Draft VPA no adverse impact on Singleton • Meetings not consultation • Better DCP controls needed	DCP • Department to get independent advice regarding appropriate local contributions and community infrastructure to add as condition of approval • Noted • Disagree – several workshops held with both Councils • Noted
10	Cessnock Council – PPR Submission 23 November 2012	Council support additional housing and employment Huntlee will bring. Project does not sufficiently provide for community infrastructure such as parks, sports fields and community buildings. No justified determination or agreement has been made on the required level of local infrastructure. Proposed infrastructure does not satisfy Council’s standards and is in conflict with riparian corridors. Recommend DP+I adopt Growth Centres ‘Precinct Planning Approach’ to rectify Council’s concerns. Indicative layout plan and zoning plan should be amended to reflect GC examples and additional mapping layers as per GC SEPP. Recommend DCP template be equivalent of GC DCPs Recommend DP+I establish a Project Control Group containing each Council, to review the Indicative Layout Plan, agree local infrastructure and provide input to amendments to the SEPP No justified determination or agreement has been made on the required level of local infrastructure. Draft DCP provided Oct 26 2012 contains lot size map – it is inconsistent with proposed Stage 1 project – and	• Support additional housing / employment • Lacks local and community infrastructure • Local infrastructure not justified / agreed • Local infrastructure below standards and conflict with riparian corridor • Should adopt Growth Centres approach – change zoning and add maps • DCP should be same as Growth Centres • Establish Project Control Group to review layout plan and local infrastructure • DCP lot size map inconsistent with Stage 1	• Noted • Department to get independent advice regarding appropriate local contributions and community infrastructure to add as condition of approval • Noted • Different circumstances to growth centres • DCP was informed by the growth centres example, but the circumstances are different at this site and DCP is tailored for this • Working groups already established to discuss these issues • Noted • Lot yield is also controlled by table outlining

	enables an increased lot yield. Minimum lot size controls enables proposed lots to be further subdivided. No controls for development in R5 zone. DAs for this land will not be able to be processed until controls established. Staging plan does not consider integration of community infrastructure. Subdivision layout likely to be affected. Should have longer exhibition period for more significant proposals. SEPP MD – zones R1, R2, B4 do not contain all mandatory land uses from Standard Instrument. Council recommend the SEPP MD Sch 3 Part 27 be consistent with Standard Instrument. EP&A Amendment 2012 – means some provisions in DCP will be void. Recommend DCP and SEPP MD be revised regarding legal precedence. Recommend sports fields and parks/playgrounds be relocated so as not to conflict with riparian corridors, (which is contrary to Water Mgt Act 2000 and Draft DCP), and be consistent with Council's <i>Recreation and Open Space Strategy</i>. Council encourage the joint use of open space land and recommend further negotiation regarding embellishment of open space land adjacent to school site. Council identify four 1st order streams and one 2nd order stream that is not shown on the Figure 6 of Trunk Stormwater and Flooding Assessment (App F of PPR) Concern with lack of district sports field in Stage 1 Concern with location of proposed sports field is not central to user catchment, fall of land is irregular, no sealed car park proposed, should have cycleway connection No detailed traffic impact assessment on local traffic and roads undertaken – needed to determine future upgrades and provision of traffic management infrastructure.	• Lot size controls allow further subdivision • No controls for R5 zone • Staging plan lacks community infrastructure integration • Longer exhibition period suggested • SEPP MD inconsistent with standard instrument • Revise DCP and MD SEPP re legal precedence • Relocate sports fields / parks outside riparian corridors • Recommend joint use of open space • Some streams not shown as riparian corridors • Lack of district sports field • Sports fields not central, fall of land irregular, no sealed car park, no cycleway connection • No local traffic impact assessment	maximum yield and will also be subject to merit assessment by Council in future as will further subdivision • MD SEPP does not require DCP for R5 zone – merit assessment can be undertaken • Noted • Noted • Noted – it is possible that Standard Instrument changed since the making of the SEPP • Not necessary – DCPs are only guides, no statutory weight • Department is satisfied with proposed location of sports fields • Noted – this can be discussed at detailed design stage for embellishment of open space areas • This is likely due to realignment of some streams into main drainage line • See above re: local contributions community facilities • Sports field location is acceptable, details of embellishment and connectivity can be discussed at detailed design stage for open space embellishment • Existing local roads are unlikely to be affected, affect on State roads has been assessed
--	---	--	---

		Proposed contribution for pre-school is insufficient – and Council does not provide government pre-schools and does not intend to. Council see a need for additional facilities relating to the care of children, youth and seniors groups and request further negotiation regarding education infrastructure. Benchmark report in App M – does not provide a like for like analysis – should be compared with Growth Centres contribution rates. VPA / s94 plan not resolved prior to exhibition of PPR – but strategic framework may change.	• Council do not provide pre-schools • Need facilities for child care, youth and seniors • Benchmark should compare Growth Centres • VPA / S94 should be resolved prior to PPR	• Noted • See above re: local contributions community facilities • Not considered relevant • Noted
11	Department of Primary Industries - NSW Office of Water and Crown Lands 5 December 2012	Recommend that proponent commitment regarding Permanent Waterbody 1 include an undertaking that the diversion of the third order stream will result in it being offline from the third order stream – that no flow from the stream will be captured by the structure. Previously 5 flood detention structures but removal of Lot 34 has changed structures proposed – these changes should retain the 2 year recurrence interval criteria to ensure that low to medium flows are not impeded by structures. Consideration is required of changes to the frequency and duration of flows into Lot 34 – no evidence has been provided to confirm the new proposed detention structure will achieve no increase in peak flows from design floods. Consider ongoing stability of this section of the stream in the design of upstream discharge structures and detention structures. Removal of first and second order watercourses is inconsistent with NOW 'Guidelines for Controlled Activities (July 2012) – though Part 3A are exempt, Dept should consider if issue adequately dealt with. Licensing requirements should be noted in statement of commitments Future approvals will require approval for Controlled	• Ensure Permanent Waterbody 1 is offline from third order stream • Retain 2 year recurrence interval criteria to ensure low to medium flows are not impeded by flood detention structures • Need evidence to confirm new detention structures will achieve no increase in peak flows from design floods • Consider ongoing stability of stream in design of upstream structures • Removal of 1st and 2nd order watercourses not supported • Note licensing requirements for future approvals	• Consider a condition of approval • Consider a condition of approval • Consider a condition of approval • Noted • Request proponent response • Noted

		Activities and should be consistent with guidelines Several Crown roads and some Crown land (in waterway) within the site. Should consider if landowner consent required. Crown roads will need to be closed and purchased – an application has been made for one of the roads.	• Crown roads and land within site • Crown roads need to be closed / purchased	• Noted • Noted – Proponent to confirm arrangements for Crown roads and land in waterway
12	Mine Subsidence Board 4 December 2012	The Board's initial submission on EA contains suggested conditions which remain unchanged after PPR Recommend proponent undertake feasibility investigation to determine most appropriate remediation method for mine workings in development area – and if alternate method proposed, consult with MSB Proponent should determine the precise location of mine workings on the eastern edge of the development and consult the Board if they require remediation.	• Proposed conditions as per EA submission • Feasibility of remediation method should be investigated • Determine location of mine workings on east side and consider remediation need	• Noted • Consider a condition of approval • Consider a condition of approval
			•	