

VINEYARD SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS AND RESPONSES

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
AGENCIES				
Department of Education	194262	School location	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed school site is located on the irregular intersection of Commercial Road and Harkness Road, which is not preferred. No details are available regarding the future upgrade of Commercial Road. Preference for the school being located next to public open space to reduce the footprint of the school site. Request for land along the south of Commercial Road to be designated public open space. Concern over the playing fields being located below the 1:100 year flood line and therefore subject to flooding. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> School sites are limited in the precinct due to the probable maximum flood line (PMF) and the contours of the precinct. A school site must be located above the PMF and ideally be on a site as flat as possible and near the village centre. The proposed school site location meets these criteria. The proposed school site cannot be co-located with open space in this location due to the presence of 'existing native vegetation' to the west of the site which cannot be cleared for active open space purposes. A significant portion of the precinct is flood affected which reduces the land available for residential purposes. The playing fields are partially located below the 1:100 year flood line to enable land above the 1:100 year flood line to be developed for residential purposes and the playing fields need a flat area which cannot be found higher up in the precinct.
Department of Primary Industries	192681	Water supply & wastewater	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No details are available on the intended water supply (potable and non-potable) for future development. No details are available on the impacts on surface water, groundwater and stormwater management. No details are available on effluent disposal systems. Use of onsite effluent disposal systems may be constrained by buffer requirements and lot sizes. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Sydney Water has confirmed it can service the precinct for drinking water and wastewater. Details can be found in the Infrastructure Precinct Planning Report. Refer to the Water Cycle Management Report. Refer to point 1 above. Refer to point 1 above.
		Land use	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Potential land use conflict (urban/ rural boundary issues) to be assessed and addressed by appropriate management strategies (e.g. setbacks/ vegetation screening). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Matters to be addressed at development application stage.
		Watercourse management	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No details are available on impacts to watercourses. No details are available on the proposed restoration and revegetation works to the watercourse. Noted these issues would be addressed a development application stage. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
Endeavour Energy	185392	Electricity provision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> General support for the Vineyard (Stage 1) precinct. Initial supply to the Vineyard precinct will be available through the existing distribution feeders currently servicing the area originating at Riverstone zone substation and South Windsor zone substation. Additional capacity will also be available following the establishment of Box Hill zone substation, planned to be commissioned in 2022. Electricity supply within the Vineyard precinct will be developer funded (distribution reticulation and augmentation works) in accordance with Endeavour Energy's policies. The ultimate supply for the Vineyard precinct will be provided by the future Riverstone East zone substation. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
Environment Protection Authority (EPA)	192828	Air quality	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Connectivity is encouraged through locating employment and services adjacent to public transport. Potential land use conflict resulting from emission sources (e.g. roads with high traffic volumes) adjacent to sensitive land uses. Future development should be planned and designed to meet air quality siting and design requirements (<i>Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads – Interim Guideline</i> & Infrastructure SEPP). Special consideration is required for the planning and design of the school site to minimise school children's exposure to air pollution. Consideration should be given to the approaches being applied in the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy. Air quality impacts should be minimised by proposed power generation technologies, restrictions on wood heaters and open fireplaces and limiting diesel and gas powered equipment in construction. The Air Quality Appraisal Tool should be used to assess health impacts resulting from increased population or increased air pollution emissions. A working group between The Department, EPA, OEH and Transport NSW should be created to develop strategies to reduce emissions and exposure. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> This is the goal for precinct planning in the Growth Areas. Very low density development is proposed adjacent to Windsor Road. Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. The timing of cessation of odour generating land uses is not known nor can be controlled by Council or the Department, as the property may be subject to odour impacts for an indeterminate period of time. We note the EPA have commented on management approaches for the existing operations. Some of the odour generating land uses can apply best practice measures to manage the odour levels from their operations, however, it is likely that to achieve a

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
AGENCIES				
		Odour	<p>7. Potential odour sources in the precinct include several farms and a mushroom production operation. These existing uses are not compatible with the proposed residential uses. An agreed negotiated transitional approach between the stakeholders should be developed addressing mitigation options and land use conflict. It is recommended that the Sydney Agriculture Strategic Approaches Working Group (DPI, The Department, EPA and Councils) be consulted in relation to any future transition approach.</p> <p>8. The proposed Vineyard DCP does not address management of odour issues from existing activities and does not include a requirement for the preparation of odour assessments.</p> <p>9. The Growth Centres Precincts DCP states that there is potential risk of odour impact for residences if they reside in certain locations. This should be revised to address recommendations of any odour assessment that is undertaken addressing such impacts.</p>	<p>level of control suitable for the rezoned precincts is not economical. It is expected that the rural uses will gradually move out as the precinct develops as land values for residential development increase.</p> <p>8. The Vineyard DCP has been revised to include an odour section with management approaches as per the exhibited odour assessment.</p> <p>9. Refer to point 8 above.</p> <p>10. Control 2.1.9 (2) of the DCP outlines the circumstances where acoustic reports are to be submitted with a DA. Report are required where proposed development is adjacent to a railway line, arterial or sub-arterial roads, potentially impacted upon by a nearby industrial / employment use or area, a subdivision or noise sensitive development within 300m of Windsor Road, or is within the vicinity of 172 Commercial Road, Vineyard. Acoustic reports submitted with DAs for subdivision of land are to demonstrate that the subdivision has been designed to minimise acoustic treatments of future buildings on the proposed lots. The report is to nominate noise mitigate requirements for future buildings. These requirements are to be included as a Section 88B restriction as to user for the subdivision so as to inform future owners.</p> <p>11. The Department notes the inconsistencies. The controls in the DCP have been amended to align with the Infrastructure SEPP (ISEPP).</p> <p>12. According to the Department's consultant, no validation requirement is necessary. Council agrees and will not validate that the design is in accordance with the ISEPP and the associated Interim Guideline. This information would be covered in the acoustic report at DA stage. Also, an additional report would not be conducive to housing affordability.</p> <p>13. The Healthy Rivers Commission's Independent Inquiry into the Hawkesbury-Nepean River System outlined that the WQOs are to be adopted as indicative values for initial planning. Hawkesbury City Council did not have any statutory requirements for target pollutant removal rates for new developments. As such, it was agreed that the pollutant removal objectives and modelling parameters as outlined in Blacktown City Council's DCP and WSUD Handbook were to be utilised for the precinct, as this was in line with the surrounding precincts which are also part of the same Hawkesbury-Nepean River System. This approach, adopted for the Vineyard precinct, is consistent with the majority of the North West Growth Centre and catchments draining to South Creek.</p> <p>14. Refer to point 13 above.</p> <p>15. The geotechnical study identified areas of potential salinity. Specific salinity impacts would be assessed at the DA stage via the provisions of Section 2.2.2 of DCP.</p> <p>16. Refer to point 13 above.</p> <p>17. Noted.</p>
		Noise	<p>10. A detailed noise assessment is required when development of the Vineyard precinct commences to assess whether the in-principle noise mitigation recommendations proposed in noise assessment are adequate or require updating. The outcomes should be incorporated into development consents or licences.</p> <p>11. There is an inconsistency between the noise criteria in the DCP and Infrastructure SEPP. This should be corrected.</p> <p>12. A validation requirement should be included in the DCP to ensure that the Infrastructure SEPP noise requirements are satisfied prior to occupation.</p>	
		Water quality and waterway health	<p>13. Request for key water principles to be incorporated into the draft Precinct Plan.</p> <p>14. Land uses changes should deliver outcomes that will support on-going improvement to the health of the catchments and waterways and achieve the NSW Water Quality Objectives over time. The endorsement of generic per cent load reductions based on DCP guidelines are generic targets and do not address WSUD.</p> <p>15. Salinity issues are required to be addressed with management measures. Specific management techniques are required for sodic soils.</p> <p>16. Water quality and flow targets need to be developed and incorporated into the DCP.</p> <p>17. Guidelines should inform the stated environmental outcomes: <i>The Managing urban stormwater: harvesting and reuse Guidelines (DEC 2006)</i>, <i>WSUD Guidelines</i>, <i>Managing urban stormwater: soils and construction</i>. The EPA notes that a treatment train process will be implemented with the use of rainwater tanks, creek/swale systems, gross pollutant traps and trash racks, and bioretention "raingardens".</p> <p>18. The EPA recommends that The Department explore opportunities through Section 94 contributions or Special Infrastructure Contribution (SIC) to ensure effective maintenance and monitoring in the future.</p> <p>19. Clear direction must be provided in terms of the provision of sewerage services and associated increased loads of pollution, practical cost effective measures for maintenance and restoration of waterways, impacts of sewage overflow, and discharges from sewage treatment plants.</p> <p>20. Identify practical and cost effective measures to maintain/restore community's uses and values of waterways, and protect public health (which includes impacts from sewerage overflows from existing systems).</p> <p>21. The new pump station should only discharge treated effluent to waters as a last resort, no pollution of water should occur as a result of overflows during dry weather.</p> <p>22. The EPA expresses support to the Growth Centres SEPP which seeks to encourage water recycling and water reuse initiatives.</p> <p>23. The EPA recommends that infrastructure planning for the new area should deliver an outcome that ensures any new sewage for sewage treatment scheme will achieve no net increase in nutrient load to the river (including offsets and other measures).</p>	

APPENDIX B Vineyard Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
AGENCIES				
		Contaminated lands	24. Future development must address the two contaminated petrol station sites adjacent to the precinct and potentially contaminated land within the precinct in accordance with SEPP 55 and the CLM Act. 25. The EPA considers two groundwater monitoring wells in Vineyard (Stage 1) insufficient to properly assess the groundwater conditions. Further investigation is required.	18. Maintenance arrangements for integrated systems are to be included in the Section 94 contributions plan, which is standard practice for Council. 19. Sydney Water undertake these investigations as part of their capital works and growth servicing plans within their licencing arrangements. Details of pollutant loads can be provided by Sydney Water. The Infrastructure Study undertaken by the Department indicates that the additional growth will be supported by the Riverstone Sewage Treatment Plant. Treatment and discharge will then be managed by Sydney Water. 20. Noted. 21. Noted. Management of the pump stations and resultant discharge will be the responsibility of Sydney Water. 22. Noted. 23. Noted. 24. Development sites will be required to undertake contamination studies in accordance with current legislation for development applications. 25. Based on limited access to properties the wells were considered appropriate. Individual DA applications will need to independently assess groundwater conditions and salinity. 26. Local waste management will be the responsibility of Council.
Waste management	26. There is limited information on future waste management. The EPA recommends implementing guiding waste principles.			
Hawkesbury City Council	188863	Map errors	1. Correct the Height of Building Map to apply the 9m height limit to E4 Environmental Living lots between O'Dell Street and Killarney Chain of Ponds. 2. Correct the Lot Size Map to apply the 10,000m ² minimum lot size control to a small area of E4 Environmental Living land and to remove the minimum lot size controls from two areas of SP2 Infrastructure land.	1. Errors corrected. 2. Errors corrected. 3. See Section 4.5 Flooding in the Finalisation report. 4. Refer to point 3 above. 5. Subsequent advice from the Department's water cycle management consultant is that OSD is not required for the commercial area. A control has been added to Section 2.4..1 of the DCP with respect to the provisions of rainwater tanks. 6. Further ENV has been protected in the precinct with the deficit being reduced to 2.1ha. The deficit will be made up Stage 2 and/ or elsewhere in the North West Growth Area. 7. Refer to the Biodiversity Consistency Reporting in Appendix E of the Finalisation Report. 8. Control 2.2.4 (6) has been added to the DCP to address this matter. 9. The Department carries out annual reporting to OEH. 10. The Existing Native Vegetation clause of the SEPP prohibits the clearing of ENV as mapped on the Native Vegetation Protection map in order to enable the ENV retention target to be met. No additional controls are required in the DCP 11. A Control 2.2.4 (9) has been added to the DCP to address this matter. 12. Most of the recommendations have been dealt with via the masterplanning process and Appendix B of the DCP. Additional controls in 2.2.4 (5) and 2.4.1 (6) have been added to the DCP to deal with the incorporation of wildlife corridors and use of local provenance wetland species. 13. It falls within the protected areas of ENV. 14. CPW is protected in areas of ENV. 15. Controls are incorporated. 16. The deficit will be made up in Stage 2 and/or elsewhere in the North West Growth Area
Development Control Plan and Water Cycle Management Report	3. Request to modify the reference of 'flood prone' to 'flood planning area' in the SEPP due to contradictions between terminology in the SEPP and draft DCP and concern that areas that are not shown on the map may be subject to flooding outside of the 1 in 100 year event. 4. Request further clarification regarding what the flood planning levels have been adopted and are applicable to future development. 5. There is inconsistent information on whether on-site detention is required or not. Clarification is required and any requirements for on-site detention should be incorporated into the DCP.			
Biodiversity Consistency Report	6. Clarification is required on the availability of existing native vegetation (ENV) in the later stages or subsequent precincts to offset the 5.7ha ENV deficit. 7. No details have been provided as to how the plan is consistent with Relevant Biodiversity Measures (RBM) to offset the impacts of clearing. 8. There are no provisions incorporated into the DCP regarding meeting RBM 19 requiring the reuse of native plants, relocation of native animals and use of top soil, as stated in the Biodiversity Consistency Report. 9. The Biodiversity Consistency Report states that the Department will notify OEH if new biodiversity information is found in the development phase. Clarification is required on how this will be implemented and monitored once development commences. 10. There is inconsistent information between the SEPP and DCP on whether the clearing of ENV and vegetation within the Native Vegetation Retention Areas is permitted. Clarification is required and specific controls should be incorporated into the DCP to ensure the native vegetation targets for the precinct are met.			
Biodiversity and Riparian Assessment Report	11. Request to identify the area subject to Condition 12 of the Certification Order. 12. The Conservation and Management Recommendations should be incorporated into the DCP, as they cannot be achieved via zoning.			
Strategic Assessment Consistency Report	13. Request for the proposed protection of the Cumberland Plain Woodland (CPW) be made clear as it crosses several zones. 14. There is inconsistency between the CPW map in the Strategic Assessment Consistency Report and the SEPP map. 15. Request for specific controls to be incorporated into the DCP and SEPP regarding the removal of ENV/CPW. 16. Clarification is required regarding the 0.3ha shortfall of CPW and any proposed compensation.			

APPENDIX B Vineyard Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
AGENCIES				
		Development Control Plan	17. Request for multiple DCP amendments resulting from errors, formatting, clarification on certain matters.	17. See Appendix D of the Finalisation report for details of all the DCP changes post-exhibition.
		Proposed amendments to the Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 2012 Maps	18. Request for minor errors with the draft Hawkesbury LEP maps to be corrected.	18. Errors corrected.
Hills Shire Council, The	192841	Open space	1. The provision of open space is satisfactory.	1. Noted.
		Indoor recreation centre	2. The provision of an indoor recreation facility for Box Hill and surrounding area was removed from the Box Hill S94 Contributions Plan as it was not deemed as 'essential works'. The social infrastructure report for Vineyard identifies the need for an indoor recreation facility in the precinct. Request that The Department deliver a shared facility to service the population of both the Vineyard and Box Hill precincts through S94 Contributions Plan.	2. The Social Infrastructure Assessment prepared for Vineyard Precinct Stage 1 by Elton Consulting concluded that demand for an indoor sports facility did not meet the threshold for 7,400 people, and that the incoming population would contribute to demand for expansion of the Hawkesbury Indoor Stadium. The final projected population of 7,100 confirms this position.
		Infrastructure Delivery and Contributions Plan	3. No draft Section 94 Contributions Plan was exhibited as part of the package raising concerns and uncertainty in relation to the funding and delivery of the required infrastructure for the precinct. Upfront consultation is required to avoid over taxing existing and planned infrastructure facilities.	3. A Section 94 Plan will be exhibited by Hawkesbury City Council in late 2017 or early 2018.
		Traffic	4. Some of the proposed intersections at Boundary Road do not align with the planned intersections within the Box Hill Precinct, which may unnecessarily increase the number of intersections along Boundary Road. 5. Request to minimise the complexity of intersection design by provision of 90 degree angles and removal of acute turns. 6. Council has commenced the planning and design of the Boundary Road upgrade to provide a 4 lane sub-arterial road in accordance with the Box Hill Precinct Plan. Request that Boundary Road (between Windsor Road and Menin Road) remain as a sub-arterial road consistent with the Box Hill Precinct Plan. 7. The need for the additional connection via an upgrade of Menin Road is not adequately justified and there is uncertainty questioning Vineyard's ability to fully fund the project. 8. Suggests further consideration of the limited funds and proposes sharing the cost of the upgrade of Boundary Road between future development within Vineyard, Box Hill, and Box Hill North precinct. 9. All intersections along Windsor Road should be funded by RMS.	4. The intersections across precincts have been checked to ensure they line up. 5. This has been reviewed and intersections adjusted where possible. 6. Boundary Road is to be a collector road as outlined in the Department's Land Use and Infrastructure Implementation Plan and the post exhibition Transport Study for the Vineyard Precinct. 7. The Menin Road upgrade is part of the Bandon Road upgrade and link through to the north. This upgrade will likely be SIC funded.
		Drainage	10. The proposed SP2 Infrastructure zoning of creek corridors is supported. However, certainty is needed with respect to funding and acquisition by Sydney Water.	8. Hawkesbury City Council and the Hills Council will need to work together to deliver the upgrade of Boundary Road.
		Timing and delivery	11. Request the timing of the release of the precinct and further rezonings be carefully planned so that it does not impact on the delivery and servicing of infrastructure in Box Hill. Sydney Water servicing of Box Hill is expected to be completed in 2018.	9. Noted. 10. The SP2 Infrastructure areas within the Vineyard precinct will be acquired by Hawkesbury City Council. 11. Noted.
NSW Police Force	184963	General	The NSW Police Force has no comment.	Noted.
NSW Rural Fire Service	179528	General	1. The NSW Rural Fire Service raise no objections to the proposed Vineyard (Stage 1) plans subject to future subdivision complying with <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i> .	1. Noted.
		Open space	2. The passive open space area requires on-going management.	2. All designated open space areas will be acquired and managed by Council.
		Asset Protection Zone	3. There is inconsistency between the APZ in the DCP and the APZ in the Bushfire Assessment, further clarification on is required confirming the required APZ. 4. Clarification is required to ensure that the APZ does not encroach into the core riparian zone.	3. The Bushfire Assessment did not apply APZ boundaries to the Native Vegetation Retention (NVR) area. The little existing vegetation did not pose a bushfire hazard, since it fell on E4 Environmental Living land where dwellings with maintained curtilage would minimise potential for a hazard to develop. Should there be a potential for revegetation in NVR, the APZ would then be applied. The figure in the DCP did and does apply APZ boundaries to the NVR, hence the difference. 4. The Department re-examined the APZ and confirmed minor encroachment into the core riparian zone. The DCP figure has been amended.

APPENDIX B Vineyard Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
AGENCIES				
Office of Environment and Heritage	192641	Protection of ENV	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. OEH's previous comments and concerns in response to the draft ILP for the precinct in relation to biodiversity, floodplain risk management, Aboriginal cultural heritage and climate change adaptation have not been addressed in the draft Indicative Layout Plan (ILP). 2. OEH does not support the draft Precinct Plan due to the 5.7ha ENV deficit with no additional ENV identified and the proposed protection measures for ENV on private land (which is under an E4 Environmental Living zoning). The plan is inconsistent with the Relevant Biodiversity Measures of the Biodiversity Certification Order. There should be no loss of protected ENV (i.e. ENV in non-certified areas). 3. The previous biodiversity survey was limited. A comprehensive survey, ground-truthed of sites that have been impacted by canopy clearing and disturbance and mapping/calculations are required to be updated to provide more accurate baseline ENV data. 4. The protection of ENV on private land under E3, E4, and RU6 zoning is no longer acceptable as per the <i>Growth Centres Progress Review Report 2016</i>. 5. Request for the Department to investigate opportunities to protect Additional High Conservation Value Vegetation (AHCVV). 6. The loss of 4.4ha of non-certified ENV will occur due to the sporting fields and Chapman Road widening. Consideration should be given to relocating the sporting fields further north outside the ENV area and offsetting the loss of developable land by providing additional R3 Medium Density land. 7. Killarney Chain of Ponds is zoned E4 Environmental Living which is unlikely to support the conservation. To provide better consistency with the Box Hill Precinct, the riparian area should be zoned E2 Environmental Conservation and provisions made in the DCP to facilitate cluster community title subdivision which would enable clustering of development outside the high flood hazard zone and protection and management of ENV by a community association. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A number of issues have been addressed, see comments below. 2. The deficit has been reduced to 2.1ha with the support of OEH. See Section 4.2.2 in the Finalisation Report for more detail. 3. Further ground-truthing has occurred within the precinct which resulted in a small amount of ENV found to be no longer existing (0.22ha). The decrease has formed part of the deficit. Ground truthing can only occur when landowners give permission for consultants to enter their property. This permission was not granted for all lots within the precinct. Therefore, the consultants must rely on aerial photography and visual assessments from outside subject sites. 4. All ENV on private land will be zoned E2 Environmental Conservation. All ENV on public land will be zoned RE1 Public Recreation or SP2 Drainage. 5. Additional ENV was protected, see point 2 above. 6. See point 2 above. The playing fields have been moved north to retain more ENV. 7. The riparian corridor will be zoned a mixture of E4 Environmental Living, RE1 Public Open Space, SP2 Infrastructure (drainage) and E2 Environmental Conservation. Any land below the 1:100 flood line is unlikely to contain any new development because residential dwellings will not be permissible below the 1:100 flood line. 8. No new residential development will be permissible below the 1:100 flood line. 9. The Department commissioned an evacuation study and worked with Infrastructure NSW (and the SES) to demonstrate that all residents below the PMF will be able to safely evacuate the precinct in a major flood event. 10. Precinct planning is not able to test the soil below the surface as not all landowners give permission for this to be done. It is done where the landowner gives permission. 11. A large part of the creek will be zoned as public open space which will open it up to the public more so than it is accessible now. 12. Climate change policy and DCP controls should be introduced as a whole across planning controls not as part of individual precinct controls.
		Floodplain risk management	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. The Water Cycle Management Report contains no new information to address OEH's concerns regarding the residential zoning of land within the 1% AEP high hazard flood areas. Some types of development unsuitable for these areas under the Growth Centres SEPP are permissible in the E4 zone. 9. Emergency management response has not been addressed. Consultation with the State Emergency Service (SES) is required to incorporate the developed precinct into the Hawkesbury Nepean Flood Sub Plan dated September 2013. 	
		Aboriginal cultural heritage	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Subsurface archaeological test excavation should be undertaken on areas identified as having high and moderate archaeological potential so it can inform the rezoning to ensure the conservation of Aboriginal cultural heritage (ACH). 11. The ability to walk in traditionally vegetated open spaces along the Killarney Chain of Ponds is a key issue for the Registered Aboriginal Parties. The proposed sporting fields will prevent access through the precinct and represents a loss of Aboriginal cultural value. 	
		Climate change adaptation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. The development of the precinct will adversely increase temperatures as a result of climate change and the proposed changes in land use. Provisions should be incorporated into DCP to increase landscaping and utilise light and heat reflective materials. 	
Sydney Water	184835	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General support if the draft Precinct Plan and proposed development outcomes. 	Noted.
		Water	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. There will be a sufficient supply of drinking water for the planned 2,400 new dwellings at Vineyard (Stage 1) and capacity in the wastewater system to cater for the full proposed development at Vineyard (Stage 1). 	
WaterNSW	179936	Water	WaterNSW has no assets, land or infrastructure that would be affected by the Plan, and therefore has no comment.	Noted.

APPENDIX B Vineyard Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS				
BELME, Michael 28 Chapman Road, Vineyard	187914	General	1. Land released in the North West Growth Area above flood prone areas should be fully utilised due to constraints on housing in flood affected areas.	1. Land above the 1:100 flood line is fully utilised for housing and other required infrastructure, e.g. open space, community facilities etc. 2. Refer to Section 4.5.3 in the Finalisation Report for a discussion of the land immediately above the 1:100 flood line and a suggested subdivision pattern. 3. Refer to point 2 above.
		Zoning	2. Highlights difference in zoning above 1:100 flood line north and south of Killarney Chain of Ponds. 3. Considers land is suitable for residential development.	
BREAR, Ron Vineyard	177006	Zoning	Requests all new residential lots including lots zoned E4 Environmental Living should have an area of land above the 1:100 flood line to construct a dwelling. Please confirm any newly created E4 Environmental Living lots have adequate space to construct a new dwelling above the 1:100 flood line without filling of the floodplain.	All land above the 1:100 flood line zoned for residential purposes will be able to construct a dwelling. Please see Section 4.5.3 in the Finalisation Report for a discussion of the land immediately above the 1:100 flood line and a suggested subdivision pattern.
BURKIN, Susan 9 O'Dell Street, Vineyard	192820	Environmental living	1. Requests that land above the 1:100 flood line is zoned R2 Low Density Residential. 2. Seeks confirmation of the minimum lot size. 3. Requests number for development potential.	1. Refer to Section 4.5.3 in the Finalisation Report for a discussion of the land immediately above the 1:100 flood line and a suggested subdivision pattern. 2. Minimum lot size for this property is 1,500m ² . 3. Refer to point 1 above. 4. For precinct planning the Department models the current situation to map the 1:100 flood line. 5. The impact on flood levels of raising of the Warragamba Dam or any other regional flood mitigation works are to be determined, are not imminent or certain and, if realised, are matters for consideration in the future. Land use planning is based on an understanding of current flood risks. 6. Precinct planning and consequent subdivisions incorporate new drainage infrastructure designed to ensure pre-development flows are maintained at post-development flows. 7. Noted.
		Flooding	4. Questions mapped 1:100 flood line. Believes 1:100 flood line should be a lot lower. 5. Warragamba Dam upgrade and works completed for the Penrith Lakes Scheme should lower the flood levels, not cause them to rise. 6. Suggests surrounding upstream development, e.g. Schofields, Box Hill and Rouse Hill are impacting land downstream, Vineyard, Oakville and McGraths Hill. 8. As works are completed on the Killarney Chain of Ponds and new bridges constructed on Boundary Road and Chapman Road, this should ease the flow of water, rather than collecting around O'Dell Street properties.	
BURNS, David 5 Bandon Road, Vineyard	179577	Flooding	How will the probable maximum flood line (PMF) affect the Windsor Country Village and what measures will be taken to ensure no problems are created?	Windsor Country Village (7 Bandon Road, Vineyard) is located in Stage 2 of the Vineyard precinct. There is no timeframe for the exhibition and rezoning of Stage 2.
CASSIDY, James Menin Road, Oakville	202015	Precinct planning	1. Objects to the release of the Vineyard precinct while there is a delay in delivering home sites in Riverstone and Marsden Park. 2. Concern that development will result in inadequate space for children and subsequent lack of accomplished sport achievers.	1. Riverstone and Marsden Park precincts have been rezoned. The roll out of essential infrastructure takes time and investment which can delay the delivery of houses. 2. Refer to Section 4.2 of the Finalisation Report for further discussion on the provision of open space. 3. Refer to Section 4.7 of the finalisation report for further discussion on land acquisition. 4. Areas of environmental value have been retained for conservation, public use and recreation purposes. 5. The continued supply of housing will contribute to bringing the cost of housing down. The growing population of NSW, especially Sydney, needs to be accommodated. 6. See point 5 above. 7. See point 5 above. 8. See point 5 above.
		Land acquisition	3. Disagrees with the compulsory acquisition of land for the benefit of developers, whose funding interests are not evenly distributed.	
		Housing	4. Concern that the environment is being destroyed by undersized homes. 5. Concern with the population living on 400 square metres or less. 6. Concern about the population density of New South Wales. 7. Vineyard is becoming over-developed. 8. Concern about housing affordability for the younger generation.	
		Flooding	9. Concern that flooding will occur at Old Pitt Town Road.	
		Heritage	10. The Windsor Bridge is being overlooked as a heritage site.	

APPENDIX B Vineyard Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
		Open space	11. The provision of open space is inadequate and too enclosed.	9. Noted. Old Pitt Town Road is not located within Vineyard precinct. The water cycle management system has been designed to ensure no net increase in runoff occurs beyond the precinct boundary. 10. Noted. Windsor Bridge is not located within the Vineyard precinct. 11. Refer to Section 4.2 of the Finalisation Report which discusses the provision of open space.
CHENG, Karl General comments, no specific address	187544	Public transport	1. The Richmond rail line should be duplicated plus an increase in bus services in the area. 2. Limit the local road network to encourage walking and alternative transport uses.	1. The duplication of the Richmond rail line above Schofields is not currently planned for and is the responsibility of Transport for NSW (TfNSW). Bus services will be developed as the precinct and greater area develops. 2. The precinct is designed for allow for all forms of transport, e.g. walking, cycling, driving.
COOPER, Mark Vineyard	184221	Traffic Vineyard (Stage 2)	1. Expressed concerns about increase in traffic and seeking practical solutions. 2. Requests that Vineyard (Stage 2) be fast tracked due to proximity to railway station and Riverstone West Business Park.	1. The Department works closely with the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) and TfNSW regarding road and rail infrastructure in the North West Growth Area. These agencies as part of their planning take into account the future housing projections of the precincts, including Vineyard. 2. Vineyard Stage 2 does not have a timeframe due to the lack of essential services and the as yet unknown impacts of the future Outer Sydney Orbital preferred corridor alignment.
DFP Planning (on behalf of Bittani P/L) Vineyard Hotel, 711-725 Windsor Road, Vineyard	189759	General Flooding Zoning	1. General support for the draft Precinct Plan, in particular, the recognition of the existing uses on the subject property. 2. Confirm the land as affected by the probable maximum flood line (PMF) will not be excluded from the operation of the plan. 3. Was flood prone land classification based on high level work, i.e. contour information or was land 'ground truthed' and classification based on local circumstances and existing infrastructure and flood mitigation works? 4. That any works to upgrade Boundary Road will not impact the operation of the hotel/motel business in terms of changing levels, increasing flood affectation or altering the existing access arrangement. 5. Question whether a commercial zoning would be more appropriate for the site.	1. Noted. 2. Land below the probable maximum flood line (PMF) is not excluded from the operation of the precinct plan and is considered suitable for development where located above the 1:100 year flood line. 3. Refer to Section 4.5 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion on the flood planning lines. 4. These arrangements cannot be confirmed until a timeframe and extent of work has been confirmed by the relevant councils (The Hills and Hawkesbury). 5. This area of the precinct is significantly flood affected and has limited access due to its frontage to Windsor Road. The most appropriate zoning for the area is E4 Environmental Living to acknowledge the constraints and allow for very low residential density development. This particular site has an existing use which has access from Boundary Road. The 'additional permitted use' proposed acknowledges the existing use, however, this site is not appropriate for new commercial purposes due to restricted access near the Boundary/Windsor Road intersection, and proximity to the planned village centre fronting Boundary Road.
DONOVAN, Jim (Action for Public Transport) General comments, no specific address	193588	Flooding Bus stop spacing	1. Concern that residential streets are located within the maximum flood line. 2. The spacing of bus stops a minimum of 400 metres apart is overly prescriptive for a low-density outer-suburban area that Vineyard will become. There should be no specified minimum spacing and nor should there be a specified average spacing. Bus stops should be at appropriate places, including popular origins, destinations and transfer points.	1. Local residential streets have been located above the 1:100 flood line. A portion of an access street onto Chapman Road is below the 1:100 flood line but will likely be raised to ensure access from the precinct is a suitable distance back from the intersection with Windsor Road and constructed to be above the 1:100 year flood level. 2. Bus stop spacing and locations will be determined by the bus providers along with Council when bus routes are determined.
Football NSW General comments, no specific address	193590	Playing fields	1. Open space, particularly playing fields, are crucial, especially with football growth placing pressure on community facilities. Football NSW wants to ensure that the football facilities in Vineyard will be able to meet the future demands.	1. Noted. 2. Council will ultimately develop the playing fields. Football NSW should make contact with Council to discuss access to planned facilities.

APPENDIX B Vineyard Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
<p>HALL, Tracey 8 O'Dell Place, Vineyard</p>	<p>181639</p>	<p>Road layout</p>	<p>2. Football NSW would like to be involved in the detailed planning of the 24 hectares of open space that has been identified in the Vineyard Precinct, particularly the allocated areas for sporting fields.</p> <p>Objects to proposed a local road encroaching subject property. The road should be located on property to the east which is proposed as R2 Low Density Residential.</p>	<p>The local roads as shown on the Indicative Layout Plan (ILP) are indicative only and present a logical development pattern. When a subdivision application is submitted to Council for an area, the landowner/developer can seek to vary the location of local roads. The need for and precise location of local roads can be demonstrated through a subdivision application, at which point it may be determined that roads may be relocated or not required</p>
<p>HAMARICK, Andrew (on behalf of Paul Bond, Craig and Rhodes) 338 Commercial Road, Vineyard</p>	<p>193592</p>	<p>Flooding</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 1:100 flood mapping as defined on the ILP and SEPP maps do not accurately reflect flood analysis as detailed in the Water Cycle Management Report (the report). Fig 5.1 and Table 8.1 of the report indicates that the 1:100 flood level is approximately RL 17.4 AHD. 2. Observes no information in the report supports the flood line on the ILP mapping showing approx. RL 19 on subject site. 3. Observes difference in the report between the modelled flood level and the mapped extent of flood level due to Commercial Road creek crossing. 4. Council provided S149 certificate advising 1:100 flood level on his land is RL 17.3 AHD. Landowner commissioned survey states RL 17.2 AHD. 5. Requests modification of the 1:100 flood line to reflect the RL 17.3 and subsequent adjustment of R2 Low Density Residential zoned land. 6. Objects to 1:100 flood line on flat terrain to defining urban development. 7. Minor retaining walls at the development edge would allow flood conveyance whilst still maximising R2 Low Density Residential zoned land. 8. Requests a review of the Water Management Report & the ILP to ensure the extent of flood mapping reflects the flood level at RL 17.4 and not RL 19. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It has been confirmed by the Department's Flooding and Water Cycle Management consultant that the flood mapping on the draft ILP and SEPP maps are accurate according to the analysis carried out for precinct planning. The hydrologic and hydraulic modelling was undertaken using TUFLOW, which is industry best practice. Figure 5.1 and Table 8.1 are not representative of flood levels attributable to individual lots, but rather are a snapshot, derived from more detailed flood results. Detailed flood results are shown on the plans in Appendix D of the report. The maps in Appendix D take precedence when assessing individual sites, as they provide more accurate results of the flood effects on each lot. 2. Refer to the snapshot of the 100yr proposed regional flood depths in drawing VY_PRR_100yr_360m_D in Appendix D of the report. The 100yr flood level extends slightly above RL19 for the subject site. 3. Refer to point 2 above. The flood levels have not been raised by a road embankment or weir. Table 8.1, VY_PRR_100yr_360m_D, and the ILP flood level are consistent. 4. The flood level specified on the S149 certificate appears to be based only on mainstream flooding associated with the Hawkesbury-Nepean river (HNR) catchment, and may not include simultaneous fringe flooding from tributaries such as the Killarney Chain of Ponds (KCOP). The site is subject to flooding from both HNR and KCOP. The report covers when both simultaneously flood, in an event referred as the 'Regional Flood'. This results in a higher flood level, than what is produced when only the HNR flooding is considered. It is likely that once this flood model is endorsed by Council the S149 certificates will be updated to reflect the results of this model. Refer to VY_PRR_100yr_360m_D. These levels are in the vicinity of RL19 which corresponds well with the landowner's commissioned survey. 5. Noted, please refer to explanation above. Site specific flood studies required for DA should be confirmed with Council during the pre-DA phase. 6. Zoning boundaries are created based on a variety of factors not necessarily just relating to flooding. Site specific amendments can be considered by Council on a case by case basis. Any land under the 1:100 year flood level is considered to be high hazard which poses significant development/evacuation challenges. The assessment of flooding considers the precinct holistically and does not consider individual modifications to sites. These recommendations are made based on best engineering practice, Australian and state standards, and in collaboration with Council. The results of the assessment are represented on the ILP map and the zoning has been based accordingly. 7. Any alterations within the floodplain can be assessed in a site specific flood study where individual proposals are examined in

APPENDIX B Vineyard Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
				isolation and assessed by Council on a case by case basis. As discussed above the rezoning is undertaken by the Department holistically with a number of inputs from specialist consultants. This process does not allow for specific engineering options on individual sites. 8. See points 1-4 above.
HARRY, Tom General comments, no specific address	182167	General	Objects to the draft medium density design guide.	Submission not specific to the Vineyard precinct plan.
HORN, Benny General comments, no specific address	183046		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Precinct Plan should be in line with the NSW government's 'Sydney's Cycling Future' policy document. (Objectives: safer cycling, make cycling more appealing to reduce car use, etc.) The Vineyard Transport Study identifies bicycle routes, but in proposed typical street cross-sections, ignores options for bicycle routes. On sub-arterial and collector roads, minimum width (2.5m) shared paths are proposed, ignoring government commitment in 'Sydney's Cycling Future' to only use shared paths "where there are no other options". Opposes shared paths as it shifts the safety risk from bike riders on busy roads onto the pedestrians using the footpath. Suggests the provision of a 1.5m footpath with an adjacent 2.5m two-way bike path, achieved by reducing the width of the verge. Suggests provision of a 1.5m footpath with a 1.5m one way bike path on each side of the road to allow bike riders a right of way when crossing side streets. 	Shared paths are proposed on major routes through the precinct. The DCP has been updated to include pedestrian and cycle routes figure. The area within the road reservation has been set at 20.8m for collector roads to accommodate cars, parking, landscaping, pedestrians and cyclists.
LEE, Peter (Calibre Consulting) 274 Commercial Road, Vineyard	193594	General	1. General support for the draft Precinct Plan.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. The open space area contains a large area of 'existing native vegetation' (ENV) which will contribute the 2,000 hectare target of ENV to be protected across the North West and South West Growth Areas. ENV on certified land can be counted towards this target, especially when there is not enough ENV on non-certified land, which is the case for Vineyard Stage 1. The open space zoning will not be altered in this location. The collector road that cut across the north west portion of the property has been moved off the property as it has been moved further west to retain ENV on the adjoining property. See Section 4.6.3 of the Finalisation Report for further discussion. The density cap is proposed to ensure the infrastructure required to support the precinct can match the future needs of residents.
		Open space	2. Objects to the extent of RE1 Public Recreation zone at the site and general open space provision in Vineyard. Proposes RE1 portion be reduced and zoned R2 Low Density Residential, as it will not encroach riparian zone and is above the 1:100 flood level.	
		Road layout	3. Objects to the road running into the north-eastern corner of the site. Proposes realignment to straighten the road.	
		Density	4. Housing density cap contradicts the nature of the precinct - to provide affordable and diverse housing.	
MEAD, J (Planning Ingenuity) 675-697 Windsor Road, Vineyard	218954	Zoning	1. The E4 Environmental Living zoning for this site is not the most appropriate landuse for this site. Non-residential development such as commercial, tourism and recreational uses are more appropriate for the site, given the flood hazard. Request for the zoning to be changed to SP3 Tourist or Zone RE2 Private Recreation or increasing the permissible uses in the E4 Environmental Living zone for this site.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The subject land is significantly flood affected and that is the main reason why the E4 Environmental Living zone is considered the most appropriate zone. Tourism or commercial recreation uses should not be located on flood affected land in this location. The site's location on Windsor Road also presents safety issues for any new access points or an intensification of uses. The RMS would not permit new access points and would be unlikely to support an intensification onto Windsor Road. The flood mapping is of sufficient accuracy for precinct planning. Please see Section 4.5 of the Finalisation Report for further detail. Within the Vineyard precinct, 'existing native vegetation' plus a 'native vegetation retention area' have been mapped. Existing native vegetation on private land is to be zoned E2 Environmental Conservation and the native vegetation retention area is also a protected area that, as the precinct develops, will form a vegetated area through the riparian corridor. All the existing native vegetation was ground-truthed by the Department's consultants.
		Flooding	2. The Flood Affected Land mapped for the site is not accurate and will constrain future development. The landowner is currently undertaking an independent detailed flood investigation of the site. The Department should undertake a more detailed flood investigation which should inform amendments to the ILP and subsequently the ILP should be reexhibited.	
		Protected vegetation	3. The Protected Vegetation Land mapped for the site is not accurate and will constrain future development. Ground-truthed ecological assessments contained in the Vineyard Precinct Biodiversity and Riparian Corridors Assessment does not match the draft mapping of 'protected vegetation'. It also conflicts with the land to be zoned RE1 and SP2. The Protected Vegetation Land map needs to be amended.	

APPENDIX B Vineyard Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
MUSOLINO, Damien 16 Chapman Road, Vineyard	188534	Minimum lot size	Landowner concerned with the minimum lot sizes (1,500m ² – 10,000m ²) in the E4 Environmental Living zone. Suggests block sizes of 2,000m ² – 4,000m ² to maintain rural lifestyle, with features such as gated estates.	Please refer to Section 4.5.3 in the Finalisation Report for a discussion of the land immediately above the 1:100 flood line and a suggested subdivision pattern.
NOPPEN, Paul 6 O'Dell Street, Vineyard	192806	General	1. General support for the draft Precinct Plan. Requests amendment to major restrictions imposed on subject site.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. The nature of precinct planning in the North West and South West Growth Areas is that the majority of previously rural land will be rezoned for urban purposes, whether that be for residential purposes, drainage, open space or commercial uses, like the village centre. Rural uses generally cannot continue to operate alongside urban uses hence the wholesale rezoning of areas like the Vineyard precinct Stage 1. Land required for a public purpose such as drainage must be acquired and is essential to enable urban development within a catchment to occur. The E4 Environmental Living zone requires a large minimum lot size because the land is primarily below the 1:100 year flood line and this area does not have residential potential. See Section 4.5 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion on the 1:100 year flood line. See point 5 above plus Section 4.5.3 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion on the proposed subdivision pattern of land around the 1:100 year flood line. All drainage infrastructure has been optimally located in the precinct to serve the future needs of the precinct. No major filling will be permitted in the precinct. However, a site specific response can be discussed with Council when a subdivision application is lodged after the precinct is rezoned. Noted. Council will ultimately construct and maintain the detention basin.
		Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to three different proposed land use zones due to complexity, cost of developing land, and loss of permissible uses under the current rural zoning. Objects to drainage zoning as it excludes development potential. 	
		Minimum lot sizes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to minimum lot size proposed for E4 Environmental Living zone. 	
		Flooding	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The 1:100 year flood line identified by aerial photography means no ground-truthing took place, Water Cycle Management Report notes that there could be approximately +/-200mm variation between the aerial assessment and a ground assessment. The E4 Environmental Living zone boundary does not align with 1:100-year flood level. Subsequently requests for R2 Low Density Residential zoning in lieu of E4 Environmental Living zoning above the 1:100 year flood level. Request for the relocation of the proposed detention basin to nearby proposed open space, to support density uplift on subject site. 	
		Earthworks	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Request for permission to fill, and use of excavated material from the construction of the detention basins be used in filling of the affected areas of the subject site below the 1:100 year flood line. 	
Infrastructure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about proposed detention basin attracting anti-social behaviour, weed, vermin and being a maintenance burden on Council. CPTED principles should be applied. 			
OWEN, Michelle 1 Putland Place, Vineyard	187961	Infrastructure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Request for SP2 Infrastructure (drainage) be removed from the subject site, as there is an existing dwelling there. Queries the reasoning of placement. Concern that the full delivery of infrastructure will not align with rezoning, as is evident by the early activation precinct (EAP). Suggests that rezoning occur 12 months before infrastructure is ready by breaking up Stage 1. Requests that the shopping centre be located outside the EAP, on the corner of Menin/Commercial/Putland where services will be available later to align with its development. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The raingarden (drainage infrastructure) has been removed off the subject site and this area is proposed to be zoned E4 Environmental Living. The early activation precinct (EAP) is a suggested area based on existing infrastructure in the area and where that capacity could be extended to. The village centre has been located for the best road access and visibility plus locating it near the proposed school site. See comments in point 2 regarding the EAP. Land acquisition generally occurs when the infrastructure is needed and the funds are available for acquisition. This cannot always be when the landowner would prefer acquisition. It is anticipated the Section 94 Contributions Plan will be exhibited by Council in early 2018. The widening and realignment of Chapman/Commercial and Menin Roads, plus any connecting roads has been located due to existing land constraints (slope and existing road alignments) while attempting to equitably share new burdens amongst landowners across the precinct. Precinct planning results in many landowners having land proposed for acquisition for public purposes. This road will be delivered by developers and arrangements for its delivery would form part of any subdivision development approval. Local roads are generally delivered by the developer.
		Land acquisition	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Land acquisition should be at landowner's request. 	
		General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Requests that S94 Contributions Plans be made available with exhibition, so landowners can better be informed in submissions. 	
		Road layout	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to the proposed major road intersecting subject site. Proposes a major intersection where Commercial Road and Menin Road meets. Concerned that this will turn into a future rat run. Requests that the road be funded by government, to deter developers from building it last. Requests that half the cost of local roads adjoining Heritage Listed Property be funded by S94 Contributions. Requests that the local road (north of subject site) be re-aligned to free land enclosed by Putland Place and road. Requests clarification whether possible roundabout will occur at the corner of O'Dell Street and Putland Place and if it will require more land. 	
		Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Requests R3 Medium Density Residential zoning instead of R2 Low Density Residential and R1 General Residential zoning along major roads. Objects to medium density residential located in areas which receive essential services first, as demand for R3 Medium Density Residential development is low, and would delay development to the rest of the precinct. Requests R3 Medium Density Residential outside of the EAP. Requests that subject land be rezoned as R3 Medium Density Residential and/or R1 General Residential either in whole or in part. 	

APPENDIX B Vineyard Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
		Heritage	14. Requests that subject land have no restrictions imposed resultant of the adjoining heritage site.	<p>9. Local roads such as this road are indicative only and can be varied in consultation with Council at subdivision stage.</p> <p>10. A roundabout would not be required in this location, however, the extension of O'Dell Street to the north west would be of collector road status with a road reserve width of 20.8m. See Section 4.6.3 of the Finalisation Report.</p> <p>11. The majority of the precinct is proposed to be zoned R2 Low Density Residential to maintain the low density residential character of the area. R3 Medium Density Residential is usually reserved for land in and around town centres and services. This is the case for the Vineyard Stage 1 area. R1 General Residential is also generally for land near services or commercial centres because it allows a greater range of non-residential uses that would not be compatible with the low density residential character.</p> <p>12. Please refer to point 2 above.</p> <p>13. The entire Stage 1 of the precinct has been rezoned due to the availability of water and sewer services, and partial electricity services.</p> <p>14. All proposed development surrounding the heritage site will have to address the significance of the heritage site when development applications are lodged with Council. See Section 2.2.3 of the Development Control Plan, control (8).</p>
PARKINSON, Mark 316 Commercial Road, Vineyard	182605	School location	Objects to the location of proposed school site for safety issues; sharp corners on its boundaries creates high incidence of car accidents and blind spots for crossing the road.	A land allowance for a roundabout at the intersection of Commercial Road and Harkness Road has been made.
RAVI, Dennis & Senaa 284B Commercial Road, Vineyard	187128	Open space	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advised previously by Council that the property is two thirds above the 1:100 year flood line and property purchased based on future development potential of land above the 1:100 year flood line. 2. Object to the proposed zoning of the site which is majority open space. Neighbouring properties contain more land zoned for low density housing. 3. Requests boundary between low density housing and open space zones be moved south to include two thirds of the property as low density housing. 	<p>In the case of Vineyard Stage 1, the Department considered the precinct as a whole, taking into account significant constraints including contours and flooding. This was to ensure that flood risks to people and property will not be increased by permitting residential development on flood prone land. This information determined the optimal placement of drainage infrastructure, open space and residential land.</p> <p>A post-exhibition change has been made to this site to increase the amount of open space zoning because the playing fields have been moved north. This was to retain more ENV where the playing fields were exhibited.</p> <p>Refer to Section 4.2.2 of the Finalisation Report.</p>
Said, S & P 127 Menin Road, Oakville	218654	Traffic and transport	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Became aware of the draft Precinct Plan six months after exhibition. Lack of proper consultation. 2. Concerned about the realignment of Commercial Road and a proposed intersection opposite their property. Adverse impacts on their property. 3. Closure and diversion of the Boundary Road-through intersection has not been properly considered. 4. Alternative would be the Bandon Road extension could use the Stahls Road intersection to feed traffic to Boundary Road (through the Vineyard precinct). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 127 Menin Road is located outside the Vineyard Stage 1 precinct boundary. While exhibition of the precinct plan was widely broadcast on the Department's website and local media, formal notification was directed specifically to all landowners within the precinct. This approach is consistent with the Department's community consultation guidelines. The submission has still been accepted and considered by the Department. 2. The Chapman, Commercial and Menin roads realignment, widening and upgrade are part of the regional road network for the North West Growth Area. The road will connect to the upgraded and extended Bandon Road project, which is being managed by the RMS. <p>The route of these road works uses much of the existing road corridor and widening is confined to land within the Vineyard</p>

APPENDIX B Vineyard Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
				<p>precinct. When complete it will function as a regional traffic connection between Boundary, Windsor and Richmond Roads.</p> <p>3. The main route of traffic will use the new Chapman, Commercial and Menin roads realignment and then Boundary Road to the north. The new road that crosses the north east of the precinct (opposite the subject property) will not be a main route but rather a new road is needed for travel to the north via Boundary Road. The current intersection of Menin and Boundary roads is unsafe because of the angle at which Menin Road meets Boundary Road. For this reason, traffic heading north along Boundary Road must use the new road and then turn right onto Menin Road and continue north. That portion of Boundary Road between the new through-road and the existing intersection of Menin and Boundary roads will likely be closed off to through traffic.</p> <p>4. See point 2 above. The Bandon Road extension is a major route heading north and cannot be diverted through the main section of the Vineyard precinct.</p>
<p>SHAW, Christopher (on behalf of Mr & Mrs Zammit) 703 Windsor Road, Vineyard</p>	193672	Zoning	<p>1. Existing veterinary practice on the site and other development in the immediate locality form part of its own 'business district'. Object to the E4 Environmental Living zone and request either an equivalent B6 Enterprise Corridor zone, a special zone exemption or a R2 Low Density Residential zone be considered for the site and immediate locality, in particular land along the Windsor Road and Boundary Road frontages. The land to the north west and south across Windsor Road is zoned R2 Low Density Residential.</p> <p>2. Object to the adjoining hotel receiving an 'additional permitted use', discriminates against subject land.</p>	<p>The land within the precinct that is below the 1:100 year flood line is proposed to be zoned E4 Environmental Living as any intensification of development below the flood line cannot be supported due to potential flood risks to people and properties.</p> <p>While there are existing business uses along Windsor Road, due to the flooding potential of the area plus the restricted access off Windsor Road (an arterial road), any further intensification of business uses is not supported. The hotel site has nearly half the site above the 1:100 flood line whereas 703 Windsor Road has practically no land above the 1:100 flood line.</p> <p>For this reason, and noting the approved expansion of the hotel site, an 'additional permitted use' for the hotel is proposed in the E4 Environmental Living zone. The veterinary site can continue to operate under existing use rights of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>, which may include improvements to the practice.</p> <p>The site is also not suitable for R2 Low Density Residential for the same reason that the land is nearly entirely flood affected.</p>
		Native vegetation retention mapping	<p>3. The site is almost fully included within the area marked for 'native vegetation retention'. However, the site is almost devoid of any native vegetation and this is an error.</p>	<p>The area marked for 'native vegetation retention' is below the 1:100 year flood line where development will not be permitted due to potential flood risks to people and properties. It is intended these areas will, along with the ENV below the 1:100 year flood line and open space, form a vegetated riparian corridor.</p>
		Flooding/ drainage	<p>4. The site includes land to be acquired for drainage infrastructure. Presume this will contribute to flood mitigation.</p> <p>5. The site has never been affected by flooding and the raising of Warragamba Dam will reduce risk of flooding shown on exhibition maps.</p>	<p>A strip of land along the eastern side of the property was exhibited as SP2 Special Infrastructure (Local Drainage). As part of the post-exhibition work it has been determined this local drainage land can be reduced in width. The final zoning maps will reflect this amendment. Drainage infrastructure for the precinct will accommodate the stormwater flows through the precinct when fully developed.</p> <p>As part of precinct planning, the Department always obtains the most up-to-date flood mapping for the area. While local residents/business owners may not have ever seen their properties flood, this does not mean the flood mapping is incorrect. The PMF has also been shown on the ILP with the State government now limiting the number of people that will potentially reside on land below the PMF. The</p>

APPENDIX B Vineyard Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
				proposed raising of the Warragamba Dam will assist but not entirely mitigate extreme flood events.
Tolson RN 61-67 Wallace Road, Vineyard	180854	General	1. The landowner's businesses (the Packing House and Mushroom Farm) are currently unable to expand on their existing sites. Arrangements to relocate the businesses to other sites cannot occur until the rezoning of these sites proceeds. Request for the Vineyard (Stage 1) area to be extended to include these sites to enable the businesses to relocate and grow.	The subject site is located within Stage 2 of the Vineyard Precinct. There is currently no timeframe for the rezoning of Stage 2 due to the services not yet being available for the entire area of Stage 2. In addition, the Outer Sydney Orbital will potentially impact on land within Stage 2 and until the preferred corridor alignment of Stage 2 is confirmed, the Department cannot plan for appropriate land uses in Stage 2.
Name withheld Vineyard	177254		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to the 1:100 flood line designation for properties along Windsor Road. Flooding has not occurred in 35 years since landowner has lived in the area. Disappointed with the proposed zoning of these properties. 2. Riverstone precinct has enough open space, why are more open areas needed in Vineyard. Landowner sees no point to proposed open space zoning when there is open space in Riverstone. 3. Requests reconsideration of draft plan to change to a more effective zoning, other than open space. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As part of precinct planning, the Department obtains the most up-to-date flood line mapping. See Section 4.5 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion on flooding. 2. Please refer Section 4.2 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion on the provision of open space. 3. Restricted access to the land directly from Windsor Road, along with the extent of flood prone land, means the residential opportunities are lower in this part of the precinct. Land below the 1:100 year flood line does not have residential potential as new housing cannot be located below this flood level. As Windsor Road is an arterial road, direct property access to new lots is not permissible for safety and efficiency reasons. This area will be accessed via a new intersection at Otago Street and Windsor Road.
Name withheld Vineyard	188428	General	Support for the draft Precinct Plan.	Noted.
Name withheld Vineyard	188444	General	Support for the draft Precinct Plan.	Noted.
Name withheld Vineyard	188410	General	Support for the draft Precinct Plan.	Noted.
Name withheld Vineyard	184465	Road layout	Objects to the Commercial Road upgrade which may run through a dwelling. Suggest a widening instead of re-alignment.	<p>The Chapman, Commercial and Menin roads realignment, widening and upgrade are part of the regional road network for the North West Growth Area. This road will connect to the upgraded and extended Bandon Road project, which is being managed by Roads and Maritime Services.</p> <p>The route of these road works uses much of the existing road corridor and widening is confined to land within the Vineyard precinct. When complete it will function as a regional traffic connection between Boundary, Windsor and Richmond Roads.</p> <p>The widening and realignment is needed to achieve the upgrade of the road as required for the greater area.</p>
Name withheld Vineyard	193573	Road layout	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to the realignment of Commercial Road through subject site. 2. Queries who will fund the proposed road. 3. Concern about road's disturbance to future community lifestyle. 4. Concern about the cost of construction for a new road rather than improving the existing roads. 5. The use of the land for a new road will result in the loss of income for the Government through developer contributions. 6. Queries whether alternate road alignment options were considered. Alternative alignments suggested in submission. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Chapman, Commercial and Menin roads realignment, widening and upgrade are part of the regional road network for the North West Growth Area. This road will connect to the upgraded and extended Bandon Road project, which is being managed by Roads and Maritime Services. <p>The route of these road works uses much of the existing road corridor and widening is confined to land within the Vineyard precinct. When complete it will function as a regional traffic connection between Boundary, Windsor and Richmond Roads.</p>
		General	7. General support for the draft Precinct Plan except for proposed impacts on subject land.	

APPENDIX B Vineyard Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
				<p>The widening and realignment is needed to achieve the upgrade of the road as required for the greater area</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The RMS is the acquisition and delivery authority for the proposed road. The proposed road corridor is necessary to support the travel movements associated with development within the North West Growth Area. The road upgrade and widening is needed to support the future residential population of the North West Growth Area. See point 4 above. Masterplanning looked at options to make best use of existing roads for the through-road link, and the exhibited route was determined taking into consideration such things as land contours, design requirements for sub-arterial roads and landuses surrounding the road alignment. Noted
Name withheld Vineyard	187372	Open space	Objects to the proposed public reserve on the subject land. Consider burden of public open space should be shared with the adjoining land owner.	Refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report for a discussion on open space.
Name Withheld Vineyard	205982	Open space	Requests that the RE1 Public Recreation zoning be moved from the lot to retain their dwelling.	A post-exhibition change has amended that area of the subject site that contains a dwelling to E4 Environmental Living.
Name Withheld Vineyard	192824	Zoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> General support for the location of the village centre and proposed zoning for surrounding land. Request for land 300 metres within the proposed shopping and community centre be R3 Medium Density Residential. Request for the subject land be zoned R3 Medium Density Residential instead of R2 Low Density Residential. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Land above the probable maximum flood line (PMF) surrounding the village centre has been zoned R3 Medium density Residential. Land below the PMF needs to have a lower density residential zoning to ensure this area can be evacuated safely in a major flood event. The density cap is proposed to ensure the infrastructure required to support the precinct can match the future number of residents. See Section 4.5 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion on flooding levels. Land below the PMF needs to have a lower density residential zoning as discussed in Section 4.5 of the Finalisation Report. The early activation precinct takes in land above and below the PMF. Investigations into the capacity of the land located below PMF have been resolved and are detailed in Section 4.5 of the Finalisation Report. The drainage infrastructure proposed for the precinct addresses water detention in the precinct which involves land above and below the 1:100 year flood line. Any land for a public purpose, e.g. open space, drainage land will be acquired by Council under the S94 Plan for the precinct. Land will be acquired based the provisions of the <i>Land Acquisition (Just Term Compensation) Act</i> and negotiation between Council and the land owner. Timeframes for acquisition relate to when the infrastructure is needed to be delivered and the availability of Section 94 funds to enable Council to purchase land. Please refer to Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report for a discussion on open space. Please refer to point 8 above.
		Density	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to housing density cap as it reduces land supply/affordability and contradicts <i>A Plan for Growing Sydney</i>. Clarification is required on how flood levels were determined and whether a physical survey was conducted. 	
		Flooding	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification is required in relation to why land below probable maximum flood line (PMF) is subject to very low to low residential density. The early activation sub-precinct has limited potential until PMF issues are resolved. 	
		Water management	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Precinct plan does not address site water detention requirements. Suggests the use of flood liable land under the 1:100 flood level for water detention requirements. 	
		Open Space	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification is required on the price and timeframe for Council to own and manage the land designated for open space. Suggests that the southern side and northern end of the precinct should have more areas zoned open space. 	
		Land acquisition	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Landowner concerns about acquisition for proposed open space, requests adequate compensation. 	
Name withheld Vineyard	190039	Flooding	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about the extent of the 1:100 flood line. Floods to that extent have not been seen. Suggests releasing the plans once flood study complete. Suggests the draft Precinct Plan should not have been released until results of flood evacuation study known. Requests the probable maximum flood line (PMF) be re-considered due to mitigation works at Warragamba Dam walls. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 4.5 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion on flooding levels. The proposed raising of the Warragamba Dam will assist with mitigating extreme flood events. Managing residential densities below the PMF will also assist with the regional flood evacuation strategy.

APPENDIX B Vineyard Summary of Submissions and Responses

NAME & ADDRESS (IF AVAILABLE)	WEB SUBMISSION ID	CATEGORY	ISSUE	RESPONSE
Name withheld Vineyard	202132	Zoning	1. Objects to the location of the school site. Requests consistency with surrounding lots zoned R3 Medium Density Residential.	1. School sites are limited in the precinct due to the probable maximum flood line (PMF) and the contours of the precinct. A school site must be located above the PMF and ideally be on a site as flat as possible and near the village centre. The proposed school site location meets these criteria. 2. If and when the school site is developed, traffic safety measures will also be planned for. 3. The Department of Education plan for the supply of schools based on the population projections supplied by the Department. The Department of Education support a school site being proposed in the precinct. 4. The playing fields need to be located on relatively flat ground which means options are limited in the precinct and they could not be co-located with the school.
		School location	2. Concern about the location not being safe for children due to accidents on the corner. 3. Concern that there is an oversupply of schools within the area. 4. Distance of the school from the playing fields is not practical due to inaccessibility.	
Name Withheld Oakville	193535	Open space	1. Objects to the proposed location of passive open space – other locations recommended. 2. Objects to the proposed passive open space citing equity reasons involving disadvantage in sale of land.	1. See Section 4.2 in the Finalisation Report for a discussion on the location of open space across the precinct. Many landowners have had land zoned for public purposes such as drainage, open space and road widening. 2. See point 1 above. 3. This area of the precinct is to be zoned R2 Low Density Residential. R3 Medium Density Residential is usually found around town or village centres and transport nodes. 4. Refer to Section 4.7 of the Finalisation Report for a discussion on land acquisition. If a landholder will suffer hardship if there is any delay in the land being acquired, section 23 of the <i>Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991</i> requires the authority to acquire the land
		Zoning	3. Requests R2 Low density Residential zoning be changed to R3 Medium Density Residential zone.	
		Land acquisition	4. Requests legal requirement for Council to purchase land within 1-2 years of gazettal.	
Name withheld Oakville	188909	General	General support for the draft Precinct Plan.	Noted.
Name withheld Oakville	196864, 178156	Aboriginal heritage	1. Requests a copy of the Indigenous Heritage Report.	1. The report was made available to the landowner. 2. Noted. 3. The Department's consultants confirmed there is no known Aboriginal cultural heritage site identified on the subject land. The DCP figure has subsequently been amended.
		General	2. General support for the draft Precinct Plan.	
		Aboriginal heritage	3. Objects to land being designated as Known Aboriginal Heritage Site in DCP figure.	
Name withheld Vineyard	188191	Road layout	1. Objects to a proposed road intersecting the subject site and several other adjoining properties, citing loss of property value. Prefers alternative, cost-effective route utilising existing roads. 2. Concerns about quality of the community with increasing traffic volumes, noise, pollution and road safety for those living near proposed road. 3. Requests reasoning for the proposed road.	The Chapman, Commercial and Menin roads realignment, widening and upgrade are part of the regional road network for the North West Growth Area. This road will connect to the upgraded and extended Bandon Road project, which is being managed by the RMS. The route of these road works uses much of the existing road corridor and widening is confined to land within the Vineyard precinct. When complete it will function as a regional traffic connection between Boundary, Windsor and Richmond Roads. The widening and realignment is needed to achieve the upgrade of the road as required for the greater area.
Name withheld Vineyard	219780	General	1. Early advice from the Department never discussed the precinct being zoned in two stages. 2. Development should be planned first within walking distance of Vineyard railway station.	Vineyard Stage 1 is proposed to be rezoned ahead of Stage 2 as there is no timeframe for the delivery of services for Stage 2. The Outer Sydney Orbital may also impact on Stage 2 and the area cannot be planned until the preferred corridor alignment is confirmed by the Government.