



Hawkesbury City Council

attachment 2
to
item 223

Summary of Submissions

date of meeting: 12 November 2013
location: council chambers
time: 6:30 p.m.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
1	Dave Reardon (Kurrajong)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Too many residents in Hawkesbury.</p> <p>Consistent traffic delays.</p> <p>Insufficient infrastructure for 1400 dwellings.</p>	<p>The proposed development will deliver 1399 dwellings over a 10 year period (i.e. approx. 140 new dwellings per annum) with staged infrastructure improvements during this time.</p> <p>The subject land neighbours existing urban development, and connects to existing infrastructure and the Nth Richmond township. This is consistent with the objectives of the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy (up to 6000 new dwellings by 2031 in existing urban areas) and confirmed in DPI's North West Subregional Strategy. To spread more dwellings throughout the LGA rather than in identified residential investigation areas will affect far more rural lands than the current proposal.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>With regards to power Endeavour Energy there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>The Proponent has entered into an agreement with NBN Co for the new estate, and this may bring forward the timetable for NBN rollout for existing residents.</p>
2	Geoffrey & Kim Slender (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Rural amenity of the site, fit for rural purpose only.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion to worsen with development – needs 4 lane Bells Line of Road/Bridge improvement.</p> <p>Insufficient water pressure, limited water supply, and how would sewer be treated/removed?</p> <p>New housing supply should be east of the river.</p> <p>Cost of ongoing maintenance/upgrade of roads and infrastructure.</p>	<p>The relatively small scale of the property and the high statutory cost of holding the land meant it was becoming financially unviable to continue as a farm. To undertake intensive commercially viable agricultural uses such as poultry, hydroponics and mushrooms would impact on immediately adjoining residential location.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p> <p>The road improvements outlined in the VPA and paid for by the Proposed Development will ensure that State/Fed funding can be directed to further road upgrades and road maintenance.</p>
3	Paul Matthews (Tennyson)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Development will worsen existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Hyder/RMS recommendations for Bells Line of Road yet to be implemented.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three Hyder/RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>The VPA provides for infrastructure improvements to solve existing and future issues progressively over the life of the project.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Development should not proceed until all recommended improvements are made.</p> <p>Recommend traffic lights at intersection of Kurrajong Road and Kurrajong Lane.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to an alternate bridge crossing before any new development west of river.</p>	<p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades.</p> <p>The VPA & TMAP outlines the details of the proposed Navua Bridge crossing. Details regarding the duplication of the Nth Richmond Bridge are documented in the "Richmond Bridge & Approaches Congestion Study" prepared by Hyder on behalf of RMS.</p>
4	Mr D.I and Mrs H. J. Reid (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Impact of development on traffic into Pecks Road, Grose Vale Road, Terrace Road, Charles Street and Bells Line of Road to/from Richmond. Presently a bottleneck/heavily congested.</p> <p>Will Pecks Road be the main access road for the 1400 lots? Already congestion issues due to on-street parking, especially when Peel Park used for cricket.</p> <p>O'Dea Place bend a known accident zone, needs attention.</p> <p>Quality/timing of infrastructure improvements throughout development e.g. water, electricity, sewer, roads.</p>	<p>The main entry to the estate will be off Grose Vale Rd. In addition to key intersection works agreed in the VPA, there will be progressive road improvements along Grose Vale Rd at the main entries to the estate. P111 of TMAP (Table 48) demonstrates improvement to Level of Service at key intersections after initial improvements are made (within the creation of the first 120 lots).</p> <p>Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dve (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on GVR.</p> <p>Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.</p> <p>Endeavour Energy has confirmed that the substation located on Pecks Road has excess capacity including sufficient to power the entire estate.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p>
5	Paul Gale	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>When Yarramundi Bridge floods traffic is forced to go over North Richmond Bridge, adding to congestion. Yarramundi Bridge must be raised prior to new development.</p> <p>New bridge at Navua Reserve - concerns over visitor safety and public liability. Also no Aboriginal artefacts study done and Darug have land rights proposal for this land.</p> <p>Ashton Road and Grose River Road needs to be resealed/widened to handle heavy vehicles over new bridge.</p> <p>Yarramundi Lane should be redesigned, power poles relocated to improve road safety with increased traffic.</p> <p>Kurrajong Road / Bells Line of Road needs to be 4 lanes minimum with North Richmond Bridge also widened to 4 lanes.</p>	<p>Areas east of the site (the western Sydney trough) including Yarramundi Bridge will be under water in the event of significant flood. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood.</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads. Tonnage limits will also be applied to restrict usage to passenger vehicles/light trucks/buses.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.).</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, including Kurrajong/Old Kurrajong and Yarramundi Lane intersection. With these improvements it is likely that less traffic will utilise the Yarramundi Lane "rat run".</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades.</p>
6	Stephen & Jacqueline Roberts (Nth Richmond)	<p>Housing construction along ridge of Grose Vale Road to be kept to single level dwelling to allow views to be maintained.</p> <p>Proposes another bridge crossing across Redbank Creek into Redbank Lane to allow an alternate route to Bells Line of Road and extension of Belmont Grove.</p> <p>Acknowledges the developer's offer of proposed Navua Bridge. Load limit should be maximum of 5 Tonnes. However foresees difficulty in enforcing any tonnage limits.</p>	<p>The proponent is to obtain Council approval and endorsement from relevant referral agencies for the Development Control Plan (DCP) for the site. This will include relevant controls for all housing, including housing along view corridors and adjoining Heritage elements.</p> <p>The suggested crossing of Redbank Creek to Redbank Lane should be considered by council.</p> <p>Tonnage limits and other vehicular limitations for the proposed Navua Bridge will be detailed in the Bridge approval process.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Timing of bridge at 1001 lots, believes contributions should be made on a per lot basis.</p> <p>Foresees a risk that bridge won't be completed if developer runs out of money during the process.</p> <p>Grose Vale Road is a rural road, and further provision needs to be made to widen and upgrade this road to meet future traffic flows from the development.</p> <p>Request installation of a water main and sewerage system along Grose Vale Road, with residential properties adjacent to the proposed site having access to a connection point for future connection.</p>	<p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. It also stipulates the Navua Bridge is to be: designed and approved by the delivery of the 501st lot. Commenced by the completion of the 701st lot. Built and operational by the delivery of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>Widening of Grose Vale Rd would require the compulsory acquisition of land which would be met with some resistance by the local community. In addition to key intersection works agreed in the VPA, there will be progressive road improvements along Grose Vale Rd at the main entries to the estate.</p> <p>Water and sewerage system upgrades are currently being finalised with Sydney Water as a pre-requisite condition to any future development. This will include the location of any structural improvements.</p>
7	K Millingham (Nth Richmond)	<p>Timing of road improvements. Wants to be assured that current congestion is eased prior to new development.</p> <p>Timing of new bridge. Would prefer this to be completed ahead of proposed timing to alleviate congestion.</p> <p>Access to the site. Would oppose heavy machinery and trucks using existing access roads. Adequacy of local roads to carry increased traffic.</p> <p>No issues with the development in general, but infrastructure needs must be considered first.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the delivery of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Heavy machinery will utilise the internal collector roads off the existing entry on Grose Vale Road, as they are currently for the RSL development.</p>
8	Wayne & Tricia Holt (Nth Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>The level of traffic congestion, with safety concerns arising due to volume of traffic on feeder roads and main thoroughfares.</p> <p>Increased traffic on Pecks Road and feeder streets (e.g. Hayman Street), in particular getting access to Pecks Road, and also dealing with traffic heading to local schools in the area.</p> <p>The destruction of the "iconic" Keyline Dam system.</p> <p>Change to the character of the area, inadequacy of existing infrastructure, timing of new infrastructure.</p> <p>New development should be in Vineyard and Richmond area, not on western side of the river.</p> <p>Lack of public transport, school availability and recreational facilities.</p> <p>Disagrees with destruction of rural character of the area.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021. This will reduce congestion on feeder roads and main thoroughfares.</p> <p>The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 6 months of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The Keyline and Dams will be substantially retained and interpreted for public parks and cycling/walking paths.</p> <p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p> <p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
9	Cathy Tindale (Kurrajong) (2 submissions)	Proposed Navua Bridge will impact on and destroy the Navua public recreational space, and also the surrounding Grose Vale and Grose Wold environments.	Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The VPA and TMAP confirms that improvements will be made to roads servicing Grose Vale and surrounds
		Proposed Navua Bridge will not provide flood free access to residents if Yarramundi / North Richmond bridges flood. Concerned for residents of RSL facility.	The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood. The targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads. The Operators of the RSL Retirement Village and RACF will have documented evacuation plan for its residents.
		Developer should prior to development begin by pre-paying for any land necessary to develop and provide a bridge at Navua. This includes any reclaiming of private land to widen road access on approaches to a new bridge and all road widenings through Grose Wold to make roads suitable for the increased traffic flow to the Redbank development's entry at Grose Vale Road.	The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.
		Major bottlenecks over North Richmond Bridge as well as Bells Line of Road and Grose Vale Road intersection. Roads cannot cope with extra traffic.	As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001 st lot. Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.
		Concerned about Redbanks entry/exits around Arthur Phillip Drive and the impact an increase of @1000 extra vehicles using Pecks Road and Charles Street to exit out to Bells Line of Road will have.	The main entry to the proposed development will be from Grose Vale Road. Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dve (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Road.
		Public transport west of river is privately owned and apart from school services is infrequent and therefore insufficient.	The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.
		Stormwater runoff from houses within the development. Asks whether any modelling for runoff through Rebank Creek and into the Hawkesbury River has been done. Who will be responsible for maintenance of detention basins and stormwater systems - Sydney Water or Council?	Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.
		Water supply to new residents - what impact will there be on water pressure to existing residents in North Richmond and surrounds, eg: Kurrajong etc. Can existing Sydney Water infrastructure provide for a doubling of its usage?	With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.
		Sewerage system and capacity for treatment. Can current infrastructure provide for a doubling of usage?	
		Requests infrastructure upfront to deal with this development and Jacaranda Ponds (Glossodia).	The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.
		New high density or large developments should be focussed on eastern side of river closer to rail/bus services, main roads and shopping centres.	Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.
		Query whether the capacity of existing pre-schools, primary and high schools could cope with the increase of children to the area.	The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.
		If the developer goes broke what is in place to ensure all infrastructure will be completed as outlined in the DA.	The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.
		The high density of this housing development is not in keeping with previous Hawkesbury developments. The development will ruin the semi rural/medium density visual aspect of the area.	Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		What type of upgrade to Peel Park has been defined and time-lined in the DA? Upgrades should cater for many types of sport.	Improvements to parks and open space (which includes Peel Park) are referenced in the VPA.
10	Patrick & Jenny Duffy (Grose Wold)	<p>Understand development is crucial to Hawkesbury remaining viable, however objections / concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic in North Richmond and surrounds (Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Bowen Mountain, Kurrajong and Kurmond) at saturation point, and cannot cope with additional traffic.</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge is inadequate as the flood evacuation route only goes to Springwood along a road known for rock fall/subsidence, and also will require improvements to feeder roads (Grose Vale, Grose Wold and Grose River Roads).</p> <p>No planned infrastructure improvements regarding emergency services (hospital, fire station or police station).</p> <p>Size of lots should reflect rural surrounds, with a minimum lot size of 500sqm appropriate.</p> <p>Concern regarding rain water runoff of houses within the development, through stormwater into Redbank Creek.</p> <p>Water and sewerage systems will need improvement.</p> <p>Concern over timing and implementation of road improvement outlined in VPA.</p> <p>Council should be lobbying State/Federal Governments for funding for flood free North Richmond and Windsor Bridges.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads. The VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads. Clearance of flood evacuation routes is an Emergency Services matter.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. The VPA also confirms that road improvements must be completed in line with performance benchmarks to allow release of land title - i.e. no further development until improvements are made.</p> <p>(Council Response) - Council undertakes this lobbying on an ongoing basis</p>
11	Craig Fuller	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion at unacceptable levels at AM and PM peaks, will worsen with development.</p> <p>Does not believe developer has demonstrated that traffic flow will be improved via Navua works or work on Richmond Bridge.</p> <p>Asks what travel times to and from work would be if Yarramundi Bridge was flooded (and Navua Bridge built).</p> <p>Lives at 121 Grose River Road. Concerned that his exit is a blind corner which will make entry/exit dangerous if Navua Bridge goes ahead.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The TMAP has been peer-reviewed by an independent engineering consultant on Council's and NSW Department of Planning behalf and reviewed by RMS. The RMS Congestion Study also provides further information relating to the proposed intersection works and subsequent level of service improvements.</p> <p>Travel times are confirmed in the Hyder/RMS report and the TMAP. Actual travel times in flood events will depend on the extent of flooding and available evacuation routes.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Additional traffic will make walking, riding pushbikes or horses along Grose River Road too dangerous.</p> <p>Intersection of Grose Vale Road and Grose River Road is dangerous and will be worse with additional traffic.</p> <p>Bus route access on Grose River Road from 121 Grose River Road. Has to cross road (blind corner) and cross narrow bridge (no pedestrian access).</p> <p>Additional traffic means school buses will need to run on earlier schedules.</p> <p>Parking at North Richmond shops already at full capacity, additional development will cause further traffic/parking issues.</p> <p>Emergency access timing during peak periods or flood.</p> <p>Rezoning should only occur if no negative impact on existing residents.</p> <p>Redbank Creek is a natural zone for public enjoyment, concern that this will be destroyed with development.</p>	<p>As confirmed in the VPA and TMAP, Navua Bridge works includes improvements to Grose River Rd and Ashtons Rd, including intersection with Grose Vale Rd. This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).</p> <p>Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evacuation access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>Quality of existing infrastructure for existing residents will worsen due to background population growth unless funding for improvements can be found. The VPA ensures that the financial burden does not fall on ratepayers.</p> <p>Redbank Creek will be a designated Riparian Corridor and Asset Protection Zone, within a proposed open space area.</p>
12	Fiona Hamann (Kurmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Timing of infrastructure contributions and improvements and how these are enforced? \$100M shortfall in budget for infrastructure.</p> <p>Proposed bridge improvements are not adequate in flood and will destroy Navua Reserve forever.</p> <p>Need infrastructure now, not after more traffic is generated by development.</p> <p>RMS report shows level of service "F" on key roads, and there is no State Government funding allocated for upgrades.</p> <p>Public transport system inadequate to service existing needs, let alone after more development.</p> <p>It does not fit State plans for housing, and State Government expressly declined its suitability in its metropolitan land solution. North Richmond does not have suitable infrastructure to be a suitable town centre.</p>	<p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evacuation access for those west of the river to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The proponent fully recognises the traffic congestion issues, as confirmed by RMS and also within the TMAP. This is why the draft VPA has a number of upfront measures to deal with traffic congestion, along with the provision of the Navua Bridge.</p> <p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.</p> <p>The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly. The majority of existing residents do not rely upon connectivity to Sydney CBD.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>There are no local businesses or manufacturing jobs for the community, and won't be without road / public transport infrastructure.</p> <p>No emergency services or hospitals west of river, and no flood contingency route.</p> <p>Current schools will be insufficient for new demand.</p> <p>Pollutant discharge into Redbank Creek and impact on wildlife.</p> <p>Concerns over destruction of rural and Aboriginal heritage.</p> <p>Insufficient water to service new demand and existing community.</p> <p>Block sizes too small.</p>	<p>In terms of local jobs, the Economic Impact Assessment (on exhibition) shows an estimated 579 direct/indirect jobs during construction phase and 108 new jobs generated from new resident expenditure (post-construction).</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi. The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The treatment of Aboriginal and Heritage elements within the subject property will be governed by the Conservation Management Plan & Aboriginal Heritage Assessment (on exhibition). Most identified Aboriginal Heritage will not be disturbed and remain in open space locations</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p>
13	Jane & Graham Uff (Kurrajong Hills)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Impact of development on traffic congestion and travel times if infrastructure not provided upfront.</p> <p>Development will make gridlock worse</p> <p>The size of blocks is totally out of character with existing homes in North Richmond.</p> <p>Water supply inadequate for new development.</p> <p>VPA states capped contribution is \$18.178M, yet Bridge will cost \$21M so no incentive for developer to provide Bridge, and alternative payment of contributions to Council will not solve traffic issues.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>The capped contribution definition relates to the monetary contribution payable in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. It is calculated in reference to a per lot benchmark (\$13k per lot) which is indexed with CPI/inflation. RMS is being added as a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contribution will be used by both RMS & Council to address necessary road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>How will the remaining elements of the VPA be funded if the amount is capped?</p> <p>Implementation/timing of the road improvements outlined in the VPA.</p> <p>Suitability of Ashton Road and Grose River Road to cater for traffic using proposed Navua Bridge.</p> <p>Wants safeguards to be in place if the current developers go into liquidation.</p> <p>Cumulative impact of Redbank and Jacaranda Ponds (Glossodia) on traffic.</p> <p>State Government "Review of Potential Housing Sites" stated that the proposed project is remote, cannot be delivered in short term, no capacity in road network, long lead times for servicing, poor accessibility to jobs, residents car dependent, and required roadwork extensive. Infrastructure to be provided prior to development.</p>	<p>The capped contribution definition (\$18.187M) relates to the monetary contribution payable to RMS/Council in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. The total financial contribution by the developer will also include amounts for open space, drainage, maintenance, community facilities and services beyond the capped amount in question.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots. The VPA also stipulates the proposed Navua Bridge is to be: designed and approved by the delivery of the 501st lot. commenced by the completion of the 701st lot. built and operational by the delivery of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>The TMAP and VPA confirm that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds).</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>The road improvements outlined in the TMAP and VPA will assist in managing any increased traffic coming from Glossodia. The Traffic and Transport Assessment for Jacaranda Ponds (Glossodia) is currently on exhibition.</p> <p>The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.</p>
14	Mechelle Spillekom (Bowen Mountain)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Road quality/safety, traffic congestion and travel times to worsen with the development.</p> <p>Response times for emergency services, particularly fire services.</p> <p>Loss of rural amenity and environmental habitat.</p> <p>Pollutants entering river systems.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot. Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved. Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p> <p>The treatment of Aboriginal and Heritage elements within the subject property will be governed by the Conservation Management Plan & Aboriginal Heritage Assessment (on exhibition).</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p>
15	Marilyn Caleo (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Lack of appropriate road infrastructure to cater for existing traffic, let alone new development.</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge not flood free and its impact on the public usage of the Reserve.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot. Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evacuation access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads. Public access will be preserved for future use.</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Lack of police, fire and ambulance service on western side of the river.</p> <p>Impact on rural amenity of the area.</p>	<p>Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p> <p>The treatment of Aboriginal and Heritage elements within the subject property will be governed by the Conservation Management Plan & Aboriginal Heritage Assessment (on exhibition). Most identified Aboriginal Heritage will not be disturbed and remain in open space locations</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p>
16	Jessie Caleo (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Increase in traffic volumes increases the risk of traffic accidents and pedestrian accidents.</p> <p>Traffic volumes mean increased travel times to and from work in the Western Sydney area.</p> <p>Inadequate police, fire and ambulance services in the area.</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge not flood free and its impact on the public usage of the Reserve.</p> <p>Road infrastructure needs to be improved upfront.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi.</p> <p>Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p> <p>The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evacuation access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads. Public access will be preserved for future use.</p> <p>Per response 1, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, and the TMAP shows there will be progressive improvement of intersection performance (reducing congestion) when three intersections are upgraded initially.</p>
17	Christine Norkaitis (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Left hand turn out of William and Elizabeth Streets into Grose Vale Road impossible in the morning unless let in by Grose Vale Road traffic. 4 changes of lights to get into Bells Line of Road.</p> <p>Impact on travel times if the new development goes ahead.</p> <p>Block sizes too small.</p> <p>Lack of police, fire and ambulance service on western side of the river.</p> <p>Destruction of flora and fauna due to proposed Navua Bridge, which will also not provide flood free access.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m². The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m² to 2000m² plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m²</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi.</p> <p>Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p> <p>The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evacuation access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
			Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.
18	Peter Caleo (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Increase in traffic volumes increases the risk of traffic accidents and pedestrian accidents.</p> <p>Traffic volumes mean increased travel times to and from work in the western Sydney area.</p> <p>Inadequate police, fire and ambulance services in the area.</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge not flood free and its impact on the public usage of the Reserve.</p> <p>Road infrastructure needs to be improved upfront.</p> <p>Block sizes too small.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi. Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p> <p>The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evacuation access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m². The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m² to 2000m² plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m²</p>
19	Elizabeth Rowan (Bowen Mountain) (3 submissions)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Increase in traffic congestion and travel times to and from work.</p> <p>Site is unsuitable due to environmental issues/concerns.</p> <p>Lack of contribution to hospital, police, emergency services and community facilities.</p> <p>VPA in favour of developer, not residents.</p> <p>No planned infrastructure for area e.g. roads, bridge, bypass.</p> <p>Destruction of rural amenity.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The "Environment Assessment" and "Environmental Benefits and Constraints Analysis" are on exhibition and identify all key issues and proposed mitigants. On balance there are very few environmental issues as the site has been extensively cleared for grazing over a population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p> <p>The TMAP and RMS Congestion Study outlines all proposed road infrastructure improvements over the short to long term.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>No Federal or State government backing for the proposed development.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs to go in first.</p> <p>Would support subdivision of minimum 5 acre lots.</p>	<p>The issue of the Gateway Determination indicates State Government support. Also the recent budget allocation of \$18,000,000 from Bells Line of Road intersection works indicates support.</p> <p>See response 1 for timing of road improvements. Endeavour Energy has confirmed sufficient power for existing and new dwellings in Redbank. With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. Reducing the yield will reduce the extent of any improvements to road and community infrastructure.</p>
20	Samantha O'Hare (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Lack of hospital or large-scale medical facilities in North Richmond, and poor road infrastructure impacts on emergency response.</p> <p>No emergency services in North Richmond area to support increased population e.g. police and ambulance.</p> <p>Limited public transport options (rail/bus) will not support new development.</p> <p>Heavy and dangerous traffic congestion. Need upfront investment in road infrastructure.</p> <p>Lack of basic amenities such as walkways, pavements and parks and limited access/parking at existing shopping facilities.</p> <p>Intolerable overload on services such as water, electricity, internet and mobile phone.</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge, in particular environmental impacts and no flood free access.</p> <p>Not opposed to development in general, however opposed to this or any other development until first all infrastructure issues are fully resolved.</p>	<p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot. Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The Keyline and Dams will be retained and interpreted for public parks and cycling/walking paths. The Indicative Zoning Maps show a community-based commercial zone providing conveniences for existing and new residents, taking the pressure off existing shopping facilities.</p> <p>With regards to power Endeavour Energy there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>The Proponent has entered into an agreement with NBN Co for the new estate, and this may bring forward the timetable for NBN rollout for existing residents.</p> <p>The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evacuation access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p>
21	Crista Magee (Horans Lane Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion through North Richmond and over North Richmond Bridge has got worse over 20 years.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Time and cost of journey will be greatly added to if new development proceeds.</p> <p>Need to have improvements to access through the lights/intersections and across North Richmond Bridge before development.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (being the same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p>
22	Ruth Bruce (Terrace Rd Nth Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion has meant more people using Terrace Road as a shortcut, this will worsen with more development.</p> <p>Terrace Road quality is poor, can't handle more traffic and is a safety concern for residents.</p> <p>Access for emergency services, delays cost lives.</p> <p>Use of Road Reserves (e.g. Navua). They are currently used for recreational use and proposed bridge/road will destroy rural amenity.</p> <p>Proposed Bridge (Navua) is not above flood level and is therefore not a suitable solution for traffic.</p> <p>Rezoning should not go ahead as North Richmond does not have facilities to support such a large increase in population.</p> <p>Infrastructure improvements required prior to development. Currently dealing with legacy of poor planning and existing infrastructure at breaking point.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key approaches (including Terrace Road) when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021. Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services.</p> <p>Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evacuation access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly. The majority of existing residents do not rely upon connectivity to Sydney CBD.</p> <p>With regards to power Endeavour Energy there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p>
23	John Legge (Bells Line of Rd)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion during peak times, public holidays and floods are bad. Existing intersection/bridge improvements are known issues and must be addressed.</p> <p>Lack of government funding to do the necessary works to provide flood free access from North Richmond (particularly low land heading into Richmond).</p> <p>Bad roads, bridges that flood, and a single line railway. Residents have put up with this for decades.</p> <p>Minimum size of lots (180sqm) are not suited to the rural amenity of area.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m². The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m² to 2000m² plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m²</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSANT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		New development will lower standard of living, destroy the rural character of the area.	The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.
24	Alex Beese (Greggs Rd Kurrajong)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion will increase travel times to work and schools, in particular over North Richmond Bridge.</p> <p>Water supply and pressure for new development and existing residents.</p> <p>Minimum lot size proposed is out of character for rural area.</p> <p>Emergency services access in time of flood.</p> <p>VPA in favour of developer, not Council or ratepayers. No guarantee promised improvements will be provided.</p> <p>Standard of surrounding roads, e.g. Greggs Road, and impact of additional development.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua/Yarramundi Reserves to build a bridge that is not flood free is senseless.</p> <p>Environmental impact has not been properly assessed. Author had to jump through hoops to have 3 trees removed from my property, what has Council asked for in this case?</p> <p>Interests of existing residents has not being considered. Development should be on the eastern side of the river on flood free land where infrastructure already exists.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot. Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evacuation access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p> <p>The road improvements outlined in the TMAP and VPA - and paid by the Proponent - will ensure that Local/State/Fed funding can be directed to further road upgrades and road maintenance.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The “Environment Assessment” and “Environmental Benefits and Constraints Analysis” are on exhibition and identify all key issues and proposed mitigants.</p> <p>(Council comment) - Apart from land in the Growth Centre (Vineyard) the land east of the river is subject to significant flood affectation. (See Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy).</p>
25	Michael Podles (Sangoma Retreat – Bowen Mountain)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion across North Richmond Bridge causes delays to guests staying at Sangoma Retreat.</p> <p>Major upgrade of existing infrastructure is required.</p> <p>Recommend to Council that rezone should limit lot size to 1 acre, and insist that developer build upgrade to bridge crossing before development consent is given (or find a developer that can).</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Council needs to conduct its review conscientiously or there could be claims against Council for negligent conduct.</p> <p>Supports Navua Bridge if lead-in and lead-out roads are upgraded to cope with increased traffic flow.</p>	<p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. Reducing the yield will reduce the extent of any improvements to road and community infrastructure.</p> <p>For Council's response.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.).</p>
26	Margaret Mason (Kurrajong)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Rezoning into higher density (in particular 180-300sqm) are completely out of character with area. Density should be in keeping with surrounding environment.</p> <p>No more dwellings west of river until road infrastructure is improved. Should be east of river where appropriate.</p> <p>Roads won't cope with increased traffic.</p> <p>Inadequate emergency services west of river.</p> <p>No guarantee the developer will provide facilities as promised, no protection if developer goes broke.</p> <p>Navua Bridge not flood free and environment impacts should be considered.</p> <p>Council should lobby for funding for bypass, and until funds received, no new development.</p>	<p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot. Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi. Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evacuation access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p>
27	Charlotte Fuller	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Rides horses to Navua Reserve from Grose River Road, are concerned about access to Reserve when new bridge is built.</p>	<p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>
28	Michael Want	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Holds 4207 signatures on petition to stop <i>any</i> rezoning west of the river until infrastructure is upgraded.</p>	

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		The planning proposal is not consistent with the Hawkesbury Community Strategic Plan	
		There is no funding at State level to upgrade infrastructure. Gateway Determination says development to occur "at no cost to government".	As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001 st lot. The road improvements in the RMS Congestion Study will also be funded by Federal Govt grant and other development contributions.
		RMS states that new Windsor Bridge is not a traffic solution, since it is simply replacing existing 2-lane bridge with another.	Windsor Bridge is not considered in the Redbank proposal.
		There is no funding at Council level to upgrade infrastructure, as per Business Papers May 28 2013 Item 92.	With regards to power Endeavour Energy there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development. With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system. This will be at the cost of the proponent.
		State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" stated that the proposed project is remote, cannot be delivered in short term, no capacity in road network, long lead times for servicing, poor accessibility to jobs. Estimated contributions are high.	The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition. In this report, contributions were estimated by DP&I on the basis of the entire regional infrastructure requirements , divided by the likely yield. Again, whilst this was appropriate for a fast-track assessment, infrastructure contributions utilised in the VPA are based on the estimates of actual site specific works required to fulfil the endorsed objectives.
		Also states it does not meet Goal 20 target, and is rated poorly due to accessibility/liveability due to the distance from Sydney and isolation from established communities.	The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly. The majority of existing residents do not rely upon connectivity to Sydney CBD.
		Redbank and Jacaranda Ponds accounts for 33-40% of additional dwellings in Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy. Subject land is part of Grose Vale, not North Richmond.	The subject land neighbours existing urban development, and connects to existing infrastructure and the Nth Richmond township. This is consistent with the objectives of the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy (up to 6000 new dwellings by 2031 in existing urban areas) and confirmed in DPI's North West Subregional Strategy. To spread more dwellings throughout the LGA rather than in identified residential investigation areas will affect far more rural lands than the current proposal.
		VPA is in favour of NRJV not Council or ratepayers – developer promises to deliver, maybe they will, maybe not.	The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.
		No commitment for developer to spend any money upfront to alleviate existing problems.	The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.
		Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy states that Redbank proposal requires resolution of road access, traffic and transport issues.	As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001 st lot. The VPA Schedule Note 1.1 further states "The TMAP identifies the delivery of infrastructure and Urban lots settled or dwellings occupied. All timing triggers above for the relevant intersection and road upgrades are based on release of lots rather than dwellings occupied. Accordingly, the delivery of infrastructure is targeted for delivery approx 6-24 months earlier than the TMAP requirement approved by TfNSW, RMS and Council".
		Per HRLS, affordable housing should be integrated into development - how will this be done?	The proponent agrees with the necessity for affordable housing, hence the proposal includes small portions of land to be zoned R3. Lot sizes on R3 land will be smaller, therefore keeping prices low and thus more affordable. The R3 dwellings will be required to contribute to infrastructure equally with R2 and R5 land.
		Per HRLS, the land needs to be in close proximity to CityRail. It is not.	The station is 5km away by road. The key issue in this case is the travel times to the rail stations due to traffic congestion. The road improvements outlined in TMAP and RMS Congestion Study will ensure much improved travel time for those requiring to commute via CityRail.
		Per HRLS, the land is considered prime agricultural land and should be preserved.	The relatively small scale of the property and the high statutory cost of holding the land meant it was becoming financially unviable to continue as a farm. To undertake intensive commercially viable agricultural uses such as poultry, hydroponics and mushrooms would impact on immediately adjoining residential location.
		Per HRLS, the Village Dwelling Target is 2100-5500 within 600m radius - of Village Shopping Centre, this means proposal fails this test	The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities. The proposal includes all relevant items listed on page 6/7 of HRLS. The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The Keyline System
		Per HCSP, the proposal doesn't look after people and places - it destroys the rural heritage and amenity of Yobarnie, is not sympathetic to the rural character.	The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Per HSCP, the proposal doesn't look after people and places - housing choice on small lots 180sqm to 375sqm, not choice at all	Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2
		Per HSCP, the proposal not supported by infrastructure, impacts on local transport, does not have easy access, linking to surroundings via PT/bike/footpath	The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online. Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator. Along with extensive footpaths and bikeways within the estate, the Proponent will work with Council to ensure suitable connectivity to North Richmond township.
		Per HSCP, the proposal does not support business or local jobs, reduce their travel times	Businesses in Nth Richmond are already seeing a pickup in turnover stemming from the development of the RSL community. In terms of local jobs, the Economic Impact Assessment (on exhibition) shows an estimated 579 direct/indirect jobs during construction phase and 108 new jobs generated from new resident expenditure (post-construction). Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021. The modelling shows improved travel times for workers.
		Flood Evacuation and the Navua Bridge needs its own planning process.	Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage.
		Proposal doesn't resolve existing traffic issues.	Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.
		Improvements to local roads (e.g. GVR, Terrace Rd, etc)	The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades, and maintenance of existing surrounding roads. Widening of Grose Vale Rd would require the compulsory acquisition of land which would be met with some resistance by the local community. In addition to key intersection works agreed in the VPA, there will be progressive road improvements along Grose Vale Rd at the main entries to the estate.
		Press release from Planning Minister says "ensure that local, regional and state infrastructure required to enable growth on all sites is properly addressed before subdivision takes place."	As per the Gateway Determination, the identified issues relating to this proposal have all been completed and endorsed by the relevant planning agency, and are now on exhibition. Final agreement relating to these issues will be written into the executed VPA, and registered on title. This will facilitate the rezoning of land, with further detailed design issues (relating to subdivision of land) dealt with during the Development Approval process.
		Wants Council to meet with people providing submissions to respond to their concerns, as per HSCP "Shaping Our Futures Together"	All submissions will be reviewed by Council staff and the proponent and will be addressed at a public Council Meeting.
29	Cheryl O'Reilly (Avoca Rd Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Rezoning from rural to lots as small as 180sqm. Nothing like that in the Hawkesbury. Council is just interested in rates?</p> <p>Inadequate emergency services west of the river. Can't deal with emergencies if they are stuck in traffic.</p> <p>VPA in favour of the developer, not Council or ratepayers.</p>	<p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi. Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p> <p>Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		No guarantee that facilities promised in VPA can be delivered. What happens if developer pulls out?	The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.
		The community agrees another bridge should be built, but it should be an improvement of North Richmond Bridge rather than Navua	The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036 .
		Navua Bridge will destroy Navua/Yarramundi Reserves, which are a tourist attraction. It will add pollution, noise and excess traffic.	The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.
			Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage.
		Need road improvements to Ashton & Grose River Roads, and additional traffic along these roads means safety risk to locals and children who use these roads currently.	TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).
		Infrastructure to be provided prior to new development e.g. roads fixed and bridges built. Would attract a lot more visitors if infrastructure improved.	As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001 st lot.
		State Government opposed this project, saying it was remote with poor accessibility to jobs and services, didn't fit with State strategic or housing guidelines.	The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition. The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly. The majority of existing residents do not rely upon connectivity to Sydney CBD.
		There is a shortfall in funding for this project. Where is it coming from?	The capped contribution definition (\$18.187M) relates to the monetary contribution payable to RMS/Council in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. The total financial contribution by the developer will also include amounts for open space, drainage, maintenance, community facilities and services beyond the capped amount in question.
		Allocation for housing in Hawkesbury is 6000+ so why add 1400 homes in an area with no infrastructure. Needs to be spread throughout LGA.	The subject land neighbours existing urban development, and connects to existing infrastructure and the Nth Richmond township. This is consistent with the objectives of the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy (up to 6000 new dwellings by 2031 in existing urban areas) and confirmed in DPI's North West Subregional Strategy. To spread more dwellings throughout the LGA rather than in identified residential investigation areas will affect far more rural lands than the current proposal.
		Development should be on flood free land on eastern side of river where infrastructure already exists.	Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.
30	Ruth Webb (Bowen Mtn)	Objections / Concerns include:	
		Existing traffic congestion. Unable to take work due to long waits to get through North Richmond via Bridge. Traffic congestion is costing jobs.	As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001 st lot. Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.
		No development until infrastructure has been improved, including bridges and approaches.	The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036 . The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. It also stipulates the Navua Bridge is to be: designed/approved by 501st lot; construction commenced by 701st lot; operational by 1001st lot.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>North Richmond Bridge is the only access for hospital and police. What happens to nursing home residents?</p> <p>Navua Bridge is a cheap and horrible land grab. It's a summer recreation and swimming area. No plan for public pool this side of the river.</p>	<p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads. RSL Lifecare is the operator of the nursing home and will have emergency evacuation plans in place as part of their regulatory guidelines.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>
31	H & D Reid (Nth Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic has worsened since they moved to the area in 1964. Can't believe Council has used 2006/7 figures when it has got worse since then.</p> <p>Capacity of water and sewerage systems.</p> <p>Stormwater – there is localised flooding in North Richmond (Michael Street, Tyne Crescent) since the original development of Tyne Crescent, 100 lots at Kelmsley Downs in the 80s when dams on Peels farm flooded and overflowed. New development will make it worse and small retention ponds won't slow down runoff into Redbank Creek.</p> <p>Quality of water discharging into Redbank and impacts on flora/fauna.</p> <p>History of Peel Farm – was only a demonstration property to display Keyline system. Was poor quality and didn't support much stock until Peel properly fertilised it and water supply allowed contour irrigation.</p> <p>Wet weather will impact sewer system in vicinity of Redbank Creek and Hawkesbury River. Tidal impact will force untreated sewerage back and forth past North Richmond Water Pumping Station which supplies water to Hawkesbury residents.</p>	<p>Traffic modelling data used in the TMAP has been approved by both RMS and the independent peer review process (on Council's behalf).</p> <p>Stormwater retention and treatment will take into account any latent deficiencies, changes to upstream water bodies (dams in Peel Farm), as well as any future development.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p>
32	G & S Moorcroft (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion makes travel difficult to facilities in Richmond and Windsor.</p> <p>No emergency services west of river e.g. police, ambulance, hospital, fire.</p> <p>No guarantee for provision of better facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>Existing residents must be considered. No new development until road and emergency facilities provided upfront.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi.</p> <p>Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p>
33	S Boronyak (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion makes travel difficult to facilities in Richmond and Windsor.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>No emergency services west of river e.g. police, ambulance, hospital, fire.</p> <p>Site has no infrastructure, no adequate roads, a single lane bridge, no public transport, and poor train services.</p> <p>Concern over small blocks of land. Is a developers dream and Council's desire for rates means a North Richmond "ghetto".</p> <p>What if developer goes bankrupt before infrastructure in place?</p> <p>Navua Bridge inadequate as Yarramundi Bridge floods.</p> <p>If the State Government finds this site unsuitable, why doesn't Council?</p> <p>Development should be on flood-free land east of river where there is suitable infrastructure.</p>	<p>Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly. The majority of existing residents do not rely upon connectivity to Sydney CBD.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads. Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood.</p> <p>The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.</p> <p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p>
34	Bill Ambesi (Nth Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion makes travel difficult to Richmond, Windsor and further east.</p> <p>No new development until road infrastructure improved.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p>
35	Cheryl (Nth Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Increased traffic will make it unsafe for children to walk to school, no footpaths provided.</p> <p>Journey time to drop off and pick up kids will be increased.</p> <p>Size of lots (180sqm) is too small and out of character for rural area.</p> <p>No emergency services west of river e.g. police, ambulance, hospital, fire .</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot. Along with extensive footpaths and bikeways within the estate, the Proponent will work with Council to ensure suitable connectivity to North Richmond township.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi.</p> <p>Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>VPA in favour of developer. No guarantee the developer will provide facilities as promised.</p> <p>Navua & Yarramundi Reserves will be destroyed and proposed Navua Bridge not flood free.</p> <p>Infrastructure to be provided upfront prior to development.</p>	<p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a “per lot” calculation from the first release of land.</p>
36	Bill Ogg (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Local resident for 40 years, same infrastructure still in place.</p> <p>Should duplicate North Richmond Bridge (at higher level) and dual carriageway from Richmond Park, or divert road behind Colo Soccer grounds through back of TAFE and onto Driftway where it was to go previously.</p> <p>Where will children be going to school? Local schools already full. How long will it take them to go somewhere else?</p> <p>Hospital in Hawkesbury is inadequate, unable to cope at the moment. Family member had recent emergency and was overnight in corridor (no beds available) before being sent on to Nepean Hospital.</p> <p>People wont be willing to buy in new estate due to traffic problems and lack of infrastructure. Price cuts and public housing "ghetto" is a possibility.</p> <p>People are leaving the Hawkesbury now due to traffic congestion, and this new development will make it 10 times worse.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p> <p>Whilst the Developer respectfully notes the submitter's example of hospital bed shortages, the Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population – specifically, that Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development.</p> <p>The proponent fully recognises the traffic congestion issues, particularly for prospective buyers in the new project. This is why the VPA has a number of upfront measures to deal with traffic congestion, along with the provision of the Navua Bridge.</p>
37	M & M Mooney (Kurrajong Hills)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion is stressful and unnecessarily time consuming. It will get worse with new development, and its Council's responsibility to manage these roads.</p> <p>Safety of children walking to schools, school drop off and pick up travel times.</p> <p>State Government opposed this project, saying it was remote with poor accessibility to jobs and services, didn't fit with State strategic or housing guidelines.</p> <p>State Government estimates infrastructure cost of \$117m, meaning a \$100m shortfall.</p> <p>Private ownership means limited access to Redbank Creek for weed and erosion control.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The State Govt “Review of Potential Housing Sites” was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly. The majority of existing residents do not rely upon connectivity to Sydney CBD.</p> <p>The capped contribution definition (\$18.187M) relates to the monetary contribution payable to RMS/Council in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. The total financial contribution by the developer will also include amounts for open space, drainage, maintenance, community facilities and services beyond the capped amount in question.</p> <p>Redbank Creek will be a designated Riparian Corridor and Asset Protection Zone, within a proposed open space area.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Traffic along Pecks Road exceeds RMS guidelines for suburban street.	Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dve (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Rd. As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, and these will make a significant impact on current traffic volumes on surrounding roads, including Pecks Rd.
		Rezoning to small lots 180sqm is completely out of character, and concern that area will become a "ghetto".	Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2
		Lack of emergency services west of the river.	There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi. Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.
		Navua & Yarramundi Reserves will be destroyed and proposed Navua Bridge not flood free.	Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads. The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.
		Development starts a precedent for destruction of rural amenity of the Hawkesbury and should not be allowed.	The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.
		VPA in favour of Developer and not Council or ratepayers, interests of existing residents have not been considered.	The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.
		No guarantee that facilities promised will be provided under VPA.	The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.
		Community is not against development, but wants guarantee that infrastructure be provided first.	The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.
		Council to consider long term, not short term interest of developers or political parties.	
		Development should be east of river on flood free land where infrastructure already exists.	(Council comment) - Apart from land in the Growth Centre (Vineyard) the land east of the river is subject to significant flood affectation. (See Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy).
38	Jan Keeley (Hazelbrook)	Supporting comments include:	
		Not against development, houses need to be built, as not easy to find one to buy or rent.	As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001 st lot.
		Visits friends and agists horses in the area, another crossing at Navua Reserve would be ideal alternate route.	Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.
		Incorrect to assume that everyone opposes everything, most just want traffic fixed.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
39	Alan McCann (Terrace Rd Nth Richmond)	<p>Traffic congestion adding to travel times into Richmond and Windsor.</p> <p>Rezoning of site into small lots (180sqm) out of character with existing rural amenity.</p> <p>Inadequate emergency services west of the river e.g. police, ambulance, fire.</p> <p>VPA in favour of developer, not Council or existing residents, interests of existing residents have not been considered. Infrastructure should be provided prior to development.</p> <p>No guarantee that existing facilities promised in VPA will be provided.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua and Yarramundi Reserves to build a bridge that is not flood free is senseless.</p> <p>New development should be in flood free land east of river where infrastructure already exists.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi. Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p>
40	Gwyneth Cox (Bowen Mtn)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion adding to travel times into Richmond and Windsor.</p> <p>Infrastructure improvement needs to happen upfront.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Inadequate emergency services west of the river e.g. police, ambulance, fire.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua and Yarramundi Reserves to build a bridge that is not flood free is a stop gap measure.</p> <p>VPA in favour of developer, not Council or existing residents, interests of existing residents have not been considered.</p>	<p>Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river. Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p>
41	Glenn McKinnon (Jervis Air Conditioning)	<p>Supports development on following basis:</p> <p>Great job opportunities that have not been available in the area for a long time.</p> <p>Author is a contractor to developer at retirement village and says that on the basis of the quality of the new village, the balance will also be to a high standard.</p> <p>Notes that the longer this is opposed or delayed, the less chance there is of working with the owners to obtain the best facilities for the community.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
42	Ben Newton (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion adding to travel times for both work commutes and short trips.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues won't be resolved with proposed infrastructure changes/solutions.</p> <p>Rezoning of site into small lots (180sqm) out of character with existing rural amenity. Council has a responsibility to develop sensitively in regard to the rural nature of the area.</p> <p>Lack of parking in existing community and new estate. Land size insufficient to accommodate future resident vehicles.</p> <p>Inadequate emergency services (police, ambulance, fire brigade) west of the river, and more likely to be a concern during flooding.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The TMAP has been peer-reviewed by an independent engineering consultant on Council's and NSW Department of Planning behalf and reviewed by RMS.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>Residential housing in R2 Zone will have minimum 15m frontages, which is ample for double car garages. R3 and Commercial Zoning Development approval process will ensure adequate parking in line with planning guidelines.</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi.</p> <p>Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>VPA in favour of developer, not Council or existing residents. Insufficient upfront monetary contributions. Interests of existing residents have not been considered.</p> <p>Agrees that housing shortage needs to be addressed, but new development should be in flood free land east of river where infrastructure already exists.</p> <p>Council should listen to community. Development should be on eastern side of river, on flood free land, where infrastructure already exists.</p>	<p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p> <p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p>
43	Wendi Nichols (Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Lack of road infrastructure to deal with existing problems, let alone new development.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua Reserve for alternate bridge.</p> <p>Not enough study into the environmental and traffic impacts of the development.</p> <p>Richmond Bridge should be by-passed or duplicated prior to new development.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p>
44	Cheryl Bourke (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Chose to live here for semi-rural lifestyle.</p> <p>Traffic & road conditions are appalling. Roads in and out of North Richmond need immediate improvement, and footpaths need improvements for pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Lack of emergency services west of the river, and concerns over emergency services access in peak times or flood.</p> <p>Rezoning into small urban lots inappropriate for the surrounding area.</p>	<p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Along with extensive footpaths and bikeways within the estate, the Proponent will work with Council to ensure suitable connectivity to North Richmond township.</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Destruction of Navua/Yarramundi reserves for new bridge, currently being used as natural tourist attraction.</p> <p>Navua Bridge won't provide flood free access.</p> <p>Proposes a \$30-40M bank guarantee to ensure that infrastructure works are finished prior to completion of new development.</p> <p>VPA in favour of developer not Council or ratepayers.</p>	<p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>As set out in the VPA, guarantees and other security will be taken to ensure that each obligation is met by the developer. The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that these infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p>
45	Andrew Mackenzie for Grasshopper Environmental (Katoomba)	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>Supports investments which benefit community and boosts the local economy provides local jobs. This will stop the current exodus of people from the area due to a lack of employment options.</p> <p>North Richmond will benefit greatly in terms of infrastructure, growth and economic stimulus.</p> <p>Supports the Navua Bridge both as a traffic solution and also as a deterrent to illegal dumping that currently happens.</p> <p>Current retirement village development is to a very high standard and expects the same quality to be delivered through the balance of the estate.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
46	Karen Ranson	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Same as submission number 12.</p>	<p>As per responses to Submission #12.</p>
47	R & U Henry (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Insufficient road infrastructure now, let alone with 1400 extra homes.</p> <p>Size of small lots is inappropriate for semi-rural area.</p> <p>Developer only prepared to pay pittance via provision of Navua Bridge. Must be more.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua/Yarramundi Reserves.</p> <p>Navua Bridge impact on Grose River Road, and surrounding roads in Grose Wold, Kurrajong. In particular, road safety/quality, and safety for horse riders and kids at school pickup with additional traffic.</p> <p>Most people live in area for semi-rural lifestyle.</p> <p>Greedy developer bought land without approvals don't let him get away with it.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The capped contribution definition (\$18.187M) relates to the monetary contribution payable to Council in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. The total financial contribution by the developer will also include amounts for open space & drainage dedication, maintenance, community facilities and services beyond the capped amount in question.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>The relatively small scale of the property and the high statutory cost of holding the land meant it was becoming financially unviable to continue as a farm. The Developer purchased the land at market value and has spent the past 7 years in negotiations with all relevant planning authorities to ensure the best outcome for all stakeholders.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Make greedy developer build a new bridge next to the North Richmond Bridge.</p>	<p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p>
		<p>Don't accept the small bridge solution. RMS has consulted with community, and even though they treated public with contempt, they have a plan for duplicated North Richmond Bridge.</p>	<p>The developer will be paying to solve existing infrastructure issues as well as for the impact of the new proposal.</p> <p>RMS is now a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contribution will be used by both RMS & Council to address necessary road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge, including the intersection works identified in the RMS Congestion Study.</p>
48	G & L Meurer (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion to increase with new development.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua Reserve.</p> <p>Amount of developer contribution to road upgrades/maintenance versus rate payer contribution.</p>	<p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades, and maintenance of existing roads</p> <p>The total financial contribution by the developer - in addition to roads - will include amounts for open space, drainage, maintenance, community facilities and services beyond the capped amount in question.</p>
49	M & J Killen (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Increase in size of North Richmond.</p> <p>Inappropriate lot sizes for rural area.</p> <p>Development will make existing traffic congestion worse.</p> <p>Pecks Road needs to be upgraded, footpath provided and widened for parking.</p> <p>Main entry into development requires a safe turning lane.</p> <p>Location of bus stop on Grose Vale Road.</p> <p>Timing of infrastructure improvements. Improvements are needed now.</p> <p>No guarantee infrastructure improvements will be delivered.</p>	<p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly. The majority of existing residents do not rely upon connectivity to Sydney CBD.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion on surrounding roads, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades, and maintenance of existing roads. Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.</p> <p>The proponent will be required to widen Grose Vale Rd to include left-in turning lane and left-out merge, as well as a dedicated right-in turning lane.</p> <p>As per the TMAP and VPA, there will be a number of bus stops located within the estate which will be serviced by the Route 680 Bus.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Destruction of Navua Reserve for new bridge.	The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.
		Navua Bridge's impact on Grose River Road and Grose Wold Road, and surrounding roads in Bowen Mountain and Kurrajong. In particular, road quality, and safety for horse riders and children at school pickup with additional traffic.	TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).
		No emergency services west of the river, concerned about emergency service access in peak traffic or flood.	The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor. Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood/fire evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.
		VPA in favour of developer, not Council or ratepayers.	The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.
		Council should be focussed on improving Bells Line of Road / North Richmond Bridge corridor.	The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.
50	V Pearce (Grose Vale)	Objections / Concerns include:	Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.
		No services west of river.	The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.
		Destruction of Navua Reserve for bridge. Need to protect creeks and need an under or overpass on Bells Line of Road at North Richmond.	The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.
		VPA in favour of developer, not Council or ratepayers.	The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.
		Lot sizes of 180sqm is inappropriate for the area.	Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2 The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a high quality Heritage-listed residential project, and has spent 7 years in the planning phase.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
51	K & D Tanner (Nth Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Rezoning is out of character with existing scenic rural setting and existing residential development. Rural amenity and character of the area will be destroyed.</p> <p>Traffic congestion through North Richmond already bad, will get worse with development.</p> <p>No guarantee that developer can or will fund road upgrades. No contingency in place.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua Reserve for alternate bridge crossing and still subject to isolation by flooding.</p> <p>Destruction of Keyline System.</p> <p>No emergency services west of river, concerns over access to emergency services.</p> <p>Doesn't meet Council Vision for Hawkesbury Community Report 2013.</p> <p>Development should be on the eastern side of the river, on flood free land where infrastructure already exists.</p>	<p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is registered on the land title, and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The Keyline System and Dams will be substantially retained and interpreted for public parks and cycling/walking paths.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood/fire evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>The proposed development is consistent with the report, it will retain rural amenity by ensuring appropriate zoning and rural conservation via the Development Control Plan & Conservation Management Plan (Vision 1), it will minimise the ecological footprint by having three times the Open Space as comparable development and providing protection zones around environmentally sensitive areas (Vision 2), and finally will provide much needed infrastructure improvements (namely water, sewer, stormwater and roads) for existing residents (Vision 3).</p>
52	Daniel Ritchie	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>1400 homes is too many.</p>	<p>The subject land neighbours existing urban development, and connects to existing infrastructure and the Nth Richmond township. This is consistent with the objectives of the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy (up to 6000 new dwellings by 2031 in existing urban areas) and confirmed in DPI's North West Subregional Strategy. To spread more dwellings throughout the LGA rather than in identified residential investigation areas will affect far more rural lands than the current proposal.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Lot sizes too small, should be minimum of 700sqm as per North Richmond.</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure. Developer is imposing conditions as to timing of road improvements.</p> <p>Erosion of rural amenity, should be maintained as rural land.</p> <p>Conditions of river crossing (planning, approval, financial commitment) should be committed to in full prior to development.</p> <p>Proposed development should have wide streets, plenty of reserves/public parklands and a shopping centre with adequate parking.</p>	<p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The VPA in its current draft form reflects the fact existing infrastructure needs improving first (i.e. the intersections noted in RMS & TMAP reports), and also specifies milestones for bridge design, approval, construction, and becoming operational. It requires endorsement and signoff from all parties, including Council, RMS and the Proponent</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>The relatively small scale of the property and the high statutory cost of holding the land meant it was becoming financially unviable to continue as a farm. To undertake intensive commercially viable agricultural uses such as poultry, hydroponics and mushrooms would impact on immediately adjoining residential location.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. It also stipulates the Navua Bridge is to be: designed/approved by 501st lot; construction commenced by 701st lot; operational by 1001st lot.</p> <p>Residential housing in R2 Zone will have minimum 15m frontages, which is ample for double car garages. R3 and Commercial Zoning Development approval process will ensure adequate parking in line with planning guidelines.</p>
53	Lyn Ward & Mark Lamb (Kurrajong)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Inadequate infrastructure i.e. no plans to expand Richmond Bridge, destroying Navua Reserve and no government budget for upgrades, limited public transport.</p> <p>The proposal does not fit into any of the State's plans for housing. The State government declined it's suitability. Lack of industries, infrastructure, emergency services etc.</p> <p>Limited local business and manufacturing to provide jobs hence residents will have to drive for employment.</p> <p>No emergency services or hospitals in North Richmond area</p> <p>Flood contingency route is long and dangerous.</p> <p>Schools are at capacity, travel will be required back over river for schooling.</p> <p>Impact on wildlife of Redbank Creek due to water run-off.</p> <p>Negative impact to local Aboriginal heritage.</p>	<p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades, and maintenance of existing roads</p> <p>The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.</p> <p>In terms of local jobs, the Economic Impact Assessment (on exhibition) shows an estimated 579 direct/indirect jobs during construction phase and 108 new jobs generated from new resident expenditure (post-construction).</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>Only to be used in emergencies. Clearance of flood evacuation routes is an Emergency Services matter.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>Redbank Creek will be a designated Riparian Corridor and Asset Protection Zone, within a proposed open space area.</p> <p>The treatment of Aboriginal and Heritage elements within the subject property will be governed by the Conservation Management Plan & Aboriginal Heritage Assessment (on exhibition).</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Negative impact to historic agricultural heritage.</p> <p>Budget shortfall of around \$100M for infrastructure.</p> <p>Capacity of water supply.</p> <p>Council survey indicated rural amenity was amongst the most important value yet small block sizes proposed.</p>	<p>The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The Keyline System and Dams will be substantially retained and interpreted for public parks and cycling/walking paths.</p> <p>The capped contribution definition (\$18.187M) relates to the monetary contribution payable to Council in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. The total financial contribution by the developer will also include amounts for open space, drainage, maintenance, community facilities and services beyond the capped amount in question.</p> <p>Development will be required to provide infrastructure upgrades to Sydney Water requirements.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p>
54	Phillip Knobbs (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Intolerable traffic congestion.</p> <p>Traffic and safety on other North Richmond roads, especially Pecks Road, Charles Street and Grose Vale Road.</p> <p>Impact of development on Navua Reserve, Yarramundi Reserve and Grose River Road. Is a slap in the face to volunteers who created the reserves.</p> <p>Negative impact on Redbank Creek and the Hawkesbury River e.g. weeds, siltation, garden lawn waste, detergents, pets.</p> <p>Land should be kept for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>Lot sizes don't fit in with the area. Too small, too concentrated.</p> <p>Who maintains the Reserves?</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades, and maintenance of existing roads</p> <p>The VPA provides for infrastructure improvements to solve existing and future issues progressively over the life of the project. Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dve (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Rd</p> <p>Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>The relatively small scale of the property and the high statutory cost of holding the land meant it was becoming financially unviable to continue as a farm. To undertake intensive commercially viable agricultural uses such as poultry, hydroponics and mushrooms would impact on immediately adjoining residential location.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The Proponent during the on-maintenance (bond) period, and the Council thereafter.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Lack of emergency services west of the river.</p> <p>Most provide infrastructure now, no guarantee that developer will provide infrastructure.</p> <p>State Government indicated that this is not the right area for intense development. State Government has no funding for project. Development should be east of river, near shopping centres, rail lines, flood free and will existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the Land Title and must be complied with prior to relevant lot release.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly. The majority of existing residents do not rely upon connectivity to Sydney CBD.</p>
55	Nicola Murphy (Kurrajong Heights)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion, rezoning should not proceed unless infrastructure provided first.</p> <p>Rezoning is out of character with existing rural setting and existing residential area.</p> <p>Inadequate emergency services west of the river e.g. police, ambulance, fire.</p> <p>VPA in favour of developer, not Council or ratepayers.</p> <p>No guarantee infrastructure improvements will be delivered.</p> <p>Interests of existing residents have not being considered.</p>	<p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi.</p> <p>Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>60 day exhibition period to collate and respond to submissions from existing residents.</p>
56	Nick Duncan for Home & Land Direct	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>There is a need for quality housing to support growth and housing choice.</p> <p>The development will provide a range of local job opportunities and an economic boost.</p> <p>The developers are highly experienced and have proven their commitment to delivering a first class development in the interests of the boarder community.</p> <p>Without development the chances of new infrastructure are limited.</p> <p>The site is above the flood plain unlike other areas near Windsor and Richmond.</p> <p>The proposal helps provide some smart solutions to the existing drainage problems adjoining the site.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>The longer the development is opposed the less chance there is of early improvement to the existing North Richmond local area which is becoming run down and requires immediate activation by more growth and stimulus of further quality development.</p> <p>The site is suitable for development and has been mostly cleared and adjoins the existing residential area. It has very little impact on the environment and will provide open spaces that would not otherwise be available.</p>	
57	RKS Electric Pty Ltd	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>The development will bring great job opportunities that not been available for a long time.</p> <p>The new bridge will provide better access to the Blue Mountains and Penrith and relieve pressure at North Richmond Bridge.</p> <p>Developers are providing a quality, high standard development.</p> <p>More housing needed so people do not need to leave the area and will boost economy.</p> <p>New bridge at Navua will not destroy the area. There are already carparks there with people dumping rubbish.</p> <p>The site is above the flood plain unlike areas near Richmond and Windsor.</p> <p>The site has been mostly cleared and adjoins the existing residential area. It will have very little impact on the environment.</p> <p>North Richmond needs growth and stimulation, the longer the development is opposed the less chance there is of working with the owners to obtain the best facilities for our community.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
58	Dianne Lanham (Glossodia)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Density of the proposal in an area with existing traffic problems.</p> <p>Current road conditions in poor condition with pot holes and are narrow without safe edges in many places.</p> <p>Compromising of the rural atmosphere, will set precedent for other development.</p>	<p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The VPA provides for infrastructure improvements to solve existing and future issues progressively over the life of the project.</p> <p>Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.</p> <p>The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades, and maintenance of existing roads</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>The proposed development will retain rural amenity by ensuring appropriate zoning and rural conservation via the Development Control Plan & Conservation Management Plan (Vision 1), it will minimise the ecological footprint by having three times the Open Space as comparable development and providing protection zones around environmentally sensitive areas (Vision 2), and finally will provide much needed infrastructure improvements (namely water, sewer, stormwater and roads) for existing residents (Vision 3).</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Ability and accountability of developer to provide infrastructure. No development until infrastructure is improved first.	The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. As per VPA and TMAP, three road intersection improvements to be delivered within the first 120 lots created which will improve existing level of service
59	Michelle Salerno (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion. Need another bridge to cross river. Impact of traffic on residents of Sunnyside Crescent, Enfield Avenue, Matheson Avenue, Keda Circuit and Patya Place in trying to turn into Grose Vale Road.</p> <p>What would be the minimum lot size?</p> <p>Public transport is very poor. Need better bus service.</p> <p>Roads in desperate need of repair.</p> <p>Need more schools, amenities, shops, carparking.</p> <p>Land should be left as primary production, move housing out further west, spreadout and don't over crowd. Loss of good lifestyle and beautiful area.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.</p> <p>The VPA provides for infrastructure improvements to solve existing and future issues progressively over the life of the project. The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades, and maintenance of existing roads</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p> <p>The relatively small scale of the property and the high statutory cost of holding the land meant it was becoming financially unviable to continue as a farm. To undertake intensive commercially viable agricultural uses such as poultry, hydroponics and mushrooms would impact on immediately adjoining residential location.</p>
60	Kelly Williamson (South Windsor)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Destruction of the heritage of the area</p> <p>Traffic congestion and lack of government funding to fix problem. Additional traffic leads to increase in noise and environmental pollution, community stress, less family time and loss of employment opportunities.</p> <p>Redbank proposal seems in direct contravention to many points contained in the NSW Urban Activation Precincts Guidelines e.g. proximity to planned transport and service infrastructure, funding to provide infrastructure and density of lots.</p> <p>Lack of public transport</p>	<p>The treatment of Aboriginal and Heritage elements within the subject property will be governed by the Conservation Management Plan & Aboriginal Heritage Assessment (on exhibition). Most identified Aboriginal Heritage will not be disturbed and remain in open space locations</p> <p>The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The Keyline System and Dams will be substantially retained and interpreted for public parks and cycling/walking paths.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>The capped contribution definition relates to the monetary contribution payable in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. It is calculated in reference to a per lot benchmark (\$13k per lot) which is indexed with CPI/inflation. RMS is being added as a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contribution will be used by both RMS & Council to address necessary road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge.</p> <p>The NSW Urban Activation Precincts Guidelines are: consistent with local/regional/state plans for housing, use/support existing and planned infrastructure (particularly transport), has support of local council, is environmentally/socially/economically sustainable and viable, and is development viable and consistent with market demand. The proposal meets these guidelines and the VPA proposes solutions to resolve existing infrastructure issues.</p> <p>The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.</p> <p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Lack of emergency services, hospital, schooling, childcare and transport options.</p> <p>Impact of development on Navua Reserve, especially Koalas.</p>	<p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>
61	Linda Price (Bowen Mountain)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Rural amenity and landscape disappearing.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion, roads must be improved first.</p> <p>No guarantee that infrastructure will follow development.</p> <p>Lack of basic services i.e.. police, ambulance, high school and child care.</p> <p>Infrastructure and services for outer suburbs should be considered first i.e. water, sewer, street lighting, and kerb and gutter.</p> <p>Impact of development on Navua Reserve.</p> <p>New bridge may be above flood levels but it will be flooded either end.</p>	<p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>To achieve the target of the residential strategy, land is required to be developed. The residential strategy identifies the growth locations whilst preserving large areas of rural land.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot. Council can control the issuance of title and approvals until such work is complete to their satisfaction.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Grose River Road and Grose Vale Road will not be able to cope with the extra pressure.	Widening of Grose Vale Rd would require the compulsory acquisition of land which would be met with some resistance by the local community. In addition to key intersection works agreed in the VPA, there will be progressive road improvements along Grose Vale Rd at the main entries to the estate. As confirmed in the VPA and TMAP, Navua Bridge works includes improvements to Grose River Rd and Ashtons Rd.
62	Sharmaine Crooks (Kurrajong Hills)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Increase in traffic congestion.</p> <p>Any development will destroy the heritage of the area and create issues of detriment to the residents and wider Hawkesbury community.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The State Heritage listing was widely advertised and advised to interested parties. The listing of the site on the State Heritage Register would clearly indicate the heritage value has been recognised.</p>
63	Rod Cohan Director NAB	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>Developer known to the Bank for many years, has met with all requirements, and has shown capacity to deliver a quality product (at RSL).</p> <p>Sales performance demonstrates the need for this type of product and service in the area.</p> <p>Much needed housing choice will be provided in the area.</p> <p>Valuable contribution to improving road infrastructure and services.</p> <p>Economic benefits in terms of jobs, and through rates and taxes for land acquisition, housing development, contribution to roads, bridges and other social benefits.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
64	Greg Jones & Lisa Walker-Jones (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Lack of improved infrastructure to support the development. Lack of State or Local Government budget to fix existing traffic problems.</p> <p>Redbank proposal seems in direct contravention to many points contained in the NSW Urban Activation Precincts Guidelines e.g. lack of access to adequate public transport.</p> <p>No funding or timing details for Navua Bridge.</p> <p>Impact of development on Navua Reserve.</p> <p>Concerned about the impact on the way of life and destruction of the semi-rural appeal.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The NSW Urban Activation Precincts Guidelines are: consistent with local/regional/state plans for housing, use/support existing and planned infrastructure (particularly transport), has support of local council, is environmentally/socially/economically sustainable and viable, and is development viable and consistent with market demand. The proposal meets these guidelines and the VPA proposes solutions to resolve existing infrastructure issues.</p> <p>The subject land neighbours existing urban development, and connects to existing infrastructure and the Nth Richmond township. This is consistent with the objectives of the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy (up to 6000 new dwellings by 2031 in existing urban areas) and confirmed in DPI's North West Subregional Strategy. To spread more dwellings throughout the LGA rather than in identified residential investigation areas will affect far more rural lands than the current proposal.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>To achieve the target of the residential strategy, land is required to be developed. The residential strategy identifies the growth locations whilst preserving large areas of rural land.</p>
65	Mr & Mrs R.K Sluiter (Vineyard)	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>New bridge crossing will provide better access to the Mountains and Penrith whilst relieving the pressure at North Richmond lights.</p>	

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Navua already has carparks and roads on both sides of the reserve with a lot of rubbish dumping.</p> <p>The New Tree Tops Adventure Park next to the reserve already cleared a lot of trees for a big carpark.</p> <p>The site is above the flood plain unlike other areas near Windsor and Richmond.</p> <p>The site has been mostly cleared and adjoins the existing residential area. It will have very little impact on the environment.</p> <p>Development should keep some dams as water features in parks and this would make a great place to live.</p> <p>North Richmond needs growth and stimulation.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
66	Hazel Slade (Bowen Mountain)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion and delays.</p> <p>Better infrastructure should be implemented before development. Current issues for the current residents and ratepayers require fixing first.</p> <p>Loss of the rural aspect.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>To achieve the target of the residential strategy, land is required to be developed. The residential strategy identifies the growth locations whilst preserving large areas of rural land.</p>
67	Gregory Todd	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Inadequate infrastructure to support the development and Glossodia traffic not taken into account for Redbank TMAP.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure problems should be addressed before development.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The road improvements outlined in the TMAP and VPA will assist in managing any increased traffic coming from Glossodia. The Traffic and Transport Assessment for Jacaranda Ponds (Glossodia) is currently on exhibition.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p>
68	Emma Kirkby	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>Author comes from a transport planning background.</p> <p>Hyder report notes intersection failure to occur by 2016 yet the State Gov announcement does not commit to upgrades until 2021.</p> <p>Developer will make improvements in the near future.</p> <p>Navua Bridge crossing provides an excellent solution in helping to alleviate congestion and provides considerable improvement to intersections.</p> <p>Redbank proposal appears to be consistent with the intersection upgrade solutions identified in the Hyder report.</p> <p>The community is in a 'catch 22' situation in that the existing traffic issues will not be resolved without developer contributions, yet the community is hesitant to support such developments until the existing traffic situation is addressed.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
69	Annie Dwight of Dwight Real Estate (Windsor)	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>There is a good need for residential blocks in the Hawkesbury as many residents and their children are buying out of the area.</p>	

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Good quality homes and residential blocks should be a high priority of Council. Development will bring more employment to the area.</p> <p>For the area to grow and keep residents in the Hawkesbury district, sites like these are needed that are flood free with good access to schools and shopping.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
70	Annie Post (Saints Catholic College)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Loss of the rural aspect.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion and increase in traffic.</p> <p>Impact of development on Navua Reserve e.g. loss of recreational opportunities and impact on Koalas. Further study require re impacts.</p>	<p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>To achieve the target of the residential strategy, land is required to be developed. The residential strategy identifies the growth locations whilst preserving large areas of rural land.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>
71	Ron Thompson of RSL LifeCare	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>Involved with the developers and delighted with the progress of the aged care facility and the commencement of the residential component.</p> <p>Pleased with the public acceptance evidenced by a high rate of presales.</p> <p>Developers are very capable and experienced with sufficient financial capacity to date.</p> <p>The vision for the Redbank site, as evidenced by the planning documents, is for a project of very high standards.</p> <p>The development will provide substantial economic and social benefits in terms of jobs creation, land and housing choice and public infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
72	Jennifer Fay	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Insufficient infrastructure to support development. Area can't support any more development.</p> <p>Not enough schools for future residents.</p>	<p>With regards to power Endeavour Energy there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>The Proponent has entered into an agreement with NBN Co for the new estate, and this may bring forward the timetable for NBN rollout for existing residents.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>North Richmond roads area beyond capacity now.</p> <p>Loss of rural aspect. Listen to the wishes of the community and don't destroy the Hawkesbury.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>To achieve the target of the residential strategy, land is required to be developed. The residential strategy identifies the growth locations whilst preserving large areas or rural land.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p>
73	Kieran Cosgrove	<p>Supports the proposed development: It will generate a lot of work. Fee's received will be a huge boost to council. Local employment opportunities. Adds to much needed housing. Bridge should have been built 20 years ago.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
74	Brooke Hatherley (Grose Wold)	<p>Increased traffic congestion without sufficient upgrades and pedestrian facilities.</p> <p>Creating a 'slum estate' which is out of touch with the area and the community. Streets on local environment and inadequate facilities.</p> <p>No provision of a local fire brigade, ambulance or emergency medical care at North Richmond, especially during flood events.</p> <p>Creation of traffic 'rat runs' on rural backstreets that are quite, narrow and not of sufficient standard e.g. Grose Wold Road and Grose River Road.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua and Yarramundi Reserves, in particular recreational opportunities and serenity.</p> <p>Severe impact on the local community's way of life, increase in traffic, noise and pollution.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over er a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly.</p> <p>The proposed development will retain rural amenity by ensuring appropriate zoning and rural conservation via the Development Control Plan & Conservation Management Plan (Vision 1), it will minimise the ecological footprint by having three times the Open Space as comparable development and providing protection zones around environmentally sensitive areas (Vision 2), and finally will provide much needed infrastructure improvements (namely water, sewer, stormwater and roads) for existing residents (Vision 3).</p>
75	Janet Hatherley (Grose	Objections / Concerns include:	

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
	Wold)	Creating a "ghetto" style environment, loss of rural/semi -rural lifestyle.	Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>With all the vacant land available in the Hawkesbury, what was reasoning to dump 1400 homes in one area.</p> <p>Effect on Schools, Medical facilities, Police, Fire, Shopping centres (and parking) railway availability and recreational facilities.</p> <p>Where are the jobs in the Hawkesbury to cater for new residents?</p> <p>Taking away recreational facilities at Navua and Yarramundi Reserves.</p> <p>Bridge at Navua will dramatically increase traffic through Kurrajong Village, Grose Vale and Grose Wold areas. Concerned about road safety, road maintenance, cost and responsibility.</p> <p>Widening along Grose River Road, Ashtons Road and Grose Wold Road is required to accommodate extra traffic, especially near Grose View Public School.</p> <p>Upgrade of existing roads is required.</p> <p>Traffic control is required at the corners of Grose River Road and Grose Wold Road.</p> <p>Federal and State government does not support this development.</p> <p>How would residents be informed if New Bridge flooded.</p>	<p>The subject land neighbours existing urban development, and connects to existing infrastructure and the Nth Richmond township. This is consistent with the objectives of the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy (up to 6000 new dwellings by 2031 in existing urban areas) and confirmed in DPI's North West Subregional Strategy. To spread more dwellings throughout the LGA rather than in identified residential investigation areas will affect far more rural lands than the current proposal.</p> <p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>Traffic heading to the new estate will travel along Grose River Rd and turning into Grose Vale Rd to access the estate. Any additional traffic heading through Grose Wold will be existing residents living further west which currently use Grose Vale Rd only. To encourage use of Grose Vale Rd and ensure that traffic is restricted to local residents only, Council could consider a range of measures including lower speed limits or traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps). This will be dealt with during the Bridge Approval process.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.).</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Any upgrade to this intersection would be determined by the traffic modelling and the submission of a design to council for their approval.</p> <p>SES standard public warning</p>
76	Steven Body (Kurrajong Heights)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Destruction of the Navua Reserve and waterways e.g. loss of recreational opportunities and historical importance, environmental impacts.</p> <p>Keep integrity of our rural and semi-rural Hawkesbury, no development west of the River.</p> <p>Flood access route should be an extra bridge at North Richmond not Navua Reserve.</p>	<p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
77	Michael Want (NRDCAA)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Advises that a public meeting was held on 18 July 2013 and that it was resolved that council should reject the Redbank Planning Proposal and review its local Environmental Plan (LEP) and Residential strategy to provide for additional lots and increased density on the eastern side of the river on flood free land where infrastructure already exists.</p>	<p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p>
78	Margaret & Brian Smith (North Richmond) (2 submissions)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Lives on Pecks Road and is concerned of the dangers with extra traffic. Road safety need to be improved before construction and residential traffic commences.</p> <p>Traffic congestion. "Rat run" along Charles Street. No State Government funds and no developer solution.</p> <p>There appears to be a multi-million dollar shortfall in VPA. Section 94 plan should be used instead. Where is Council's due diligence?</p> <p>Lack of emergency services e.g. ambulance, fire and health services.</p> <p>Costings of new bridge are very low compared with RMS estimates of similar structure and developer can choose to pay the estimated charge to council to avoid actual construction cost.</p>	<p>Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dve (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Rd</p> <p>Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The capped contribution definition (\$18.187M) relates to the monetary contribution payable to RMS/Council in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. The total financial contribution by the developer will also include amounts for open space & drainage dedication, maintenance, community facilities and services beyond the capped amount in question.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The capped contribution definition relates to the monetary contribution payable in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. It is calculated in reference to a per lot benchmark (\$13k per lot) which is indexed with CPI/inflation. RMS is being added as a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contribution will be used by both RMS & Council to address necessary road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge.</p>
79	Roy Edwards from Heyden Frame & Truss	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>The development brings employment. Heyden is a small company and the independent living village development so far has kept 20 people employed for 9 months.</p> <p>Also increased employment opportunities for immediate community through ongoing services.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
80	Nuno Paula for Sydneywide Cement Renderers	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>Development will create job opportunities and bring economic strength to neighbouring businesses and properties.</p> <p>Critical that developments in and around Sydney boom and expand in order to keep on par with our ever growing population.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
81	William Matthews (Tennyson)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Infrastructure should be provided first to help ease traffic congestion.</p>	<p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p>
82	Roseanne & Allan Graham	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Increase in traffic in Pecks Road and Arthur Phillip Drive. Reduction in safety on Pecks Road. Additional access points to Grose Vale Road are required.</p> <p>Support bridge but it should be built first not after 1001 homes.</p>	<p>Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dve (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Rd. Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. It also stipulates the Navua Bridge is to be: designed/approved by 501st lot; construction commenced by 701st lot; operational by 1001st lot.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
83	Paul Matthews (Tennyson)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion and more than 500 lots released before any upgrades planned.</p> <p>Bells Line of Road/North Richmond Bridge should be upgraded first.</p> <p>Bridge proposal obscene. Insufficient funds to complete, connects to an unstable, dangerous and inadequate route west, destruction of Navua reserve, loss of recreational opportunities.</p> <p>What if the developer goes broke or developer reneges on the agreement?</p> <p>Limited capacity at local schools. Additional Primary and High schools are required.</p> <p>Lack of emergency services e.g. fire, police and ambulance.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>The capped contribution definition relates to the monetary contribution payable in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. It is calculated in reference to a per lot benchmark (\$13k per lot) which is indexed with CPI/inflation. RMS is being added as a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contribution will be used by both RMS & Council to address necessary road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge.</p> <p>Proposed flood route via Springwood only used in emergencies/floods.</p> <p>Clearance of flood evacuation routes is an Emergency Services matter.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p>
84	Adam Wellington (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Small lots out of character with semi-rural area.</p> <p>Proposed bridge not above flood height.</p> <p>Increased traffic on roads leading to new bridge.</p> <p>Road upgrade works should be done prior to development.</p> <p>No emergency services.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds).</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Community against development and if approved will see the re-location of a large number of residents to other locations due to such a negative impact it will have on our day to day lives.	
85	Karen Buccini (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Consistent traffic delays. School bus late to school.</p> <p>Inadequate public transport.</p> <p>Increased traffic Pecks Road and pedestrian safety concerns.</p> <p>Destruction of reserves at Navua and Yarramundi, impact on environment and wildlife, surrounding road network, Grose View Public School. Yarramundi Bridge is the first bridge to be flooded.</p> <p>No emergency services e.g. fire, police and ambulance. Lack of capacity in local schools.</p> <p>Ability to accommodate extra cars at North Richmond shops.</p> <p>Development should not proceed until all recommended improvements are made.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator.</p> <p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.</p> <p>Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dve (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Rd. Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p>
86	Ziauddin Ahmed (Lakemba)	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>The proposed development will provide quality housing and a broad range of local jobs desperately needed in the Hawkesbury.</p> <p>Developers are highly experienced demonstrated by the current RSL development.</p> <p>Without development the chances of new infrastructure is limited.</p> <p>Site is suitable for development as it has been mostly cleared and adjoins existing residential area.</p> <p>Local area is becoming run down and requires immediate activation by more growth and stimulus.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
87	Brent O'Neill, Lauren Walsh and Brian Toyota from ML Design (3 submissions)	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>The Redbank proposal is a unique opportunity to create a new community around the historical centre of North Richmond that is not only drawn from standard controls and guidelines, but seeks to establish a new standard in urban living drawn from the sites important historical context and reference to the city Forrest by PA Yeoman.</p>	

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>A small neighbourhood centre will be located adjacent to the main open space body, encouraging visitors to come and visit and utilise the public open space and facilities.</p> <p>The Redbank proposal supports an average lot size of 500sqm+ across the project, which is in alignment with a more traditional urban form that is supported by the community.</p> <p>The development seeks to achieve almost double the current standard of open space, with 17% of the total area of site contributing to open space.</p> <p>The proponent has a history of designing/marketing/delivering high quality (and award winning) master planned communities that mix public amenity, commercial opportunity, and private living for the benefit of all (e.g. Raby Bay, Casuarina Beach, Bluewater Bay, Salt, and Halcyon communities).</p> <p>The proponent has a passion for the site and has never intended for it to be carved up into a standard subdivision - in keeping with the wishes of local authorities and Heritage Council.</p> <p>The project will preserve Yeoman's legacy, enhance Redbank Creek's environment as a public amenity, and introduce new open space and park opportunities for all.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
88	Chris Lockhart Smith from Ecodweller	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>Area is ideal for such a development being above the nearby areas in Richmond and Windsor which are subject to flooding</p> <p>No negative environmental impacts due to much of the land already being degraded as farmland.</p> <p>Confident that Redbank will be developed in such a way as to enhance the natural environment; the use of water features and several nature corridors will allow diverse flora and fauna to flourish.</p> <p>Impressed with the intelligent mix of different housing density and integration with existing housing.</p> <p>A need for more housing in the area and it will provide an economic benefit and boost employment.</p> <p>New bridge will be a significant infrastructure asset which will help relieve congestion and improve access to both Penrith and the Mountains.</p> <p>Confident NRJV can delivery a suburb of high quality that will be a great addition to the area.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
89	Fiona Smith from Kurrajong Community Forum	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Author lodged the contents of her presentation given at the information evening held on 18/07/13 at North Richmond Panthers as an objection to the rezoning of land from a minimum 200Ha lots to low density, medium density and large lot residential.</p> <p>Inadequate infrastructure.</p> <p>Shortfall of funding to provide infrastructure.</p> <p>Worsening of traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Destruction of Navua and Yarramundi Reserves. Local of recreational opportunities, should preserve community asset and amenity.</p> <p>High density housing is out of keeping with the rural environment of the Hawkesbury.</p> <p>No consideration of emergency services, particularly in times of flooding.</p> <p>Navua Bridge will not solve access issues in times of flood. It feeds onto Yarramundi Bridge which floods first and Springwood Road in its current form is unsuitable for high traffic flow in wet weather.</p> <p>Inadequate water supply and pressure. VPA protects the developer not Council.</p> <p>Proposal is inconsistent with Federal and State Planning objectives</p> <p>There is an aparent shortfall in the cost of suplying the infrastructure of approximately \$100m that is not in the VPA. There is inadequate detail regarding provision of essential and emergency services to cater for the increased development.</p>	<p>The proposed development will retain rural amenity by ensuring appropriate zoning and rural conservation via the Development Control Plan & Conservation Management Plan (Vision 1), it will minimise the ecological footprint by having three times the Open Space as comparable development and providing protection zones around environmentally sensitive areas (Vision 2), and finally will provide much needed infrastructure improvements (namely water, sewer, stormwater and roads) for existing residents (Vision 3).</p>
90	Fiona Smith (Kurrajong)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Inconsistent with Federal and State planning objectives.</p> <p>Traffic (cant see how the proposals will resolve the traffic issues. The bridge at Navua will not begin construction until after the issuance of the 1001st block and will destroy the reserves. In times of flood the only evacuation is a narrow winding road to Springwood.</p> <p>Cost of infrastructure. Shortfall of \$100M in VPA.</p> <p>VPA permits a donation rather than the proposed infrastructure. No safety clause to protect council if developer sells and then there are financial difficulties.</p> <p>Due diligence should be conducted on the businesses that comprise North Richmond Joint Venture.</p>	<p>The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The VPA stipulates the Navua Bridge is to be: designed/approved by 501st lot; construction commenced by 701st lot ; and operational by 1001st lot.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over er a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>Flood evacuation route only used in emergencies. Clearance of flood evacuation routes is an Emergency Services matter.</p> <p>The capped contribution definition (\$18.187M) relates to the monetary contribution payable to RMS/Council in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. The total financial contribution by the developer will also include amounts for open space & drainage dedication, maintenance, community facilities and services beyond the capped amount in question.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>The planning process that led to the issuance of the Gateway Determination by NSW Dept of Planning & Infrastructure was assessed and verified by the NSW Planning & Assessment Commission. Hawkesbury City Council legal representative will undertake the necessary due diligence as part of the finalisation of the VPA.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Essential services, not enough water.	With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.
		Lack of emergency services.	The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.
91	Sue Wall (Grose Vale)	Irreversible damage to Redbank Creek and Yeomans Keyline system.	Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP. The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The Keyline System and Dams will be substantially retained and interpreted for public parks and cycling/walking paths.
		Infrastructure should be completed before any development.	The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.
		Existing traffic congestion.	Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.
		Fearful of increased traffic along Grose Vale Road due to proposed bridge at Navua Reserve.	TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders). Traffic heading to the new estate will travel along Grose River Rd and turning into Grose Vale Rd to access the estate. Any additional traffic heading through Grose Wold will be existing residents living further west which currently use Grose Vale Rd only. To encourage use of Grose Vale Rd and ensure that traffic is restricted to local residents only, Council could consider a range of measures including lower speed limits or traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps). This will be dealt with during the Bridge Approval process.
92	Elizabeth Stevenson (Grose Vale)	Objections / Concerns include:	
		Existing traffic congestion and validity of traffic report.	Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.
		Housing planned without corresponding improvement to existing infrastructure.	The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.
		Minimum lot size proposed is out of character with the area. Character of the area community will be irretrievably compromised.	Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2
		Inadequate emergency services e.g. fire, police and ambulance.	The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.
		VPA in favour of the developer, insufficient safeguards for developer to deliver, concerned about on-going maintenance costs.	The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.
		Inadequate water and sewerage services.	With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.
		Destruction of environmental and heritage values of Navua and Yarramundi Reserves as a result of a bridge that is not flood free.	The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares - which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Improve infrastructure prior to development.</p> <p>More suitable locations elsewhere within the Hawkesbury.</p> <p>State Government indicated that this is not the right area for intense development.</p>	<p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p> <p>The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.</p>
93	Ray Stevenson (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Development should not proceed until all recommended improvements are made.</p> <p>Council, State and Federal governments need to plan this infrastructure and put it in place.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua and Yarramundi Reserves e.g. loss of recreational opportunities and environmental impacts. Proposed bridge not flood proof.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>
94	Helen Rylands (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion/problems.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p>
95	Marianne McMillan (Penrith)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Housing adjacent to Redbank Creek will reverse the work put in by the original farm and damage the local ecology.</p> <p>Surface and storm water pollutants entering Redbank Creek.</p>	<p>The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The Keyline System and Dams will be substantially retained and interpreted for public parks and cycling/walking paths.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p>
96	Muriel Picton & Mirium Knee	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Keep the relaxed lifestyle with quietness, space and scenery.</p> <p>High density housing is least desirable and there is no employment in the area.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Per Hawkesbury Council's Vision Plan, the proposed development will retain rural amenity by ensuring appropriate zoning and rural conservation via the Development Control Plan & Conservation Management Plan (Vision 1), it will minimise the ecological footprint by having three times the Open Space as comparable development and providing protection zones around environmentally sensitive areas (Vision 2), and finally will provide much needed infrastructure improvements (namely water, sewer, stormwater and roads) for existing residents (Vision 3).</p> <p>In terms of local jobs, the Economic Impact Assessment (on exhibition) shows an estimated 579 direct/indirect jobs during construction phase and 108 new jobs generated from new resident expenditure (post-construction).</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Fragile environment of native flora and fauna will be disturbed and destroyed.	The "Environment Assessment" and "Environmental Benefits and Constraints Analysis" are on exhibition and identify all key issues and proposed mitigants. On balance there are very few environmental issues as the site has been extensively cleared for grazing over a prolonged period of time.
97	Ian Duckworth (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Current infrastructure is not sufficient for the existing population let alone 1400 new homes.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to traffic, emergency services, existing business, roads and escalating crime rates.</p> <p>Building a non flood proof bridge and destroying Navua and Yarramundi Reserves.</p>	<p>The Proponent has entered into an agreement with NBN Co for the new estate, and this may bring forward the timetable for NBN rollout for existing residents.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.</p> <p>The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades, and maintenance of existing roads</p> <p>In terms of local jobs, the Economic Impact Assessment (on exhibition) shows an estimated 579 direct/indirect jobs during construction phase and 108 new jobs generated from new resident expenditure (post-construction).</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>
98	Emged Rizkalla from Geotechnique	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>The development will provide a broad range of local job opportunities and a major economic boost for the local region.</p> <p>NRJV are highly experienced and committed to the deliver a development whilst recognising the general needs of the community at large.</p> <p>Without development, new or upgraded infrastructure would be limited.</p> <p>The development includes ensuring that site surface levels are above the flood plain.</p> <p>The proposal provides drainage solutions for the residents adjoining the site.</p> <p>Site is suitable for development as it has been mostly cleared and adjoins existing residential area.</p> <p>The site has very little impact on the environment and could provide interesting and accessible open spaces that would otherwise not be available to the community.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
99	Marie McDermott & Ian Biddle (Windsor)	<p>Objections / Concerns include: Same as submission number 60.</p>	<p>As per responses to Submission #60.</p>
100	Marilyn Chivers & Judith Taylor (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Insufficient emergency services.</p> <p>Roads and bridges should be upgraded first.</p> <p>Development should be on flood free land on eastern side of river where infrastructure already exists.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p> <p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p>
101	Graeme Pont (Windsor Downs)	<p>Supports the proposed development: Author has work commitments in the area and currently leases a house. He is looking for property to purchase and Redbank offers everything he is looking for i.e. rural outlook, beautiful surrounds, good access to shopping, and close proximity to local schools, vet and hospital. The flood free zoning is in favour with loan finance.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
102	John Canellis (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion and access for emergency services.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood/fire evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades, and maintenance of existing roads</p>
103	Herman and Elaine Boyd (Tennyson)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion and access for emergency services.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood/fire evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the current North Richmond Bridge.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
104	Mark & Michelle Feneley (North Richmond)	Objections / Concerns include:	
		Increase in traffic congestion, no reasonable alternative available.	Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.
		Safety on surrounding local roads, such as Pecks Road, due to increased traffic. Safety at bus stops.	Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dr (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Rd Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.
		North Richmond was rejected as an area for potential growth.	The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.
		The Redbank project would place too much strain on services such as water, electricity and sewage.	With regards to power Endeavour Energy there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development. With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.
		No emergency services available on this side of the river and nearest hospital is at least 20 minutes away.	The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.
		North Richmond shopping village will be unable to cope with the increased volume of shoppers and the cars they drive. Impact of increased traffic on Riverview Street and Pitt Lane.	The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.
		Capacity of child care centres and schools to cater for extra children in the area.	The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.
		Bus companies will need to adjust timetables to allow a constant flow of people around the area.	Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator.
		Lot sizes too small (e.g. 180sqm). Loss of rural character, loss of property values.	Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2
		Bridge crossing at Navua should be provided before any development.	As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, and these intersection works will improve the level of service significantly. The construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed and be operational prior to the delivery of the 1001st lot.
		Destruction of Navua Reserve e.g. impact on environment and loss of recreational opportunities.	The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.
		Effect on Redbank Creek from water runoff needs careful consideration.	Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.
		Development should be in area with existing infrastructure and land available.	Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.
		Loss of rural amenity and reduction in property values.	The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
105	John Croft (Kurrajong)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>No DA approved until construction commences to solve the traffic congestion.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion.</p>	<p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p>
106	Adrian & Jenni Bryden (Bowen Mountain)	<p>Existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Wants guarantee that second bridge at Navua will be built and it should be built first.</p> <p>Traffic impact on roads approaching the second bridge e.g. Grose River Road, Grose Wold Road, Ashtons Road, Grose Vale Road and Bowen Mountain Road. Traffic lights will be required at intersection along Grose River Road.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. It also stipulates the Navua Bridge is to be: designed/approved by 501st lot; construction commenced by 701st lot; operational by 1001st lot. The VPA also shows the three intersection improvements will require completion within the first 120 lots.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).</p>
107	David & Marjorie Hearne (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion and impacts of increased traffic. Traffic lights required on Grose Vale Road. No more traffic should go down Pecks Road due to safety reasons.</p> <p>No police, fire or ambulance this side of the river and access is impeded by the congested roads.</p> <p>Wants guarantee that that facilities will be provided?</p> <p>Increased travel time means children need to be dropped at school earlier. Concerned about pedestrian safety of school children.</p> <p>The size of blocks are too small.</p> <p>Disaster management in the event of an extreme flood everyone will be trying to go up Bells Line of Road.</p> <p>Greater consideration of the environment and existing residents is required.</p> <p>Run off into Redbank Creek and increase in flood levels.</p>	<p>Both TMAP and RMS reports estimate background traffic growth that is occurring, even without the proposed development. Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The initial intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, which will improve local travel times. Further improvements will be made when the Navua Bridge is built and operational.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the current North Richmond Bridge.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p>
108	John & Patricia Patterson (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>The bridge at Navua Reserve is a band aid solution and will have a detrimental effect on the reserves e.g. environmental impacts and loss of recreational opportunities.</p>	<p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>The detrimental effect on the lifestyle of residents of Grose Vale / Grose Wold due to extra vehicles using the new bridge.</p> <p>The topography of Grose Wold is such that the traffic noise and pollution is amplified and will seriously affect the whole area, road and reserves.</p> <p>No emergency services on the western side of the river. Improvements to traffic flow between Richmond and North Richmond area necessary.</p> <p>Concerned about an uncertain future for assets and lifestyle and loss of rural/residential environment.</p>	<p>Traffic heading to the new estate will travel along Grose River Rd and turning into Grose Vale Rd to access the estate. Any additional traffic heading through Grose Wold will be existing residents living further west which currently use Grose Vale Rd only. To encourage use of Grose Vale Rd and ensure that traffic is restricted to local residents only, Council could consider a range of measures including lower speed limits or traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps). This will be dealt with during the Bridge Approval process.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders). Traffic calming measures (via speed limitation) will deal with noise and pollution issues in small townships and will be dealt with at the Development Application level.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly.</p>
109	Mary South (Bowen Mountain)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Too many homes.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion and state of existing roads.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades, and maintenance of existing roads</p>
110	Dianne Tait (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Development should not proceed without a second crossing of the Hawkesbury River.</p> <p>What if the developer goes broke?</p> <p>A second bridge at Yarramundi will be of little assistance as it is one of the first places that will go under during a flood.</p> <p>Traffic congestion. Impact on Riverview Street and Pitt Lane. People will be forced to leave the area.</p> <p>Loss of property values.</p> <p>Unsure of timing for second bridge at Navua.</p>	<p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. This includes improvements to three intersections (confirmed by RMS) which will immediately improve level of service. It also stipulates the Navua Bridge is to be: designed/approved by 501st lot; construction commenced by 701st lot; operational by 1001st lot.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. It also stipulates the Navua Bridge is to be: designed/approved by 501st lot; construction commenced by 701st lot; operational by 1001st lot.</p>
111	Tricia Moses-Holt (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>New bridge is inappropriate and feeds into a bridge that is regularly flooded. Destruction of Navua reserve - loss of recreational opportunities.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Lot sizes too small (e.g. 180sqm). Loss of rural character, loss of property values.</p> <p>Lack of schools, child care and before and after school care.</p> <p>Lack of emergency services and medical services.</p> <p>Development not supported by the community. Council is not acknowledging or acting on community's concerns. People are being forced to leave the area.</p> <p>Impact and traffic on local roads e.g. Pecks Road, Charles Street and Hayman Street.</p>	<p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dve (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Rd. Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.</p>
112	Doug Wiggins (Glossodia)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Wants infrastructure upgraded first.</p> <p>Roads and river crossings can't cope with traffic volumes.</p> <p>Water supply is a concern. Currently insufficient for Kurrajong residents.</p> <p>What if the developer goes broke?</p>	<p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p>
113	Terry & Robyn Jones (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Inadequate infrastructure to cope with additional residences, e.g. public transport, emergency services, shopping facilities.</p> <p>Traffic congestion causes delay for local trips and trips east to work.</p> <p>Navua Bridge will increase traffic on rural/access roads, which are not of sufficient standard to cater for increased volumes.</p>	<p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Traffic heading to the new estate will travel along Grose River Rd and turning into Grose Vale Rd to access the estate. Any additional traffic heading through Grose Wold will be existing residents living further west which currently use Grose Vale Rd only. To encourage use of Grose Vale Rd and ensure that traffic is restricted to local residents only, Council could consider a range of measures including lower speed limits or traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps). This will be dealt with during the Bridge Approval process.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Concern over the "domino effect" this will have in terms of more development, no planning models provided to see what will happen. Council should have a strategic plan for area west of the river.	The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.
		Not against development per se, but want to ensure it improves (not destroys) current living standards.	The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly.
114	Adrian & Lisa Isaacs (Grose Wold)	Objections / Concerns include:	
		Increased traffic from development will add to congestion, which is already unacceptable.	Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.
		Does not agree that money set aside for road improvements is adequate.	The capped contribution definition relates to the monetary contribution payable in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. It is calculated in reference to a per lot benchmark (\$13k per lot) which is indexed with CPI/inflation. RMS is being added as a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contribution will be used by both RMS & Council to address necessary road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge.
		State Government won't be contributing, so concern there will be a shortfall of funding to complete necessary infrastructure. Council and ratepayers to carry shortfall.	The capped contribution definition (\$18.187M) relates to the monetary contribution payable to RMS/Council in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. The total financial contribution by the developer will also include amounts for open space & drainage dedication, maintenance, community facilities and services beyond the capped amount in question.
		Inadequate social infrastructure to cope with additional population.	The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.
		Navua Bridge will increase traffic on rural/access roads, which are not of sufficient standard to cater for increased volumes, and doesn't improve level of service on main roads.	TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders). Table 48 of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when both the intersection works and Navua Bridge are complete.
		Destruction of Navua Reserve for a short-medium term fix a tragedy. Impact on environment and loss of recreational opportunities.	The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.
115	Pauline Alchin (Grose Wold)	Objections / Concerns include:	
		Existing traffic is a problem for author's business (horse stud on Avoca Road), clients complain about delays to visit their horses.	TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders). Table 48 of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when both the intersection works and Navua Bridge are complete.
		Lot sizes too small (e.g. 180sqm) and out of character with surrounds and will have a negative impact on community.	Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2
		Lack of services e.g. police, ambulance, fire, schools etc.	The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.
		Lack of shopping facilities. Parking at North Richmond is already at capacity. Impact of increased traffic on Riverview Street.	The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Destruction of Navua Reserve to build alternate bridge e.g. impact on environment and loss of recreational opportunities. Reserve should be preserved.</p> <p>Navua Bridge will increase traffic on surrounding roads, which are not of sufficient standard to deal with volumes e.g. Grose River Road, Grose Wold Road and Grose Value Road.</p> <p>What if the developer goes broke? What guarantees are there works will be completed?</p> <p>Proposed development in favour of the developer not the community.</p>	<p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders). Table 48 of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when both the intersection works and Navua Bridge are complete.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p>
116	Nicole Kanawati (North Richmond)	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>A terrific opportunity for more people to live in Hawkesbury, will help grow the area and for local businesses to expand.</p> <p>More jobs for local residents, good for the local economy.</p> <p>Council will benefit from improved infrastructure provided by the development and also expanded rate base.</p> <p>Traffic concerns raised by public are ill founded and has a long way to go before being considered truly "congested".</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
117	Stephanie Leon & Simon Borrie (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Capacity of Grose Vale Road. Lack of footpaths and bike tracks and therefore resident safety.</p> <p>People aren't sticking to speed limits on Grose Vale Road, and increased traffic will mean greater risk of accidents.</p> <p>Impact on lifestyle.</p> <p>Impact on heritage of the area.</p> <p>Lots sizes are too small, should be 5-10 acre lots.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua Reserve e.g. loss of recreational opportunities.</p>	<p>Widening of Grose Vale Rd would require the compulsory acquisition of land which would be met with some resistance by the local community. In addition to key intersection works agreed in the VPA, there will be progressive road improvements along Grose Vale Rd at the main entries to the estate.</p> <p>The proponent will be required to widen Grose Vale Rd to include left-in turning lane and left-out merge, as well as a dedicated right-in turning lane. Enforcement of speed limits is a Police matter.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly.</p> <p>The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The Keyline System and Dams will be substantially retained and interpreted for public parks and cycling/walking paths.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. Reducing the yield will reduce the extent of any improvements to road and community infrastructure.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
118	Brian Hegarty (Bowen Mountain)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Accident on Grose Vale Road (front end loader working on Redbank site) caused traffic gridlock. Infrastructure needs to be put in place.</p> <p>Quality of Grose Vale Road between Bowen Mountain and Kurrajong, condition of Westbury Road and emergency access in event of fire.</p> <p>Navua Bridge will increase traffic on rural/access roads, which are not of quality to deal with volumes, and lead to safety issues.</p> <p>Who bears responsibility for loss of life in traffic accidents due to inadequate emergency service access?</p> <p>Development should be east of river on flood free land where infrastructure already exists.</p> <p>State Government has declared the site to be too remote to be rezoned.</p> <p>Asks if a plan has been done or futre plan to do F.A.R (fatal accident research) and S.I.R (serious injury research) on Bowen Mountain Rd, Grose Vale Rd and Grose River Rd over the past twenty five years.</p>	<p>The accident involved a loader doing RMS road upgrades to Grose Vale Rd, and had nothing to do with the Proponent or the RSL development. As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future road upgrades and maintenance of existing roads</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.).</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. It is essential that residents take responsibility to follow the instructions of Emergency Services in the event of natural disasters, and follow traffic laws at all times - failure to do so will increase risk of accident or injury and possibly invalidate insurance. In any case, the proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood/fire evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>(Council comment). Apart from land in the Growth Centre (Vineyard) the land east of the river is subject to significant flood affectation (see Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy).</p> <p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly. The majority of existing residents do not rely upon connectivity to Sydney CBD.</p>
119	Audrey Nutman (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Infrastructure should be provided first.</p> <p>Lot sizes too small, more like inner city, not Hawkesbury.</p> <p>Traffic congestion will get worse at key intersections causing long delays.</p> <p>Lack of parking at local shops, won't cope with new development.</p> <p>What guarantees are there that the works under VPA will be completed?</p> <p>Lack of amenities and emergency services west of the river and long delays in traffic between Richmond and North Richmond.</p> <p>Ratepayers deserve better planning for the whole of North Richmond, including facilities, roads, etc.</p>	<p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The proposed development is consistent with the report, it will retain rural amenity by ensuring appropriate zoning and rural conservation via the Development Control Plan & Conservation Management Plan (Vision 1), it will minimise the ecological footprint by having three times the Open Space as comparable development and providing protection zones around environmentally sensitive areas (Vision 2), and finally will provide much needed infrastructure improvements (namely water, sewer, stormwater and roads) for existing residents (Vision 3).</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
120	Kate Beresford-Banks from B2 Property Solutions)	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>Community needs measured and considered sustainable growth to prosper.</p> <p>Projects like this allow people access to home ownership, which improves security, social support and personal confidence.</p> <p>Affordable housing is not just an issue for the disadvantaged, all are suffering due to lack of housing supply and land affordability.</p> <p>Without development, we will never meet the goal of affordable housing for all Australians.</p> <p>Council should consider the importance of these social needs for existing and future residents.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents, and to providing access to a range of housing options for new homebuyers..</p>
121	Colin Chesterman (Bowen Mountain)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing Hawkesbury River crossings inadequate, causing traffic congestion which will get worse with development.</p> <p>Grose Vale Road quality is poor, increased traffic will cause further deterioration.</p> <p>Site unsuitable for urban development, it should be preserved for food production.</p> <p>Rezone will lead to further deterioration of eco-system along Redbank Creek, it should be protected within buffer zone.</p> <p>Pedestrian/bike safety along Grose Vale Road.</p> <p>Council is not complying with the Community Strategic Plan in terms of governance & community leadership. Direction - Have transparent, accountable and respected leadership and an engaged community. Strategy - Achieve community respect through good corporate governance and community leadership and engagement.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the delivery of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Widening of Grose Vale Rd would require the compulsory acquisition of land which would be met with some resistance by the local community. In addition to key intersection works agreed in the VPA, there will be progressive road improvements along Grose Vale Rd at the main entries to the estate.</p> <p>The relatively small scale of the property and the high statutory cost of holding the land meant it was becoming financially unviable to continue as a farm. To undertake intensive commercially viable agricultural uses such as poultry, hydroponics and mushrooms would impact on immediately adjoining residential location.</p> <p>Redbank Creek will be a designated Riparian Corridor and Asset Protection Zone, within a proposed open space area.</p> <p>Along with extensive footpaths and bikeways within the estate, the Proponent will work with Council to ensure suitable connectivity to North Richmond township.</p>
122	Kylie Christian (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>No development until infrastructure is improved, development puts existing residents at risk.</p> <p>VPA in favour of the developer, not the community.</p> <p>Council should prepare a Masterplan for development west of the river.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua Reserve.</p> <p>Traffic congestion on existing road corridors will get worse.</p> <p>There is a shortfall in bridge funding. Proposed bridge leads onto floodplain.</p>	<p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the delivery of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p> <p>Refer to Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The capped contribution definition relates to the monetary contribution payable in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. It is calculated in reference to a per lot benchmark (\$13k per lot) which is indexed with CPI/inflation. RMS is being added as a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contribution will be used by both RMS & Council to address necessary road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Impact on safety and condition of local roads. Who will maintain local and feeder roads?</p> <p>Lack of emergency services west of the river e.g. hospital, police and fire.</p> <p>Lot sizes are too small and unsuitable for rural heritage of the area.</p> <p>No guarantee that the developer will deliver facilities or upgrades.</p> <p>Requests a public hearing to address all submissions.</p>	<p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The Keyline System and Dams will be substantially retained and interpreted for public parks and cycling/walking paths.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the draft VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed.</p> <p>All submissions will be reviewed by Council staff and the proponent and will be addressed at a public Council Meeting.</p>
123	Grant Christian (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include: Same as submission number 122.</p>	<p>See Response to Submission #122</p>
124	Peter Tyldsley (Kurrajong)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Development should be focussed east of the river.</p> <p>Richmond Bridge is not able to be expanded.</p> <p>Navua Bridge does not provide flood free access and causes greater traffic through local/rural roads and the reserve will be destroyed forever.</p> <p>Roads already level of service "F". No State Government funding. We need improvements now.</p> <p>No State or Local Government funding for road improvements.</p> <p>Inadequate public transport for the area.</p> <p>Proposal failed the State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites". Rated poorly due to accessibility/liveability due to the distance from Sydney, isolated from established communities.</p>	<p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>Areas east of the site (the western Sydney trough) including Yarramundi Bridge will be under water in the event of significant flood. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.).</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS issue of the Richmond Bridge & Congestion Study confirms Federal Govt funding of \$18M toward intersection and bridge improvements. State Govt funding towards this corridor will be determined in future year's budgets.</p> <p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.</p> <p>The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly. The majority of existing residents do not rely upon connectivity to Sydney CBD.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Inadequate funding. There is a \$100M shortfall in budget for infrastructure.</p> <p>No local or manufacturing jobs.</p> <p>Lack of emergency services west of river and no flood contingency route.</p> <p>Insufficient water supply and water pressure for new and existing residents.</p> <p>Negative impact on local Aboriginal Heritage.</p> <p>Lack of capacity in local schools.</p> <p>Impact of stormwater runoff into Redbank Creek.</p> <p>Impact of development on Redbank Creek flora and fauna.</p> <p>Negative impact on rural/agricultural heritage.</p> <p>Lots sizes are too small. Inappropriate for rural amenity.</p>	<p>The capped contribution definition (\$18.187M) relates to the monetary contribution payable to Council in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. The total financial contribution by the developer will also include amounts for open space & drainage dedication, maintenance, community facilities and services beyond the capped amount in question.</p> <p>In terms of local jobs, the Economic Impact Assessment (on exhibition) shows an estimated 579 direct/indirect jobs during construction phase and 108 new jobs generated from new resident expenditure (post-construction).</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>The treatment of Aboriginal and Heritage elements within the subject property will be governed by the Conservation Management Plan & Aboriginal Heritage Assessment (on exhibition). Most identified Aboriginal Heritage will not be disturbed and remain in open space locations.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>Redbank Creek will be a designated Riparian Corridor and Asset Protection Zone, within a proposed open space area.</p> <p>The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The Keyline System and Dams will be substantially retained and interpreted for public parks and cycling/walking paths.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p>
125	Phillipa Tyldsley (Kurrajong)	<p>Objections / Concerns include: Same as submission number 124.</p>	See Response to Submission #124
126	Marie Keeley (Katoomba)	<p>Supporting comments include: Fantastic opportunity for new housing, new infrastructure, more jobs and a boost for local business. Cost of buying/renting a house too high, more housing supply is needed. Brings much needed infrastructure forward, including second crossing of river at Navua - great alternate travel route. Area is ideal for such a development being above the floodplain and mostly cleared land with services.</p>	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
127	Frances Simpson (Bowen Mountain)	<p>Objections / Concerns include: Traffic congestion and travel times bad now, will get worse with more development.</p>	Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Emergency access and egress in event of bushfire/flooding without improved infrastructure.</p> <p>Rural lifestyle will change with additional development/population.</p> <p>Infrastructure should be provided first, including an extra bridge crossing, prior to development.</p>	<p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood/fire evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p>
128	Sue Lobsey form Lobsey Property	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>100% support. We need more houses in the Hawkesbury for our children to buy.</p> <p>Provided the developer fixes traffic (which will be a condition of approval) keen to see more homes.</p> <p>Author does a lot of subdivision work in Baulkham Hills & Blacktown. These Councils are great to deal with. Hawkesbury Council needs to get with the times and support the proponent to ensure this goes ahead.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
129	Iain & Sharon Hodges (Grose Vale)	<p>Development will impact on lifestyle of residents in North Richmond and surrounds.</p> <p>Traffic chaos, congestion is bad and will get worse.</p> <p>Navua Bridge is impractical, not a flood free route, and approach roads cannot cope with extra traffic.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua Reserve.</p> <p>No emergency services west of the river e.g. police, ambulance, fire. Concern about emergency service access in peak traffic or flood.</p> <p>Size of blocks of land is unsuitable for the area, will create a "ghetto".</p> <p>No jobs in the area and inadequate public transport to get people to jobs further east. Unemployment rate will increase.</p>	<p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Areas east of the site (the western Sydney trough) including Yarramundi Bridge will be under water in the event of significant flood. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood. TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.).</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>In terms of local jobs, the Economic Impact Assessment (on exhibition) shows an estimated 579 direct/indirect jobs during construction phase and 108 new jobs generated from new resident expenditure (post-construction).</p> <p>Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Schools are at capacity.</p> <p>VPA in favour of the developer. No guarantees. Infrastructure improvements should be asked for upfront.</p> <p>Development should be focused east of the river.</p>	<p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p> <p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p>
130	Richard Beaumont (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Author will be a neighbour to the R5 zone. Concerned about lack of privacy and that members of public could walk through.</p> <p>Wants to ensure fencing is appropriate and shields view of author's yard.</p>	<p>The property concerned (406 Grose Vale Rd) is adjacent to protected Cumberland Plain Woodland (CPW) which will not be developed. The access road to the R5 zoned land will be appropriately fenced (per DA conditions), and the provision of walkways and bike paths within the R5 zone will discourage public walking through private property.</p> <p>Approved fencing types will be advertised in the Redbank DCP to be exhibited as part of the rezoning/approval process.</p>
131	M & L Shepherd (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Infrastructure has not been upgraded in 50 years.</p> <p>Entry A on Arthur Phillip Drive was to be emergency exit only as required by Rural Fire Service. Concerned about increase in traffic in Pecks Road.</p> <p>Council notification of planning proposal should have been sent to all residents.</p> <p>Will North Richmond be renamed "Redbank" as developer is having free rein?</p>	<p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p> <p>Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dve (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Rd</p> <p>(Council comment) - approximately 1,000 letters were sent to adjoining or affected properties.</p> <p>The proposal will be branded Redbank at North Richmond.</p>
132	Mark Clark (Bowen Mountain)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion is dreadful and will get worse with development.</p> <p>North Richmond Bridge is inadequate.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p>
133	Christopher Hallam from Christopher Hallam Pty Ltd	<p>Author is a traffic consultant and has provided a 72 page submission on Traffic and Transport Infrastructure issues.</p> <p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Lack of certainty of road infrastructure improvements, in particular, what improvements will be made if Navua Bridge approvals are not obtained and money is paid to Council - no clear mechanism to pay to RMS for Hyder works</p> <p>Doesn't believe that TMAP was specifically endorsed by RMS.</p>	<p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The capped contribution definition relates to the monetary contribution payable in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. It is calculated in reference to a per lot benchmark (\$13k per lot) which is indexed with CPI/inflation. RMS is being added as a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contributions can be utilised by RMS and to address necessary improvements to road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge.</p> <p>The author was not party to Project Control Group meetings including Council, RMS and the Proponent. The information quoted in the report by the author confirms that RMS provided specific approval for the TMAP (and its proposed solutions) to be exhibited for the purposes of the rezoning, and that RMS "did not object" to the proposed solutions within the TMAP. The reason for this is simple - since the TMAP was put on exhibition, RMS has issued Part 2 of its Richmond Bridge and Approaches Congestion Study on August 1st 2013. Part 2 includes increases to the scope/extent of the intersection upgrades provided in Part 1 (adopted by the Proponent in its TMAP) and recommends an option for the duplication of Nth Richmond Bridge by 2036. The changes in Part 2 of the Study were not made available to the proponent prior to exhibition. As such, RMS were not able to specifically endorse the TMAP solutions, which were based on improvements which were to be superseded in Part 2 - hence they were "not objected" to. RMS endorsement of the eventual traffic solutions will be officially recognised in the VPA, of which RMS is now a party to, and agreement regarding delivery and payment will be negotiated as a condition of any rezoning.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>State Government has confirmed that it will not fund development, so raises issue of who pays for intersection works.</p>	<p>The author notes on several occasions that the State Government does not have funding to do the necessary works, quoting an email from RMS/TfNSW on 15th January 2013. The author argues that this correspondence is proof that not only will funds not be available in the budget year in question, but all future budget years as well - i.e. that the State Govt will <i>never</i> provide funding for any improvements on the BLR/Richmond Bridge Corridor. This is quite a significant assumption to make. The author also failed to note in the Richmond Bridge and Approaches Congestion Study the following statement "In addition to the \$2M funding for this Richmond Bridge and Approaches Congestion Study, the Australian (Federal) Government has committed \$18M funding beyond 2013-2014 to improve traffic conditions on and around Richmond Bridge and its approaches" . As stated above, agreement regarding delivery and payment will be negotiated within the final VPA, of which RMS is now a signatory.</p>
		<p>More thought about public transport to improve Sustainable Travel Strategy.</p>	<p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online. Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator. Along with extensive footpaths and bikeways within the estate, the Proponent will work with Council to ensure suitable connectivity to North Richmond township.</p>
		<p>Traffic distribution projections from CUBE modelling need to be updated to follow current Census patterns of work location of Hawkesbury residents - slight increase in traffic through major intersections (i.e. TMAP understating volumes).</p>	<p>The modelling assumptions were deemed acceptable by GTA as part of their review on Council's behalf, however this should be noted in future modelling work required in this proposal. The author's assessment suggests that trip distribution in the TMAP is skewed to western destinations such as Blue Mtns, Glossodia, and Springwood, and that the traffic volumes stated "don't make sense". The author adjusts the 2021 data <u>(which assumes Navua Bridge is built)</u> and reassigns the "displaced" traffic over the Richmond Bridge back into eastern destinations such as Hawkesbury, Penrith, Blacktown. However, the author notes "we have not reassigned any traffic onto the proposed Yurrumundi Bridge because the Springwood Rd and Castlereagh Rd percentages are still more than the Census job locations". This overstates the negative impact of the reassigned data by assuming that commuters will completely ignore an alternative route (via bridge crossing at Yurrumundi) which would provide them with access to Census job locations east of the river. This assumption requires review.</p>
		<p>Uncertainty in VPA surrounding the scope of (Hyder recommended) intersection works and who will pay for them.</p>	<p>As mentioned above, since the TMAP was put on exhibition, RMS has issued Part 2 of its Richmond Bridge and Approaches Congestion Study on August 1st 2013. Part 2 includes increases to the scope/extent of the intersection upgrades provided in Part 1 (adopted by the Proponent in its TMAP) and recommends the duplication of Nth Richmond Bridge by 2036. RMS endorsement of the eventual traffic solutions will be officially recognised in the VPA, of which RMS is now a party to, and agreement regarding delivery and payment will be negotiated as a condition of any rezoning.</p>
		<p>TMAP implies that State Government will pay for Hyder recommended intersection works, irrespective of Redbank proposal. State Government has confirmed no funding.</p>	<p>As previously noted, the author was not present at PCG meetings between RMS, Council and the Proponent. The assumptions used within TMAP were all based on those used by Hyder (author of the Congestion Study) and were approved for use within the TMAP by RMS. Unfortunately the author's analysis did not include an assessment of background 2021 congestion through BLR intersection assuming no Redbank development and no intersection works completed - this would have provided the means for a like for like assessment, and would have confirmed that traffic issues for locals would go on unresolved. The author continues to focus on an email from RMS/TfNSW on 15th January 2013 to suggest that the State Govt will <i>never</i> have the funds to complete the works in the Richmond Bridge and Approaches Congestion Study. The author also failed to note that "...the Australian (Federal) Government has committed \$18M funding beyond 2013-2014 to improve traffic conditions on and around Richmond Bridge and its approaches" .</p>
		<p>Level of service at Bells Line of Road /Grose Vale Road (key intersection) does not improve when the proposed Navua Bridge is built, which is contrary to assertion that congestion will improve.</p>	<p>As mentioned above, since the TMAP was put on exhibition, RMS has issued Part 2 of its Richmond Bridge and Approaches Congestion Study on August 1st 2013. Part 2 includes increases to the scope/extent of the intersection upgrades provided in Part 1. The author's assessment is flawed in two ways. Firstly, by only focusing on 2021 traffic flows, the author avoids highlighted that the level of service at the three intersections improves significantly from current levels through TMAP benchmark years (2015 and 2018) - i.e. from level of service "F" to "C" at BLR/GVR providing immediate relief to traffic congestion which is a key community issue. Secondly, the author seems to be comparing two different types of intersection upgrades in his analysis of 2021 traffic flows - which he depicts in the diagrams on pages 12 and 14. There can be no other logical explanation why traffic would actually <i>worsen</i> with the provision of an alternate bridge crossing at Yurrumundi if the same "upgraded" intersection layouts outlined in Part 2 of the Congestion Study were used in both data sets. Again, RMS endorsement of the eventual traffic solutions will be officially recognised in the VPA, of which RMS is now a party to, and agreement regarding delivery and payment will be negotiated as a condition of any rezoning.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Level of service within Richmond (March/Bosworth Streets) does not improve in the scenarios modelled.</p> <p>On the basis that no State Government funding can be obtained, suggests that the number of approved lots should be reduced to suit intersection performance.</p> <p>Concern over use of Charles Street as a traffic solution due to proximity of school and capacity as a residential road.</p> <p>Concern over proposed Navua Bridge approaches. NRJV should fund the widening of Grose River Road to minimum acceptable standard.</p> <p>Suggests an overview study regarding Hawkesbury River Bridge capacity to arrive at a coordinated approach whereby funding for Redbank, Glossodia and new Windsor Bridge is instead combined and used to complete the duplication of North Richmond Bridge.</p>	<p>As per our response to the Bells/GVR assessment, the author references two versions of the intersection upgrade - the Part 1 upgrades (used in TMAP) on page 17 of author's report, and the Part 2 "enhanced" upgrades as per diagram on page 19. Again, the author's focus on 2021 data ignores the much improved level of service through the preceding years (benchmarked in TMAP at 2015 and 2018). Also, it appears the author has again compared "apples with oranges" and compared Part 1 upgrades (per TMAP) and assumed the Navua bridge is built in one data set, but then compared it to Part 2 upgrades in the other. No meaningful conclusion can be drawn unless Version 2 upgrades are applied in both data sets. The author again relies on previous assumption that no State Govt funding will ever be found, and no mechanism exists to transfer contributions from Council to RMS (answered in previous responses above).</p> <p>This reasoning is flawed on two levels - firstly the assumption that no State Govt or alternative funding can be obtained (answered above), and secondly, the VPA sets out contributions to road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. Reducing the yield will reduce the extent of any improvements to road and community infrastructure, potentially leaving jobs half-finished.</p> <p>The traffic solutions provided in the TMAP and VPA will need to be re-assessed in light of the Part 2 "enhanced" intersection upgrades as provided in the Richmond Bridge and Approaches Congestion Study</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).</p> <p>The author's recommendation for a coordinated approach is valid, and will depend on the willingness of all parties to negotiate a fair outcome.</p>
134	Jane Uff on behalf of the H.A.R.C	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Increased demand on social services and community infrastructure.</p> <p>Traffic created by this development would impact client's stress levels, travel times (and running costs) for service providers.</p> <p>Capacity of service providers.</p> <p>Emergency access in event of bushfire/flooding north of river.</p> <p>More people mean social issues within the community.</p> <p>Traffic created by this development would impact client's stress levels and negative impact on family relationships, engaging in community life and access health/community services.</p> <p>Shortfall in funding when comparing Richmond Bridge & Approaches Study estimate of intersection works at \$28M whilst VPA capped at \$18.187M.</p> <p>Concerns that under VPA if Navua Bridge does not proceed, funds go to Council, not to road works.</p> <p>Timing of Navua Bridge. Bridge needs to go in first not built after 1001st lot.</p>	<p>Although no specific information given as to the increased demand forecast, the increased population deriving from the proposed development is gradual (over a 10 year period), and government funding is measured and linked in terms of demographics (population, ageing, etc). Also, the proponent is contributing to community infrastructure as outlined in the VPA.</p> <p>Traffic congestion is already an issue impacting on client's stress levels and service providers time/costs - the community has made this very clear. The proposed intersection works outlined in the TMAP/VPA (delivered within first 120 lots) will provide immediate improvement to congestion through the Bells Line of Road corridor. The Navua Bridge will provide further improvements.</p> <p>As per above, additional funding expected with increased population and improvements to community infrastructure.</p> <p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood/fire evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>The percentage of social issues will most likely remain consistent across an increased population. Again, government funding will likely increase to meet this demand. Also, the VPA outlines a number of improvements including roads, cycle/walking trails, open space and recreation areas, preserved natural habitats, increased public transport and improved community facilities - all of this will the liveability (and social fabric) of the area significantly.</p> <p>Traffic congestion is already an issue impacting on commuters - the community has made this very clear. The proposed intersection works outlined in the TMAP/VPA (delivered within first 120 lots) will provide immediate improvement to congestion through the Bells Line of Road corridor. The Navua Bridge will provide further improvements.</p> <p>The estimate of intersection works of \$28M relates to the increased scope/extent of improvements in the updated version of the Study released on August 1st 2013. These supersede the intersection works outlined in initial version of the Study as utilised in the TMAP. The VPA capped contribution of \$18.187M relates to the monetary contribution payable in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. It is calculated in reference to a per lot benchmark (\$13k per lot) which is indexed with CPI/inflation. RMS is now a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contribution will be used by both RMS & Council to address necessary road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge, including the intersection works. In addition to this, the Congestion Study also indicates \$18M in Federal funding will be available toward these improvements beyond 2013-2014. The timing, delivery and payment of these works will be agreed in the final VPA.</p> <p>RMS is now a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contribution will be used by both RMS & Council to address necessary road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge, including the intersection works identified in the RMS Congestion Study.</p> <p>The VPA stipulates the Navua Bridge is to be: designed/approved by 501st lot; construction commenced by 701st lot; operational by 1001st lot.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Impact on Ashton/Grose River Roads and surrounding areas such as Grose Wold/Bowen Mountain.</p> <p>Concern over calculation of "per lot" contributions for community facilities, open space improvements, etc and also funding going to Council not service providers. Timing of provision open to change/review.</p> <p>Concerns over the accuracy of the Community Needs Assessment Report prepared by Urbis. No comment from Department of Education on demand for schools and options for new schools, negligible impact on health/seniors health and access to seniors residential facilities, not enough for youth to do, funding for community facilities, public transport improvements, no police station in Richmond.</p> <p>Need road infrastructure now.</p> <p>Gateway Determination issued to Buildev, who are broke. There are now 5 joint venture partners. What safeguards are in place if one/all go broke?</p> <p>Further consultation is required. Solutions to issues raised need to be addressed and resolved.</p> <p>Jacaranda Ponds development not contributing to North Richmond infrastructure.</p>	<p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders). Traffic heading to the new estate will travel along Grose River Rd and turning into Grose Vale Rd to access the estate. Any additional traffic heading through Grose Wold will be existing residents living further west which currently use Grose Vale Rd only. To encourage use of Grose Vale Rd and ensure that traffic is restricted to local residents only, Council could consider a range of measures including lower speed limits or traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps). This will dealt with during the Bridge Approval process.</p> <p>For simplicity, the draft VPA references monetary contributions on a per lot basis to ensure that the proponents financial obligation is measured throughout the development. The final calculation of Open Space will be determined once detailed plans are completed as part of the DA approval process - as this is a rezone application only, open space can only be estimated at this stage. At present, the draft VPA gives Council the option of either upgrading existing community facilities, or requiring the developer to build new facilities within the proposed development. Community programs will be determined with assistance of Council and service providers.</p> <p>The author of the Community Needs Assessment Report met with the Principle of both Colo High and North Richmond Primary as part of the assessment, and the report indicates that the schools are operating at their natural capacity. The assessment that new high schools will not be needed are on the basis of the future demand calculated in reference to its demographic assessment. The Department of Education and Training is responsible for addressing the issue of capacity and catchments for secondary students and will be involved when the planning outcome of the proposal is known. The options available to the Department would be changes to the catchment boundaries, or the expansion/creation of new capacity.</p> <p>The proponent is currently building a new 80 bed RACF and 197 unit Retirement Village, to be owned and operated by RSL Lifecare. This provides a significant resource for senior residents in the LGA</p> <p>The proposal and VPA outline a number of enhancements to open space & recreational parks, including the provision of bike paths throughout the estate connecting to Nth Richmond township. The In terms of local jobs, the Economic Impact Assessment (on exhibition) shows an estimated 579 direct/indirect jobs during construction phase and 108 new jobs generated from new resident expenditure (post-construction) - this would include opportunities for youth employment.</p> <p>The VPA outlines both dedication of parks and open space for community benefit, along with a monetary contribution (or works in kind) for the expansion and improvement of community facilities (at the election of the Council).</p> <p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online. Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator.</p> <p>The report notes that the Richmond police presence is a "branch" office supported by Local Area Command at Windsor.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>(Council comment) - Jacaranda Ponds is subject to a separate VPA addressing matters directly impacted by that proposal.</p>
135	Ciprian Pasco from Design it Telco	<p>Supporting comments include: Author has worked with major developers on many land releases. The new proposal will have NBN, this will be great for residents, and will provide ongoing employment opportunities for local IT/Telco designers and installers. The new development will be a benefit for residents and local economy.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
136	Graeme & Christine Keeley (Hazelbrook)	<p>Objections / Concerns include: Same as submission number 126.</p>	

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
137	Scott McKune (Bligh Park)	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>Proposal will be a boost for local economy, great opportunity for trades/suppliers, along with much needed housing stock.</p> <p>Children are looking for new homes, cannot find affordable options in Hawkesbury. This project will deliver choice for first home buyers.</p> <p>Senior project manager on RSL project - having local work for trades/suppliers means less need to commute east, which alleviates some of the existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>The proposal will be an economically sound outcome for the Council over many years to come.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
138	Karen McKune (Bligh Park)	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>Proposal will bring many benefits to local businesses.</p> <p>Great short and long term job opportunities.</p> <p>It will provide affordable and modern housing.</p> <p>It will bring about much needed traffic improvements to ease congestion.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
139	Kayla Gatt & Thea Brailey (South Windsor)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion will get worse.</p> <p>Delays for work commute, school pickups.</p> <p>Concerned about availability and level of employment.</p> <p>Who is paying for infrastructure? Shouldn't be rates/taxes.</p> <p>Water supply and water recycling.</p> <p>Impact on native fauna once houses are built.</p> <p>Lack of parking at shops? What is the plan?</p> <p>Lack of public transport and delays with road improvements.</p> <p>Impact of development, long timeframe of disruption.</p> <p>Emergency access in congestion or in event of flood/fire.</p> <p>Build fewer houses over a period of time as needed.</p> <p>Make bridge 4 lanes and higher and provide road improvements prior to new development.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades, and maintenance of existing roads</p> <p>In terms of local jobs, the Economic Impact Assessment (on exhibition) shows an estimated 579 direct/indirect jobs during construction phase and 108 new jobs generated from new resident expenditure (post-construction). The new RSL development is already boosting local businesses and the local economy.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system. Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>Redbank Creek will be a designated Riparian Corridor and Asset Protection Zone, within a proposed open space area. On balance there are very few environmental issues as the site has been extensively cleared for grazing over a prolonged period of time.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.</p> <p>Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator. Road improvements will be managed by RMS to ensure minimal disruption to existing traffic, particularly in peak periods (i.e. road works undertaken at night or outside peak times)</p> <p>Heavy machinery will utilise the internal collector roads off the main entry on Grose Vale Road, as they are currently for the RSL development. This will minimise disruption to existing local roads.</p> <p>Access in the event of congestion, or disaster (flood/fire) is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed road improvements will provide relief to current congestion and consequently assist with emergency response.</p> <p>The proposed development will deliver 1399 dwellings over a 10 year period (i.e. approx. 140 new dwellings per annum) with infrastructure improvements during this time. The production of new houses will ultimately be based on demand for new housing in the Hawkesbury. Greater housing choice is an important issue for first homebuyers.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot. The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Increase contribution to community infrastructure e.g. libraries, hospitals, parks, church.	The VPA outlines both dedication of parks and open space for community benefit, along with a monetary contribution (or works in kind) for the expansion and improvement of community facilities (at the election of the Council).
140	Janet Bourke (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Inadequate infrastructure, lack of public transport, lack of emergency services e.g. hospital, ambulance, fire and police.</p> <p>Emergency service access in congestion or in event of flood/fire.</p> <p>Traffic congestion will get worse.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua Reserve and increased traffic on local roads.</p> <p>Destruction of Keyline System. The site is heritage listed.</p> <p>Lot sizes are inappropriate for rural area.</p> <p>Timing and funding for Navua Bridge in VPA.</p> <p>What if the developer goes broke?</p>	<p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.</p> <p>Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p> <p>Access in the event of flood/fire is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood/fire evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).</p> <p>The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The Keyline System and Dams will be substantially retained and interpreted for public parks and cycling/walking paths.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The capped contribution definition relates to the monetary contribution payable in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. It is calculated in reference to a per lot benchmark (\$13k per lot) which is indexed with CPI/inflation. RMS is being added as a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contribution will be used by both RMS & Council to address necessary road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p>
141	Lea Sainsbury & Simon Bakhos (Kurrajong Heights)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Live in the area for the rural amenity.</p> <p>Partner is a tradesman who commutes to Sydney metro area.</p> <p>Traffic congestion will get worse.</p> <p>Access to emergency medical services.</p>	<p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>In terms of local jobs, the Economic Impact Assessment (on exhibition) shows an estimated 579 direct/indirect jobs during construction phase and 108 new jobs generated from new resident expenditure (post-construction).</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Timing of infrastructure improvements. Needed before development.	The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.
142	Tony Buccini (North Richmond)	Objections / Concerns include: Same as submission number 85.	Refer to response to Submission #85
143	Denyse Chesterman (Bowen Mountain)	Objections / Concerns include: Same as submission number 121.	Refer to response to Submission #121
144	E Blyton (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>No guarantee that the developer will deliver facilities or upgrades.</p> <p>A slower rate of development (in time with infrastructure upgrades) more appropriate.</p> <p>No emergency services west of the river e.g. police, fire, ambulance and hospital.</p> <p>Lack of shopping facilities. Post Office and parking already at capacity.</p> <p>Impact of development on endangered fauna in the area and Redbank Creek.</p> <p>Traffic congestion causing delay to recovery of patients of St John of God.</p> <p>Proposal not in keeping with existing developments, lot sizes are inappropriate. Development will create a "ghetto".</p> <p>Stormwater runoff into Redbank Creek and existing residences.</p> <p>Traffic congestion on key intersections will get worse.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua Reserve e.g. impact on environment, loss of recreational opportunities, reduction in tourism. Reserve developed by the community.</p>	<p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed.</p> <p>The proposed development will deliver 1399 dwellings over a 10 year period (i.e. approx. 140 new dwellings per annum). The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.</p> <p>The "Environment Assessment" and "Environmental Benefits and Constraints Analysis" are on exhibition and identify all key issues and proposed mitigants. On balance there are very few environmental issues as the site has been extensively cleared for grazing over a prolonged period of time. Redbank Creek will be a designated Riparian Corridor and Asset Protection Zone, within a proposed open space area.</p> <p>Access to emergency call outs is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. even without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved to resolve existing congestion issues.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m². The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m² to 2000m² plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m²</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP. Stormwater retention and treatment will take into account any latent deficiencies, changes to upstream water bodies (dams in Peel Farm), as well as any future development.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Proposal failed the State Government "Review of Potential Housing Sites".</p> <p>Development should be east of river on flood free land where infrastructure already exists.</p> <p>Lack of coherent planning/development west of river.</p>	<p>The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.</p> <p>The subject land neighbours existing urban development, and connects to existing infrastructure and the Nth Richmond township. This is consistent with the objectives of the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy (up to 6000 new dwellings by 2031 in existing urban areas) and confirmed in DPI's North West Subregional Strategy. To spread more dwellings throughout the LGA rather than in identified residential investigation areas will affect far more rural lands than the current proposal.</p>
145	Colleen Turnbull (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>TMAP assumes all work on Bells Line of Road is completed, whilst RMS does not indicate time or funding for these works.</p> <p>Access to site should not be via Pecks Road. Grose Vale Road access needs improvements.</p> <p>Community Needs report has a number of false conclusions, because a number of facilities require private transport to access.</p> <p>Riparian zones will be in private hands and will lead to degradation of Redbank Creek.</p> <p>North Richmond has flooded previously and no flood study to measure run-off from new development.</p> <p>Lot sizes are inappropriate for rural area.</p> <p>Lack of funding for infrastructure. State Government estimates \$100M, developer only contributing \$21M.</p> <p>NRJV does not have experience or money to fulfil development. What due diligence has Council undertaken?</p> <p>What level of Bank support is there?</p> <p>Development should be east of river on flood free land where infrastructure already exists.</p> <p>VPA in favour of developer.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot. The latest Hyder/RMS issue of the Richmond Bridge & Congestion Study confirms Federal Govt funding of \$18M toward intersection and bridge improvements. State Govt funding towards this corridor will be determined in future year's budgets. The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>Heavy machinery will utilise the internal collector roads off the existing entry on Grose Vale Road, as they are currently for the RSL development. The proponent will be required to widen Grose Vale Rd to include left-in turning lane and left-out merge, as well as a dedicated right-in turning lane.</p> <p>Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator. The fact that local facilities can only be accessed by private vehicle does not render them unusable.</p> <p>Redbank Creek will be a designated Riparian Corridor and Asset Protection Zone, within a proposed open space area. The Proponent maintains Reserves during on-maintenance (performance bond) period, and Council thereafter.</p> <p>Stormwater retention and treatment will take into account any latent deficiencies, changes to upstream water bodies (dams in Peel Farm), as well the proposed development.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The contribution referred to relates to the monetary contribution payable to Council in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. The total financial contribution by the developer will also include amounts for open space & drainage dedication, maintenance, community facilities and services beyond the capped amount in question.</p> <p>The Gateway Determination was subject to a review by the Planning Assessment Commission, which included due diligence into the Developer. The partners within the NRJV have been active in the development industry for over 40 years - please refer to submission #87 for more information.</p> <p>Please refer to Submission #63 from NAB.</p> <p>(Council comment) - Apart from land in the Growth Centre (Vineyard) the land east of the river is subject to significant flood affectation. (See Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy).</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
146	Heather Nutman (Londonderry)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>No infrastructure to support development.</p> <p>No emergency services west of river.</p> <p>Traffic congestion will get worse.</p> <p>Poor public transport.</p> <p>Nothing for youth to do.</p> <p>Lot sizes are inappropriate for rural area.</p>	<p>With regards to power Endeavour Energy there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>The Proponent has entered into an agreement with NBN Co for the new estate, and this may bring forward the timetable for NBN rollout for existing residents.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online. Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator.</p> <p>The proposal and VPA outline a number of enhancements to open space & recreational parks, including the provision of bike paths throughout the estate connecting to Nth Richmond township. In terms of local jobs, the Economic Impact Assessment (on exhibition) shows an estimated 579 direct/indirect jobs during construction phase and 108 new jobs generated from new resident expenditure (post-construction) - this would include opportunities for youth employment.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m². The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m² to 2000m² plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m²</p>
147	John Maguire (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Timing of road infrastructure. Should go in first to deal with congestion.</p> <p>Concern over timing of Navua Bridge. Wants a guarantee it will be built.</p> <p>What if the developer goes broke?</p> <p>What about improvements to Bells Line of Road corridor and "superhighway" by State and Federal Governments.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. It also stipulates the Navua Bridge is to be: designed/approved by 501st lot; construction commenced by 701st lot; operational by 1001st lot.</p> <p>The capped contribution definition relates to the monetary contribution payable in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. It is calculated in reference to a per lot benchmark (\$13k per lot) which is indexed with CPI/inflation. RMS is being added as a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contribution will be used by both RMS & Council to address necessary road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p>
148	Anita Burgess (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion means delays for work and school drop-off. Will get worse with new development.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021. The initial intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, which will improve local travel times. Further improvements will be made when the Navua Bridge is built and operational.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Lot sizes are inconsistent with character of surrounding area.</p> <p>Loss of rural amenity.</p> <p>Use of Pecks Road to access estate.</p> <p>Impact on flora/fauna and water quality in Redbank Creek. Damage to Navua Reserve.</p> <p>No emergency services west of the river e.g. police, ambulance, hospital.</p> <p>Should be lower density development with infrastructure in place first.</p>	<p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The subject land neighbours existing urban development, and connects to existing infrastructure and the Nth Richmond township. This is consistent with the objectives of the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy (up to 6000 new dwellings by 2031 in existing urban areas) and confirmed in DPI's North West Subregional Strategy. To spread more dwellings throughout the LGA rather than in identified residential investigation areas will affect far more rural lands than the current proposal.</p> <p>Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dve (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Rd</p> <p>The "Environment Assessment" and "Environmental Benefits and Constraints Analysis" are on exhibition and identify all key issues and proposed mitigants. On balance there are very few environmental issues as the site has been extensively cleared for grazing over a prolonged period of time. Redbank Creek will be a designated Riparian Corridor and Asset Protection Zone, within a proposed open space area.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. Reducing the yield will reduce the extent of any improvements to road and community infrastructure.</p>
149	Adam Shaffer (Windsor)	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>Will make North Richmond a better town.</p> <p>Will boost the local economy, more infrastructure, more jobs.</p> <p>Will be of benefit to whole community.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
150	Natalie McKune (Bligh Park)	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>Will create jobs in the area.</p> <p>Will provide first time home buyers with affordable choice, especially young locals who want to stay in Hawkesbury.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
151	Linda Duckworth (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Destruction of Navua Reserve e.g. loss of recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Impact of Navua Bridge traffic on local roads and surrounds.</p> <p>Significant planning and infrastructure required first before development.</p>	<p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders). Traffic heading to the new estate will travel along Grose River Rd and turning into Grose Vale Rd to access the estate. Any additional traffic heading through Grose Wold will be existing residents living further west which currently use Grose Vale Rd only. To encourage use of Grose Vale Rd and ensure that traffic is restricted to local residents only, Council could consider a range of measures including lower speed limits or traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps). This will be dealt with during the Bridge Approval process.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly.</p>
152	Anne Nelson	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion is already a problem and will get worse.</p> <p>No rail west of river, so roads are it and they are inadequate.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The intersection improvements paid by the developer (confirmed in VPA) will provide relief to existing traffic congestion, and will ensure that State/Fed funding can be focussed on future BLR/NR Bridge upgrades, and maintenance of existing roads</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Emergency access in event of bushfire/flooding. How to evacuate community?</p> <p>Rural amenity lifestyle will change with additional development/population.</p> <p>Council favouring development without listening to community wishes.</p>	<p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. It is essential that residents take responsibility to follow the instructions of Emergency Services in the event of natural disasters. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood/fire evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>The proposed development is consistent with the Council's Vision for Hawkesbury, it will retain rural amenity by ensuring appropriate zoning and rural conservation via the Development Control Plan & Conservation Management Plan (Vision 1), it will minimise the ecological footprint by having three times the Open Space as comparable development and providing protection zones around environmentally sensitive areas (Vision 2), and finally will provide much needed infrastructure improvements (namely water, sewer, stormwater and roads) for existing residents (Vision 3).</p>
153	Finn Jakobsen (Bowen Mtn)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing river crossings are inadequate with significant congestion.</p> <p>Grose Vale Road quality is poor. Increased traffic will cause further deterioration.</p> <p>Fit for rural purpose only. Productive agricultural land should be reserved for food production.</p> <p>Impact of development on Redbank Creek flora and fauna.</p> <p>Council is not complying with the Community Strategic Plan in terms of governance & community leadership. Direction - Have transparent, accountable and respected leadership and an engaged community. Strategy - Achieve community respect through good corporate governance and community leadership and engagement.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Widening of Grose Vale Rd would require the compulsory acquisition of land which would be met with some resistance by the local community. The proponent will be required to widen Grose Vale Rd to include left-in turning lane and left-out merge, as well as a dedicated right-in turning lane.</p> <p>The relatively small scale of the property and the high statutory cost of holding the land meant it was becoming financially unviable to continue as a farm. To undertake intensive commercially viable agricultural uses such as poultry, hydroponics and mushrooms would impact on immediately adjoining residential location.</p> <p>The "Environment Assessment" and "Environmental Benefits and Constraints Analysis" are on exhibition and identify all key issues and proposed mitigants. On balance there are very few environmental issues as the site has been extensively cleared for grazing over a prolonged period of time. Redbank Creek will be a designated Riparian Corridor and Asset Protection Zone, within a proposed open space area.</p>
154	Natalie McEvoy (Environmental Consultant - Arterra)	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>Author working with the project team tasked with delivering the proposal. Focus is on creating a quality place to live.</p> <p>Proposed amenity to residents and public via open space is exceptional.</p> <p>Strongly committed to preserving heritage elements and providing above average environmental outcomes, particularly in water management and re-use.</p> <p>Sees the Redbank proposal as benefitting the whole LGA.</p> <p>Pedestrian/cycle paths within estate creates sense of space.</p> <p>Focus on tree-planting as per Keyline.</p> <p>Will provide a rich and well integrated place to live and provide benefit to whole community needs.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
155	Colin Tindale (Kurrajong)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Development should be focussed east of the river, between Windsor and Bligh Park and Vineyard, where there is appropriate infrastructure.</p>	<p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Doubling the size of North Richmond Village.	The subject land neighbours existing urban development, and connects to existing infrastructure and the Nth Richmond township. This is consistent with the objectives of the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy (up to 6000 new dwellings by 2031 in existing urban areas) and confirmed in DPI's North West Subregional Strategy. To spread more dwellings throughout the LGA rather than in identified residential investigation areas will affect far more rural lands than the current proposal.
		Disagrees with findings of TMAP. It is Inconsistent with RMS congestion study.	The TMAP has been peer-reviewed by an independent engineering consultant on Council's and NSW Department of Planning behalf and reviewed by RMS.
		Public transport provided by private operator and not used by locals because it is infrequent and sporadic. Questions viability of bus service.	This is quite a valid concern - PT will only improve with demand, and with so few locals using PT there is unlikely to be improvements without generating demand via development. The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.
		Retention of heritage/rural amenity onsite is the only way community benefits.	The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The State Heritage listing was widely advertised and advised to interested parties. The listing of the site on the State Heritage Register would clearly indicate the heritage value has been recognised. The Keyline System and Dams will be substantially retained and interpreted for public parks and cycling/walking paths - for community use and benefit
		Trunk drainage/riparian areas of no community benefit.	The proposed development will minimise the ecological footprint by having three times the Open Space as comparable development and providing protection zones around environmentally sensitive areas. Stormwater retention and treatment will take into account any latent/existing deficiencies, changes to upstream water bodies (dams in Peel Farm), as well as any future development. The riparian areas will be public open space for community use and benefit
		Landscape embellishment (including cycle/walking paths) of no community benefit.	Landscape embellishments, in particular cycle and walking paths, will open up previously private rural land (including protected natural habitats) for the public's enjoyment, and lead to active and healthy communities. There will be linkages from these pathways to the North Richmond township. This is a community benefit
		What about enhancements to existing community facilities?	The VPA states that the developer either builds new facilities or provides monetary contributions to Council to enhance existing community facilities.
		No need for additional shopping centre, North Richmond Shopping Village is adequate.	
		Disagrees that jobs will be created. Only long term jobs will be in aged care facility.	The Economic Impact Assessment takes into account jobs created directly by the development, but also factors in the boost in local economy from increased population.
		Lot sizes are inappropriate for rural area, and concerned about visual impact of roof tops when viewed from Grose Vale Road.	Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2
		Inadequate water and sewerage services, no allowance in VPA for upgrades.	With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.
		Impact on traffic congestion. Navua Bridge modelling is not valid, unlikely that people will use it.	Assumptions used in the modelling of the Navua Bridge were validated independently by GTA Consultants on behalf of Council and RMS.
		Impact of Navua Bridge traffic on local roads and surrounds.	TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders). Traffic heading to the new estate will travel along Grose River Rd and turning into Grose Vale Rd to access the estate. Any additional traffic heading through Grose Wold will be existing residents living further west which currently use Grose Vale Rd only. To encourage use of Grose Vale Rd and ensure that traffic is restricted to local residents only, Council could consider a range of measures including lower speed limits or traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps). This will dealt with during the Bridge Approval process.
		Planning/approvals for Navua Bridge. Need to acquire land for Ashton Road widening.	Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies. This will include an assessment on any additional requirements of the bridge and approaches.
		Destruction of Navua and Yarramundi Reserves. Local of recreational opportunities, should preserve community asset and amenity.	The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.
		Road corridor within Navua Reserve meant for horse and cart, not enough for a bridge. Toilet and carpark will require relocation.	Please refer to the indicative plan for the Navua Bridge in the TMAP. The corridor is suitable for a single lane bridge.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Timing of Navua Bridge? Not built til 700 lots released. What happens if it is too expensive?</p> <p>Navua Bridge impractical, not a flood free route. Duplication of North Richmond Bridge would be better.</p> <p>RMS traffic solutions in congestion report better for community.</p> <p>Funding for RMS long term solutions.</p> <p>Lack of capacity in local schools.</p> <p>Should wait until State Government funds improvements before approving rezone.</p>	<p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. It also stipulates the Navua Bridge is to be: designed/approved by 501st lot; construction commenced by 701st lot; operational by 1001st lot. The Developer only has the ability to opt for a monetary contribution where it was unable to obtain planning approval for a bridge. The capped contribution is then paid to RMS (now a party to the VPA).</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads. Duplication of Nth Richmond bridge would be a better option, however the cost involved requires coordinating funding from Federal and State Govt and future development in the LGA.</p> <p>The proponent supports the updated traffic improvements as reported in the Richmond Bridge and Approaches Congestion Study. The draft VPA will be review in light of these changes.</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021. Delaying development will deprive the State and Local Govt with the necessary funding to complete these works now.</p>
156	Sandra Kelly	<p>Objections / Concerns include: Same as submission number 144.</p>	<p>As per response to Submission # 144</p>
157	Savanna Robinson	<p>Objections / Concerns include: Same as submission number 144.</p>	<p>As per response to Submission # 144</p>
158	Grant O'Hare (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing heavy and dangerous traffic congestion.</p> <p>Public amenities (shops) are inadequate.</p> <p>Inadequate public transport for the area.</p> <p>No hospital or large-scale medical facilities for the area.</p> <p>No emergency services west of river e.g. ambulance and police.</p> <p>Navua Bridge impractical, not a flood free route. Duplication of North Richmond Bridge would be better.</p> <p>Stop development, improve local infrastructure.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.</p> <p>This is quite a valid concern - PT will only improve with demand, and with so few locals using PT there is unlikely to be improvements without generating demand via development. The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five</p> <p>Areas east of the site (the western Sydney trough) including Yarramundi Bridge will be under water in the event of significant flood. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>Development contributions are a means to improving local infrastructure, which is already struggling to cope. Coordinated delivery of infrastructure is possible, to be paid for by the proposal and not local ratepayers.</p>
159	Adam Phillips (Werrington Downs)	<p>Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
160	David Smith (Ryde)	<p>Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
161	Tu Tran (Fairfield East)	<p>Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
162	Gary Bleeks (Leumeah)	<p>Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
163	Henry Cai (Lakemba)	<p>Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
164	Simon Boutres (Clemton Park)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
165	Darren Wakeling (Currans Hill)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
166	Jaad Ghaby (Guildford)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
167	Steve Beadman (Kelso)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
168	Stephen Harris (Belmont)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
169	Jenni Heads	Same as submission number 144.	As per response to Submission # 144
170	Tony Scott (Quadrant Creative)	Supporting comments include: Author has long history working with the proponents, dating back to the early 1980's. Experience of NRJV second to none. In particular the vision, market knowledge, attention to detail that comes from experience of delivering projects. Redbank proposal epitomises "best practice" in action, due to the attributes of the site and the enhancements planned. Proposal will enhance and preserve the quality and lifestyle of North Richmond for generations to come.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
171	Jim Moores (Quadrant Creative)	Supporting comments include: Author excited to be working on a project which tells the Redbank story. One of high quality residential land with larger than average prestige homesites centred around preserved central parkland accessible to the wider community. Open space is at least three times that of competing developments.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
172	Grant Newby (Quadrant Creative)	Supporting comments include: Redbank typifies a quality development. Open space, larger lot sizes, planned amenity will be key to a high quality residential project. Designed to preserve and enhance the quality and lifestyle of the region.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
173	Anne & John Duffy (Grose Wold)	Objections / Concerns include: A resident of Hawkesbury for 70yrs. Development usually has community consultation. Traffic congestion makes it hard to access Bells Line of Road. Will get worse with Redbank. Capacity of water and sewer (was a constraint of developing Pecks Road 20 years ago). More amenable to rural blocks where people provide own services.	The Exhibition process (lasting 60 days) is aimed to allow residents to submit their concerns about future development. Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021. With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system. The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Lot sizes are inappropriate for rural area.</p> <p>No emergency services west of the river.</p> <p>Emergency access in congestion. A concern if need to get to hospital.</p> <p>What if the developer goes broke? What guarantee of delivery?</p> <p>RSL over-55's - what happens when residents move on? Do families move in?</p> <p>Destruction of Navua Reserve and work undertaken by volunteers.</p> <p>Development should be east of river on flood free land where infrastructure already exists.</p> <p>Impact of Navua Bridge traffic on local roads and surrounds.</p>	<p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA/TMAP will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed.</p> <p>Further information on RSL policy regarding its communities (including minimum age of residents) can be found at www.rslifecare.org.au</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>(Council comment) - Apart from land in the Growth Centre (Vineyard) the land east of the river is subject to significant flood affectation. (See Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy).</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.).</p>
174	Louise Carter (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion will get worse with proposed development, even on weekends.</p> <p>Inadequate public transport for the area.</p> <p>Doesn't believe Navua Bridge would be a better option than focussing on Bells Line of Road corridor and duplicating Richmond Bridge.</p> <p>What if the developer goes broke? What guarantee of delivery?</p> <p>Has a study been done into impact of the increase in traffic? How bad does it get?</p> <p>Are there plan to increase public transport, making sure that each transport links to a connecting destination.</p> <p>Are the developers paying a fee upfront for the future construction of a bridge or a bank guarantee?</p> <p>Navua Bridge is not flood free.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online. Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator.</p> <p>RMS have recently released an update on the Richmond Bridge and Approaches Congestion Study, which includes further enhancements to the BLR Corridor, and the recommendation of a Richmond Bridge duplication. The VPA will be revisited in light of these new proposals.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed.</p> <p>The proponent has completed a TMAP and RMS has completed the Richmond Bridge and Approaches Congestion Study. Both of these have shown that intersection improvements along the BLR corridor will provide substantial improvements to congestion (level of service improving from "F" to "C"), with further improvements in the long term when upgrades to river crossings are carried out.</p> <p>Areas east of the site (the western Sydney trough) including Yarramundi Bridge will be under water in the event of significant flood. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Lot sizes are inappropriate for rural area. Will these be allowed elsewhere in the Hawkesbury?</p>	<p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p>
175	Alexander Rimmelt (ML Design)	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>Commends the Council for its proposal to rezone land for community benefit. Will lead to improved facilities and greater prospects for growth/prosperity.</p> <p>Provides significantly more open space than comparable developments in western Sydney.</p> <p>Diversity and embellishment of the open space will be of community benefit (connectivity).</p> <p>Proponent is a highly experienced development team who recognises and will work with the sites best attributes, particularly Yeoman's Keyline.</p> <p>Sustainable water management throughout the site.</p> <p>Diversity of housing options. Good for first home buyers.</p> <p>Proposal is an opportunity to create a landmark residential community which will benefit the wider community.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
176	Stephanie Barker (ae design partnership)	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>Commends the Council for its proposal to rezone land.</p> <p>Proposal comprehensively considers the key issues of heritage and traffic.</p> <p>Redbank is well located and a logical extension of North Richmond township.</p> <p>Managing growth through expansion will mean new residents become part of the local community and Hawkesbury character endures.</p> <p>Provides much needed housing supply at a scale suitable to Hawkesbury and should be supported.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
177	Eric Dickinson (Nth Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Impact of increased in traffic in Pecks Road. Concerned about safety.</p> <p>Lack of emergency services west of the river.</p> <p>Roads/infrastructure should be improved first.</p> <p>VPA in favour of developer.</p>	<p>Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dve (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Rd. Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p>
178	Leiatusa Iosalu (Nth Mead)	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
179	Shane Saulala (Guildford)	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSANT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
180	Jim Parras (Harrington Park)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
181	Michael Kubik (Grendale)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
182	Ross Humble (Sussex Inlet)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
183	Chris Palaitis (Woollamia)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
184	M Longham (Kurrajong)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
185	Tony Allchin (McGraths Hill)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
186	Signed (Winsten Hills)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
187	Shane Spinks (Canton Beach)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
188	Dane Hamill (Shoalhaven Heads)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
189	David Leaper (Blackheath)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
190	Matthew Young (Cranebrook)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
191	Jason DeJoux (Nth Richmond)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
192	Matthew Crawford (Nth Richmond)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
193	James Beckett (Nth Richmond)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
194	Troy Bampton (Davlan Roof Tiling)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
195	Mario Gallo (Londenderry)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
196	Andrew Terri (Westmead)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
197	Daniel Terri (Londonderry)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
198	Wendy Middleton	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
199	Riverfront Seafood (Nth Richmond)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
200	Signed (Dean Park)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
201	Alexander Bramley (Nth Richmond)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
202	B Sherratt (Nth Richmond)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
203	W Minnett (Kurrajong Heights)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
204	D Taylor (Glen Alpine)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
205	William Wise (South Penrith)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
206	Malcolm Price (Kurrajong)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
207	Jon Bonney (Wahroonga)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
208	Adels Nth Richmond Pharmacy	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
209	Nicole Elfar CTC Nth Richmond	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
210	Signed (Grose Vale)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
211	Signed (Nth Richmond)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
212	Peter Cole (Nth Richmond)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
213	Jodie Kelly (Bligh Park)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
214	Rebecca Hall (Kurrajong)	Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
215	B McManus (Grose Vale)	Supporting comments include: Same as submission number 126.	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
216	Beatriz Insausti (Nth Richmond)	<p>Objections / concerns are same as per number 145, but also include:</p> <p>TMAP assumes all work on Bells Line of Road is completed however State Government does not indicate time or funding for these works.</p> <p>Increase in traffic in Pecks Road, Grose Vale Road and Bells Line of Road. Concerned about safety.</p> <p>Community Needs report has a number of false conclusions because a number of facilities are private facilities and require private transport to access.</p> <p>Riparian zones will be in private hands, will lead to degradation of Redbank Creek.</p> <p>North Richmond has flooded previously and no flood study to measure run-off from new development.</p> <p>Lot sizes are inappropriate for area, loss of property values.</p> <p>Lack of emergency services west of river e.g. ambulance, fire, police, hospital.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot. The latest Hyder/RMS issue of the Richmond Bridge & Congestion Study confirms Federal Govt funding of \$18M toward intersection and bridge improvements. State Govt funding towards this corridor will be determined in future year's budgets. The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>Heavy machinery will utilise the internal collector roads off the existing entry on Grose Vale Road, as they are currently for the RSL development. The proponent will be required to widen Grose Vale Rd to include left-in turning lane and left-out merge, as well as a dedicated right-in turning lane.</p> <p>The report in question was an assessment of all social infrastructure in the area. The fact that local facilities are not used or can only be accessed by private vehicle does not mean that they should be excluded. Frequency and location of local bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator.</p> <p>Redbank Creek will be a designated Riparian Corridor and Asset Protection Zone, within a proposed open space area. The Proponent maintains Reserves during on-maintenance (performance bond) period, and Council thereafter.</p> <p>Stormwater retention and treatment will take into account any latent deficiencies, changes to upstream water bodies (dams in Peel Farm), as well the proposed development.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Emergency response times due to traffic congestion.	Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion <i>already exists and will increase</i> with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.
		VPA in favour of developer.	The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed.
217	Di & John Roberts (Nth Richmond)	Objections / Concerns include:	
		No guarantee that the developer will deliver facilities or upgrades.	The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed.
		Council said they would not support development until infrastructure is put in place.	As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, and these intersection works will improve the level of service significantly. The construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed and be operational prior to the delivery of the 1001st lot.
		Lot sizes are inappropriate for area.	Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m ² . The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m ² to 2000m ² plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m ²
		Traffic congestion already bad and will get worse with development.	Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.
		Needs to upgrade existing services. Rates have gone up but facilities like Medicare, library, ambulance, police, and fire services are not on western side of river. Increase in heavy goods delivery vehicles to North Richmond Shopping Village.	The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.
			The VPA outlines both dedication of parks and open space for community benefit, along with a monetary contribution (or works in kind) for the expansion and improvement of community facilities (at the election of the Council).
		Inadequate public transport for the area. More buses means more traffic.	The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online. It is generally accepted fact that increased public transport use reduces traffic volumes.
		Increase in traffic in Pecks Road. Concerned about safety.	Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dve (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Rd. Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.
		Concerned that Charles Road and Pecks Road will eventually have signalised intersections at Grose Vale Road creating further delays.	Please refer to the RMS Richmond Bridge and Approaches Congestion Study for future traffic congestion solutions.
		Proposed Navua Bridge won't be flood free and approach roads inappropriate to cater for traffic.	Areas east of the site (the western Sydney trough) including Yarramundi Bridge will be under water in the event of significant flood. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood. TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).
		VPA in favour of developer. Put infrastructure in first.	The VPA in its current draft form reflects the fact existing infrastructure needs improving first (i.e. the intersections noted in RMS & TMAP reports), and also specifies milestones for bridge design, approval, construction, and becoming operational.
218	Debra Fitzgibbon (Grose Vale)	Objections / Concerns include:	
		Area cannot sustain further development. Lack of infrastructure.	The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land.
			The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The Keyline System and Dams will be substantially retained and interpreted for public parks and cycling/walking paths.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Destruction of agriculture and rural history.	The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.
		Richmond Bridge and approaches are under standard, needs improvement, but no funding available from State or Local Government.	As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.
		Redbank proposal seems in direct contravention to many points contained in the NSW Urban Activation Precincts Guidelines.	The NSW Urban Activation Precincts Guidelines are: consistent with local/regional/state plans for housing, use/support existing and planned infrastructure (particularly transport), has support of local council, is environmentally/socially/economically sustainable and viable, and is development viable and consistent with market demand. The proposal meets these guidelines and the VPA proposes solutions to resolve existing infrastructure issues.
		Lot sizes are inappropriate for rural area.	Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2
		Development is car dependent and inadequate public transport will not alleviate congestion. Additional traffic will create additional noise and pollution.	Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator.
		Lack of emergency services, hospital, child care and transport options west of the river.	The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.
		Lack of school places.	The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.
		Lack of affordable housing options and seniors housing options.	The rationale for including R3 Zoning (minimum lot sizes 180sqm) is to provide affordable housing choice. The proponent is currently building a new 80 bed RACF and 197 unit Retirement Village, to be owned and operated by RSL Lifecare. This provides a significant resource for senior residents in the LGA
		Development will create a community of isolated residents.	The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly. The proposal provides a focal point for community engagement and activity.
		North Richmond & surrounds presents no significant employment opportunities.	In terms of local jobs, the Economic Impact Assessment (on exhibition) shows an estimated 579 direct/indirect jobs during construction phase and 108 new jobs generated from new resident expenditure (post-construction). Please refer to the North West Growth Strategy for further information on job creation.
		Destruction of Navua Reserve. Reserve is a Koala corridor and bird watching site. Impact on flora and fauna and creek.	Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage, and Environment & Heritage.
		Council not representing constituents, rates going up, destroying heritage of area (Windsor Bridge/CSG exploration).	Council to respond.
219	Patricia Blyton	Objections / Concerns include: Same as submission number 144.	Please refer to response to Submission #144
220	Rebecca Sykes	Objections / Concerns include: Same as submission number 144.	Please refer to response to Submission #144
221	D Sykes (Nth Richmond)	Objections / Concerns include: Same as submission number 144.	Please refer to response to Submission #144
222	Christine Foote (Nth Richmond)	Objections / Concerns include: Traffic congestion is bad and will get worse with development. Increase in traffic will impact negatively on health due to increased noise, vibration, particulate air pollution, stress and reduction in pedestrian safety.	Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Proposed Navua Bridge won't be flood free and approach roads inappropriate to handle traffic. Impact on environment and loss of recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Lot sizes are inappropriate for area.</p> <p>Impact on Redbank Creek flora and fauna from stormwater run-off.</p> <p>Council cannot maintain public open space e.g. Peel Park playground has deteriorated so badly that it is unsafe for use and toilets are locked. Developer needs to contribute.</p> <p>Lack of footpath on Grose Vale Road.</p>	<p>Areas east of the site (the western Sydney trough) including Yarramundi Bridge will be under water in the event of significant flood. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood. TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>The VPA outlines both dedication of parks and open space for community benefit, along with a monetary contribution (or works in kind) for the expansion and improvement of community facilities (at the election of the Council). This will include improvements to Peel Park.</p> <p>Along with extensive footpaths and bikeways within the estate, the Proponent will work with Council to ensure suitable connectivity to North Richmond township.</p>
223	E. Betancur (North Richmond)	<p>Consistent traffic delays. Increase in traffic will create acute chaos in the area. Increase in traffic noise, pollution, dust and deterioration of road surfaces.</p> <p>Impact and traffic on local roads in particular Pecks Road which has no footpaths.</p> <p>Increase in trucks using Pecks Road.</p> <p>Concerned about run-off into Redbank Creek.</p> <p>Development should not proceed until all recommended improvements are made.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dr (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Rd. Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.</p> <p>Along with extensive footpaths and bikeways within the estate, the Proponent will work with Council to ensure suitable connectivity to North Richmond township.</p> <p>Heavy machinery will utilise the internal collector roads off the existing entry on Grose Vale Road, as they are currently for the RSL development.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>The VPA provides for infrastructure improvements to solve existing and future issues progressively over the life of the project.</p>
224	G. Lafferty (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Consistent traffic delays.</p> <p>Should be improvements to Bells Line of Road / Grose Vale Road intersection and Yarramundi Lane / Kurrajong Road intersection.</p> <p>Impact and traffic on local roads, in particular Pecks Road.</p> <p>Lack of footpaths in area.</p> <p>Against more truck noise, dust and pollution along Pecks Road. Concerned about noise, dust and pollution during building and construction.</p> <p>Redbank Creek will become more polluted and eroded.</p> <p>A bridge should not be allowed across Navua due to people that use it and traffic along Grose River Road.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The TMAP and VPA confirm that these intersections will be upgraded within the first 120 lots.</p> <p>Residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dr (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Rd. Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.</p> <p>Along with extensive footpaths and bikeways within the estate, the Proponent will work with Council to ensure suitable connectivity to North Richmond township.</p> <p>Heavy machinery will utilise the internal collector roads off the existing entry on Grose Vale Road, as they are currently for the RSL development.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Why have more bus stops when there are no buses?</p> <p>Against the community centre proposed in Peel Park, this is unnecessary spending when one exists in William Street. Other improvements to Peel Park could be sun shelter over children's play area, extend for dog park, seating.</p>	<p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).</p> <p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.</p> <p>The VPA outlines both dedication of parks and open space for community benefit, along with a monetary contribution (or works in kind) for the expansion and improvement of community facilities (at the election of the Council).</p>
225	Shane Macgregor from Quadrant Creative	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>Redbank is a beautiful site with the developers intention to retain that look with open space and parklands and the traditional neighbourhood setting.</p> <p>Considers the Redbank proposal to be of the highest quality.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
226	Alan Eagle (Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion.</p> <p>The extra traffic to travel down Grose River Road through Navua Reserve is wrong for the region and contrary to why author choose to live in the Hawkesbury.</p> <p>VPA refers to monetary contribution for Navua Bridge if approvals aren't issued. Concerned that alternative payment of contributions to Council will not solve traffic issues. What happens is the developer goes bust.</p> <p>Maintain rural amenity and put development east of the river. Look for alternatives such a new North Richmond Bridge and widen approaches. Consider use of Transfer of Development Rights.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Traffic heading to the new estate will travel along Grose River Rd and turning into Grose Vale Rd to access the estate. Any additional traffic heading through Grose Wold will be existing residents living further west which currently use Grose Vale Rd only. To encourage use of Grose Vale Rd and ensure that traffic is restricted to local residents only, Council could consider a range of measures including lower speed limits or traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps). This will be dealt with during the Bridge Approval process.</p> <p>The monetary contribution is payable in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. It is calculated in reference to a per lot benchmark (\$13k per lot) which is indexed with CPI/inflation. RMS is being added as a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contribution will be used by RMS to address necessary road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge (i.e. used to make improvements as stated in the Richmond Bridge and approaches congestion study).</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p>
227	Simon Parsonage	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure on the western side of the river.</p> <p>Traffic congestion.</p> <p>Lack of public infrastructure e.g. pools, libraries, sporting complexes, fields, ovals and cycleways. Need properly planned and funded infrastructure.</p> <p>Putting a bridge through Navua Reserve is vandalistic and shameful.</p>	<p>With regards to power Endeavour Energy there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The VPA outlines both dedication of parks and open space for community benefit, along with a monetary contribution (or works in kind) for the expansion and improvement of community facilities (at the election of the Council).</p> <p>Along with extensive footpaths and bikeways within the estate, the Proponent will work with Council to ensure suitable connectivity to North Richmond township.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Feeder roads to bridge are unsafe for the volume of traffic. Road network should be expanded.	TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).
228	Finola McConaghy (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Lot sizes too small (e.g. 180sqm).</p> <p>Infrastructure not suitable.</p> <p>No public transport.</p> <p>There are no jobs and no industry to support jobs.</p> <p>There are no major shopping centres and no suitable access roads to existing shops.</p> <p>The development will reduce the quality of life for existing residents.</p> <p>Inadequate emergency services e.g. ambulance, police, fire. Concerned about response times.</p> <p>VPA in favour of the developer.</p> <p>What guarantees are there that the works under VPA will be completed?</p> <p>Destruction of Navua and Yarramundi Reserves to build a bridge that is not flood free is senseless. Impact on environment and loss of recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Appropriate infrastructure must be in place prior to any rezoning proposal.</p> <p>Plus matters raised in submission number 218.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>With regards to power Endeavour Energy there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development. With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.</p> <p>In terms of local jobs, the Economic Impact Assessment (on exhibition) shows an estimated 579 direct/indirect jobs during construction phase and 108 new jobs generated from new resident expenditure (post-construction).</p> <p>The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>The VPA provides for infrastructure improvements to solve existing and future issues progressively over the life of the project.</p>
229	Joanne McKay (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion and safety, condition of roads.</p> <p>Destruction of reserves, loss of recreational opportunities.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Lack of infrastructure and emergency services, hospital, police, ambulance, shopping centre west of river.</p> <p>Little for youth to do.</p> <p>Impact on Redbank Creek from water runoff.</p> <p>VPA in favour of the developer. Infrastructure should be provided first.</p>	<p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>The proposal and VPA outline a number of enhancements to open space & recreational parks, including the provision of bike paths throughout the estate connecting to Nth Richmond township. In terms of local jobs, the Economic Impact Assessment (on exhibition) shows an estimated 579 direct/indirect jobs during construction phase and 108 new jobs generated from new resident expenditure (post-construction) - this would include opportunities for youth employment.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed.</p>
230	Michelle Ryan	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Against the bridge crossing at Navua and the impact on the reserves and also concerned about the Aboriginal heritage of the area.</p>	<p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads. Tonnage limits will also be applied to restrict usage to passenger vehicles/light trucks/buses.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p>
231	Judith Ryan	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Concerned about the sensitivity of the creek, the environmental impact on the Yarramundi Reserve and the sensitivity of the areas aboriginal heritage.</p>	<p>The "Environment Assessment" and "Environmental Benefits and Constraints Analysis" are on exhibition and identify all key issues and proposed mitigants. On balance there are very few environmental issues as the site has been extensively cleared for grazing over a prolonged period of time.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>
232	Belinda Sherriff (Kurrajong Heights)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Consistent traffic delays.</p> <p>Council should protect rural amenity and maintain Hawkesbury as an integral part of the Sydney food basin.</p> <p>Lack of emergency services e.g. police, ambulance, fire, hospital west of the river.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>All risks and mitigants relating to Bushfire has been outlined in the exhibited Bushfire Constraints and Opportunities Report</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Concern about bushfire, water and electricity.</p> <p>Should be larger lots (rural not urban) with open space. Discrepancy in the number of lots.</p> <p>Run-off into Redbank Creek and impact on Aboriginal sites.</p> <p>It will be a poor quality development which is not affordable.</p> <p>Lack of public transport.</p> <p>Destruction of rural and significant heritage.</p>	<p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>With regards to power Endeavour Energy there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>The development provides a range of lot sizes suitable for all budgets, not just large lot/acreage that is unaffordable for many people.</p> <p>Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator.</p> <p>The treatment of Aboriginal and Heritage elements within the subject property will be governed by the Conservation Management Plan & Aboriginal Heritage Assessment (on exhibition). Most identified Aboriginal Heritage will not be disturbed and remain in open space locations</p>
233	Kylie Harvey	Same of submission number 144.	Please refer to response to Submission #144
234	Elizabeth Robinson (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic already heavy approaching North Richmond Bridge. Diversion of traffic onto Grose River Road that is not a safe road. Intersection at Grose River Road and Grose Vale Road is dangerous and access from Riverview Street onto Grose Vale Road is nearly impossible now.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua Reserve e.g. loss of recreational opportunities and impact on environment. In terms of flood events, how does the new bridge solve any traffic issues when its use is contingent upon also using the Yarramundi Bridge which sits at a lower level than North Richmond Bridge and is regularly covered with flood water?</p> <p>Lack of Facilities. No medical, hospital, police, ambulance, emergency facilities.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>As confirmed in the VPA and TMAP, Navua Bridge works includes improvements to Grose River Rd and Ashtons Rd. It will also include upgrades to intersection of Grose Vale Road and Grose River Road.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads. Tonnage limits will also be applied to restrict usage to passenger vehicles/light trucks/buses.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p>
235	Hugh McKay (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>The roads and bridges are not in any shape to cope with the increased volume of traffic.</p> <p>The new bridge will alter the environment of Grose Wold and the roads in Grose Wold will not cope with the traffic increase. The quiet, semi-rural nature of Grose Wold will be destroyed.</p> <p>Development should be east of river where infrastructure is in place.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Traffic heading to the new estate will travel along Grose River Rd and turning into Grose Vale Rd to access the estate. Any additional traffic heading through Grose Wold will be existing residents living further west which currently use Grose Vale Rd only. To encourage use of Grose Vale Rd and ensure that traffic is restricted to local residents only, Council could consider a range of measures including lower speed limits or traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps). This will be dealt with during the Bridge Approval process.</p> <p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSANT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
236	Robert Montgomery submitted a letter from Paul Maher	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
237	Andrew Flaherty from NRJV	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>The upgrade of key intersections and a new bridge at Yarramundi will provide a significant improvement in capacity and traffic queue time in the Bells Line of Road corridor and provide an alternate route.</p> <p>Stakeholder consultation has delivered a Conservation Management Plan endorsed by the Heritage Council following public exhibition to deliver demonstrative water sensitive / retention networks across the site to educate the local community and visitors in Yeomans principles.</p> <p>Water network modelling has proven the significant current capacity in the SWC network which can be augmented with offsite works by the proponent to not only supply Redbank, but also the surrounding local area.</p> <p>Sewer network modelling has proven the significant current capacity in the SWC network which can be augmented with offsite works to support Redbank.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
238	James Bradley (Bowen Mountain)	<p>Concerned about the destruction of rural amenity/lifestyle.</p> <p>VPA in favour of the developer. No guarantee infrastructure will be provided.</p> <p>Development should not proceed until all recommended infrastructure improvements are made.</p> <p>Traffic congestion, lack of footpaths, lack of shops and parking at shops.</p> <p>Lack of emergency services e.g. police, ambulance, fire, hospital, west of the river.</p> <p>The proposed rezoning should not contain any high density area as it is totally at odds with the existing lifestyle of the area. Certainly not down to 180sqm. Will create a "ghetto".</p> <p>Destruction of reserves e.g. loss of recreational opportunities and impact on environment.</p>	<p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots to solve <i>existing traffic issues</i>. The VPA provides for infrastructure improvements to solve existing and future issues progressively over the life of the project.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m². The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m² to 2000m² plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m². The range of lot sizes ensures appropriate housing choice.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>
239	Denyse Chesterman	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Same as submission number 121.</p>	<p>Refer to response to Submission #121</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
240	Ben Duckworth (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion.</p> <p>Destruction of reserves, no access to reserves.</p> <p>Safety on roads leading to river.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).</p>
241	Elizabeth Williams (Yarramundi)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Does not consider new bridge at Navua as an appropriate solution to the traffic problems.</p> <p>Where the new bridge at Navua would enter on to Springwood Road is quite a dangerous juncture. Worth noting that Yarramundi Bridge has flooded several times in the past 18 months.</p> <p>The size and location of the development is completely over scaled and unnecessary. There is not a big market for homes in the area.</p> <p>In regard to the advertisement in the Gazette, there are too many aspects of the economic and community benefits proposed that are nebulous and unproven, in particular, with regards to creating jobs and improved public transport.</p>	<p>The TMAP has been peer-reviewed by an independent engineering consultant on Council's and NSW Department of Planning behalf and reviewed by RMS.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>Areas east of the site (the western Sydney trough) including Yarramundi Bridge will be under water in the event of significant flood. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly. The range of lot sizes will provide housing choice for a broad range of home buyers.</p> <p>The Gazette Ads were placed to encourage more people to submit on the proposal. The benefits listed in the ads came directly from the various reports into the project that were exhibited on the Council website.</p> <p>Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator.</p>
242	Paul & Carolyn Clarke (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Traffic congestion on Richmond Bridge.</p> <p>No emergency services west of the river e.g. ambulance, police, hospital.</p> <p>The traffic increase from the development will make access across the river more difficult.</p> <p>The proposal will adversely change the character of the area and reduces farmland.</p> <p>A new bridge through the reserves to link up with a flood prone bridge serves little benefit.</p> <p>VPA in favour of the developer. Development should not proceed without some firm commitments and actual progress on improved infrastructure and funding upfront before work begins.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>There are four rural fire service stations west of the river, including Grose Vale, Grose Wold, Kurrajong and Yarramundi.</p> <p>Richmond Ambulance Station, Richmond and Hawkesbury Police stations and the Hawkesbury District Health Service are east of the river, however the Community Needs Report indicates sufficient capacity in these facilities to accommodate an increased via new development west of the river.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>Areas east of the site (the western Sydney trough) including Yarramundi Bridge will be under water in the event of significant flood. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed.</p>
243	Bryan & Margaret Smith from NRDCAA	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Doubles population but provides little required infrastructure.</p>	

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Rezoning should be east of the river near infrastructure.	Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.
		Proposal failed the State Government "Review of Potential Housing Sites".	The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.
		Traffic delays and lack of infrastructure the primary issues.	As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot. With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system. Stormwater retention and treatment will take into account any latent deficiencies, changes to upstream water bodies (dams in Peel Farm), as well as any future development.
		TMAP shows traffic gets worse.	Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.
		VPA fails to provide certainty of outcomes.	The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed. RMS is being added as a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contribution will be used by both RMS & Council to address necessary road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge.
		Appendix A Plan 10 - access to Belmont Grove is needed (for bushfire), no pedestrian links through to Redbank Creek (missed opportunity to provide public access).	There will be a connection to Belmont Grove as recommended for Bushfire Constraints/Opportunities report. Along with extensive footpaths and bikeways within the estate, particularly through the Riparian area along Redbank Creek, the Proponent will work with Council to ensure suitable connectivity to North Richmond township.
		Appendix A Plan 11 - good planning will see gradual merging between rural and urban. R2 density and R3 zoning is out of keeping with the area.	Plan 11 demonstrates this suggested planning outcome. The R5 zone at the western edge of the site is zoned for larger lots in keeping with the rural residential that neighbours it at Belmont Grove. Moving east, the zoning changes to R2 located within significant open space/green corridors. Some R3 zoning is provided close to the shopping centre as is appropriate (proximity to amenity) and to provide affordable housing choice.
		Appendix B TMAP - does nothing to address the issue of congestion on Grose Vale Road.	RMS Richmond Bridge and approaches congestion study was undertaken specifically to address traffic congestion issues in the North Richmond area, including the BLR/GVR/Terrace Rd intersection, and also provides diagrams of intersection changes. The TMAP and VPA make reference to this and other intersection works, all of which will greatly improve level of service on Grose Vale Road.
		Appendix B TMAP - omits any detail on the impact on Pecks Road and Arthur Phillip Drive.	Again, TMAP deals with congestion issues on the main roads, and any improvements will obviously flow through to local feeder roads. In terms of access, residents of new allotments developed within the "crescent" of Arthur Phillip Dve (bound by Peel Park and Townsend Rd) will most likely use Pecks Rd. The remainder of the estate will utilise the internal collector roads to the main entry on Grose Vale Rd. Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.
		Appendix B TMAP - doesn't take into account lack of footpaths.	Along with extensive footpaths and bikeways within the estate, particularly through the Riparian area along Redbank Creek, the Proponent will work with Council to ensure suitable connectivity to North Richmond township (Pecks Road and Grose Vale Road).
		Appendix B TMAP - suggests that all short term proposals per RMS Congestion Study have been implemented. Seagull intersection between Bells Line of Road/Charles St never discussed with RMS.	These improvements are included because under the draft VPA, the proponent is obliged to make the Part 1 congestion study intersection improvements. As per the response to submission #133, under Part 2 of the congestion study (released 1st August) the scope and extent of the intersections have increased, and will provide much improved level of service at these intersections.
		Appendix B TMAP - Jacaranda Ponds impact not considered.	The Jacaranda Ponds TTA was not available to the proponent when the TMAP was undertaken. RMS authorised the TMAP to proceed without this information. However, intersection improvements outlined in TMAP and RMS Congestion study will help alleviate traffic congestion arising from Jacaranda Ponds.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Appendix B TMAP - improvement on Bells Line of Road/Grose Vale Road intersection is untrue. Confusing when performance based on dates, not number of houses. How will the intersection deal with increased traffic volumes.	Part 2 of RMS Congestion study shows improvement to level of service on BLR/GVR intersection. This does not take into account the proposed Navua Bridge. Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded (to Part 1 standards) within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.
		Refers to submission number 133 from Christopher Hallam regarding intersection performance.	Performance was based on the estimated dates of completion of the proposed Navua Bridge, and to ensure it would align with the RMS Congestion Study. The VPA Schedule Note 1.1 states "The TMAP identifies the delivery of infrastructure and Urban lots settled or dwellings occupied. All timing triggers above for the relevant intersection and road upgrades are based on release of lots rather than dwellings occupied. Accordingly, the delivery of infrastructure is targeted for delivery approx. 6-24 months earlier than the TMAP requirement approved by TfNSW, RMS and Council".
		Appendix C TMAP Peer Review - failed to pick up issues above.	Refer to submission #133 for our response about the scope of RMS intersection works and subsequent analysis provided by Christopher Hallam.
		Appendix E Flood Free Access - Yarramundi Bridge would have to be raised by 3m to deal with flood, Springwood Road is too dangerous for evacuation route. Bridge would be a massive structure offering minimal flood relief and damaging two beautiful, well used reserves which are cherished by communities in all the surrounding areas.	Refer to submission #133 for our response about the scope of RMS intersection works and subsequent analysis provided by Christopher Hallam.
		Appendix F CMP - does not address environmental protection only heritage. Also, should be widely distributed and should be reviewed more often than every 10 years.	Areas east of the site (the western Sydney trough) including Yarramundi Bridge will be under water in the event of significant flood. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood. Clearance and traffic management along flood evacuation routes (including Springwood Rd) is an Emergency Services matter.
		Appendix G Draft VPA - Council should review by appropriate legal firm, and ensure it has a strong position when resolving disputes with NRJV. Due diligence on NRJV partners - one a PR/lobbyist, the other four unknown to a major investor in the superannuation industry.	The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The proponent announced this via the Hawkesbury Gazette. The CMP is technically not a publicly available document, but was provided by OEH at the time of release to parties that requested it via email. OEH will be involved in the approval process leading up to development, including the authorisation of the Redbank Development Control Plan, and Development Approval process (where necessary).
		Appendix G Draft VPA - concern over monetary contribution (rather than providing infrastructure), and many details to be provided "at later date".	With regards to the NRJV, the approval process leading to the Gateway Determination was reviewed and approved separately by the Planning Assessment Commission. The NRJV team are specialist property developers with over 40 years experience in industry, and have been responsible for a number of master planned communities prior to the proposed at Redbank. They are not involved in PR or lobbying, and do not have any links to the superannuation industry.
		Appendix J Community Needs Assessment - lack of capacity in local schools.	Refer to earlier comments about delivery of road infrastructure. The VPA outlines both dedication of parks and open space for community benefit, along with a monetary contribution (or works in kind) for the expansion and improvement of community facilities, at the election of the Council. It should be noted that the VPA is in draft form and aims to lock in the mechanism and where possible the dollar rate of developer contribution. However, as this is a rezone proposal many details will not be known until detailed design is undertaken as part of the Development Approval process.
		Appendix J Community Needs Assessment - lack of community facilities with footpath connectivity. Lack of youth centres.	We refer to the traffic solutions and levels of service in the TMAP. The author of the Community Needs Assessment Report met with the Principle of both Colo High and North Richmond Primary as part of the assessment, and the report indicates that the schools are operating at their natural capacity. The assessment that new high schools will not be needed are on the basis of the future demand calculated in reference to its demographic assessment. The Department of Education and Training is responsible for addressing the issue of capacity and catchments for secondary students and will be involved when the planning outcome of the proposal is known. The options available to the Department would be changes to the catchment boundaries, or the expansion/creation of new capacity.
		Appendix J Community Needs Assessment - identified parks and active recreation areas are all a long way from the development. Pools access requires transport, Kurrajong pool is for private lessons only.	The VPA outlines both dedication of parks and open space for community benefit, along with a monetary contribution (or works in kind) for the expansion and improvement of community facilities (at the election of the Council). Along with extensive footpaths and bikeways within the estate, the Proponent will work with Council to ensure suitable connectivity to North Richmond township including Pecks Rd and Grose Vale Rd.
		Appendix J Community Needs Assessment - lack of capacity in health services.	This is valid point - however, the Report in question aims to demonstrate what social amenity exists in the area currently (i.e. excluding development), and the listed facilities cannot be invalidated on the basis of a lack of transport options. It is also important to consider the large amount of open space and park facilities proposed within the estate.
		Appendix J Community Needs Assessment - lack of emergency services west of river e.g. fire, police, ambulance and concerned about emergency response times.	The report confirms that Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. With the delivery of road infrastructure improvements as planned, access to these services (particularly in the event of emergency) will be improved.
			The report confirms that the emergency services east of the river has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. With the delivery of road infrastructure improvements as planned, access and response times by these services (particularly in the event of emergency) will be improved.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Appendix J Community Needs Assessment - State Government considers the site as 'remote', lack of connectivity to North Richmond.	The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed and reports put on public exhibition for public comment. The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly. The majority of existing residents do not rely upon connectivity to Sydney CBD.
		Appendix J Community Needs Assessment - lack of connectivity to North Richmond shops.	The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.
		Appendix K Community Net Benefit Assessment - disagrees that the development will provide employment to the region (with exception of nursing home and shops).	The majority of employment will be transitory (i.e. generated by development), however full time jobs will also be created out of resident demand and employment growth will be sustained over a 10 year period. We note whilst the report accounts for inflows to Government Revenue (Stamp Duty, GST, etc), it does not include any assumptions for the implementation of State Govt job creation strategies proposed for the North West region.
		Appendix K Community Net Benefit Assessment - report is vague about transport improvements.	This report was prepared without the availability of the TMAP or RMS Congestion Study, and as such could not be expected to provide complete details or timing of road improvements.
		Appendix K Community Net Benefit Assessment - uses old census data, and conclusions are vague and cannot be relied on.	The report outlines its methodology clearly and notes the limitations of the Census data used in the executive summary. Whilst there may be a margin for error in the calculations on the changes in updated census data, the report indicative findings can be relied upon.
		Appendix N Riparian Assessment - concerned about who maintains the Riparian Areas, should be Council. Also concerned about private ownership of riparian areas along Redbank Creek.	Redbank Creek will be a designated Riparian Corridor and Asset Protection Zone, within a proposed open space area. Further to this, easements can be granted to Council to ensure appropriate access for the care for the natural habitats.
		Appendix N Riparian Assessment - concerned about stormwater runoff into Redbank Creek	Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.
		Appendix O Environmental Constraints/Benefit Analysis - concerned about destruction of CPW.	The predominate CPW are identified in the R5 zone on the western boundary of the site will be retained. The smaller area of CPW identified in the centre of the site will either be retained within the estate, or if removal is required that process will be managed in accordance with relevant environmental statutes.
		Appendix P Flood & Bushfire Safety Evaluation - should be a helicopter landing area within the seniors development as recommended.	The design of the Seniors Community is a matter for the RSL. Potential sites for emergency helicopter access will be identified as part of the ongoing approval process.
		Appendix Q - Bushfire Constraints/Opportunities Report - concerned about lack of water pressure, the lack of access to Belmont Grove, and concerned about Richmond Fire Station access (through traffic congestion).	The proponent is presently working with Sydney Water and both parties are well advanced in terms of the planning of interim and final water infrastructure to ensure adequate water pressure is provided. There will be an access point to Belmont Grove. Fire access and response times will improve with road infrastructure improvements per TMAP/RMS Congestion study.
		Appendix R - Agricultural Land Study - fails to recognise the improvements brought by Keyline System, intensive hydroponic horticulture may be viable.	The relatively small scale of the property and the high statutory cost of holding the land meant it was becoming financially unviable to continue as a farm. To undertake intensive commercially viable agricultural uses such as poultry, hydroponics and mushrooms would impact on immediately adjoining residential location.
		Appendix S - Storm Water Management Strategy - concerned about downstream discharge and impact on existing residents.	Stormwater retention and treatment will take into account any latent deficiencies identified in Council's Flood Study, changes to upstream water bodies (dams in Peel Farm), as well as any future development.
		Appendix T - Utilities Infrastructure Report - notes the requirement for water pressure and amplification of sewage system, accepts that energy supply is sufficient.	With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system. The proponent is presently working with Sydney Water and both parties are well advanced in terms of the planning of interim and final water infrastructure.
		Appendix U - Geotechnical Report - notes that there is some risk of erosion given the nature of the soils, and two dams are unstable and have unsafe levels of copper/zinc. Council has duty of care in addressing these.	Any future development will require satisfactory erosion controls are in place. Any augmentation or deletion of dams will be in line with WSUD principals and with reference to obligations under the Conservation Management Plan.
		Appendix V - Economic Impact Assessment - benefits grossly overestimated, includes Seniors (not part of the proposal), minimising economic leakage by using local labour/suppliers is anti-competitive and impractical, disputes claim that occupants of smaller/cheaper houses can fill local jobs as these jobs are already oversupplied.	The report takes into account all available employment sources, and the seniors development is an employment source as is the development of the proposal. The seniors development was planned and is currently being delivered by the proponent, and it should be recorded that the NRDCAA also opposed the seniors development despite the numerous benefits it provides. Local labour and suppliers are currently used within the seniors development as they generally offer better value for money and can deal with existing traffic congestion. No reasoning is provided with this submission to elaborate why occupants of smaller/cheaper homes can't fill local jobs generated by the development.
		Appendix W - Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy Sustainability Criteria - notes that perfect compliance claimed (due to skill of JBA).	The Exhibition process (lasting 60 days) is aimed to allow residents to submit their concerns about future development. Solutions to issues identified will be incorporated in the rezoning and development approval process.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Appendix X - Consistency with State Environmental Policies & Section 117 Directions - fails to provide affordable housing, provides private ownership along Redbank Creek, State Government Review of Potential Home Sites states water pressure & waste water will take 5 years to improve (bushfire hazard).</p>	<p>The mix of zones (R5, R3 and R2) provide a range of housing choice, and the smaller housing options available in the R3 zone are made available for the purpose of providing affordable housing. Prices are dictated by demand and supply.</p> <p>Redbank Creek will be a designated Riparian Corridor and Asset Protection Zone, within a proposed open space area. Further to this, easements can be granted to Council to ensure appropriate access for the care for the natural habitats.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system. The proponent is presently working with Sydney Water and both parties are well advanced in terms of the planning of interim and final water infrastructure.</p>
244	John McFarlane	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>A development with small housing lots is out of character with what is currently a rural residential area.</p> <p>Bells Line of Road and North Richmond Bridge should be upgraded first.</p> <p>There are major issues currently with Redbank Creek in terms off water quality and wash out/subsidence.</p> <p>It is not sensible to be adding further residents before a high level bridge is built.</p> <p>Abandoning the reserves to provide access to Yarramundi Bridge which is not a high level bridge.</p> <p>Development should be on eastern side of river on flood free land where infrastructure already exists.</p>	<p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot. The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the delivery of the 1001st lot. Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>Areas east of the site (the western Sydney trough) including Yarramundi Bridge will be under water in the event of significant flood. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood.</p> <p>(Council comment) - Apart from land in the Growth Centre (Vineyard) the land east of the river is subject to significant flood affectation. (See Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy).</p>
245	Claudia Khouri (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Lot sizes too small. A proposal to retain the rural character would be preferred and have small acreages.</p> <p>No emergency services west of the river and no immediate proposal to upgrade any of the roads, bridges and facilities.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>The VPA sets out that the developer will be obliged to contribute towards road, bridge and community infrastructure with reference to a "per lot" calculation from the first release of land. Reducing the yield will reduce the extent of any improvements to road and community infrastructure.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Development should be on eastern side of river on flood free land where infrastructure already exists.	Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.
246	Steve Hearn from McDonald Jones Home	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>The shortfall of land in Sydney has had a restrictive impact on their business ever since they started operating in Sydney.</p> <p>Unsold developed registered land is in critically short supply.</p> <p>There is a desperate need for land to be fast tracked and released to the market.</p> <p>The development at North Richmond is in the perfect area to offer people a selection of choices to suit their lifestyle.</p> <p>The site can offer a good cross section of product ranging from R2 zoned lots to smaller R3 lots that will allow a price point for first home buyers.</p> <p>There is an impressive amount of open space and it has a strong commitment to the heritage of the area.</p>	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
247	Mike Scott	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>Sydney is currently one of the least affordable cities in the world and is experiencing a severe housing shortage.</p> <p>There has been very little new housing added in the Hawkesbury in the last 30 years.</p> <p>The housing industry and local business need the stimulation of the construction activity and demand to remain economically sustainable.</p> <p>The site is above the flood plain and substantially cleared minimising the environmental impact.</p> <p>The development is being produced in a way that integrates with the sites heritage value.</p> <p>Redbank provides Hawkesbury with the opportunity to produce one of Sydney's best new communities.</p>	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
248	Barry McGlasson (North Richmond)	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>While Australia's population continues to grow more housing will be required and the Hawkesbury could benefit from the economic activity that will arise.</p> <p>The areas in which new housing subdivisions can occur in the Hawkesbury are limited by the extent of flood prone areas.</p> <p>Additional housing should be attached to existing townships. This way the attractive landscape can be preserved.</p> <p>The soils of the development area are only rated Type 3 in terms of productivity so the question is what could be profitably grown if the land was retained for agriculture.</p> <p>Another river crossing is required to divert some of the traffic away from the present North Richmond Bridge.</p>	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
249	Birgit Walter on behalf of NR Community Centre Inc.	<p>Community centre is heavily used and will not be able to cope with doubling of North Richmond population.</p> <p>There is a need for more community meeting space as well as more services currently offered.</p> <p>The proposal suggests proponent is going to build a new facility 2km from the existing one.</p> <p>NRCC Inc suggests that the money would be better spent expanding current facilities (per VPA).</p>	The VPA outlines both dedication of parks and open space for community benefit, along with a monetary contribution (or works in kind) for the creation of a new community facility, or the expansion/improvement of existing community facilities. This will be a decision of the Council, and the proponent does not object to this NRCC Inc suggestion.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		NRCC Inc suggests that the contributions toward personnel/support services (per VPA) should be directed to NRCC Inc.	This is a common sense suggestion, to be reviewed and decided by Council. Again, the proponent does not object to this NRCC Inc suggestion.
		One of the proposed bus stops provided by developer should be out the front of the current/expanded community centre.	This is a common sense suggestion, to be reviewed and decided by Council. Again, the proponent does not object to this NRCC Inc suggestion.
250	Kate & Andreas Jagle (North Richmond)	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>The development will help bring job opportunities to the area and increase the diversity of business.</p> <p>The development brings an excellent opportunity to reduce traffic congestion at the Bells Line of Road / Grose Vale Road intersection by the addition of a bridge crossing at Navua.</p> <p>As there are already carparks in the Navua area, the increase in traffic should not cause any damage and may also limit the amount of litter and rubbish dumped in this area.</p> <p>Would like to see some alteration to the Riverview Street/Grose Vale Road intersection as this is already problematic and the increase in residents will only increase this congestion.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p> <p>Road pacifying measures to existing council roads will be covered in subsequent development applications, not this rezone proposal.</p>
251	Fiona Binns from Urbis (Heritage Consultant for NRJV)	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>NRVJ strongly committed to achieving a strong and meaningful heritage outcome.</p> <p>CMP was prepared to recognise the heritage features of the site, and develop policies to retain that significance, balancing the heritage values with strategic objectives for housing.</p> <p>Extensive consultation with OEH and Heritage Council, which included substantial input into master plan development, and the listing of the site on the State Heritage Register.</p> <p>The CMP planning process was a model of cooperation between developer, Council and OEH/Heritage Council to recognise Keyline's significance and retain dams in the landscape, as well integrating subdivision elements effectively.</p> <p>The proposal is consistent with the policy and principles of the CMP.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
252	Robert Montgomery from Montgomery Planning Solutions	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>There is a critical need for more housing in the area in terms of numbers, housing choice and affordability.</p> <p>Approval of the planning proposal will provide significant economic benefits and a boost to employment in the local area.</p> <p>North Richmond is identified in the draft North West Subregional Strategy and Council' Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy as suitable for urban development.</p>	

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>The proposal will bring infrastructure improvements to roads that have become increasingly congested over the last 10-20 years. This type of planned development may also act as a catalyst for the RMS to finally address the river crossing and traffic congestion in Richmond and North Richmond.</p> <p>Due to the physical constraints of flooding etc there is very little suitable land for residential development within the Hawkesbury LGA. The Redbank site has been identified as suitable.</p> <p>By developing suitable land for housing, pressure is removed for ad hoc rural subdivision in areas within the LGA which are not suitable for increased housing density.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
253	Kieran O'Kane from Home & Land Direct	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>There has been very little new housing added in the Hawkesbury in the last 30 years.</p> <p>The proposal will allow new residents to enjoy an area the LGA.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
254	Mark Regent from Regent Property Group	<p>Supporting comments include:</p> <p>There is a misconception in parts of the community that development of this site is being proposed with no regard to heritage significance and/or heritage investigation. However, heritage has been thoroughly investigated, analysed and assessed in accordance with the requirements of NSW Heritage and the Burra Charter principles and is listed on the State Heritage Register.</p> <p>The planning proposal provides for a comprehensive suite of transport improvement measures. The Redbank planning proposal provides a unique solution at no cost to tax payers.</p> <p>The planning proposal provides independent flora and fauna assessments for exhibition. The Cumberland Plain Woodland has being identified and protected. The majority of the site is extensively cleared.</p> <p>The question of strategic merit has been answered in several forums i.e. the endorsement of the Hawkesbury City Council Residential Land Strategy, the Gateway planning proposal and the Gateway approval requiring council to meet several conditions prior to exhibiting the rezoning to the community. The 2 major conditions were the endorsement of the CMP and the provision of the TMAP and draft VPA.</p> <p>The planning proposal is required to nominate minimum lot sizes for various zones. In this case there are 3 residential zones. The minimum is exactly that, the minimum requirement. The overall average will find most residential lots in excess of 500m2 in the R2 zone.</p> <p>The endorsed CMP shows a masterplan that provides for extensive connected open space areas. Those open space areas were a key requirement of NSW Heritage and will provide a unique environment to live in comparison to other residential areas in the Hawkesbury and greater Sydney.</p> <p>There are requirements for more affordable homes to rent and / or buy. The increase of supply benefits the market by placing downward pressure on prices.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
255	Justin O'Connell	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>The development is not supported by the State Government due to its remote location and lack of public infrastructure.</p>	<p>The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>The contractual arrangement between Council and developer are reliant on the solvency of the developer. This is a risky arrangement and development strategy. The commercial basis of joint ventures and the historically fraught nature of them indicate that the advantage resides with the developer and public benefit is compromised.</p>	<p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p>
		<p>The provision of infrastructure and services will be the responsibility of Council.</p>	<p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed. RMS is being added as a party to the VPA to ensure that RMS can address necessary road infrastructure.</p>
		<p>The area cannot accommodate an additional 1400 homes due to present and future limitations. There are concerns with landscape formation and geographic constraints and infrastructure and service deficiencies.</p>	<p>The "Environment Assessment" and "Environmental Benefits and Constraints Analysis" are on exhibition and identify all key issues and proposed mitigants. On balance there are very few environmental issues as the site has been extensively cleared for grazing over a prolonged period of time.</p> <p>With regards to power Endeavour Energy there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to cope with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p>
		<p>No public transport provision features in the proposal in the definite sense.</p>	<p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online. Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator.</p>
		<p>The new proposal will add to bush fire hazards and risk. The increased traffic congestion will impede accessibility for bushfire evacuation.</p>	<p>Access in the event of flood is an existing issue and is managed by the Emergency Services. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency flood/fire evac access for those West of the River to Penrith via Springwood. Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p>
		<p>There are broad environmental impacts being drainage into Redbank Creek and the new bridge at Navua.</p>	<p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>
		<p>VPA in favour of the developer.</p>	<p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p>
		<p>Timing and adequacy of road upgrades.</p>	<p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements (as per their Congestion Study) must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot. Part 2 of the congestion study shows intersection works includes additional lanes and road widening.</p>
		<p>Concerned about environmental impact of Navua Bridge, destruction of the Navua Reserve, loss of recreational opportunities and impact on flora and fauna.</p>	<p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage. The Yarramundi and Navua Reserves were subjected to extensive mining operations over a lengthy period of time and the Plan of Management in 2007 indicates there is limited aboriginal significance as a result of the activities.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Inadequate public transport, no firm commitment for bus service.	The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.
		Proposed new 300sqm community centre is inadequate.	The VPA outlines both dedication of parks and open space for community benefit, along with a monetary contribution (or works in kind) for the creation of a new community facility, or the expansion/improvement of existing community facilities. This will be a decision of the Council, and the proponent does not object to the NRCC Inc suggestion (submission #249).
		Concern over discharge of chemical and household rubbish into Redbank Creek.	Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.
		Concern that financial viability of project may mean park upgrades never done.	The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works. Upgrades are linked to the release of lots, meaning the development cannot proceed without fulfilling obligations under the VPA.
		Unfit for residential development as per State Government review of housing sites and the fact that it is agricultural land with heritage elements.	The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.
		The site is bushfire prone. Accuracy of Bushfire Prone Land Map and response from RFS.	The site has been extensively cleared for grazing over a prolonged period of time, and risks/mitigants outlined in the Bushfire report on exhibition.
		Infrastructure upgrades in the hands of developers (no State Government funding) means it will be done on the cheap.	RMS is being added as a party to the VPA to ensure that the contributions for roads will be used by RMS to address necessary road infrastructure improvements.
		Lot sizes inappropriate for the surrounding semi-rural area.	Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2
		Concern regarding sewer and drainage provision.	With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system. Stormwater retention and treatment will take into account any latent deficiencies, changes to upstream water bodies (dams in Peel Farm), as well as any future development.
		Uncertainty of provision of road improvements.	As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot. Widening of Grose Vale Rd would require the compulsory acquisition of land which would be met with some resistance by the local community. In addition to key intersection works agreed in the VPA, there will be progressive road improvements along Grose Vale Rd at the main entries to the estate. As confirmed in the VPA and TMAP, Navua Bridge works includes improvements to Grose River Rd and Ashtons Rd.
		No footpaths, despite being proposed in TMAP.	Along with extensive footpaths and bikeways within the estate, the Proponent will work with Council to ensure suitable connectivity to North Richmond township.
		Concern over road improvements being linked to release of lots.	The VPA Schedule Note 1.1 states "The TMAP identifies the delivery of infrastructure and Urban lots settled or dwellings occupied. All timing triggers above for the relevant intersection and road upgrades are based on release of lots rather than dwellings occupied. Accordingly, the delivery of infrastructure is targeted for delivery approx 6-24 months earlier than the TMAP requirement approved by TfNSW, RMS and Council".
		Environmental impacts of the development i.e. impact on flora and fauna, endangered species/communities. What if proponent cannot meet biodiversity offset requirements?	
		Should be used for agricultural land, wrong to say it can't be.	The relatively small scale of the property and the high statutory cost of holding the land meant it was becoming financially unviable to continue as a farm. To undertake intensive commercially viable agricultural uses such as poultry, hydroponics and mushrooms would impact on immediately adjoining residential location.
		Claims the site is book-ended by development is false.	The site adjoins existing residential development to the east (Nth Richmond), and existing rural residential development to the west (Belmont Grove).
		Claims the economic benefits (particularly jobs) are false, as is the regional plan for more jobs. State Government benefits from VPA, Stamp Duty and GST more than Council's benefit from rates.	The report was prepared by a professional consultant, and methodology was clearly stated. The submission includes no information to disprove the State Govt regional strategy for jobs - other than a reference to the decline of the RAAF base and mushroom growers.

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Concerned about visual amenity, heritage/rural components.</p> <p>Increased population without infrastructure.</p> <p>Community dividend out of this proposal is not enough.</p>	<p>The proponent is to obtain Council approval and endorsement from relevant referral agencies for the Development Control Plan (DCP) for the site. This will include relevant controls for all housing, including housing along view corridors and adjoining Heritage elements.</p> <p>The proposed development will deliver 1399 dwellings over a 10 year period (i.e. approx. 140 new dwellings per annum) with staged infrastructure improvements during this time.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to existing community (Nth Richmond), road improvements listed in the VPA (and paid by the proponent) and increased public transport frequency will improve accessibility, contributions to community facilities will improve social connection, and the large open spaces and public amenity within the project will improve the liveability of the area significantly. The project solves existing issues, and future issues.</p>
256	Vince Head (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>The existing drainage system in North Richmond is inadequate without adding to it.</p> <p>The town water supply cannot support this development.</p> <p>Lack of emergency services e.g. police, fire and ambulance.</p> <p>Upgrades of roads and a bridge at Navua only after completion of hundreds of homes is nothing but disastrous.</p> <p>Has the Navua bridge been tested for suitability? Will it hold in place during flood? The landscape changes with every flood, washing away banks and changing the river course.</p> <p>Lot sizes too small (e.g. 180sqm) and out of character with country feel of the area.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP. Stormwater retention and treatment will take into account any latent deficiencies, changes to upstream water bodies (dams in Peel Farm), as well as any future development.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the delivery of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by RMS, Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p>
257	Glenn Jameson (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Author has witnessed many developments not live up to their projected forecasts, whether it be for financial reasons or socio economic reasons.</p> <p>Upfront improvements are needed prior to any significant development.</p> <p>No consideration of the extra traffic generated by construction activities during the course of development. With heavy vehicles being driven on a daily basis to the site it is considered that the lights at North Richmond will reach their expected level of congestion much earlier than that stipulated in reports.</p> <p>Doubt cast on the developers traffic report by a report by Christopher Hallam Pty Ltd. This needs to be explored with an independent report commissioned by Council.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The VPA will be registered on the land title, meaning that the infrastructure obligations pass with the land in the event of sale. Any transfer must be approved by the Dept. of Planning to ensure the incoming developer is of sufficient financial standing to complete the works.</p> <p>The VPA provides for infrastructure improvements to solve existing and future issues progressively over the life of the project.</p> <p>The VPA Schedule Note 1.1 states "The TMAP identifies the delivery of infrastructure and Urban lots settled or dwellings occupied. All timing triggers above for the relevant intersection and road upgrades are based on release of lots rather than dwellings occupied. Accordingly, the delivery of infrastructure is targeted for delivery approx 6-24 months earlier than the TMAP requirement approved by TfNSW, RMS and Council".</p> <p>Please refer to response to Submission #133</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>The lot sizes are out of character with the surroundings and will not suit a township that has and will only ever have a poor public transport system.</p> <p>Navua Reserve forms a valuable space in which access to the river is maintained and that the provision of a bridge creating noise pollution will diminish its significance.</p> <p>Should not start with the assumption that a bridge across the Grose River will be approved. Should determine the level of development that can be accommodated on the current road network, allowing for individual intersection improvements, and at the same time proceeding with an application for the proposed bridge, with the planning process and environmental studies undertaken in parallel.</p>	<p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>
258	Vicki Farrugia	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion will get worse with development.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p>
259	Chris Bain from JBA Urban Planning	<p>Suggested amendments include:</p> <p>Check and adjust northern boundary of the land to ensure all relevant maps (e.g. zoning map) reflects the existing DP boundary.</p> <p>Amend boundary between R2 and the proposed RE1 Public Recreation zone to show a consistent RE1 Public Recreation zone along the Redbank Creek Corridor as shown in diagram within submission.</p> <p>Amend boundary between R2 and the proposed R3 zone to align with seniors development and to ensure a more uniform building block within R3 (diagram supplied in submission).</p> <p>NRVJ/JBA will provide a detailed plan showing final site and zone boundaries shortly to enable finalisation of the planning proposal prior to forwarding to DP&I. The changes will be minor and retain consistency with objections of the planning proposal.</p>	<p>For Council's consideration and response.</p>
260	Andre Vogelzang (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Increased traffic flow on already congested roads.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua Reserve e.g. loss of recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Should a bridge be built at Navua then Grose Wold road traffic volumes would increase.</p> <p>Grose Wold Road and Grose River Road are not suitable for such increased traffic volumes.</p> <p>Rezoning should not proceed before suitable infrastructure is in place including improvements to North Richmond Bridge.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>Traffic heading to the new estate will travel along Grose River Rd and turning into Grose Vale Rd to access the estate. Any additional traffic heading through Grose Wold will be existing residents living further west which currently use Grose Vale Rd only. To encourage use of Grose Vale Rd and ensure that traffic is restricted to local residents only, Council could consider a range of measures including lower speed limits or traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps). This will be dealt with during the Bridge Approval process.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).</p> <p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
261	Robin Woods from HEN	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Loss of rural amenity, agricultural land and impact on landscape/habitat.</p> <p>Discharge into Redbank Creek.</p> <p>Loss of connectivity through fragmentation is the greatest ecological impact of this proposal.</p> <p>There could be community gardens, use of native plants, reduction of areas of lawn, passive energy housing styles, and maximising layouts to create community hubs.</p> <p>Previous subdivision of land, including at Kelmsley Downs (circa 1987), created stormwater discharges that has caused flooding, nutrient inputs and pollution, and erosion of land bordering the creek.</p> <p>Asks for Flood Study currently being reviewed by Council should be put on exhibition as it is clearly relevant to this proposal.</p> <p>Post-development flows must be restricted to pre-development levels.</p> <p>Concern about impact on bio-habitat on site, and destruction of Navua Reserve.</p> <p>Focus should be on protecting all native flora and fauna on the site to support the whole ecosystem.</p> <p>Atlas of Living Australia shows 108 records of mammals within 5km of site.</p> <p>Inappropriate lot sizes for rural area.</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land and Yeoman's Keyline system.</p>	<p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>The length of Redbank Creek along the site will be a designated Riparian Corridor and Asset Protection Zone, within a proposed open space area. Further to this, easements can be granted to Council to ensure appropriate access for the care for the natural habitats. The proposal will minimise the ecological footprint by having three times the Open Space as comparable development and providing protection zones around environmentally sensitive areas.</p> <p>All of these are good suggestions, and this and other elements will be dealt with in the Development Control Plan and during the Development Approval process.</p> <p>Stormwater retention and treatment will take into account any latent deficiencies, changes to upstream water bodies (dams in Peel Farm), as well as any future development.</p> <p>For Council's consideration and response.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>The "Environment Assessment" and "Environmental Benefits and Constraints Analysis" identify all key issues and proposed mitigants. On balance there are very few environmental issues as the site has been extensively cleared for grazing over a prolonged period of time.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>As previously indicated, the proposal will retain rural amenity by ensuring appropriate zoning and rural conservation via the Development Control Plan & Conservation Management Plan, and it will minimise the ecological footprint by having three times the Open Space as comparable development and providing protection zones around environmentally sensitive areas. Existing flora noted in the submission diagram will be retained where possible within open space corridors.</p> <p>The site has been extensively cleared for grazing over a prolonged period of time and as the exhibited report notes the mammals are unlikely to be found on the site. As noted in the Submission, a 5km radius from the proposal site takes in the Yarramundi and Navua Reserves, the Blue Mountains National Park, and Susella Reserve - the likely habitat for these mammals.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The relatively small scale of the property and the high statutory cost of holding the land meant it was becoming financially unviable to continue as a farm. To undertake intensive commercially viable agricultural uses such as poultry, hydroponics and mushrooms would impact on immediately adjoining residential location.</p> <p>The Conservation Management Plan was the result of 2 years of consultation and planning with NSW Heritage Council. The Keyline System and Dams will be substantially retained and interpreted for public parks and cycling/walking paths.</p>
262	Trevor Hulme (Bowen Mountain)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion and impact of additional traffic.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Road infrastructure should be adequately addressed before any further development.	The VPA provides for infrastructure improvements to solve existing and future issues progressively over the life of the project.
263	Cheryle Thornton (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion and impact of additional traffic.</p> <p>The post office is already busy. If the Bells Line of Road is going to be widened to get easier access to the Richmond Bridge, will a new post office be built for the residents that already live here?</p> <p>Lack of parking at shops and if there is a shopping centre in the development then how are trucks going to enter. Arthur Phillip Drive is not strong enough for semi-trailers.</p> <p>Are there going to be more buses for residents?</p> <p>Inadequate traffic conditions could put lives at risk when emergency vehicles cannot get through the chaotic traffic that is banked up at the bridge.</p> <p>Concerned about how the stormwater drains will cope.</p> <p>Loss of rural amenity.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities. Heavy machinery will utilise the internal collector roads off the existing entry on Grose Vale Road, as they are currently for the RSL development.</p> <p>The VPA sets out the requirement for a bus route and the provision of bus shelters within the development. As confirmed in the TMAP, the Senior Planner of the bus operator has confirmed in writing that frequency of service of Route 680 will be reviewed when development commences and additional demand comes online.</p> <p>Emergency services are trained to deal with traffic congestion in emergency response. Given traffic congestion already exists and will increase with background growth (i.e. without Redbank development), the VPA will ensure that road infrastructure will be improved.</p> <p>Stormwater retention and treatment will take into account any latent deficiencies, changes to upstream water bodies (dams in Peel Farm), as well as any future development.</p> <p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p>
264	Melinda Graham from Thomsons Lawyers	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>Author's company has a longstanding relationship with the North Richmond Joint Venture. Company's view that the NRJV has demonstrated industry knowledge and know-how, a strong commitment to the broader Council area and the local community and a deep understanding of the issues arising from Stage 1 of the development. NRJV's strong track record on Stage 1 sets the tone for their commitment to the planning proposal and the future development of that land.</p> <p>NRJV are demonstrably committed to providing long-term solutions to the Council area and local community.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
265	Mary & Euan Leckie (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>There should be no more development approved on the west side of the river until the traffic problem is solved.</p> <p>There is still no progress visible on the upgrade of the Windsor bridge crossing.</p> <p>Why would people want to settle in closely spaced housing on the west side of the river when there is better infrastructure on the east side.</p> <p>Access route through the reserves puts traffic onto minor roads in the Grose Wold area.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The VPA provides for infrastructure improvements to solve existing and future issues progressively over the life of the project.</p> <p>Council to respond.</p> <p>The proponent fully recognises the traffic congestion issues, particularly for prospective buyers in the new project. This is why the VPA has a number of upfront measures to deal with traffic congestion, along with the provision of the Navua Bridge.</p> <p>Traffic heading to the new estate will travel along Grose River Rd and turning into Grose Vale Rd to access the estate. Any additional traffic heading through Grose Wold will be existing residents living further west which currently use Grose Vale Rd only. To encourage use of Grose Vale Rd and ensure that traffic is restricted to local residents only, Council could consider a range of measures including lower speed limits or traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps). This will be dealt with during the Bridge Approval process.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPOSER'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Cant see why a route should use the reserves. There a few points for public to access the river.</p> <p>The new access has to be completed before the development proceeds.</p> <p>The new route is seen as a second-best solution. The Agnes Banks bridge is quickly flooded.</p> <p>Any such new route has to be funded by the developer. Why should council funds be spent on a second-best solution?</p> <p>The map shows six new roads joining Grose Vale Road. This seems like a recipe for lots of traffic crashes and resultant injuries.</p> <p>Adding such a large number of people to the area will see services and resources stretched past breaking point.</p>	<p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, and these intersection works will improve the level of service significantly. The construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed and be operational prior to the delivery of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge has a targeted deck level of 13m above the riverbank, well above the Reserve and access roads.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations.</p> <p>In addition to key intersection works agreed in the VPA, there will be progressive road improvements along Grose Vale Rd at the main entries to the estate.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report confirms that existing medical, police and fire infrastructure is sufficient to cater for increased population. Hawkesbury District Health Service has sufficient capacity to copy with demand from the proposed development. There are five Fire Stations, an Ambulance Station and one Police station within 5km of the site, with the Hawkesbury Local Area Police Command located in Windsor.</p> <p>With regards to power Endeavour Energy there is sufficient capacity for the proposed development.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p>
266	Hugo Douglas from IMA Pty Ltd	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>Roads - the TMAP and VPA provide a developer-led traffic solution which is consistent with the findings of the "Richmond Bridge and Approaches Congestion Study" commissioned by RMS. The TMAP was independently assessed and endorsed by a third party consultant appointed by Council and was endorsed by RMS as per the conditions of the Gateway Proposal. These road improvements will solve long standing traffic issues that continue to worsen.</p> <p>Heritage - The CMP was developed over a 2 year consultative process with the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage and the knew Heritage Council. This process has led to a number of initiatives which will mean that the proposal will be a unique heritage listed master planned community, the first of its kind in the region.</p> <p>Infrastructure - in addition to the solutions to well documented traffic problems, the VPA outlines significant upgrades of existing community infrastructure including stormwater and stormwater management, water pressure and supply, NBN, footpath and local road improvements, dedicated parks and enhanced open spaces and upgrades to community facilities.</p> <p>The suggestion that development should be focused on the eastern side of the river is short sighted given the known flood constraints, and given that any road improvements would also be focused on the eastern side of the river - meaning that existing traffic congestion west of the river will continue to worsen.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		The proposal provides housing choice in an area designated in both the Hawkesbury Residential Land Strategy and regional planning documents as suitable for urban development. Continued subdivision of large rural holdings into acreage does not provide housing choice, and does not provide a meaningful contribution to the improvement of infrastructure.	
267	Derek Osborne from Arterra	<p>Supports the proposed development: Increasing population is increasing demand for housing.</p> <p>The Redbank site is ideally suited to rezoning as it directly adjoins the existing town of North Richmond. The proposed zoning allows for low to medium densities in the centre and east of the site to large lot residential in the west of the site. The Redbank proposal will provide a transition between the existing small suburban lots on the western edge of town and the existing large residential lots to the west of the Redbank site.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a generous allocation of open space which will be developed to cater to a variety of public recreation and presents a unique opportunity for the adaptive re-use and interpretation of the European and pre-European heritage of the site.</p> <p>The open space will also serve as a vegetated buffer to environmental features such as Redbank Creek.</p>	The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.
268	Helen O'Neill (Grose Wold)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Concerned about the possibility that Grose Wold Road will become a direct route from Kurrajong to Penrith.</p> <p>Lot sizes too small (e.g. 180sqm) and out of character with semi-rural area.</p> <p>The Redbank development is not the good well planned development that our community deserves, it is not suitable in this area, and it continues the terrible Sydney sprawl into a beautiful semi-rural area and compounds the terrible traffic congestion that already exists around North Richmond.</p> <p>The development will have a devastating effect on the Redbank area and Reserves including flora & fauna impacts and loss of recreational opportunities.</p>	<p>Traffic heading to the new estate will travel along Grose River Rd and turning into Grose Vale Rd to access the estate. Any additional traffic heading through Grose Wold will be existing residents living further west which currently use Grose Vale Rd only. To encourage use of Grose Vale Rd and ensure that traffic is restricted to local residents only, Council could consider a range of measures including lower speed limits or traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps). This will dealt with during the Bridge Approval process.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p> <p>The proposed development will retain rural amenity by ensuring appropriate zoning and rural conservation via the Development Control Plan & Conservation Management Plan, it will minimise the ecological footprint by having three times the Open Space as comparable development and providing protection zones around environmentally sensitive areas, and finally will provide much needed infrastructure improvements (namely water, sewer, stormwater and roads) for existing residents.</p> <p>The "Environment Assessment" and "Environmental Benefits and Constraints Analysis" are on exhibition and identify all key issues and proposed mitigants. On balance there are very few environmental issues as the site has been extensively cleared for grazing over a prolonged period of time.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>
269	Robyn Bushell (Kurrajong)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Same as submission number 244.</p>	As per responses to Submission #244.
270	Peter Warwick (Guildford)	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>Rezoning will help meet the increased demand for additional housing in the North Richmond area as well as creating significant job opportunities.</p>	

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>The proposed infrastructure required will be provided at no additional cost to the public and the construction of new dwellings will boost the regions economy and lift adjoining property values.</p> <p>The site has long being identified for its development potential and is not flood affected.</p> <p>The proposed development area is mostly cleared and directly adjoins a large residential area, meaning the development will not be out of character with adjoining lands and carried out with minimal impact to the surrounding environment.</p> <p>The planning proposal reveals that some of the existing dams will be retained as water features within future parks which should enhance the amenity of the site.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
271	Megan Booth (North Richmond)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion and increase in traffic. Traffic problems should be fixed now.</p> <p>Local shops and schools will not be able to cope with the extra demand.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a community-based commercial zone which will provide conveniences for new and existing residents, taking the pressure of existing facilities.</p> <p>The Urbis Community Needs Report notes that the proposed development benchmarks will not trigger the need for new primary or secondary schools, but additional childcare will be required. The VPA requires the Proponent to contribute to the upgrading or replacing of local community facilities.</p>
272	Ken & Tracey Forsstrom (Kurrajong)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Number of home and small size of lots.</p> <p>Impacts of increase in traffic.</p> <p>The development will impact on already congested traffic flowing across the North Richmond Bridge with no plans to fix the problem.</p> <p>Questions merit of new bridge which leads to a bridge that already floods during rain.</p> <p>What happens if there is not enough water supply?</p> <p>Environmental impact on Redbank Creek from water runoff.</p> <p>NSW Government disagreed with development.</p> <p>No builders guarantee or funds required up front to cover possible loss or bankruptcy. Should have bank guarantee of \$20M.</p>	<p>The proposed development will deliver 1399 dwellings over a 10 year period (i.e. approx. 140 new dwellings per annum) with staged infrastructure improvements during this time.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded (per RMS plans) initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Areas east of the site (the western Sydney trough) including Yarramundi Bridge will be under water in the event of significant flood. The proposed Navua Bridge will provide emergency access to Penrith via Springwood.</p> <p>With regards to water and sewerage systems there is sufficient capacity for the development however improvements to water pressure will be required. The sewer system can also accommodate the development with minor augmentation bearing in mind the proposed system is a low infiltration system.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP. Stormwater retention and treatment will take into account any latent deficiencies, changes to upstream water bodies (dams in Peel Farm), as well as any future development.</p> <p>The State Govt "Review of Potential Housing Sites" was undertaken to fast track suitable land for housing. The limitations relating to Redbank in the review were specifically noted in the Gateway Determination as conditions of its approval to develop, all of which have been addressed – i.e. an RMS-endorsed TMAP, Heritage-endorsed CMP, and a draft VPA for public exhibition.</p> <p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed as agreed.</p>
273	Sharon Parnwell (Bowen Mountain)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Council should improve the North Richmond Bridge not build more housing to cause traffic congestion.</p>	<p>The latest Hyder/RMS report recommends that the Nth Richmond Bridge/BLR upgrade not occur until after key intersections are improved (same intersections as listed in VPA and provided by developer) and even then, will be subject to LEP amendments, EIS, approvals and compulsory land acquisitions before a targeted completion date of 2036.</p>
274	M Jenkins (Pitt Town)	<p>Supports the proposed development:</p> <p>Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
275	Bill & Tracy Denne (North Richmond)	<p>Supports the proposed development: Author has resided in the area for over 50 years and seen numerous developments that have occurred in staggered and disjointed sections. The thoughtful and integrated style of this proposal can only be described as tremendous.</p> <p>The benefits to the community including alternate housing options, employment and growth to the township.</p> <p>Developers have offered to provide infrastructure that will not be provided by local funding.</p> <p>Feel if we loose this opportunity this large parcel of land will be sold in sections and sold to smaller developers.</p> <p>People need somewhere to live.</p> <p>We must acknowledge the fact that an area will grow and we should work together to achieve the best outcome for the inevitable.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
276	L Jenkins (Pitt Town)	<p>Supports the proposed development: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
277	Benjamin Jenkins (Pitt Town)	<p>Supports the proposed development: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
278	Melissa Ellis (Winmalee)	<p>Supports the proposed development: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
279	Christina Hatton	<p>Supports the proposed development: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
280	Nicholas Jenkins (Winmalee)	<p>Supports the proposed development: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
281	Shane Wall (Pitt Town)	<p>Supports the proposed development: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
282	Luana McFall (B.Pharm) from North Richmond	<p>Supports the proposed development: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
283	Phillip Doueihy (B.Pharm) from North Richmond	<p>Supports the proposed development: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
284	Daniel Hawkins (Bowen Mountain)	<p>Supports the proposed development: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
285	Connie Williams	<p>Supports the proposed development: Same as submission number 126.</p>	<p>The Proponent is committed to the successful development of a unique Heritage-listed residential project, and to assist in resolving longstanding infrastructure issues for existing residents.</p>
286	Scott Walker (Kurrajong area)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Lack of public transport.</p>	<p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021.</p> <p>Frequency and location of local and school bus routes will most likely change with increase demand and road infrastructure improvements, and will be determined by the bus operator.</p>

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		<p>Developer should install infrastructure prior to any works. No guarantees that it will be delivered.</p> <p>Destruction of Navua Reserve.</p> <p>Impact on Redbank Creek from water runoff.</p> <p>Development should be in an area where infrastructure is in place.</p> <p>If lot sizes were more appropriate and roads improved, it would resolve a lot of community angst.</p>	<p>The VPA is an agreement between the Proponent, Council and RMS to ensure that adequate road and community infrastructure is delivered and paid for by the Proponent - not Council or ratepayers - and that the obligation is secured and passes with the land in the event of developer default on its obligations. Under the VPA, Council can withhold the release of new allotments until the required work is completed or funds provided as agreed.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares – which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p> <p>Rainwater runoff and stormwater treatment has been designed utilising MUSIC modelling and when implemented it must satisfy the water quantity and water quality requirements outlined in Council's Stormwater Drainage DCP.</p> <p>Land east of the Hawkesbury River is subject to significant flooding constraint, as confirmed in the Molino Stewart Flooding Report. Flood-free land is held by multiple landowners making amalgamation difficult and housing unaffordable. It would also limit scope to improve infrastructure west of river, meaning existing traffic problems would remain unresolved.</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal has identified minimum lot sizes, as required by NSW Planning, there is a total number of lots. The total of 1399 lots results in an average density of 8.68 dwellings per hectare of the 161 hectare gross developable land area. This is considerably lower than the average density in western Sydney of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The estimated net developable land is approximately 100 hectares allowing for open space, drainage and roads. This results in a broad average lot size of 750m2. The development will provide for a mix ranging from 375m2 to 2000m2 plus in size. Within the R2 area the average lot size would be in excess of 500m2</p>
287	Catherine Watkins (Town Planner) on behalf of John Starr	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Proposed Navua Bridge identified in SREP No.20 Map (provided) in a location identified to be of regional significance for riverine scenic quality, and requires further investigate (no studies done at this point). Should have been done as part of TMAP process, because if bridge is "solution" what if it cannot be approved? Specialist reports do not extend to an analysis of impacts of the proposed bridge construction on the environment.</p> <p>Dimensions for Navua Bridge and approaches are unclear and do not show lot boundaries. The proposal impacts on additional sites adjacent to the proposed bridge and road connection. The provided drawings are not scaled making it difficult to understand the potential scale of the proposal.</p> <p>No report into potential impact on local roads feeding into Navua Bridge. Insufficient information has been provided to support community net benefit arguments.</p> <p>The Navua Bridge won't be delivered until 2018, and 60% of site developed. Concern about traffic congestion, sight distances/visibility, site access, etc. There is no certainty that any bridge will be approved and subsequently constructed, with 2018 a nominal timeframe.</p> <p>Draft VPA makes reference to a capped contribution. There is no adequate fallback in the event that approvals for Navua Bridge are not obtained, money to Council doesn't solve traffic issues. Without environmental assessments having been undertaken in relation to the bridge, the complete costs cannot be estimated.</p> <p>Should be a infrastructure first policy. The proposal allows for construction of 60% of the development to be built prior to bridge construction with no guarantee the bridge will ever be built.</p>	<p>Plans for the proposed Navua Bridge must be approved by Council and endorsed by all relevant referral agencies, in particular Aboriginal Heritage and Environment & Heritage, and will include due reference to SREP No.20 as provided.</p> <p>Plans for the Navua Bridge included on exhibition were for public comment, with further detailed design and refinements made during the Bridge planning process.</p> <p>TMAP & VPA confirms that proposed Navua Bridge works will include approaches and improvements to existing roads (Ashton & Grose River Rds.). This will include minimum requirements for pedestrian safety (including horse riders).</p> <p>As outlined in the VPA schedule, three RMS endorsed road improvements must be made prior to the delivery of 121 lots, with the construction of the Proposed Navua Bridge crossing and approaches to be completed prior to the creation of the 1001st lot.</p> <p>The capped contribution definition relates to the monetary contribution payable in the event that the Proposed Navua Bridge fails to obtain necessary approvals to be built. It is calculated in reference to a per lot benchmark (\$13k per lot) which is indexed with CPI/inflation. RMS is being added as a party to the VPA to ensure that the capped contribution will be used by both RMS & Council to address necessary road infrastructure in lieu of the Navua Bridge.</p> <p>The VPA provides for infrastructure improvements to solve existing and future issues progressively over the life of the project.</p>
288	S Bishell (The Slopes)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p>	

Ref. No.	Name	Summary of Individual Submission	PROPONENT'S RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS
		Same as submission number 144	Response as per Submission #144
289	Jjoanna George	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>People are moving to eastern side of river due to traffic congestion.</p> <p>Bridge solution required with development.</p>	<p>See previous comments re traffic.</p> <p>The VPA is proposing a bridge and upgrading of Bells Line of Road</p>
290	Valerie O'Brien (Grose Vale)	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Development incompatible character of the area.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion, road/bridge is inadequate.</p> <p>Capacity of water supply and sewage system.</p> <p>Impact of development on ecology.</p> <p>Public transport is non-existent.</p> <p>Who will be responsible for maintaining the roads.</p> <p>Navua Bridge is impractical, not a flood free route.</p> <p>Impact of bridge on Navua and Yarramundi Reserves.</p>	<p>The rural amenity within the Hawkesbury LGA is not confined within the boundaries of the Redbank site. It is a whole of LGA issue and the Redbank Planning Proposal does remove rural use land in one small section of the LGA. The provision of housing on a site identified for residential investigation rather than the subdivision of rural lands over the whole district provides greater conservation of rural land.</p> <p>Page 111 (Table 48) of the TMAP shows there will be improved Level of Service on key intersections when the three intersections are upgraded initially within the first 120 lots, and a relative improvement to today's Level of Service even accounting for growth in traffic volumes to 2021. This will reduce congestion on feeder roads and main thoroughfares.</p> <p>Development will be required to provide infrastructure upgrades to Sydney Water requirements.</p> <p>Ultimately Council will be responsible.</p> <p>The proposed bridge is not intended to be a flood evacuation route.</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares - which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>
291	Bill White	<p>Objections / Concerns include:</p> <p>Increase in traffic on roads approaching Navua Bridge.</p> <p>Destruction of Yarramundi Reserve e.g. loss of recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion and will get worse with increase in traffic.</p> <p>Replace North Richmond Bridge with 4 lane bridge and widen Bells Line of Road</p>	<p>The VPA proposed upgrade works for these roads to cater for any additional traffic</p> <p>The Navua/Yarramundi Reserve is approx. 78 hectares in size. The road reserve encroachment required for the Bridge and approaches will be approx. 0.7 hectares - which is effectively less than 1% of the total area. Public access to the Reserves will be preserved for future use. The alignment along the existing road reservations is within areas close to the current car parks and access roads.</p>