



10 December 2021

Felicity Hall
Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal
PO Box K35
HAYMARKET POST SHOP NSW 1240

Our Ref: FP262

Dear Ms Hall,

Comments on IPART Information Paper – Contributions Plan No. 18 (FP262)

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on IPART's Information Paper for Contributions Plan No. 18 – Bella Vista and Kellyville Station Precincts. The following officer level comments are provided below for your consideration.

1. What is the correct land area for open space items in the Plan (OSE1-12)?

Landcom has since advised Council that the open space areas within the draft Plan are accurate. Accordingly, the areas specified within the draft Plan should be retained.

2. Why have the costs for the Viaduct Park (OSE4) increased by \$5.7 million when the initial cost estimate already included park amenities?

It is difficult to compare these items as Council did not receive a breakdown of the original costings. This is a matter that Landcom may be able to clarify in more detail. The proposed embellishment of the open space (based on the Landcom's submission to IPART) indicates that the original costs were based on IPART benchmarks and/or similar Contributions Plans. The uniqueness of this open space and difficulty in obtaining comparable costs may have contributed to the under-costing in Landcom's original estimates. Nevertheless the level of embellishment of the open space will need to be consistent with the intended embellishment within the draft Plan which specifies '*small courts (as well as associated seating, lighting and fencing) which will cater for a combination of activities*'.

3. What evidence supports the need for a vehicular bridge (RT11) and what share of costs should be funded from development within the precinct?

The RMS has recently advised Landcom that no new intersections with Memorial Avenue will be accepted. This will necessitate the replacement of the proposed Left-in/ Left-out (LILO) intersection onto Memorial Avenue with a new vehicular bridge from the north-eastern corner of the District Park to Free Settlers Drive. Vehicular access to Memorial Avenue (from the Bella Vista Precinct) will still be required in order to facilitate orderly development within the Precinct. Without this

access point all vehicular traffic within the northern portion of the Precinct will be forced to access the State road network via Balmoral Road. This bridge would service north-south connections within the Precinct particularly as densities increase. The demand for this bridge is entirely created by increased densities in the Metro precincts and not by the existing population in the Balmoral Road Release Area. Accordingly, the item should be fully apportioned to CP18. It is anticipated that the new vehicular bridge would operate in a very similar manner to the proposed Colonial Street Bridge (within the Kellyville Precinct).

4. *Should single or dual lane roundabouts (RT9 and RT10) be provided and what is the reasonable cost?*

The Precinct will accommodate high levels of traffic movement. The proposed traffic and transport improvements seek to provide reasonable amenity, vehicular permeability and minimise traffic congestion throughout the Precincts.

Roundabout RT9 is proposed to be dual-lane in order to provide additional capacity at the roundabout for vehicles that are turning. The SSDA Traffic Report prepared by Jacobs identifies Colonial Street and Arnold Avenue as an alternative access point to/from the Kellyville Precinct by enabling traffic from the Kellyville Station Precinct to arrive/depart via Memorial Avenue. A double lane roundabout at the new road near Colonial Street will be required in order to efficiently carry through traffic from Memorial Avenue and Colonial Street through the Precinct.

Roundabout RT10 is also proposed to be dual lane in order to provide additional capacity at the roundabout for vehicles that are turning and accessing the future District Park and school. The removal of the LILLO access to Memorial Avenue and identification of a new vehicular bridge to Free Settlers Drive will also reinforce the need for a dual lane roundabout at this location.

5. *What are the reasons for the higher contingency rates in the quantity surveyor report when compared to the rates in the Council's plan?*

The costings in the draft Plan do not include separate contingencies as it was assumed that the original costings included contingency allowances. Landcom's QS report is considered to provide the most likely and accurate indication of project costs, including contingencies that have regard to site and project-specific factors.

6. *Why are some infrastructure costs in APP's submission different to the costs in the quantity surveyor report? In particular, the path along creek at Kellyville (OSE6), the path along creek at Bella Vista (OSE7), and Gross Pollutant Traps (DR1-6).*

Landcom is best placed to address the inconsistencies between costings in their submission and the QS Report.

With respect to the proposed shared paths the draft Plan utilises a linear metre rate whereas Landcom's QS includes m² rate. It is recommended that the lineal rate be applied as per Council's previous submission to IPART's first exhibition.

With respect to items DR1-6, it should be noted that whilst Landcom's cost for GPTs is generally consistent with GPT costs from other contribution plans across Sydney (including North Kellyville and Box Hill), these costs do not account for differences in size or inflation. The proposed costs for GPTs within the draft Plan have taken into consideration matters such as size and other localised factors such as the need for maintenance access points. The costs for the proposed GPTs are based on the tendered price for Oxlade Street Reserve (within Council's Contributions Plan No. 13 – North Kellyville Precinct). This is considered to be a more accurate estimate of the likely cost for

these items as the GPT for Oxlade Reserve is comparable in terms of scale, design and materials. Therefore, it is requested that Council's original cost be utilised.

Whilst there could be cost savings for Landcom in providing such infrastructure as part of future development of the Sydney Metro land, this would not be the same for Council. At this time, Council has not received, considered or endorsed any VPA offer from Landcom and the potential for this to occur in the future should not be of determinative weight in IPART's assessment, until such time as a VPA of this nature has been entered into by both parties.

Should you require any further information, or wish to discuss the matter further, please contact Dragana Strbac, Town Planner on [REDACTED].

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

Brent Woodhams
PRINCIPAL COORDINATOR – FORWARD PLANNING