



Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal  
New South Wales

# Application for assessment of a section 94 development contributions plan – Part A

**Contributions Plan No. 24L Schofields Precinct (land)**



---

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Instructions</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Who should fill in this application form?	1
1.2	How should a council submit an application?	1
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminary Information</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	All applications	2
2.2	For contributions plans previously reviewed by IPART	3
<b>3</b>	<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Criterion 1 – the Essential Works List	5
3.2	Criterion 2 – Nexus	6
3.3	Criterion 3 – Reasonable costs	10
3.4	Criterion 4 – Reasonable timeframe	13
3.5	Criterion 5 – Reasonable apportionment	14
3.6	Criterion 6 – Appropriate community liaison	16
3.7	Criterion 7 – The plan complies with other matters IPART considers relevant	17
<b>4</b>	<b>Quality assurance</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Attachment checklist</b>	<b>21</b>



# 1 Instructions

## 1.1 Who should fill in this application form?

This form is for NSW councils that are submitting a **section 94 contributions plan** to IPART for assessment. A separate application must be submitted for each contributions plan.

Councils are encouraged to discuss information requirements or other queries relating to the contributions plan assessment process with IPART prior to submitting an application.

Call IPART on 02 9290 8400 to speak to the Local Government Contributions Plan Team.

## 1.2 How should a council submit an application?

Councils should complete this Application Form Part A and submit it to IPART, along with the contributions plan and all relevant supporting documentation (see Checklist in section 5) by email, post or in person. We require an electronic copy of all documents.

Email	Post	In Person
Attention: Local Government Contributions Plan Team	Attention: Local Government Contributions Plan Team	Attention: Local Government Contributions Plan Team
localgovernment@nsw.gov.au	Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal PO Box K35 Haymarket Post Shop Sydney NSW 1240	Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal Level 15 2-24 Rawson Place Sydney NSW 2000

## 1.3 What other information is available?

Please refer to IPART's website <<https://www.ipart.nsw.gov.au/Home/Industries/Local-Government/S94-Contributions-Plans>> for further information on our assessment process, including current and completed assessments. The website also has copies of:

- ▼ Application Form Part B (optional)
- ▼ *Section 94E Ministerial Direction for Local Infrastructure Contributions 2012*, as amended (s94E Ministerial Direction), and
- ▼ *Local Infrastructure Contributions Practice Note*, January 2018.

## 2 Preliminary Information

### 2.1 All applications

#### A. Council information

<b>Council name</b>	Blacktown City Council
<b>Primary council contact details</b> (Provide name, position, phone number, and email address)	Jenny Rodger - Section 94 Officer [REDACTED]
<b>Secondary council contact details</b> (Provide name, position, phone number, and email address)	Dennis Bagnall – Manager Developer Contributions [REDACTED]

#### B. Information about the plan

What is the name of the plan?	Contributions Plan No. 24L Schofields Precinct (land)																																									
Which clause of the <i>section 94E Ministerial Direction for Local Infrastructure Contributions</i> (s94E Ministerial Direction) applies to this plan (ie, clause 6, 6A, 6B or 6C)?	The Schofields Precinct is listed in 6A of the July 2017 Direction.																																									
What is the current maximum contribution amount (per lot or dwelling) for this plan under the section s94E Ministerial Direction?	\$40,000.00																																									
In the absence of any cap imposed by the s94E Ministerial Direction, what are the indicative contribution amounts (per lot or dwelling) for each type of residential development in the catchment area?	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="6">Indicative Contributions Per Dwelling</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Density (Dwellings Per Ha)</th> <th>12.5</th> <th>15</th> <th>25</th> <th>30</th> <th>40</th> <th>45</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Occupancy (No. Persons Per Dwelling)</td> <td>2.9</td> <td>2.9</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>2.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eastern Catchment</td> <td>\$74,732</td> <td>\$66,953</td> <td>\$49,412</td> <td>\$45,494</td> <td>\$40,639</td> <td>\$39,002</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Western Catchment1</td> <td></td> <td>\$39,261</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Western Catchment2</td> <td></td> <td>\$26,029</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Indicative Contributions Per Dwelling						Density (Dwellings Per Ha)	12.5	15	25	30	40	45	Occupancy (No. Persons Per Dwelling)	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	Eastern Catchment	\$74,732	\$66,953	\$49,412	\$45,494	\$40,639	\$39,002	Western Catchment1		\$39,261					Western Catchment2		\$26,029				
Indicative Contributions Per Dwelling																																										
Density (Dwellings Per Ha)	12.5	15	25	30	40	45																																				
Occupancy (No. Persons Per Dwelling)	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7																																				
Eastern Catchment	\$74,732	\$66,953	\$49,412	\$45,494	\$40,639	\$39,002																																				
Western Catchment1		\$39,261																																								
Western Catchment2		\$26,029																																								
When was the plan publicly exhibited?	27 June 2018 to 24 July 2018																																									
Has the council adopted the plan? If so, when was it adopted and when did it come into force?	Adopted 12 September 2018 In force 10 October 2018																																									
To what extent was the Department of Planning & Environment (DPE) involved in the development of this plan?	The Department of Planning and Environment were responsible for the precinct planning for the Schofields Precinct in consultation with Blacktown City Council.  They had no direct involvement with the																																									

	preparation of the contributions plan, except for providing various information that informs the Plan.
Over what period will development in the catchment area of the plan occur?	25 years
What proportion of the total projected development in the catchment area of the plan has been approved and/or constructed?	Approximately 50%
What planning instruments (SEPPs, LEPs, or DCPs) apply to land in the catchment area of the plan?	State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006 Blacktown City Council Priority Growth Area Precincts Development Control Plan
Has the Minister referred this contributions plan to IPART for review? If so, provide details.	No – Council refers it to IPART to be eligible for funding under the Local Infrastructure Growth Scheme.

## 2.2 For contributions plans previously reviewed by IPART

Councils only need to complete these three questions for plans that IPART has previously reviewed.

### C. Information about revisions to the plan

Why is the council submitting the revised plan for IPART's review?	This revision has created two distinct contributions plans 'CP24L – Schofields Precinct (land)' and 'CP24W – Schofields Precinct (works)'.  Since the adoption of the initial plan it is evident that land values have increased significantly compared to the consumer price index. To ensure Council collects sufficient funds to acquire the remaining land need to acquire, we have had the land costs' re-valued".
Briefly explain how the plan has been revised in response to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– recommendations made in IPART's assessment report on the previous version/s of the plan, and</li> <li>– any directions from the Minister for Planning in relation to IPART's assessment.</li> </ul>	The 2015 adoption of CP 24 Schofields Precinct incorporated the directions from the Minister for Planning in relation to IPART's assessment.

Briefly explain any other revisions to the plan such as updated costings, revised apportionment of costs, or amended delivery timeframe.

The plan provides or updates details on the costs of land acquisition to the Schofields Precinct in the North West Priority Growth Area. It also provides the Section 94 contribution rates proposed under each plan.

Further information regarding the review is in Section 22.



## 3 Assessment Criteria

We will assess the contributions plan against the criteria listed in the *Local Infrastructure Contributions Practice Note*, issued by the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) in January 2018 (Practice Note).

Your responses to the questions in this section will assist us in understanding how the plan, including the proposed cost of land and works, has been prepared.

- ▼ If the information in your proposed response is clearly set out in the contributions plan or a separate report or document, it is sufficient to refer to the appropriate sections/pages.
- ▼ Any referenced reports and documents will need to be attached to this application (see Checklist in Section 5).

### 3.1 Criterion 1 – the Essential Works List

#### The public amenities and public services in the plan are on the Essential Works List

We are required to assess whether the land and works in the contributions plan are on the Essential Works List (EWL). Refer to the Practice Note for the most recent version of this list, including a definition of base level embellishment of open space.

#### Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Include land or works <b>not</b> on the EWL	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Include costs for any land or works <b>not</b> on the EWL in the calculation of contribution rates	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1. If the plan includes costs for land and/or works not on the Essential Works List:
  - a) list these items below, and
  - b) indicate how their costs are to be met.

NA

Only the land component for community services is on the Essential Works List. However, we require details of the community services that are intended to be provided on this land, so we can determine what proportion of the land costs can be recovered through development contributions.

- 2. List the community services that will be provided on the land that is to be acquired for community services (eg, youth centre, library) and indicate the floor space area allocated to each.**

#### **Local/District Community Neighbourhood Centre**

- Neighbourhood centre, community and cultural development
- Child and family services and facilities

The Neighbour Centre is identified as a 750sqm floor space.

#### **Aquatic Facility**

The Aquatic Facility located in the Marsden Park Precinct services a number of Precincts within the North West Growth Area.

The total cost for the land for the Aquatic Facility has been apportioned over the six precincts, being Marsden Park Industrial, Schofields, Marsden Park, Marsden Park North, Schofield West and Shanes Park. 12.6% of these costs are attributed to the Schofields Precinct.

## 3.2 Criterion 2 – Nexus

**The proposed public amenities and public services are reasonable in terms of nexus (the connection between development and the demand created).**

Nexus ensures that the land and works included in the contributions plan are required to meet the increased demand for facilities generated by the anticipated development.

### Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Incorporate a map showing the geographical catchment area of the contributions plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Appendices A to C Pages 36 to 41
Detail the types of development that will occur in the catchment area(s) of the plan, and the approximate area of each land use	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 1.13 Page 5
Include information about:			Section 1.12
▼ the existing population in the catchment area	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Page 5
▼ the projected residential population and/or workforce	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Appendix D Page 42
Include details about how the need for land and works was determined	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Sections 2 to 7 Pages 9 to 29
Refer to design and construction standards used in determining the works in the plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Sections 2 to 7 Pages 9 to 29

### 3. Explain the process used to determine the need for all land and works in the plan.

List any supporting studies relied on and explain any deviations from recommendations in those studies.

The land required for public purposes was determined as part of the Schofields Precinct Planning by the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE). DPE commissioned technical studies to determine the quantum of additional facilities required to serve the planned increased population.

The land required to provide these facilities is gazetted in the SEPP land acquisition and reservation map. Where Council is the nominated acquisition authority, the cost of the land has been included in our contributions plans. The technical studies that support the precinct planning are listed below:

#### a) Transport land and works

- The Schofields Transport & Access Study (2010) by Urbanhorizon Pty Ltd

#### b) Stormwater land and management works

- J. Wyndham Prince Schofields Precinct, Rouse Hill – Water Cycle Management Strategy Report Incorporating Water Sensitive Urban Design Techniques dated July 2011.
- Opus International Consultants Schofields Precinct Review of Water Cycle Management Strategy 09 November 2012.

**c) Open space land and works (embellishments)**

- Blacktown City 2025 – Delivering the Vision (Blacktown City Council, 2008).
- Elton Consulting – Social Infrastructure and Open Space Report – Schofields (2010), undertaken by the Growth Centres Commission.
- Northwest Growth Centres Recreational Framework (Blacktown City Council, 2009).
- Wellness Through Physical Activity Policy (Blacktown City Council, 2008).
- Blacktown City Council Social Plan (2007).
- Recreation and Open Space Strategy (Blacktown City Council, 2009).

**d) Community services land**

- Community Infrastructure Report (Social Infrastructure and Open Space Report Schofields Precinct 2010, undertaken by the Growth Centres Commission.
- Riverstone and Alex Avenue Precincts Demographic Profile & Community Infrastructure Report 2007), undertaken by the Growth Centres Commission.
- The Informal Indoor Recreation Needs Assessment and the Section 94 Community Facilities Report, undertaken by Council.

**4. Were any supporting studies prepared for the catchment area but not relied on? If so, explain why they were not used.**

No

**5. How has non-residential development been considered in determining the need for infrastructure in the plan.**

**Water Management**

Demand for stormwater management infrastructure is generally driven by the amount of impervious area. There are controls in the DCP that allow the upper limits of impervious area to be estimated. This was then used in the numerical modelling to size the required stormwater management infrastructure. In terms of stormwater treatment, on lot treatment is the adopted strategy for non-residential uses. Provision is made in the CP to provide supplementary treatment for public roads in non-residential areas. Roads generally occupy approximately 25% of the gross development area and this has been used in apportioning stormwater treatment costs.

**Traffic Management**

In this CP the costs associated with the roads servicing the precinct have been allocated over an area basis for the non-residential.

**6. In determining the need for infrastructure in the plan, what consideration was given to:**

- a) the existing population in the catchment area
- b) any existing or projected population outside the catchment area
- c) the capacity of existing infrastructure in the catchment area, and/or
- d) any existing or proposed infrastructure outside the catchment area.

---

### **Traffic & Water Management**

Typically the only existing stormwater infrastructure in the precincts are rural standard culverts under existing roads. These do not have the capacity to manage the increased flows resulting from development and must be replaced to comply with current design standards. Therefore there is no surplus capacity in the existing stormwater management infrastructure.

Existing roads are generally rural roads that do not comply with current road design standards and requirements. Therefore the existing road network does not have any surplus capacity and the full cost of upgrades is included in the CP.

### **Open Space**

There is no existing open space within the precinct that will meet the needs of the new population.

Overall, there is a shortage of open space provision in North West Growth Centre. The new incoming population will not be able to rely on open space outside the precinct. Open spaces in adjacent precincts do not have the capacity to serve additional out of precinct population.

Therefore, open space works included in the CP are essential to meet the needs of the new incoming population.

### **Community Facilities**

There is no existing community facility infrastructure and capacity in the precincts relating to this CP plan.

### 3.3 Criterion 3 – Reasonable costs

The proposed development contribution is based on a reasonable estimate of the cost of the proposed public amenities and public services.

IPART must advise whether the proposed development contributions are based on a *reasonable* estimate of the cost of the proposed public amenities and public services. This includes how the base costs of land and each item of infrastructure are derived and the method used to calculate the contribution rates and escalate them over time.

#### Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...	Yes	No	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Explain how the proposed cost of works was derived (eg, quantity surveyor or other consultant advice, standard costs used by the council)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sections 2 to 7 Pages 9 to 29
Explain how the proposed cost of land was derived	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Sections 2 Page 9
Include a schedule of the contributions rates (eg, \$/ha, \$/person, \$/dwelling)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Appendix E Page 43
Explain how the contribution rates will be adjusted for inflation/ changes in costs	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Sections 9.4 Page 33
Provide details of accounting arrangements for contribution funds (eg, is pooling of funds permitted, will internal borrowings be used to deliver infrastructure projects?)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Sections 1.21 Page 8
If using a Net Present Value (NPV) approach, include assumptions made in the modelling of costs and revenue	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

#### 7. What is the base period for costs in the plan (eg, June 2017)?

Base CPI – All Groups Sydney - March 2018

#### 8. Explain the process used to estimate costs for works for each infrastructure category.

Refer to matters such as:

- Use of consultant or QS estimates
- Use of council costs
- Use of benchmark costs
- Any allowances included, such as professional fees and contingencies
- Details of any indexation of cost estimates to the base period of the plan, including the index used

##### a) Transport works

No work costs have been included in CP24L – Schofields Precinct (land)

##### b) Stormwater management works

No work costs have been included in CP24L – Schofields Precinct (land)

**c) Open space works (embellishments)**

No work costs have been included in CP24L – Schofields Precinct (land)

**9. Explain the process used to estimate the cost of plan preparation and administration.**

No administration costs have been included in CP24L – Schofields Precinct (land)

**10. What, if any, land has the council already acquired to provide local infrastructure for development in the catchment area? How has the cost of this land been included in the plan?**

Only land that was acquired under the previous CP24 – Schofields Precinct has been included in this revised plan.

**11. Explain the process used to estimate the cost of land yet to be acquired by the council.**

Refer to:

- Details of any inclusions for just terms compensation
- Details of any indexation of cost estimates from the base period of the plan, including the index used

Council engaged M J Davis Valuations Pty Ltd to provide independent estimated land value rates for land to be acquired in the Schofields Precinct. Specifically they estimated average rates which might apply as at June 2018 to the various categories/underlying zones in each precinct. Council then adds 5% for estimated “other acquisition costs”.

The following assumptions were made in determining the % for “ other acquisition costs”:

- Review of 2016 and 2017 actual acquisition data.
- Purchase cost included the engagement of consultants for contamination assessment, surveying, planning, valuations and Legal costs.
- In addition we are required to pay items under the Just Terms Compensation Act for Disturbance, Injurious Affection, Disadvantage resulting from relocation and reasonable owners legal fees
- Whilst our preference is to negotiate an outcome with an incentive cost of \$7,500 to the owner, there a handful of cases which will be tested by the Courts.

On this basis the average purchase cost as a percentage of acquisitions is estimated at 5%.

The average land values are applied to the areas yet to be acquired for each catchment type and then apportioned over either the incoming population or developable area. This produces the base rate in the CP.

Base rates are indexed quarterly by the All Groups Sydney CPI.

**12. If contributions rates in the plan are calculated using an NPV model,**

- a) Does the model use real or nominal values?
- b) If the model uses nominal values, what indexation assumptions are applied to costs and revenue?
- c) What discount rate does the model use, and why?

We do not use the NPV model.

**13. What measures have been taken to minimise costs in the contributions plan (eg, adjustment to design or alternative engineering solutions)?**

The land that is to be purchased in the plan must be acquired under the Just Terms Compensation Act, therefore there is little scope to minimise costs, other than to negotiate the best outcome possible.



### 3.4 Criterion 4 – Reasonable timeframe

The proposed public amenities and public services can be provided within a reasonable timeframe

#### Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Contributions plan page reference(s)
Include details of the anticipated rate of development in the catchment area and how this was determined	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 1.15 Page 6
Include a program for infrastructure delivery and explain how it relates to the anticipated timing of development	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 1.20 Page 8
Include a statement regarding potential revision of the scheduled timing for infrastructure delivery	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 1.18 Page 7

#### 14. How has the council determined the timing of infrastructure provision?

Provide details of the program for delivery of infrastructure in the contributions plan and explain its underlying rationale.

Timing of land acquisition is linked to the provision of works. Anticipated timing is shown in CP24W Schofields Precinct (works).

### 3.5 Criterion 5 – Reasonable apportionment

The proposed development contribution is based on a reasonable apportionment of costs between existing and new demand, and also demand generated by different types of development.

Apportionment is about ensuring the allocation of costs equitably between all those who will benefit from the infrastructure or create the need for it. While nexus is about establishing a relationship between the development and demand for infrastructure, apportionment is about quantifying the extent of the relationship.

#### Checklist for the contributions plan

Does the contributions plan ...		Contributions plan page reference(s)
Include details of apportionment calculations	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 7 Page 28

#### 15. How does the plan apportion costs?

Provide details of calculations made, and explain how the apportionment takes into consideration demand arising from (as relevant):

- new and existing development in the catchment area
- different stages of development
- different sub-catchments
- residential and non-residential development
- different residential development densities
- new and/or existing development outside the catchment area

##### a) Transport land

Transport land costs are levied over the developable area of the Schofields Precinct. The developable area has been apportioned over residential and non-residential development, initially between zonings. The apportionment to residential zoned developable areas has then been adjusted to be levied on a per person basis.

Non Residential zoned developable areas continue to be levied on a developable area basis.

##### b) Stormwater management land

Stormwater management – Quantity land costs have been apportioned over 3 separated catchments, based on their drainage topography. Both residential and non-residential are levied on a developable area basis.

##### c) Open space land

Open Space land costs are levied over the incoming population of the Schofields Precinct and levied on a per person basis.



**d) Community services land**

Community Services land costs are levied over the incoming population of the Schofields Precinct and levied on a per person basis.

**e) Plan preparation and administration**

N/A for land

### 3.6 Criterion 6 – Appropriate community liaison

**The council has conducted appropriate community liaison and publicity in preparing the contributions plan.**

We require evidence that the plan has been exhibited and publicised in accordance with the statutory requirements and that submissions received during the exhibition period have been taken into account. The post-exhibition version of the plan should not differ so significantly from the exhibited version that it requires re-exhibition.

It is not necessary that the relevant information is included in the contributions plan itself.

#### **16. When was the plan publicly exhibited?**

27 June 2018 to 24 July 2018.

#### **17. In developing the contributions plan, was any publicity and community liaison undertaken outside the mandatory exhibition period?**

No

#### **18. How has the council taken into account submissions received on the draft plan placed on exhibition?**

No submissions were received.

#### **19. Does the council intend to undertake any further publicity or community liaison?**

No.

### **3.7 Criterion 7 – The plan complies with other matters IPART considers relevant**

IPART may take into consideration other matters relevant to our overall assessment of the contributions plan.

These matters may include compliance with the statutory requirements for making section 94 contribution plans and with the Practice Note, whether the plan uses up-to-date information, as well as issues of transparency and accountability in the council's proposed arrangements for the levying and collection of contributions under the plan.

#### **20. Is there any other information relating to the contributions plan (such as use of VPAs) which may assist us to assess it against this criterion?**

No new VPAs have been executed since the 2015 adoption of CP 24

#### **21. Is the council aware of possible changes to any underlying assumptions used in preparing the plan which may be relevant to our assessment?**

Such matters could include:

- revised population projections
- potential rezoning or changes to dwelling yields
- other changes to the applicable LEP, SEPP or DCP
- changes to NSW government policy for infrastructure delivery

No.


#### **22. Provide any other information which you consider would assist or expedite our assessment.**

This revision has created two distinct contributions plans 'CP24L – Schofields Precinct (Land)' and 'CP24W – Schofields Precinct (Works)' and incorporated new land acquisition rates. It also updated historical costs for both completed land and works.

We believe that this is an efficient way to ensure that we can quickly review land values which are escalating ahead of CPI in the North West Growth Area. As mentioned earlier, we have only adjusted the works costs by the CPI to try and facilitate a quicker review.

As the original contributions plan (CP24) was assessed by IPART in August 2014, approved by the Minister for Planning in March 2015, and amended in accordance with IPART's assessment of our reasonable costs, only those items that have changed have been provided to IPART for review. These include revised land valuations (CP24L) and a minor planning proposal.

Council considers that as IPART's comprehensive assessment of our first plan found our works costs to be reasonable (when adjusted), that reassessing those costs again will only delay the review and disadvantage the Council. For this reason we believe it is reasonable that these costs not be reassessed until the works costs are comprehensively reviewed. We also believe that increasing the costs by the CPI is more than reasonable.



We note that 50% of the Schofields precinct is either developed or has development applications approved. It is a precinct that has 2 major developers as its key stakeholders, Stockland and Defence Housing Australia make up around two third of the precinct. The developers require certainty for works costs for planning agreements or works-in-kind agreements which they have with us.

Increasing our approved works costs by an approved index continues that certainty for them.

## History

The first iteration of CP 24 was exhibited in September to October 2013. It was then submitted to IPART for assessment (prior to adoption).

IPART completed its assessment in August 2014 and the Minister's advice was received in March 2015.

Draft CP24 was amended as per the Minister's advice so it could be eligible for LIGS. It was adopted by Council and came in force in May 2015.

We have since been receiving LIGS funding based on this "IPART approved plan", which complies with Minister's advice.

This review addresses the following things;

- Splitting one plan into two plans - Land and Works
- New land value estimates were used to update any land yet to be acquired
- Actual land and works costs were updated for all land acquired & works completed since the adoption of the initial CP
- Remaining work estimates were indexed from the base date of the 2015 plan (March 2013) to the current index (June 2018) using the Sydney All Groups CPI
- An additional 1.6992ha and 73 persons were included in the catchments, for a partial rezoning of the Nirimba Education Precinct to residential. The planning proposal resolved that the addition area and dwellings would not impact on the infrastructure provision in the plan, so no changes to infrastructure were needed.
- Catchment areas were re-measured using the zoned areas, which resulted in a net decrease to the Eastern Creek Stormwater Quantity Catchment of 1.5084ha. This is the same method used for CP 21 Marsden Park and CP 22 Rouse Hill.
- The Stormwater Quality Contribution was amended to have separate rates for R2 zoned development and all other development. This was an IPART recommendation and has been used in the CP 22 Rouse Hill review.
- The Traffic Management Contribution was amended to have separate rates for residential development and non-residential development. This was an IPART recommendation and has been used in the CP 22 Rouse Hill review.

## 4 Quality assurance

We also request that council undertake a quality assurance (QA) check of the contributions plan before it is submitted to IPART for review.

The purpose of the council's QA check is to identify and address any errors or inconsistencies within the work schedules and also between the contributions plan and relevant supporting information to ensure that the plan, as submitted, is accurate. This should reduce the risk that our assessment is delayed by the need for corrections to be made, or our report unnecessarily include recommendations to correct what are, in essence, calculation errors.

### Checklist for the contributions plan

Has the contributions plan been checked for ...		
Typographical errors	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Calculation errors (including checking infrastructure and land cost calculations)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Use of the most up-to-date- data and information	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

### 23 Explain the quality assurance process undertaken for the contributions plan prior to submitting it to IPART for review.

Plan was cross checked by staff and reviewed by senior staff.



## 5 Attachment checklist

Please complete the checklist below to ensure that all information necessary for IPART's assessment is submitted.

Councils should complete and attach Application Form Part B,<sup>1</sup> or provide IPART with spreadsheets (.xls files) that:

- ▼ detail all infrastructure items included in the plan, with references to the studies that support their inclusion in the plan as relevant
- ▼ detail the cost of each infrastructure item (including source and date of costings, and any indexation of cost estimates)
- ▼ list all parcels of land required for infrastructure in the plan
- ▼ detail the cost of any land that has already been acquired and land that the council is yet to acquire
- ▼ show how the total cost of land and works for each infrastructure category (or subcategory) have been apportioned
- ▼ show how the contributions rates in the plan have been calculated (including net present value modelling if this approach is used), and
- ▼ show indicative contribution amounts for each type of residential dwelling.

### Checklist for council application

Application attachment			
<b>Work schedules and calculation of contribution rates</b>			
Application form Part B or	Yes	No	
spreadsheets that provide the information listed above	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Contributions plan</b>			
Version of contributions plan incorporating any post exhibition changes	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Version of contributions plan publicly exhibited	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Version of contributions plan previously submitted to IPART for review	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Public consultation</b>			
Copy of all submissions to publicly exhibited contributions plan	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Summary of submissions and council's response	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Technical studies and consultant documents</b>			
Land valuation report/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting studies for stormwater management infrastructure (eg, Flooding and Water Cycle Management report)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>1</sup> Application Form Part B is available on IPART's website.

### Application attachment

Supporting studies for transport infrastructure (eg, Traffic and Transport Assessment report)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting studies for open space infrastructure (eg, Demographic and Social Infrastructure report)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting studies for community services (eg, Demographic and Social Infrastructure report)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>

### Maps

Plan catchment map/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Final Indicative Layout Plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Zoning map/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Land acquisition map/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Constrained land maps/s	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>

### Other documents

VPAs	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Details of other funding agreements for state or local infrastructure in the area covered by the plan (including draft agreements)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Council business papers or meeting minutes related to the preparation of the contributions plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>
Any other documents that you think could be useful in IPART's assessment of the contributions plan	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/a <input type="checkbox"/>

### Other Information - State Funding Agreements

The section of Quakers Road from Akuna Vista to Quakers Hill Parkway attracts funding under the SIC. We are currently preparing a Strategic Business Case, under the INSW Investor Assurance Framework, to form our submission to DPE to secure the funding for this project.

This road is identified within the government's own planning documents, specifically the "Western Sydney Growth Areas Special Infrastructure Contribution Determination 2011".