

**DUE TO TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES, THE  
ATTACHED TABLES WERE OMITTED FROM THE  
COUNCIL REPORT o-EP4 DRAFT WINGECARRIBEE  
LEP 2009 – PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS ON EXHIBITION  
ON THE AGENDA  
FOR 24 JUNE 2009.**

**Sincere apologies**

## Group 4 Bowral Submissions and Comments

Table 6 provides a basic summary of each of the issues.

<b>Table 6 Bowral related issues</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments made in the Public submissions</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommendations from LEP Working Group</b>
<b>Extent &amp; impacts of medium density zone in Bowral.</b>	<p>The zoning of large sections of Bowral, particularly within the area bounded by Bowral Street, Sheffield Road, Park Road and Purcell Street, as well as along Aitken Road and Westwood Drive, has the potential to create an 'R3 ghetto'.</p> <p>Existing R3 development does not bode well for future development. What new controls are proposed?</p>	<p>Much of the land zoned R3 under draft WLEP 2009 is currently zoned 2(b) under the 1989 LEP and already contains medium density development.</p> <p>The area is serviced by public transport and is within a reasonable distance of the Bowral town centre and railway station. The retention of this area for medium density will contribute to meeting Council's population obligations under the Sydney-Canberra Corridor Strategy as well as providing a diversity of housing within the Shire to meet the needs of the population.</p> <p>New development will be controlled by a new Bowral Development Control Plan to ensure that the design of such development enhances the existing amenity of the area. There is strong emphasis in</p>	<p>That the proposed R3 zoning, as exhibited in draft WLEP 2009, be retained.</p>

<b>Table 6 Bowral related issues</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments made in the Public submissions</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommendations from LEP Working Group</b>
	Is there adequate infrastructure to support such development?	<p>the new DCP on the siting of buildings, height controls and landscaping.</p> <p>Developer contributions from new development will be used to help provide infrastructure upgrades and expansion.</p>	
Proposed zoning to R5 of land on Mount Road.	<p>That Lot 3, DP 1033664, Mount Road Bowral should be zoned either E3 or E4 rather than the proposed R5.</p> <p>Mount Road is a 'slippage seam' and the erection of a dwelling house would adversely impact on neighbouring properties by either flooding or slippage.</p>	<p>Following a submission from the owners of the subject site during the exhibition of the 2007 draft, Council resolved to rezone the site from E3 to R5 (large lot residential) to allow for the possible erection of a dwelling house on that portion of the site closest to Mount Road, subject to appropriate studies indicating that the site had the capability to allow such development.</p> <p>The rezoning of the site will not automatically result in a dwelling house being erected. Land capability studies, including flooding and slippage studies would be required and no development would be approved unless such studies</p>	<b>That in respect of Lot 3, DP 1033664, Mount Road Bowral, Council retain the R5 zoning over the portion of the land above the flood planning level and zone the portion of the site flood affected as E3 Environmental Management</b>

<b>Table 6 Bowral related issues</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments made in the Public submissions</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommendations from LEP Working Group</b>
		supported the proposal.	
<b>OLSH</b>	<p>25 submissions addressed the proposed inclusion of the OLSH site within Schedule 1, permitting the development of the site for Seniors Housing. All seek to have the site excluded from Schedule 1.</p> <p>Other submissions: The site should not be rezoned from SP2 (School) to R5 (Large Lot Residential).</p> <p>The site should be rezoned to R3 (Medium Density) to help meet Council's goal of accommodating an additional 3,000 dwellings under the Sydney-Canberra Corridor Strategy.</p> <p>The rezoning of part of the site to RE1 should not proceed.</p>	<p>This matter was considered at Council's meeting on 10 June 2009 and it was resolved to remove the subject site from Schedule 1.</p> <p>This rezoning was a consequence of a DOP direction that schools should be zoned consistently with adjoining zones. Therefore R5 was the most logical zone to use.</p> <p>A medium density zoning would not be in keeping with the zoning of adjoining areas.</p> <p>The subject land was originally zoned 6(d) Proposed Future Public recreation under WLEP 1989. Council resolved to rezone the land again for recreation purposes which protects the creek</p>	<p><b>That the site be removed from Schedule 1 as resolved by Council at its meeting on 10 June 2009.</b></p> <p>That the R5 zoning be retained as exhibited.</p> <p>Retain the R5 Large Lot Residential zoning as exhibited.</p> <p>That the RE1 zoning be retained as exhibited.</p>

<b>Table 6 Bowral related issues</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments made in the Public submissions</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommendations from LEP Working Group</b>
	<p>The Category 3 streams identified on the Natural Resources Sensitivity Maps are incorrect and the maps need to be corrected.</p> <p>Schedule 1 should be amended to include the additional uses of health services facility and exhibition village to allow a senior housing development to be properly serviced and marketed.</p>	<p>line. The land is included on the Land Acquisitions Map for future acquisitions.</p> <p>The streams data was provided by the DNR and would be confirmed at the DA stage. The Category 3 streams are generally intermittent streams and identified from ground depressions where water flows during very heavy rain.</p> <p>Exhibition Homes, Health Consulting Rooms and Residential Care Facilities are all permissible with consent in the R5 zone under the draft WLEP 2009. Exhibition Homes would provide sufficient opportunity for marketing purposes.</p>	<p>That the creek classification be retained as exhibited.</p> <p>No further action required</p>
<b>Steiner School site</b>	The site should not be rezoned from SP2 (School) to R5 (Large Lot Residential)	<p>The site is currently zoned 2(a1) Residential under LEP 1989. The Draft LEP was exhibited with the site zoned as RE2 Private Recreation.</p> <p>The DOP has instructed that schools or school sites should not be</p>	No further action required.

<b>Table 6 Bowral related issues</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments made in the Public submissions</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommendations from LEP Working Group</b>
		zoned an infrastructure zone.	
<b>Burradoo</b>	Residential zoning in Burradoo should be R2 with a minimum lot size of 2,000m <sup>2</sup> , rather than R5 with a minimum lot size of 4,000m <sup>2</sup> . This would make better use of the existing infrastructure and services and allow better infill to reduce the need for further green-fields subdivision.	The proposed zoning reflects the current zoning and minimum lot size and sparse development pattern. Services and infrastructure such as roads would have difficulties in meeting such an increase in demand.	No further action required.

## Group 5 Bundanoon Submissions and Comments

Table 7 provides a basic summary of each of the issues.

<b>Table 7 Bundanoon related issues</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments made in the Public Submissions</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommendations from LEP Working Group</b>
<b>Bundanoon CBD</b>	There is a lot of opportunity within the CBD for expansion and car parking.	The Draft LEP makes provision for additional commercial zoned land in Bundanoon. The commercial zoning allows for car parking to occur.	No further action required
<b>Infrastructure issues</b>	<p>Nowhere in the draft LEP are the infrastructure needs of the shire addressed, especially those for Bundanoon.</p> <p>Although the provision of infrastructure is not Council's responsibility, Council should take the lack of infrastructure into account in planning future residential areas.</p> <p>There should be no further residential development until there is an improved rail transport service &amp; the bridges over the railway are upgraded.</p>	<p>Firstly, the LEP is not the policy document to address infrastructure needs. Council required infrastructure needs will consequently be identified and levied for under the Developer Contributions Plans which are under development.</p> <p>The lag time in the provision of infrastructure is as frustrating for Council as it is for residents. State Authorities require evidence of population growth before they commit funds to improved infrastructure and services and Council does seek to maintain dialog with these authorities to ensure that delays are</p>	No further action required

**Table 7 Bundanoon related issues**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments made in the Public Submissions</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommendations from LEP Working Group</b>
	<p>Additional population without additional public transport will create car dependent communities which are not environmentally sustainable.</p> <p>Services are already inadequate so there should be no further residential development until social facilities and services such as school, aged care, health and welfare, police &amp; fire services are all upgraded.</p> <p>There should be no further residential development until local roads and car parking are improved.</p> <p>A car park is necessary at the railway station for commuters.</p>	<p>minimised.</p> <p>It is possible that additional population may generate additional demand for rail services which may make their provision more viable and encourage those services to be provided.</p> <p>As with infrastructure, the provision of social services (or 'soft' infrastructure) by State Authorities requires evidence of population growth. Again, Council does seek to maintain dialog with these authorities to ensure that delays are minimised.</p> <p>Additional development provides additional s.94 contributions which can be applied to roadworks and car parking.</p> <p>Commuter parking has been identified by Council as a necessary requirement to future growth.</p>	
<b>Potential residential conflicts</b>	The draft Plan proposes R2 low density land in close proximity to the	This is an existing and developed residential area under the current	No further action required

**Table 7 Bundanoon related issues**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments made in the Public Submissions</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommendations from LEP Working Group</b>
	<p>'identified and potential extractive material buffer zone for the Bundanoon Sandstone Quarry'. This is poor land use planning.</p>	<p>LEP.</p>	
<p><b>Greasons Road area</b></p>	<p>The current LEP provides Greasons Road as a buffer between the main part of the town and the rural area. This buffer should be retained.</p> <p>Proposed density increases will place 2/3 of population on northern side of railway line without providing any improvements to access to the commercial centre of the town.</p> <p>Proposed release areas are good farming land and should not be developed for housing.</p>	<p>In most cases existing residents want their local environment to remain as it is, however many of the residential areas in Bundanoon have been greenfield sites in the past.</p> <p>Bundanoon has been earmarked for residential growth for many years and this is reflected in the Strategic Plan.</p> <p>The Sydney Canberra Corridor Strategy also identifies Bundanoon as one of the four towns of the Shire and expects it to take a share of future residential growth.</p>	<p>No further action required</p>
	<p>There is an imbalance between proposed residential growth and the capacity of the business centre to grow in response.</p>	<p>Increased residential base may improve the viability of the business centre without requiring additional commercial space. Notwithstanding,</p>	<p>No further action required</p>

<b>Table 7 Bundanoon related issues</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments made in the Public Submissions</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommendations from LEP Working Group</b>
		additional land adjoining the business centre has been zoned for commercial purposes.	
<b>Environment</b>	<p>There are insufficient controls to protect native vegetation.</p> <p>The area's high scenic quality should be preserved.</p> <p>The area is environmentally sensitive with significant ecological communities, wildlife communities and Aboriginal heritage items.</p>	<p>Objectives make specific reference to the protection of native vegetation and further controls will be placed in the DCP.</p> <p>The DCP will make provision for the protection of views and vistas.</p> <p>Any proposed development would require environmental assessments which would identify such items.</p>	<p>That the Bundanoon DCP include controls to protect native vegetation.</p> <p>That the Bundanoon DCP include controls to protect views and vistas.</p>

## Group 6 Exeter Village Submissions

Table 8 provides a basic summary of each of the issues.

<b>Table 8 Exeter related issues</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments made in the Public Submissions</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommendations from LEP Working Group</b>
<b>Zoning of land surrounding the former Exeter Quarry land.</b>	<p>Rural small holdings are not sustainable and should not be allowed.</p> <p>Very limited market for 8 or 4ha properties. 2ha more viable.</p> <p>The minimum lot size for land on Ringwood Road Exeter should be lowered from 8ha to at least 4ha and preferably 2ha as has been allowed on the former Exeter Quarry site. Averaging not a valid argument.</p>	<p>The minimum allotment size provisions for Exeter Quarry and Vine Lodge were negotiated with the owners in return for the Quarry ceasing operations.</p> <p>The total area of the Exeter Quarry site is approximately 200ha which, when divided by the maximum number of allotments on the site, being 25, provides an average lot size of 8ha. The range however, will vary from 2ha-30+ha.</p>	That the proposed minimum lot sizes be retained.
<b>Westgrove Road</b>	The minimum lot size for land on the western side of Westgrove Road should not be reduced to 2ha. The Rural Small Holdings zone for this land is an inefficient use of the land.	<p>Land on the western side of Westgrove Road and on the western side of Devon Road south of Cornwell Road is currently zoned 7(b). The equivalent zoning under the draft LEP is E3 and the minimum lot size for such land would be 40ha.</p> <p>Current lot sizes vary from 2 to around 14ha, well below the standard minimum lot size for E3 zoned land. Therefore Council</p>	That the proposed rezoning to RU4 with a minimum lot size of 2 ha be retained.

**Table 8 Exeter related issues**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments made in the Public Submissions</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommendations from LEP Working Group</b>
		<p>resolved to rezone the land to allow for rural residential development in keeping with the surrounding scale of development.</p> <p>The rear boundaries of these properties provide an appropriate delineation between the proposed smaller allotments and the agricultural land to the west where allotments vary from 30 ha to over 60ha.</p>	
<b>Commercial development</b>	Council should clarify the location of the commercial centre of Exeter – is it the existing intersection, or Sally’s Corner?	<p>The B1 Neighbourhood Centre land is located at the intersection of Exeter Road and Middle Road. Sally’s Corner is a Highway Service Centre as opposed to the B1 Neighbourhood Centre within Exeter which meets the needs of the local residents.</p>	No further action required