




Ordinary Meeting

Tuesday, 27 October 2015

**CL02 Rural Residential Lands
Review**

**ATTACHMENTS
UNDER SEPARATE
COVER**





ATTACHMENTS UNDER SEPARATE COVER

Page


CL02	Rural Residential Lands Review	
(a)	Submissions Map.....	3
(b)	Location Specific Supply Analysis	5
(c)	Planning Review Report GCC - Public Submissions & Land Supply - Draft LEP2013 - FINAL	14
(d)	Submissions - Site 1, Site 2 and Site 3.....	76


Attachment 'A' – Submission Maps








Attachment 'B' – Location Specific Supply Analysis – R5 – Large Lot Residential (Pink)



























Planning Report

Review of Public Submissions and Lands Supply – Draft LEP2013

Griffith City Council



Prepared for Griffith City Council

June 2014

14002: Document History

Revision	Revision Date	Authorised		
		Name/Position	Signature	Notes
Draft	27/04/2014	Garry Salvestro Director		
Final Draft	09/07/2014	Garry Salvestro Director		For Council review
Final – Rev1	15/08/2014	Garry Salvestro Director		
Final – Rev2	02/09/2014	Garry Salvestro Director		Stats update



This report is prepared by
Salvestro Planning
 16 Fitzmaurice Street
 PO Box 783
 WAGGA WAGGA NSW 2650

Telephone: (02) 69218588
 Facsimile: (02) 69218388
 Email: admin@salvestroplanning.com.au
 Website: www.salvestroplanning.com.au

Disclaimer

While every reasonable effort has been made to ensure that this document is correct at the time of printing, Salvestro Planning and its employees make no representation, undertake no duty and accepts no responsibility to any third party who use or rely upon this document or the information contained in it

© Salvestro Planning 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	4
1.1	Summary of Report Aims	4
1.2	General Planning Principles	4
1.3	Land Economics	4
2	ASSESSMENT OF SUBMISSIONS	6
2.1	Submission No.7 - Nardo	6
2.1.1	Background	6
2.1.2	Submission Summary	7
2.1.3	Meeting Notes	7
2.1.4	Assessment Criteria	7
2.1.5	Conclusions & Recommendation	9
2.2	Submission No.8 - Catanzariti	10
2.2.1	Background	10
2.2.2	Submission Summary	10
2.2.3	Meeting Notes	11
2.2.4	Assessment Criteria	11
2.2.5	Conclusions & Recommendation	12
2.3	Submission No.23 - Mallinson Road	14
2.3.1	Background	14
2.3.2	Submission Summary	15
2.3.3	Meeting Notes	15
2.3.4	Assessment Criteria	16
2.3.5	Conclusions & Recommendation	18
2.4	Submission No.32 - Beelbangera Road	19
2.4.1	Background	19
2.4.2	Submission Summary	20
2.4.3	Meeting Notes	20
2.4.4	Assessment Criteria	21
2.4.5	Conclusions & Recommendation	23
2.5	Submission No.40 - Joeky	24
2.5.1	Background	24
2.5.2	Submission Summary	25
2.5.3	Meeting Notes	25
2.5.4	Assessment Criteria	25
2.5.5	Conclusions & Recommendation	26
2.6	Submission No.42 - Rossetto	28
2.6.1	Background	28
2.6.2	Submission Summary	29
2.6.3	Meeting Notes	29
2.6.4	Assessment Criteria	29
2.6.5	Conclusions & Recommendation	30
2.7	Submission - Lot 230 DP751728, Yenda	32
2.7.1	Background	32
2.7.2	Submission Summary	33
2.7.3	Meeting Notes	33
2.7.4	Assessment Criteria	33
2.7.5	Conclusions & Recommendation	34
3	LAND SUPPLY & DEMAND	35
3.1	Revised Population and Development Data	35
3.2	Rural Residential Land	37
3.2.1	Common Terms and Definitions	37
3.2.2	Servicing Costs	38
3.2.3	Energy Utilisation Implications	39
3.2.4	Supply	39
3.2.5	Demand	42
3.2.6	Balancing Supply and Demand	43
3.2.7	Appropriateness of existing zoned land	43
3.2.8	Rural residential lot size mix	47
3.3	Staging Strategies	48
3.4	Industrial Land	48
4	SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS	49
4.1	Public Submissions Reviewed	49
4.2	Supply & Demand of Rural Residential & Industrial Lands	50
4.2.1	Rural Residential Land	50
4.2.2	Industrial Land	51
ATTACHMENT 1:	MEETING NOTES	52
ATTACHMENT 2:	POPULATION & DWELLING PROJECTIONS	53

1 INTRODUCTION

Griffith City Council has commissioned an independent review of several submissions as a result of its finalisation of the draft LEP 2014. As part of undertaking the review, Council also requests further advice in relation to the demand and supply of land suitable for rural residential and industrial subdivision.

The findings of this review are provided below.

1.1 Summary of Report Aims

This report aims to provide the following:

- a. Recommendations for each public submission
- b. General recommendations on the supply and demand of rural residential and industrial lands.

1.2 General Planning Principles

Various publications, particularly from NSW Planning, promote best practice planning principles in dealing with land use supply and location. In relation to both rural residential and industrial land, the guiding principles focus on:

- o "proven need" – considering the existing land stock and likely legitimate demand
- o "right location" – considering the environment, rural industries, local communities and future residents
- o "layout that suits the landscape" – development design that responds to the site and surroundings

For Griffith LGA specifically, Council has adopted the following specific general planning principles to guide land use decision-making:

- o Discourage further fragmentation
- o Discourage unnecessary service augmentation
- o Discourage potential land use conflict
- o Avoid land within floodway areas indicated in the GCC Flood Management Study
- o Avoid bushfire prone land
- o Avoid land with high scenic value
- o Avoid land with high biodiversity significance
- o Avoid land with high agricultural capability and suitability
- o Complement applicable 117 Directions
- o Avoid physical impediments posed by irrigation channels
- o Avoid high water table in certain known localities
- o Avoid areas of known high salinity
- o Avoid main roads and associated traffic impacts
- o Avoid railway and associated (noise and traffic) impacts
- o Avoid Airport related constraints – Noise contours (ANEF) & Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS)

The above general planning principles are used in the analysis of the subject submissions.

1.3 Land Economics

The questions asked of this review also involve the principles of land economics.

Land economics is dedicated to the study of land use, natural resources, public utilities, housing and urban land issues. In the analysis and

determination of spatial land use allocation, the awareness of land economic implications is essential to ensure strategically responsible decision-making.

Local authorities, related agencies and the wider community all have a role in shaping landuse policies that balance individual needs against the needs of the overall community.

Land use allocation plays a critical role in how land is treated and what impact it has on future development scenarios. Taking into account regional characteristics, land use strategies will vary according to various influencing factors and/or strategic intent aimed at achieving a desired outcome for a local area. It also considers the protection of viable agricultural land and it's protection from unjustified development resulting in fragmented farming operations and loss of viable agricultural land.

In Griffith, the need to provide an appropriate release of serviced land to meet the requirements of the City must be kept in check to avoid negatively effecting land values in the area. Council's current strategic review process, including extensive data capture and analysis, is a step in the right direction to respecting land economics and sound landuse planning principles.

2 ASSESSMENT OF SUBMISSIONS

A total of seven submissions were re-assessed as part of this review.

2.1 Submission No.7 - Nardo

This submission is in relation to Lots 726 & 727 DP46245 Boorga Road/Mallinson Road Lake Wyangan and was prepared by Planning Matters on behalf of the landowners. The document is a copy of a previous submission and ultimately seeks development for either residential or rural residential development in the short term.

Council has requested:

1. Whether the land should be brought forward based on demand or any other general planning principles, and
2. An analysis of the appropriateness of these lands for rural residential development as opposed to village residential development.

2.1.1 Background

The land has been the subject of discussion between the current landholder and Council since prior to the drafting of the original 2030 Strategy document in 2000. Previous strategy (2000 version) identified the land as General Expansion (Rural Residential) 2006-2010. As a result of the recent Beyond 2030 Land Use Strategy document the land has been targeted as a residential candidate site to accommodate future growth of Lake Wyangan Village (stage 2 – 2023-2033 & beyond).

The current zoning under LEP2014 is RU4-Primary Production Small Lots with a minimum lot size of 5.0 hectares.



Growth Strategy – 2000 version



Growth Strategy – 2013 version

2.1.2 Submission Summary

The detailed submission prepared by Planning Matters suggests that R5-Large Lot Residential (approximately 2000m² lot areas) should be supported for various reasons. A draft Concept Plan subdivision layout is included in the submission and is intended to be indicative only.

The submission notes the following:

- Demand for this type of rural-residential development
- Located in close proximity to city and within Lake Wyangan catchment (growth corridor)
- Access to main distributor road - Boorga Road
- Opportunity to realign Mallinson Road
- Location of existing shared pedestrian/cycle way along frontage and opportunity for relocation within subdivision
- Proximity to essential services
- Potential impacts/interface issues with existing rural activities (eg frost fan)
- Proximity to existing abattoir
- Requirements of Lake Wyangan Drainage Catchment re water/sewer (new technologies available)

2.1.3 Meeting Notes

A meeting was held with landowner representatives to discuss the submission in more detail. A copy of the meeting notes is included in the attachments to this report.

It was noted that there is general frustration with the planning process, particularly as they have been discussing various options with Council since 1999. Current farming activities are being hindered by interface issues with the encroachment of urban type activities, in particular the location of the shared pedestrian/cycle way.

The currently adopted strategy provides no certainty on the future development of this site; however, it was acknowledged that the longer-term inclusion of the land, as part of the village residential expansion, was positive.

Discussion relating to recent failing of a major rural residential development highlighted a potential oversupply of zoned rural residential land that may require some readjustment by Council.

2.1.4 Assessment Criteria

A review has been undertaken of data and reports prepared for the Beyond 2030 Strategy document and draft LEP Planning Proposal, as supplied by Council. In addition, current statistical data on population and development has been noted, as made available by Council.

Council's original review of submissions, together with an independent review, noted the following in relation to this land:

- *Inconsistent with GS2030, which identifies the site for future rural residential development (2006-2010)*
 - *Consistent with adjacent submissions*
 - *Need to consider demand for rural residential vs. residential*
 - *Impacts of buffer, especially frost fan, requires further consideration*
 - *Impact of development within Lake Wyangan Catchment*
- The subject property falls within the area proposed to provide room for village expansion in a southern direction towards Griffith. The proposed*

southern expansion of the village area is based on available infrastructure and a more desired urban form created by working towards a linkage between Lake Wyangan and Griffith."

Council's final strategic assessment of this submission, as provided with the draft LEP Planning Proposal, concluded that:

"the land be subject to further investigation and if that investigation shows strong demand for development in this specific precinct the following be done:

- *A review of the Land Use Strategy to reflect the outcome of the study if needed; and*
- *Amendment of the LEP to reflect the outcome of the review if needed"*

Noting the above and using Council's agreed assessment criteria, the following comments are provided:

Table 1: Submission No.7 - Nardo

Planning Principle	Supported	Comment
<i>Discourage further fragmentation</i>	Partially	Short-term development has potential to create an isolated development particularly if demand takeup is not realized. Longer term integration with village expansion would support this principle
<i>Discourage unnecessary service augmentation</i>	Partially	Service augmentation would be required and potentially out of sequence with normal service delivery. Viability of Mallinson Road realignment would require necessary assessment of local developer contributions once nexus proven.
<i>Discourage potential land use conflict</i>	No	Short-term would raise issues of current rural activities being potentially impeded. Consider impact of "frost fan". Residential development would, however, alleviate current issues with pedestrian/cycleway conflicts between users and farm activities.
<i>Avoid land within floodway areas indicated in the GCC Flood Management Study</i>	Yes	No identified flooding issues.
<i>Avoid bushfire prone land</i>	Yes	No identified bushfire issues.
<i>Avoid land with high scenic value</i>	Yes	No identified high scenic value issues.
<i>Avoid land with high biodiversity significance</i>	Yes	No identified biodiversity issues.
<i>Avoid land with high agricultural capability and suitability</i>	No	The land is historically supportive of intensive agricultural activities including access to water supply. Currently the land is suitable for continued agricultural use

		within a supportive local environment.
<i>Compliment applicable 117 Directions</i>	Partially	As identified in strategy document
<i>Avoid physical impediments posed by irrigation channels</i>	No	Existing network of irrigation channels whilst legitimate farming activities operate in the local area.
<i>Avoid high water table in certain know localities</i>	Yes	No known water table issues based on strategic mapping.
<i>Avoid areas of know high salinity</i>	Yes	No known high salinity issues based on strategic mapping.
<i>Avoid main roads and associated traffic impacts</i>	Partially	Boorga Rd is main access link road between LW & city centre, and is a B-Double route. However, impacts manageable with applicable subdivision design mitigation.
<i>Avoid railway and associated (noise and traffic) impacts</i>	Yes	Not located near a railway corridor.
<i>Avoid Airport related constraints – Noise contours (ANEF) & Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS)</i>	Partially	Within OLS mapping boundary, minimal impact. Further development would require assessment against ANEF requirements.

2.1.5 Conclusions & Recommendation

In this locality, the adopted Beyond 2030 Strategic Plan provides a strong focus on developing a village residential node to ensure the sustainable development of land, considering the potential interface issues between existing rural and future residential uses. This position is supported and the village expansion scenario should be maintained, particularly as this would satisfy the general planning principles, as listed in the table above.

Current statistical data on growth and development take-up of residential land (including rural residential) indicates a continuing slowing of activity. There are no indications of strong demand for rural residential at this stage to warrant changing the adopted strategy and the land should not be brought forward for development, at this stage.

Council will be continually monitoring population and economic development data to assess the performance of this latest strategy. The development of this land should be reviewed within the next 5 years against the rollout of the urban residential expansion strategy and essential infrastructure provision.

Recommendation:

1. At this stage, the subject land to remain RU4 with currently adopted min lot size.
2. This position be reviewed within the next 5 years against the rollout of the urban residential expansion strategy and provision of essential infrastructure.

2.2 Submission No.8 - Catanzariti

The subject submission was prepared by the landowners and is in relation to Lot 2 DP1019423 McCarthy Road, Lake Wyangan. The submission seeks rezoning of the land to allow 4000m² large lot residential development.

Council has requested:

1. Whether the land should be brought forward based on demand or any other general planning principles, and
2. An analysis of the appropriateness of these lands for rural residential development as opposed to village residential development.

2.2.1 Background

The landholders have previously requested rezoning of this land during an earlier draft LEP exhibition.

Previous strategy (2000 version) identified the land as an investigation area for rural residential. Under the recent Beyond 2030 Land Use Strategy document, the land has been targeted as a residential candidate site to accommodate future growth of Lake Wyangan Village (stage 2 – 2023+).

The current zoning under LEP2014 is RU4-Primary Production Small Lots with a minimum lot size of 5.0 hectares.



Growth Strategy – 2000 version



Growth Strategy – 2013 version

2.2.2 Submission Summary

The landholders indicate that the farm is directly opposite land recently zoned residential with a DA approval. The current farm is no longer viable.

All services will be available to the site to facilitate subdivision development

and, overall, the rezoning would complement the surrounding areas.

2.2.3 Meeting Notes

A meeting was held with a representative landowner to discuss the submission in more detail. A copy of the meeting notes is included in the attachments to this report.

The landholders also own other land surrounding Lake Wyangan Village, which has currently been zoned RU5 Village. The merit of a more strategic focus on the village centre and urban expansion was acknowledged, with a strong view that the village centre also requires masterplanning to coordinate quality development, subdivision layout and infrastructure delivery.

Discussion relating to the recent failing of several rural residential developments highlighted a potential oversupply of zoned rural residential land that may require some readjustment by Council. Local rural economic issues also noted, as well as other strategic landuse issues.

2.2.4 Assessment Criteria

A review has been undertaken of data and reports prepared for the Beyond 2030 Strategy document and draft LEP Planning Proposal, as supplied by Council. In addition, current statistical data on population and development has been noted, as made available by Council.

Council's original review of submissions, together with an independent review, noted the following in relation to this land:

- *Inconsistent with GS2030, which identifies the site for future rural residential development (2006-2010)*
 - *Consistent with adjacent submissions*
 - *Need to consider demand for rural residential vs. residential*
 - *Impacts of buffer, especially frost fan, requires further consideration*
 - *Impact of development within Lake Wyangan Catchment*
- The subject property falls within the area proposed to provide room for village expansion in a southern direction towards Griffith. The proposed southern expansion of the village area is based on available infrastructure and a more desired urban form created by working towards a linkage between Lake Wyangan and Griffith."*

Council's final strategic assessment of this submission, as provided with the draft LEP Planning Proposal, concluded:

"That Lot 2 DP 1019423 remains zoned RU4 Primary Production Small Lots."

Noting the above and using Council's agreed assessment criteria, the following comments are provided:

Table 2: Submission No.8 - Catanzariti

Planning Principle	Supported	Comment
<i>Discourage further fragmentation</i>	Partially	Short-term development has potential to create an isolated development particularly if demand take up is not realized. Note that there is subdivision development commencing across the road, however, no significant

		establishment of residential housing. Longer term integration with village expansion would support this principle
<i>Discourage unnecessary service augmentation</i>	Partially	Service augmentation would be required and potentially out of sequence with normal service delivery, unless services are passed on by the development to the north.
<i>Discourage potential land use conflict</i>	No	Short-term would raise issues of current rural activities being potentially impeded. Consider impact of "frost fan".
<i>Avoid land within floodway areas indicated in the GCC Flood Management Study</i>	Yes	No identified flooding issues.
<i>Avoid bushfire prone land</i>	Yes	No identified bushfire issues.
<i>Avoid land with high scenic value</i>	Yes	No identified high scenic value issues.
<i>Avoid land with high biodiversity significance</i>	Yes	No identified biodiversity issues.
<i>Avoid land with high agricultural capability and suitability</i>	No	The land is historically supportive of intensive agricultural activities including access to water supply. Currently the land is suitable for continued agricultural use within a supportive local environment.
<i>Compliment applicable 117 Directions</i>	Partially	As identified in strategy document
<i>Avoid physical impediments posed by irrigation channels</i>	No	Existing network of irrigation channels whilst legitimate farming activities operate in the local area.
<i>Avoid high water table in certain known localities</i>	Yes	No known water table issues based on strategic mapping.
<i>Avoid areas of known high salinity</i>	Yes	No known high salinity issues based on strategic mapping.
<i>Avoid main roads and associated traffic impacts</i>	Yes	The land does not front a main road.
<i>Avoid railway and associated (noise and traffic) impacts</i>	Yes	Not located near a railway corridor.
<i>Avoid Airport related constraints – Noise contours (ANEF) & Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS)</i>	Partially	Within OLS mapping boundary, minimal impact. Further development would require assessment against ANEF requirements.

2.2.5 Conclusions & Recommendation

The adopted Beyond 2030 Strategic Plan provides a strong focus on developing a village residential node, centred on Lake Wyangan Village, to ensure the sustainable development of land, considering the potential interface issues between existing rural and future residential uses. This position is supported and the village expansion scenario should be maintained, particularly as this would satisfy the general planning principles, as listed in the table above.

Current statistical data on growth and development take-up of residential land (including rural residential) indicates a continuing slowing of activity.

There are no indications of strong demand for rural residential at this stage to warrant changing the adopted strategy and the land should not be brought forward for development, at this stage.

Council will be continually monitoring population and economic development data to assess the performance of this latest strategy. The development of this land should be reviewed within the next 5 years against the rollout of the urban residential expansion strategy and essential infrastructure provision.

Recommendation:

1. At this stage, the subject land to remain RU4 with currently adopted min lot size.
2. A further reviewed be undertaken when land opposite has been development in accordance with the urban residential expansion strategy and provision of essential infrastructure.

2.3 Submission No.23 – Mallinson Road

Mackenzie & Vardanega Lawyers lodged this submission on behalf of landholders along the northern side of Mallinson Road Lake Wyangan, including Nardo/Ballestrin, Zirilli/Agresta, Casella, Pasin, Agresta, Rinaldo, Mancini, Bonaccorsi, D'Aquino and Mancini. The submission seeks rezoning of the land to R5 large lot residential with 4000m² min lot size.

Note that owners of Nardo/Ballestrin land on corner of Boorga Road/Mallinson Road have lodged a separate submission which is also the subject of this review (see submission no.7).

Council has requested:

1. Whether the land should be included as a candidate site for rural residential development based on demand or any other general planning principles, and
2. Suitability to be determined using the same 15 point criteria used in the strategy for approved candidate areas.

2.3.1 Background

The landholders have continued citrus farming on the subject land in anticipation of future rural residential development based on the previously adopted landuse strategy. The subject holdings total approximately 90 hectares in area, involving the following land parcels:

- Lot 727 DP46245 – Nardo/Ballestrin
- Lot 115 DP751743 – Zirilli/Agresta
- Lot 116 DP751743 – Casella
- Lot 679 DP39618 – Pasin
- Lot 2 DP817588 – Agresta
- Lot 2 DP1154593 – Rinaldo
- Lot 120 DP751743 – Mancini
- Lot 134 DP751743 – Bonaccorsi
- Lot 135 DP751743 – D'Aquino
- Lot 136 DP751743 – Mancini



DP751743 lots are original crown portions, whilst other DP's are the result of earlier concessional lot subdivisions excising the original farm dwelling or an additional rural dwelling site. The land is already subject to some


fragmentation in relation to legitimate rural landuse activity.

Previous strategy (2000 version) identified all the properties as General Expansion (Rural Residential)(2011-2020). Under the recent Beyond 2030 Land Use Strategy document, three of the properties (Lots 727, 115 & 116) are included in the future urban residential expansion of Lake Wyangan Village 2023+ release, whilst the properties further west have not been identified for any future rural residential intensification. The preferred strategy identifies that land in its existing state, that is, as existing rural small holdings (horticulture & viticulture).

The current zoning under LEP2014 is RU4-Primary Production Small Lots with a minimum lot size of 5.0 hectares. This would be considered an interim zoning pending further development based on demand.



Growth Strategy - 2000 version



Growth Strategy - 2013 version

2.3.2 Submission Summary

The submission points out that the current zoning is contrary to the previous Growth Strategy (2000 version) where subdivision of the northern side of Mallinson Road would follow once the southern available R5 land was exhausted.

The land is highly valued with significant housing currently established in the R5 area (southern side).

Oversupply of rural residential land noted, however, Mallinson Road area is considered very popular and desirable in relation to its elevated setting. Essential infrastructure exists on the southern side.

2.3.3 Meeting Notes

A meeting was held with the landholders' solicitor and four representatives from the landholder group. A copy of the meeting notes is included in the attachments to this report.

General concern expressed over the current zoning and revised strategy that is a significant departure to the original expectations for future development of their land. The RU4/5ha minimum lot size is not an efficient use of their land resources, uneconomic to develop. Acknowledgment of lots to be included in village/urban residential expansion in medium to long term.

Noted the merits of the location and existing investment in infrastructure to develop southern side of Mallinson Road, with view to support future subdivision development on Northern side.

Discussion relating to the recent failing of several rural residential developments highlighted a potential oversupply of zoned rural residential land that may require some readjustment by Council. General discussion also on the current structure of NSW statutory planning, focus on sustainable development, use of minimum lot size provisions for strategic purposes, necessity for LGA's to review strategies at regular intervals (5-10 years depending on growth), rural economic issues affecting regional centres, restructuring of rural enterprises, orderly/economic development and demand/supply analysis.

2.3.4 Assessment Criteria

A review has been undertaken of data and reports prepared for the Beyond 2030 Strategy document and draft LEP Planning Proposal, as supplied by Council. In addition, current statistical data on population and development has been noted, as made available by Council.

There was no submission made or considered during the Growth Strategy preparation stage relating to this land. The subject submission was made during the draft LEP preparation and subsequently forms part of the supporting planning proposal for the new LEP2014.

Council's final strategic assessment of this submission, as provided with the draft LEP Planning Proposal, concluded:

"That the area remain zoned RU4 Primary Production Small Lots and be subject to further investigation and if that investigation proof strong demand for development in this specific precinct the following be done:

- A review of the Land Use Strategy to reflect the outcome of the study if needed; and*
- Amendment of the LEP to reflect the outcome of the review if needed."*

In reaching this decision, Council noted the following:

- These large "General Expansion" areas were set aside in 2002 as part of the GCC Growth Strategy 2030 during a time when Griffith was expanding quickly and there were hopes that by 2013 the population of Griffith would be closer to 40,000.*
- The growth of Griffith has substantially slowed since 2002 and this is evident in the large over supply of rural residential zoned lands which have not been developed.*
- The GCC Growth Strategy 2030 has been replaced by the Griffith Land Use Strategy Beyond 2030 which is the supporting strategic planning document for the draft Griffith LEP 2013.*
- As indicated under submission 10 (strategic response) the rural residential analyses done as part of the Griffith Land Use Strategy Beyond 2030 indicated that a total over supply of rural residential land already exists. This only includes land already zoned Rural Residential and exclude the 1(d) General Expansion land.*
- Land previously zoned Rural Residential have been rolled over to the new draft Griffith LEP 2013 into the replacement zone R5 Large Lot Residential carrying forward the previous over supply.*

• Although the subject properties have been earmarked for 1(d) General Expansion Rural Residential and was proposed to be released 2011-2020 in terms of the 2030 Growth Strategy (subject to demand), the more recent analyses indicated strongly that an over supply already exists.

• The 2030 Growth Strategy was the strategic planning support document for the Griffith LEP 2002 and if the objectives in particular d (iii) is considered it is clear that sufficient demand is a main aspect to be considered by council before allowing subdivision in any of the current 1(d) General Expansion areas.

Noting the above and using Council's agreed assessment criteria, the following comments are provided:

Table 3: Submission No.23 – Mallinson Road

Planning Principle	Supported	Comment
<i>Discourage further fragmentation</i>	Partially	Introduction of R5 zoning at this stage would potentially lead to piecemeal development based on declining demand, leading to further fragmentation. Threat to current legitimate farming activities must be recognized. Without an integrated masterplan and staged release plan the current submission would not support this principle. Longer term integration with village expansion would support this principle for 3 of the properties. The currently adopted strategy provides the most sustainable outcome, based on current data.
<i>Discourage unnecessary service augmentation</i>	Partially	Service augmentation would be required and partially available from development of land on southern side of Mallinson Road. Potentially out of sequence with normal service delivery, unless services are passed on an integrated land release plan. Intersection realignment requires consideration and establishment of nexus in relation to developable land and subsequent contributions.
<i>Discourage potential land use conflict</i>	No	Short-term would raise issues of current rural activities being potentially impeded. Consider impact of "frost fan". Fragmented development as a result of slowing demand would exacerbate urban/rural land use incompatibilities.
<i>Avoid land within floodway areas indicated in the GCC Flood Management Study</i>	Yes	No identified flooding issues.
<i>Avoid bushfire prone land</i>	Yes	No identified bushfire issues.

<i>Avoid land with high scenic value</i>	Yes	No identified high scenic value issues.
<i>Avoid land with high biodiversity significance</i>	Yes	No identified biodiversity issues.
<i>Avoid land with high agricultural capability and suitability</i>	No	The land is historically supportive of intensive agricultural activities including access to water supply. Currently the land is suitable for continued agricultural use within a supportive local environment.
<i>Compliment applicable 117 Directions</i>	Partially	As identified in strategy document
<i>Avoid physical impediments posed by irrigation channels</i>	No	Existing network of irrigation channels whilst legitimate farming activities operate in the local area.
<i>Avoid high water table in certain know localities</i>	Yes	No known water table issues based on strategic mapping.
<i>Avoid areas of know high salinity</i>	Yes	No known high salinity issues based on strategic mapping.
<i>Avoid main roads and associated traffic impacts</i>	Yes	The land would have main access to Mallinson Road.
<i>Avoid railway and associated (noise and traffic) impacts</i>	Yes	Not located near a railway corridor.
<i>Avoid Airport related constraints – Noise contours (ANEF) & Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS)</i>	Partially	Within OLS mapping boundary, minimal impact. Further development would require assessment against ANEF requirements.

2.3.5 Conclusions & Recommendation

The adopted Beyond 2030 Strategic Plan provides a strong focus on developing a village residential node, centred on Lake Wyangan Village, to ensure the sustainable development of land, considering the potential interface issues between existing rural and future residential uses. This position is supported and the village expansion scenario should be maintained, particularly as this would satisfy the general planning principles, as listed in the table above.

Current statistical data on growth and development take-up of residential land (including rural residential) indicates a continuing slowing of activity. There are no indications of strong demand for rural residential at this stage to warrant changing the adopted strategy and the land should not be brought forward for development, at this stage.

Council will be continually monitoring population and economic development data to assess the performance of this latest strategy.

Council's strategic assessment, as noted above, is supported.

Recommendation:

1. At this stage, the subject land to remain RU4 with currently adopted min lot size.
2. Review this position in next 5 years in relation to rollout of urban residential expansion strategy and essential infrastructure provision

2.4 Submission No.32 – Beelbangera Road

This submission was prepared by Planning Matters on behalf of landholders along the along the western side of Beelbangera Road between Clifton Boulevard and Calabria Road. The submission seeks a reduction in the minimum lots size proposal for this area from 3 hectares to 1 hectare or less.

Council has requested advice on:

1. Whether the minimum lot size should be decreased to 1 hectare based on demand or any other general planning principles, or
2. If there is scope and demand to zone these properties for rural residential purposes (R5).

2.4.1 Background

The subject holdings total approximately 80 hectares in area, involving the following land parcels:

- Lot 2 DP870431
- Lot 899 DP751709
- Lot 900 DP751709
- Lot 901 DP751709
- Lot 1106 DP751709
- Lot 2 DP1128694
- Lot 5 DP1128516
- Lot 1402 DP751709
- Lot 2 DP802981



DP751709 lots are original crown portions, whilst other DP's are the result of earlier concessional lot subdivisions excising the original farm dwelling or an additional rural dwelling site. The land is already subject to some fragmentation in relation to legitimate rural landuse activity. Lot 1402 is a former winery site now used for light industrial/rural industrial purposes.

Previous strategy (2000 version) identified all the properties as Investigation area (Residential) (2030+). Under the recent Beyond 2030 Land Use Strategy document, all of the properties are identified for Future Rural Small Holdings.

The current zoning under LEP2014 is RU4-Primary Production Small Lots with a minimum lot size of 3.0 hectares. Note possible use of averaging

clause in new LEP to allow flexibility in the preparation of more site responsive subdivision layout.



2.4.2 Submission Summary

The submission considers that the subject land should be considered for smaller sized residential allotments (1 ha or less) due to its proximity to the city's newly developing residential estates and advances in sewer reticulation technology.

Some of the landholders have ceased making further improvements to their horticultural properties in anticipation of rezoning for more intensive residential or rural residential use as a result of the previous landuse strategy adopted directions. Some of the properties have been cleared due to being unviable to continue production due to watering and other inherent costs.

Council needs to reconsider landuses on the eastern fringe as there is not enough demand for large rural residential lots (ie 3 ha size), and the establishment of this form of subdivision is inefficient, with potential access & infrastructure issues. Consideration for concessions on smaller lots where adequate measures are made for the disposal of sewage is noted.

2.4.3 Meeting Notes

A meeting was held with the landholders' planning consultant and two representatives from the landholder group. A copy of the meeting notes is included in the attachments to this report.

Landholders have invested considerably in developing various masterplanning models to ensure a cost-efficient subdivision of this area, including infrastructure modeling. Based on those investigations a lot size of between 6000-8000m² lots are preferred to ensure a cost-effective/efficient development.

Concerns noted that land-farming infrastructure has been downgraded over previous years since the 2000 version of the Strategic Plan in anticipation of future residential development. Also noted issues with current real estate market, oversupply of residential lots and rural residential, inappropriate locations, valuation/rates issues, etc..

Noted the current flooding concerns for this area and that a revised flooding strategy is being developed.

Discussed planning regulation setup, state model instrument, use of min lot sizes to control development, how Council must demonstrate responsible management of land resources to meet supply/demand pressures and to regularly review its strategies based on current data.

2.4.4 Assessment Criteria

A review has been undertaken of data and reports prepared for the Beyond 2030 Strategy document and draft LEP Planning Proposal, as supplied by Council. In addition, current statistical data on population and development has been noted, as made available by Council.

Council's original review of submissions, together with an independent review, noted the following in relation to this land:

"• Inconsistent with GS2030, which identifies the site for future residential (2030+)

- Residential more appropriate considering adjacent land uses*
- Issue of flood affectation & predominant <0.5% gradient require further consideration.*

Current oversupply of Rural Residential land does not justify support for the submission further more the subject property forms part of an area currently utilized as primary production. CS&D would like to emphasize the fact that rural residential development should be contained within reasonable precincts related to availability of services and consideration of adjacent land uses. Support for such development would open up another Rural Residential precinct isolated from other existing Rural Residential precincts stretching services unnecessary."

Council's final strategic assessment of this submission, as provided with the draft LEP Planning Proposal, concluded:

"That the proposed minimum lot size of Land west of Beelbangera Road between Clifton Blvd & Calabria Rd be retained.."

In reaching this decision, Council noted the following:

"• The existing zoning under the GLEP 2002 is 1 (i) Investigation which permits a minimum lot size of 20 ha.

- The zoning under the draft Griffith LEP 2013 is RU4 Primary Production Small Lots. Within this zone minimum lot sizes vary from 1ha to 20ha and areas which have been allocated a minimum lot size of 1ha are those lands previously zone 1(h) Rural Small Holdings which permitted the subdivision of lots for dwellings using lot averaging to 1 ha or in some cases 4000 sq. m.*
- Other than the lands previously zoned 1(h) Rural Small Holdings, the subject lands are proposed to have the smallest minimum lot size in the RU 4 zone.*
- The strategic response offered under Submission10 indicated why the release of more land for "Rural Residential" is problematic and not recommended. Therefore the request for subdivision of the subject land to less than 3 ha is not supported.*
- The most recent Flood Study information indicates that the area is flood affected and an increase in density smaller than 3ha is not recommended.*
- The proposed Lot Averaging clause (refer to General Amendment No.1) would permit smaller lots to be subdivided on the lands within this area which are not considered flood prone while retaining the remainder of the lands for small scale farming practices or hobby farms etc. The average lot size in this area is approximately 12 ha with 220 metre of frontage on Citrus Road. Under a potential scenario the landowner could subdivide 3 lots with an area of 4,000 sq. m. with development consent and subject to the "Flood Planning Area" clause, a land capability assessment and other*

factors; and retain a 10.8ha parcel at the rear of the site on the lands which are considered flood liable."

Noting the above and using Council's agreed assessment criteria, the following comments are provided:

Table 4: Submission No.32 – Beelbanger Road

Planning Principle	Supported	Comment
<i>Discourage further fragmentation</i>	Partially	Introduction of a lower minimum lot size at this stage would potentially lead to piecemeal development based on declining demand, leading to further fragmentation. Threat to current legitimate farming activities must be recognized. The land is legitimately available and used in most instances for legitimate horticultural activities (notwithstanding the decisions made by the landholders and state of the current rural economy). Without an integrated masterplan and staged release plan the current submission would not support this principle. Longer term integration with city expansion would support this principle. The currently adopted strategy provides the most sustainable outcome, based on current data.
<i>Discourage unnecessary service augmentation</i>	Partially	Service augmentation would be required, would need to ascertain viability of other options as noted. Potentially out of sequence with normal service delivery, unless services are passed on an integrated land release plan.
<i>Discourage potential land use conflict</i>	No	Short-term would raise issues of current rural activities being potentially impeded. Fragmented development as a result of slowing demand would exacerbate urban/rural land use incompatibilities.
<i>Avoid land within floodway areas indicated in the GCC Flood Management Study</i>	No	Current flooding data indicates potential flooding issues across this land. Further detailed information required before any revised strategic direction is considered.
<i>Avoid bushfire prone land</i>	Yes	No identified bushfire issues.
<i>Avoid land with high scenic value</i>	Yes	No identified high scenic value issues.
<i>Avoid land with high biodiversity significance</i>	Yes	No identified biodiversity issues.

<i>Avoid land with high agricultural capability and suitability</i>	No	The land is historically supportive of intensive agricultural activities including access to water supply. Currently the land is suitable for continued agricultural use within a supportive local environment.
<i>Compliment applicable 117 Directions</i>	Partially	As identified in strategy document
<i>Avoid physical impediments posed by irrigation channels</i>	No	Existing network of irrigation channels whilst legitimate farming activities operate in the local area.
<i>Avoid high water table in certain know localities</i>	Yes	No known water table issues based on strategic mapping.
<i>Avoid areas of know high salinity</i>	Yes	No known high salinity issues based on strategic mapping.
<i>Avoid main roads and associated traffic impacts</i>	Partially	Beelbangera Road is a classified road. The land would require alternative access which is available.
<i>Avoid railway and associated (noise and traffic) impacts</i>	Partially	A railway corridor exists on the eastern side of Beelbangera Road. Adequate buffer distances are achievable, subject to masterplanning design.
<i>Avoid Airport related constraints – Noise contours (ANEF) & Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS)</i>	Partially	Within OLS mapping boundary, minimal impact. Further development would require assessment against ANEF requirements.

2.4.5 Conclusions & Recommendation

The adopted Beyond 2030 Strategic Plan contains a significant amount of data that has guided the settlement themes captured in the support maps, including recommended residential candidate areas and other residential and rural residential areas. Oversupply of zoned rural residential land continues to be an issue and cannot be ignored.

The current position Council has put forward in its strategic assessment, noted above, is supported and the current minimum lot size maintained until more relevant data is available to support an alternative view.

Current statistical data on growth and development take-up of residential land (including rural residential) indicates a continuing slowing of activity. There are no indications of strong demand for rural residential at this stage to warrant changing the adopted strategy. Council will be continually monitoring population and economic development data to assess the performance of this latest strategy.

Recommendation:

1. At this stage, the subject land to retain the RU4 with currently adopted minimum lot size of 3 hectares, and
2. Review this position in next 5 years in relation to rollout of urban residential expansion strategy and essential infrastructure provision, especially in relation to the flooding strategy.

2.5 Submission No.40 - Joecky

The subject submission was prepared by the landowners and is in relation to Lot 510 DP751728, Farm 1527, Cemetery Road, Yenda. The submission seeks rezoning of the land to IN1, IN2 or IN3 to allow greater flexibility in future land use options.

Council has requested:

1. Whether the property should be zoned IN1 (General Industrial), IN2 (Light Industrial) or IN3 (Heavy Industrial).

2.5.1 Background


The current property operates as an established vineyard with rural dwelling.

Previous strategy (2000 version) identified the land as continuing rural zone activities. Under the recent Beyond 2030 Land Use Strategy document, the land has continues to be targeted for ongoing rural zone activities.

The current zoning under LEP2014 is RU1-Primary Production with a minimum lot size of 20.0 hectares.



Growth Strategy – 2000 version



Growth Strategy – 2013 version

2.5.2 Submission Summary

The landholders indicate that due to the farm being located close to the Yenda township, consideration should be given to rezone the land to IN1, IN2 or IN3 to allow greater flexibility in future land use options.

2.5.3 Meeting Notes

A meeting was held with a representative landowner to discuss the submission in more detail. A copy of the meeting notes is included in the attachments to this report.

The landholders consider the land has opportunity for future industrial uses, in particular targeting truck depots and rail freight/warehousing activities, logistics type activity. Growth of Casella Wines, proximity to main roads and railway are all major influences on potential support industries in the general area of Yenda.

Discussion on current zoning of land and permitted uses. Not aware of current zoning of land, viewed online mapping and landuse guide. Acknowledged that all uses suggested are permissible under the current zoning. Noted infrastructure opportunities, proximity to road/rail and other potential attributes and limitations of site.

2.5.4 Assessment Criteria

A review has been undertaken of data and reports prepared for the Beyond 2030 Strategy document and draft LEP Planning Proposal, as supplied by Council, including the Industrial Lands analysis. In addition, current statistical data on population and development has been noted, as made available by Council.

There was no submission made or considered during the Growth Strategy preparation stage relating to this land. The subject submission was made during the draft LEP preparation and subsequently forms part of the supporting planning proposal for the new LEP2014.

Council's final strategic assessment of this submission, as provided with the draft LEP Planning Proposal, concluded:

"That for Lot 510, DP 751728 remain zoned RU1 Primary Production."

In reaching this decision, Council noted the following:

"Council staff performed a detailed analysis of all Industrial Land in the Griffith LGA as part of the Griffith Land Use Strategy 2030 and Beyond. The analyses indicated that sufficient land is available for General Industrial development. Additional land was identified as needed to accommodate heavy/hazardous industrial development to the west of Griffith and major wineries have also been allocated an Industrial zoning allowing further expansion."

"These areas would develop as Industrial precincts and ad hoc zonings of land for Industrial development are not recommended."

Noting the above and using Council's agreed assessment criteria, the following comments are provided:

Table 5: Submission No.40 - Joeky

Planning Principle	Supported	Comment
<i>Discourage further fragmentation</i>	No	Development for IN1 – IN3 landuses would be adhoc and not consistent with the outcomes of the industrial lands analysis. Other suggested landuses are permissible in the zone and would be considered on their merits.
<i>Discourage unnecessary service augmentation</i>	No	Service augmentation would be required and potentially out of sequence with normal service delivery.
<i>Discourage potential land use conflict</i>	No	Short-term would potentially raise issues of compatibility with adjoining rural and rural dwelling landuses.
<i>Avoid land within floodway areas indicated in the GCC Flood Management Study</i>	No	Identified as potentially flood liable.
<i>Avoid bushfire prone land</i>	Yes	No identified bushfire issues.
<i>Avoid land with high scenic value</i>	Yes	No identified high scenic value issues.
<i>Avoid land with high biodiversity significance</i>	Yes	No identified biodiversity issues.
<i>Avoid land with high agricultural capability and suitability</i>	No	The land is historically supportive of intensive agricultural activities including access to water supply. Currently the land is suitable for continued agricultural use within a supportive local environment.
<i>Compliment applicable 117 Directions</i>	Partially	As identified in strategy document
<i>Avoid physical impediments posed by irrigation channels</i>	No	Existing network of irrigation channels whilst legitimate farming activities operate in the local area.
<i>Avoid high water table in certain know localities</i>	Yes	No known water table issues based on strategic mapping.
<i>Avoid areas of know high salinity</i>	Yes	No known high salinity issues based on strategic mapping.
<i>Avoid main roads and associated traffic impacts</i>	Yes	The land does not front a main road.
<i>Avoid railway and associated (noise and traffic) impacts</i>	N/A	N/A for nominated landuse.
<i>Avoid Airport related constraints – Noise contours (ANEF) & Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS)</i>	N/A	N/A for nominated landuse.

2.5.5 Conclusions & Recommendation

The adopted Beyond 2030 Strategic Plan includes an analysis of Industrial Lands needs for the city based on existing and projected data. There is no immediate need to provide for additional IN1, IN2 or IN3 land in and around Yenda. Casella Wines has a dominate effect on landuse change and industrial precinct growth in this local area.

The discussions with the landholder revealed that the targeted landuses for the site could be accommodated under the current RU1 zoning, so there would be no need to change the current zoning of the land.

Strategically, industrial land is generally oversupplied in regional centres, as is the case for Griffith. Any larger scale industrial proposals are generally accommodated on appropriately located land and any necessary statutory changes initiated as part of the development process. The strategic model encompassed in the Beyond 2030 Growth Strategy provides sufficient guidance to enable the local plan to react to industrial proposals as they eventuate.

Council's strategic response to this submission is supported.

Recommendation:

1. At this stage, the subject land to remain RU1 with currently adopted min lot size.

2.6 Submission No.42 - Rossetto

The subject submission was prepared by the landowners and is in relation to Lot 464 DP751728, Farm 797, Cremasco Road, Yenda. The submission seeks rezoning of the land from RU1 Primary Production to RU4 Primary Production Small Lots.

Council has requested:

1. Whether the property should be zoned RU4 Primary Production Small Lots based on demand or any other general planning principles.

2.6.1 Background

The current property operates as an established vineyard with rural dwelling.

Previous strategy (2000 version) identified the land as continuing rural zone activities. Under the recent Beyond 2030 Land Use Strategy document, the land has continues to be targeted for ongoing rural zone activities.

The current zoning under LEP2014 is RU1-Primary Production with a minimum lot size of 20.0 hectares.



Growth Strategy – 2000 version



Growth Strategy – 2013 version

2.6.2 Submission Summary

The landholders indicate that rezoning to RU4 will allow greater flexibility in considering future options for the land. Noted viability and difficulties with current real estate market are not strategic landuse criteria for influencing property zoning considerations.

2.6.3 Meeting Notes

A meeting was held with a representative landowner to discuss the submission in more detail. A copy of the meeting notes is included in the attachments to this report.

The landholders consider the land has opportunity to provide a transition to normal rural farming activities, whilst providing a hobby farm environment opposite the existing R5 (4000m² min lot size) area. The site is surrounded by existing urban infrastructure including water (raw & filtered), electricity, telstra services, sealed road to part of existing lot frontage.

Noted that the land was affected by minor flooding during the 2012 event.

2.6.4 Assessment Criteria

A review has been undertaken of data and reports prepared for the Beyond 2030 Strategy document and draft LEP Planning Proposal, as supplied by Council. In addition, current statistical data on population and development has been noted, as made available by Council.

There was no submission made or considered during the Growth Strategy preparation stage relating to this land. The subject submission was made during the draft LEP preparation and subsequently forms part of the supporting planning proposal for the new LEP2014.

Council's final strategic assessment of this submission, as provided with the draft LEP Planning Proposal, concluded:

"That Lot 464 DP 751728 remain zoned RU1 Primary Production."

In reaching this decision, Council noted the following:

"The subject property is situated in an area which is predominantly zoned RU1" Primary Production". Creating one isolated block of land with a RU4 "Primary Production Small Lots" zoning will set a precedent not based on sound planning principles. The RU4 Primary Production Small Lots zoning has been used to transition lands previously zoned for rural industry and employment, mixed use, small holdings, investigation or expansion only and has not been used to re-zone lands previously zoned 1(b) Agricultural Protection which is the zoning of the subject lands under the GLEP 2002.

Noting the above and using Council's agreed assessment criteria, the following comments are provided:

Table 6: Submission No.42 - Rossetto

Planning Principle	Supported	Comment
Discourage further fragmentation	Partially	Subdivision of the land would potentially create fragmentation. However, the location opposite existing R5 land could be viewed as a transition to RU1 land further

		east, particularly as the land has access to essential infrastructure.
<i>Discourage unnecessary service augmentation</i>	Yes	Essential services exist to the site.
<i>Discourage potential land use conflict</i>	Partially	Short-term would potentially raise issues of compatibility with adjoining rural and rural dwelling landuses, depending on land take up. Also note proximity to industrial zoned land.
<i>Avoid land within floodway areas indicated in the GCC Flood Management Study</i>	No	Identified as potentially flood liable. Would need to verify appropriate floor levels for site.
<i>Avoid bushfire prone land</i>	Yes	No identified bushfire issues.
<i>Avoid land with high scenic value</i>	Yes	No identified high scenic value issues.
<i>Avoid land with high biodiversity significance</i>	Yes	No identified biodiversity issues.
<i>Avoid land with high agricultural capability and suitability</i>	Partially	The land is historically supportive of intensive agricultural activities including access to water supply. Currently the land is suitable for continued agricultural use within a supportive local environment.
<i>Compliment applicable 117 Directions</i>	Partially	As identified in strategy document
<i>Avoid physical impediments posed by irrigation channels</i>	Partially	Existing network of irrigation channels whilst legitimate farming activities operate in the local area. Would still be utilised with hobby farming activities in the future.
<i>Avoid high water table in certain know localities</i>	Yes	No known water table issues based on strategic mapping.
<i>Avoid areas of know high salinity</i>	Yes	No known high salinity issues based on strategic mapping.
<i>Avoid main roads and associated traffic impacts</i>	Partially	The land has frontage to Whitton Road, however all access can be from Cremasco Road.
<i>Avoid railway and associated (noise and traffic) impacts</i>	Yes	Not located near a rail corridor.
<i>Avoid Airport related constraints – Noise contours (ANEF) & Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS)</i>	Yes	Not located within vicinity of an airport.

2.6.5 Conclusions & Recommendation

Current statistical data on growth and development take-up of residential land (including rural residential) indicates a continuing slowing of activity. Whilst there are no indications of strong demand for rural residential at this stage, there is some merit in considering, from a strategic landuse

viewpoint, to provide for a parcel of RU4 land in this location to act as a transition (buffer) between R5 land and RU1 land.

An analysis of landuse trends in the local area indicate growth in industrial lands activities to the north. Whilst zoning has been applied to accommodate industrial growth, with general rural surrounding this land, there is also merit in retaining the current RU1 zoning over the subject land at this stage to ensure interface issues are not exacerbated prematurely in this local area. Further zoning consideration in the future in relation to this land, and land between Barracks Road and Wood Road, would be justified once land take-up rates have increased relative to population growth.

Recommendation:

1. At this stage, the subject land to remain RU1 with currently adopted min lot size.

2.7 Submission - Lot 230 DP751728, Yenda

In relation to this land, Council has requested:

1. Whether the land should be brought forward based on demand or any other general planning principles, and
2. An analysis of the appropriateness of these lands for rural residential development as opposed to village residential development.

2.7.1 Background


The land has traditionally been used for irrigated crop production and is surrounded by similar rural activities. The land adjoining to the east has been zoned RU5 Village and, subject to appropriate infrastructure provision, targeted for future village residential subdivision development.

Previous strategy (2000 version) identified the land as continuing rural zone activities. Under the recent Beyond 2030 Land Use Strategy document, the land has continued to be targeted for ongoing rural zone activities.

The current zoning under LEP2014 is RU1-Primary Production with a minimum lot size of 20.0 hectares.



Growth Strategy – 2000 version



Growth Strategy – 2013 version

2.7.2 Submission Summary

To rezone the land for residential or rural residential purposes.

2.7.3 Meeting Notes

No meeting was held as no contact details were provided for this submission.

2.7.4 Assessment Criteria

A review has been undertaken of data and reports prepared for the Beyond 2030 Strategy document and draft LEP Planning Proposal, as supplied by Council. In addition, current statistical data on population and development has been noted, as made available by Council.

Council's original review of submissions, together with an independent review, noted the following in relation to this land:

- "• Separated from Yenda by channel
- Not considered orderly development due to separation from remainder of Yenda Township Leading to sprawl of such land uses and encroachment into agricultural land.
- Predominantly <0.5% gradient, which sees issues with infrastructure/servicing."

The final draft LEP Planning Proposal did not include this site for any residential or rural residential landuse. The land was zoned RU1 Primary Production.

Noting the above and using Council's agreed assessment criteria, the following comments are provided:

Table 7: Submission - Lot 230 DP751728, Yenda

Planning Principle	Supported	Comment
<i>Discourage further fragmentation</i>	Partially	Development of his land should not occur until a masterplan and infrastructure plan has been established for this and adjoining land. Potentially ad hoc development and isolated in relation to Yenda village because of main canal barrier. Noted strategic view of providing land not affected by flooding issues.
<i>Discourage unnecessary service augmentation</i>	Partially	Service augmentation would be required and potentially out of sequence with normal service delivery, unless an infrastructure plan is adopted.
<i>Discourage potential land use conflict</i>	No	Short-term would raise issues of current rural activities being potentially impeded.
<i>Avoid land within floodway areas indicated in the GCC Flood Management Study</i>	Yes	No identified flooding issues.
<i>Avoid bushfire prone land</i>	Yes	No identified bushfire issues.
<i>Avoid land with high scenic value</i>	Yes	No identified high scenic value issues.
<i>Avoid land with high</i>	Yes	No identified biodiversity

<i>biodiversity significance</i>		issues.
<i>Avoid land with high agricultural capability and suitability</i>	No	The land is historically supportive of irrigated cropping agricultural activities including access to water supply. Currently the land is suitable for continued agricultural use within a supportive local environment.
<i>Compliment applicable 117 Directions</i>	Partially	As identified in strategy document
<i>Avoid physical impediments posed by irrigation channels</i>	No	Existing network of irrigation channels whilst legitimate farming activities operate in the local area.
<i>Avoid high water table in certain know localities</i>	Yes	No known water table issues based on strategic mapping.
<i>Avoid areas of know high salinity</i>	Yes	No known high salinity issues based on strategic mapping.
<i>Avoid main roads and associated traffic impacts</i>	No	The land does front a main road. Alternative access required.
<i>Avoid railway and associated (noise and traffic) impacts</i>	Yes	Not located near a railway corridor.
<i>Avoid Airport related constraints – Noise contours (ANEF) & Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS)</i>	Yes	Not located in vicinity of an airport.

2.7.5 Conclusions & Recommendation

The adopted Beyond 2030 Strategic Plan provides a strong focus on developing a village residential nodes, to ensure the sustainable development of land, considering the potential interface issues between existing rural and future residential uses. This position is supported. The logical impetus for this submission is assumed to be access to flood free land for village urban settlement.

Current statistical data on growth and development take-up of residential land (including rural residential) indicates a continuing slowing of activity. There are no indications of strong demand for rural residential at this stage to warrant changing the adopted strategy and the land should not be brought forward for development, at this stage (ie 1st phase release).

Council will be continually monitoring population and economic development data to assess the performance of this latest strategy.

Recommendation:

1. At this stage, the subject land to remain RU1 with currently adopted min lot size.

3 LAND SUPPLY & DEMAND

The following section provides a review of:


1. The existing supply of rural residential lands and demand for increased rural residential lands, including, but not limited to:
 - An analysis of potential locations for increased rural residential lands should adequate demand exist; and
 - An analysis of the appropriateness of existing underutilized rural residential lands (lands which have not been subdivided or fully utilised for rural residential housing).
2. Existing rural residential lot sizes and demand/appropriateness of alternative lot sizes.
3. Current staging strategies for residential development as proposed in the Growth Strategy Beyond 2030.

3.1 Revised Population and Development Data

The Beyond 2013 Growth Strategy document contains a comprehensive analysis of population and development statistics that have been relied upon in formulating the adopted landuse strategies, based on 2006 Census data, Council development statistics and independent analysis. For strategic planning purposes a targeted estimated population of approximately 36648 (2006 ABS census count + 12847) was adopted, which incorporated allowing for 4758 additional households @ 2.7 persons per household (equivalent to an average 1.5% population growth rate per annum).

Recent inter-censal data for 2013 indicates that Griffith LGA population growth has slowed. 2003-2013 data indicates an average 0.46%pa growth rate over that 10-year period. New dwelling approvals have also declined since 2010 (143 to 69 in 2012) and current dwelling approvals from 2013 till present are relatively low.


However, recent population forecasting for Griffith indicates a steady growth of between 0.25 – 0.91% through to 2036 (See updated charts and tables below).



Griffith LGA ERP & Projections 2011-2036 - Chart (Source: GCC & ID 2014)

Forecast population, households and dwellings						
	Forecast year					
Summary	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	2036
Population	22,000	24,000	26,000	27,000	28,000	29,000
Change population by year		200	200	100	100	100
Households	5,111	5,543	5,972	6,401	6,830	7,259
Change households by year		432	429	429	429	429
Population per private dwelling	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Dwellings	1,419	1,540	1,659	1,778	1,894	2,019
Change dwellings by year		121	119	119	116	125
Dwelling occupancy rate	82.65	82.75	82.84	82.97	83.11	83.24

Griffith LGA ERP & Projections 2011-2036 - Table (Source: GCC & ID 2014)



Griffith LGA Dwelling Approvals 2008-2012 (Source: ABS)

These building figures may be a temporary reaction to community insecurity and uncertainty with regard to future of water allocations and potential negative effects of volatile markets for the wine, rice and citrus industry, as discussed in the Growth Strategy document. A sluggish real estate market, potentially fueled by an oversupply of developable land, together with the failure of some significant subdivisions to attract interest, can also contribute to declining confidence in the local economy. Current national real estate statistics categorise Griffith as a "slow" market, showing around 1% growth (5 year growth) and low rental demand.

However, all regional centres experience fluctuations in population and development growth where both external impacts and local development activity (or lack of) require necessary adjustments to predictions and strategies to keep the local land economy in check.

The latest ABS statistics, NSW Planning projections and projections from ID Forecasting indicate that the conclusions reached in the latest Growth Strategy may require some minor reassessment and reconsideration, particularly in relation to expected land take-up over the nominated strategic planning period. Note that the current Beyond 2013 Growth Strategy document is also attempting to redress the overly high predictions on growth for the Griffith region that was based on high growth rates at the time of publication (1998-2000), which were then between 2.0 – 2.4% pa.

Based on the above discussion, it is suggested that a more reliable (and potentially more realistic) population growth rate prediction should rest in the 0.5 – 1.0%pa range for strategic land use planning purposes.

3.2 Rural Residential Land

Rural residential lots are an integral part of the contemporary urban framework of most rural regional centres including Griffith. They are a premium real estate product and provide an alternative lifestyle choice as well as being a legitimate strategic planning land use.

They are, however, an inefficient form of landuse activity and must form part of a strategic mix of a local area's residential settlement strategy to ensure economic, efficient and sustainable landuse development.

A strategic mix of landuse choices must take into account household affordability to both purchase construct and maintain a rural residential property (see stats below on servicing costs and impacts of this type of residential living environment). Whilst it may be a desire, most households will make a final decision on affordability, which has traditionally focused on a typical urban residential lot size (500-1000m²). Local landuse policy must avoid the scenario where rural residential lots are competing for, and dominating, demand for general residential housing sites.

3.2.1 Common Terms and Definitions

There are many terms used to describe Rural Residential development, all of which are applicable as they clearly define the sorts of activities that are labeled as rural residential living. Statutory terms include 'Small Holdings', 'Large Lot Residential', 'Concessional Lots' and 'Primary Production Small Lots', as well as other general terms such as 'Hobby Farms' and 'Rural Retreats'.

The following table extract was sourced from an earlier document prepared by NSW Planning, which sets out guidelines on rural settlement and classifies various rural residential types. The classifications are still relevant today to help define various rural settlement options.

Table 8: Rural Residential Terms (Source: NSW Planning)

Type	Approx range of lot sizes	Activity emphasis	Land characteristics	Utility services normally provided
Rural Residential Estates	2000m ² – 2ha	Accommodation, enjoyment of rural environment	range of environs normally close to urban areas – for employment, recreation and community facilities	sealed roads, reticulated water, electricity, telephone, improved drainage, sometimes reticulated sewerage
Hobby Farms	2 ha – 40 ha	accommodation enjoyment of rural environment part-time agricultural pursuits	small subdivision and estates; mix of cleared areas and remnant vegetation often good soils and dam for water supply	sealed or gravel roads, electricity, telephone, sometimes reticulated water available
Rural Retreats	4000 m ² – 40 ha	accommodation seeking solitude enjoyment of natural/rural environment some agricultural pursuits	generally isolated from other residences range of topography greater emphasis on natural environment	usually gravel roads, telephone, electricity (optional), tank, creek or dam water

Cluster Farming and Multiple Occupancy	Generally over 40 ha with small residential envelopes	cooperative land use and development, agriculture and/or care of natural environment	varies according to theme of development and group needs involves agricultural land and/or natural vegetation	electricity (optional), usually gravel roads, telephone, can be self-contained for utility services
Dispersed Households including Concessional Allotments	Generally large properties over 40 ha	accommodation and lifestyle, part to full-time farming	varies according to use, from prime agricultural land to "bush blocks" can be any distance from urban centres	wide range from fully reticulated services to fully self reliant dependent on location

For Griffith, most of the above rural residential settlement types are relevant to providing a mix of living environments. Existing and proposed developments make use of the term "rural residential" loosely, however, the particular site characteristics/constraints and access to essential services ultimately define the appropriate type of achievable rural living character.

For the purposes of this review, the rural residential land bank is restricted to the R5 zoned land. However, the other existing RU2 & RU4 land, as well as small RU1 concessional lots must be factored into the smallholdings land bank strategies to complete the overall suite of available options for rural lifestyle residential living.

Ultimately, rural residential is a premium product and its position in the residential lifestyle choice mix should be defined and strategically maintained to ensure a balanced residential land portfolio.

3.2.2 Servicing Costs

Studies in both Australia and overseas have highlighted the inherent cost of servicing varying rural settlement patterns including rural residential and hobby farms. Ad hoc settlement patterns can increase costs dramatically.

Developer costs vary depending on site location and acquisition arrangements (geared or not geared). In general, rural residential requires less hard infrastructure (eg no kerb & gutter, options for access arrangements, some reticulation services alternatively provided onsite, etc) and so can be an incentive for maximizing profit when compared with managed higher density residential estates. However, some environmental constraints can involve costly solutions to ensure sustainable development.

In terms of private cost, building in a dispersed pattern can increase costs to both the developer and the individual by 113% (capital) over similar planned concentrated development. The costs of commuting (ongoing, private) may be up to 1660% higher, depending on the degree of dispersal, location, number of people and method of commuting. On average, the cost is 550% more than in a concentrated residential environment.

In terms of public cost, scattered housing is up to 395% (capital) and 236% (ongoing) more costly to the community as a whole. Whilst the average costs to the individual in a dispersed development are some 85% more than a concentrated estate, the community bears a far larger 236% cost increase. ¹(SOURCE: R.J. SMITH & P.B. REYNOLDERS, Cost of Servicing Urban Sprawl)

The current dispersed, and somewhat ad hoc, establishment of rural residential development in Griffith would attract these inherent cost burdens across both private and public sectors.

3.2.3 Energy Utilisation Implications

Inappropriate management of rural residential land development can result in significant energy consumption and utilisation issues, resulting in a net increase in CO₂ (equivalent) emissions, and subsequent impact on global warming levels. This may take several forms:

- Increase in transmission losses in grid supplied electricity. Losses may be as high as 6% per 100 metres of power cable, and may be exacerbated by the need to use higher voltage supplies (3.3 or 6.6 KV) and transformer sub-stations to meet transmission distances to poorly located rural residential land. These losses can be directly translated to an increase in required energy load to effect supply, and a consequent increase in CO₂e emissions (based on conversion of 1 kW/hr = 0.962 tonnes CO₂e).
- Inability to connect to Natural Gas supplies. As use of Natural Gas as an alternate energy source to electricity has an immediate 75% reduction in Greenhouse Gas emissions per unit of energy consumed, rural residential development in areas where access is at an excessive cost to the retailer effectively prohibits this reduction occurring. This prevents the market transformation necessary to allow meeting of Government emission reduction targets.
- Water and Sewerage energy consumption. In supplying water and sewerage services to rural residential developments, an energy penalty is incurred if excess pumping distances are required. Currently, 24.8% of the cost per kilolitre of these services is electricity consumption at pump stations and treatment works. Inappropriate location may mean the installation of additional pump stations to maintain mains pressure supply, rather than using gravity-fed systems.

There are many acceptable alternative solutions to the above that can be investigated by both the local authority and land developer, depending on individual circumstances. For example:

- Solar, Wind or mini-hydro power to supplement or replace grid supplies.
- Use of composting toilets and water reclamation systems
- Rainwater tank supplies
- Reduction in mains pressure water from 6 Bar to 4 Bar
- Development of biodigester systems for production of Compressed Organic Gas from green and organic waste, and use of the gas as an alternative to Natural gas supplies.

²(SOURCE: S.E.D.A)

3.2.4 Supply

The supply of existing zoned land stock should relate to the strategic planning timeframe of the currently adopted strategy, be it 5, 10, 20 or longer years. This forms part of the developable "land bank" that assists in keeping check of the economic performance of the local area. Fundamentally, housing supply should not be dominated by rural residential development.

For a sub-regional centre experiencing growth, most best practice planning

guidelines suggest a serviceable land bank of not more than 10 years supply of zoned rural residential land (based on "legitimate" demand), which is reviewed at least every 5 years. This is essential to align with development time frames, investor expectations on returns and sustained land values, which all ultimately contribute to a balanced local economy based on secure real estate equity levels.

In addition, a surplus land supply factor would appropriately be incorporated into a strategic model to cater for promoting regional attractiveness for both investment and land availability purposes. This strategic model is appropriate for a sub-regional centre targeting sustained growth and servicing lifestyle choice. It is also appropriate to ensure that development incentives are factored into the supply chain to counteract situations of landholder reluctance to subdivide for various reasons. The surplus factor is suggested to be at least 20-30% over current "legitimate" demand data.

Calculating the existing zoned stock of rural residential lots would be based on the following key data:

1. *Vacancy rate*
2. *Existing zoned stock ready for sale or occupation*
3. *Potential additional zoned stock from unsubdivided appropriately zoned land*
4. *Alternative land sources of similar size and character including concessional lots and other historic smallholdings in other rural zone settings.*

An ongoing "land monitor" greatly assists in keeping check on takeup rates of developable /zoned land. A typical "land monitor" would include the following items:

- *Total potential lots zoned*
- *Lots created per annum*
- *Lots not created*
- *Lots built per annum*
- *Lots vacant*

The current supply of rural residential zoned land in Griffith is provided in the table below, as extracted from the Beyond 2030 Growth Strategy.

Table 9: Extract from Growth Strategy – Land Zoned Rural Residential

LAND ZONED RURAL RESIDENTIAL GLEP 2002				
Map Indication No.	Area Description	Total Area	Total area developed	Area available
1	Portion of McPherson Range North of Griffith Includes larger farming lots	320Ha	275Ha	45Ha (Only for lots of min. 5Ha)
2	Land situated East of Yenda	46.3 Ha	9.6 Ha	36.7 Ha
3	Pelican Shores & Fawcett Drive	110.3 Ha	58 Ha	52.3 Ha
4	Mallinson Road Lake Wyangan	63 Ha	45 Ha	18 Ha

5	Beelbanger	16.5 Ha	2.7 Ha	13.8 Ha
6	Yoogali	59 Ha	33 Ha	26 Ha
7	Watkins Avenue	64 Ha	28.7 Ha	35.3 Ha
8	Walla Avenue	15 Ha	4Ha	11Ha
9	Hanwood	29 Ha	1.2Ha	27.8Ha
Additional Land Already Approved by Council for Rural Residential				
10	Northern Foreshore of Lake Wyangan	181 Ha	0Ha	181Ha
11	Lakes Road 2 Annex (Bets Development)	70.4 Ha	0Ha	70.4Ha
12	Snaidero Road	15.3 Ha	2.6Ha	12.7Ha
13	Spencer Road	8.4 Ha	2.8Ha	5.6Ha
TOTAL of areas 2 to 13		578Ha	187.6Ha	390.4Ha x 80% = 312.32Ha

In the current strategy, rural residential land represents around 16.5% of the zoned residential land supply available for development. The zoned developable area also represents a land bank of over 35 years supply, which is more than triple the amount recommended by best practice guidelines and basic land economics principles.

Considering other similar regional centres, this is on the high side and pushes the envelope of what could be considered a sustainable land settlement strategy.

In reviewing rural residential land supply for the Griffith LGA, the following alternative data sets are put forward based on revised statistics and data provided by Council and other best practice models:

- Between 0.5 and 1.0% per annum population growth rate for the Growth Strategy period;
- Residential land settlement to be geared to accommodate a population of between 28800 – 32600 by 2038;
- Between 1350 – 2870 new dwelling sites are required to accommodate this population growth, of which 200 – 430 (15%) are targeted for rural residential type lots;
- The urban lot/rural residential lot size split of 750m²/3000m² is considered consistent with known planning guidelines;
- For rural residential landuse, the required “un-constrained and serviceable” land to meet estimated additional settlement needs would be up to **155 hectares** (this includes the 20% contingency for essential service requirements).
- For a balanced land budget, only 50 hectares (representing 10 years supply) of zoned land should be made available for “legitimate” development, reviewed every 5 years.

Comparing the current zoned land available for rural residential development (312 hectares) and the recommended area (155 hectares) based on best practice models, it is clear that there is a significant

oversupply of rural residential zoned land identified in the current city plan.

3.2.5 Demand

There are various models that can be used calculate demand for rural residential lots. As there are many factors that can affect demand, at best they provide a general understanding of the number of lots to meet future demand.

For land use purposes, and respecting the aims and objectives of the E P & A Act 1979 under which Council discharges its planning powers, demand must be measured in terms of "legitimate" demand, although the presence of "speculative" and "institutional" demand must also be recognised.

"Legitimate" demand is where a lot is purchased for cash and then the purchaser builds a house upon it to live in based on immediate need and affordability.

The following is a general guide based on the assumption that rural residential lots, of varying lot size, will take up between 12-15% of the overall dwelling allocation in the local area. This would represent the "legitimate" demand for this type of residential landuse and aims for a balanced, sustainable, residential settlement strategy for the Griffith Area.

Table 10: Legitimate Demand Estimate – Version 1

1.	Estimation of average population increase per annum	200
2.	Estimated future average household size based on historic trends	2.7
3.	Estimated number of occupied rural dwellings required	11
4.	Upwards adjustment (say 10%) to allow for unoccupied dwellings	12.2
5.	Upwards adjustment (say 20%) for unoccupied lots	14.7
8.	Real estate sale performance and views of agents, adjustment (say 10%)	16.1
9	Monitoring of land stock and take up rates via a land monitor (not available, estimate only)	17.7
10.	Adjusted Demand Rate per Annum (with rounding upwards)	18

An alternative and more simplistic, model for calculating demand is by averaging the rate of dwelling unit approvals on rural residential lots over the preceding 5 years plus 30% allowance for changes in demand.

Approved new dwelling units data from Council, as provided in the Growth Strategy document, does not provide a separate figure for rural residential lots. Only lots on larger traditional rural farms are provided. Therefore, only an estimation based on current 6:1 ratio is used.

Table 11: Legitimate Demand Estimate – Version 2

1.	5 year dwelling unit approvals – ABS average pa all residential	108
2.	Including 30% allowance for changes in demand pa	140
3.	Rural Residential Component – average pa	20

Both models produce similar results and are a reasonable test of demand based on currently available data.

For strategic planning purposes, it is suggested that current "legitimate" demand, on average, equates to approximately 20 vacant lots per year.

3.2.6 Balancing Supply and Demand

Ultimately, analytical assessment of demand vs real world activity in land development is measured in sustained positive land valuation and sales performance figures.

From discussions with selected real estate agents it has been suggested there is a strong demand for residential and rural residential land, however, lack of choice and unrealistic pricing is frustrating land sales. On the other hand, there appears to also be a significant amount of land zoned for development but an inherent reluctance by developers to undertake subdivision due to either lack of viable returns or a variety of factors including taxation, phasing and other particular issues. Some reasons put forward include high servicing costs and authority fees.


Real estate agent views, as noted, focused more on quality of product, appropriate location and perceptions of needs, which must be taken with a certain amount of caution. However, the views are to be respected and provide an insight into the opportunities and pressures that exist in the local land market.

The Griffith rural residential land supply, as currently zoned, is owned primarily by traditional farming families where the incentive to develop is influenced by other rural industry, taxation and intergenerational factors. Land that has been targeted for development by genuine land developers (individuals or development companies) have experienced mixed levels of success with several large ventures failing for various reasons. Current vacant land prices, for both residential and rural residential, do not reflect a strong market demand, with indications that prices have either retracted or have been static over recent years.

Based on the available information reviewed, it is evident that demand is not taking up current supply of zoned land and this is having a negative effect on land values and general real estate property values overall.

3.2.7 Appropriateness of existing zoned land

An analysis of each rural residential zoned land has been conducted as part of this review. Map Area References are as shown in Map 44 Land Use Strategy contained in the Growth Strategy document. Comments and conclusions are contained in the table below.



Map 44 – Land Use Strategy – GSBeyond2030

Table 12: Analysis of Existing Rural Residential Zones

Map Area Ref	Area Description	Comment on appropriateness & recommendations
1	Portion of McPherson Range North of Griffith, includes larger farming lots	<p>The RU2 zoning is appropriate, however, the minimum lot size should be increased to 20ha as a strategic move to limit further creation of lots that would not sustain extensive viable primary production, as described in the zone objectives. Current zoning/lot size (in particular Z1-4ha) suggests hobby-farming activities at best. The land needs to be factored in as available options for alternative residential lifestyle living with potential impact on demand for existing & future residential/rural residential lots.</p> <p>Continue monitoring of land development and takeup.</p>
2	Land situated east of Yenda	<p>Zoned R5/W-4000m2 or 3000m2 with sewer. Subject to flooding policy review.</p> <p>This land is appropriately zoned to form part of the rural residential land supply under the current strategy. Continue monitoring of land development and takeup.</p>
3	Pelican Shores & Fawcett Drive	<p>Zoned R5/AA-5ha or 3000m2 with sewer.</p> <p>This land is appropriately zoned to form part of the rural residential land supply under the current strategy. Continue monitoring of land development</p>

Map Area Ref	Area Description	Comment on appropriateness & recommendations
		and takeup.
4	Mallinson Road Lake Wyangan	<p>Zoned R5/Y-1ha or 3000m2 with sewer. Also some E4/ Y-1ha or 3000m2 with sewer.</p> <p>This land is appropriately zoned to form part of the rural residential land supply under the current strategy. Continue monitoring of land development and takeup.</p>
5	Beelbangera	<p>Zoned R5/W-4000m2 or 3000m2 with sewer.</p> <p>This land is appropriately zoned to form part of the rural residential land supply under the current strategy. Continue monitoring of land development and takeup.</p>
6	Yoogali	<p>Zoned R5/W-4000m2 or 3000m2 with sewer.</p> <p>Note also pockets of existing underdeveloped RU5/AA-5ha or 700m2 with sewer, and RU4/Y-1ha & AA-5ha land (Oakes Rd) that need to be factored in as available options for alternative residential lifestyle living with potential impact on demand for existing & future residential/rural residential lots.</p> <p>Area 6 land is appropriately zoned to form part of the rural residential land supply under the current strategy. Continue monitoring of land development and takeup. Consideration to allowing 2000m2 min lot size for more efficient use of infrastructure whilst maintaining rural residential density & character, and promoting affordability & sustainability of land resources, containment of urban sprawl etc.</p> <p>Monitor Oakes Rd area for orderly & efficient development and land takeup. Consider RU5 Village masterplan to ensure preferred residential character is identified and strategically introduced.</p>
7	Watkins Avenue	<p>Zoned R5/W-4000m2 or 3000m2 with sewer.</p> <p>Note also pockets of existing underdeveloped RU4/Y-1ha & AA-5ha land that need to be factored in as available options for alternative residential lifestyle living with potential impact on demand for existing & future residential/rural residential lots.</p> <p>Area 7 land is appropriately zoned to form part of the rural residential land supply under the current strategy. Continue monitoring of land development and takeup. Consideration to allowing 2000m2 min lot size for more efficient use of infrastructure whilst maintaining rural residential density & character, and promoting affordability & sustainability of land resources, containment of urban sprawl etc.</p> <p>Monitor RU4 land for orderly & efficient development and land takeup.</p>
8	Walla Avenue	<p>Zoned R5/W-4000m2 or 3000m2 with sewer.</p> <p>Note also pockets of existing underdeveloped RU4/Y-1ha & AA-5ha land that need to be factored in as available options for alternative residential lifestyle living with potential impact on demand for existing &</p>

Map Area Ref	Area Description	Comment on appropriateness & recommendations
		<p>future residential/rural residential lots.</p> <p>Area 8 land is appropriately zoned to form part of the rural residential land supply under the current strategy. Continue monitoring of land development and take-up. Consideration to allowing 2000m² min lot size for more efficient use of infrastructure whilst maintaining rural residential density & character, and promoting affordability & sustainability of land resources, containment of urban sprawl etc.</p> <p>Monitor RU4 land for orderly & efficient development and land take-up.</p>
9	Hanwood	<p>Zoned R5/W-4000m² or 3000m² with sewer.</p> <p>This land is appropriately zoned to form part of the rural residential land supply under the current strategy. Continue monitoring of land development and take-up.</p> <p>However, the proximity of residential and rural residential zones to noxious industry may raise future issues with complaints re odour etc. Suggest community discussion to ascertain strategy is robust enough to avoid these issues.</p>
10	Northern Foreshore of Lake Wyangan	<p>Zoned R5/AA-5ha or 3000m² with sewer.</p> <p>There has been no subdivision development in this area. It is understood that a development application for this site has lapsed and the original land developers have sold the land with the new owner undertaking ongoing rural primary production activities.</p> <p>The current strategy has appropriately not included this land as a future land resource for rural residential settlement in the foreseeable future as there are no indicators suggesting otherwise.</p> <p>Strong consideration to be given to rezoning this land RU1 or E2/AE-200ha. This will assist in balancing the supply/demand ratio and help correct current market conditions.</p>
11	Lakes Road 2 Annex (Betts Development)	<p>Zoned E4/ W-4000m² or 3000m² with sewer.</p> <p>There has been no subdivision development in this area. Development application status and immediate intentions need to be clarified. If opportunity exists, consider redefining boundary of realistic expectations of subdivision development and range of lots sizes to meet current rate of land take-up citywide.</p> <p>Current strategy identifies the land as high scenic value/low density residential development. Strong consideration to be given to rationalizing the extent of this zoning to assist balancing the supply/demand ratio and help correct current market conditions.</p>
12	Snaidero Road	<p>Zoned RU4/AA-5ha. This land is subject to a current DA. Development application status and immediate intentions need to be clarified. If opportunity exists, consider redefining boundary of realistic expectations</p>

Map Area Ref	Area Description	Comment on appropriateness & recommendations
		<p>of subdivision development and range of lots sizes to meet current rate of land take-up citywide.</p> <p>Current strategy and zoning appropriate, forms part of the rural residential land supply under the current strategy. Continue monitoring of land development and takeup.</p>
13	Spencer Road	<p>Zoned RU4/AA-5ha. This land is subject to a current DA. Development application status and immediate intentions need to be clarified. If opportunity exists, consider redefining boundary of realistic expectations of subdivision development and range of lots sizes to meet current rate of land take-up citywide.</p> <p>Current strategy and zoning appropriate, forms part of the rural residential land supply under the current strategy. Continue monitoring of land development and takeup.</p> <p>Note proximity to future industrial areas and potential interface conflicts/issues.</p>

3.2.8 Rural residential lot size mix

Rural residential is a lifestyle choice and households are generally geared to ensure affordability in securing a desired site, constructing a new dwelling and outbuildings, and then maintaining the property. Varying factors such as external land activity choices including landscaping, recreational and hobby farm pursuits, have an influence on appropriate lot size choice. Essentially a range of lot sizes targeting expected activity provides the most secure model for efficient, sustainable land supply management.

The astute land developer will undertake their own research to understand the customers that their subdivision development is to be marketed to. Council's have a duty to provide the opportunities via appropriate land policy, including lot size, for the developer to explore viable options.

Under the current NSW planning system, the zoning and minimum lot size provisions provide a somewhat prescriptive means to guide landuse lifestyle choice, however, the system does also enable flexibility by incorporating some creative means of working with the guidelines with respect to the results of their market research.

With the current Griffith LEP, rural residential policy is focused around an optimum lot size of 3000m² where sewer reticulation is available. Without this infrastructure, a minimum of 4000m² is required. Other lot sizes within the LEP include 1, 3, 4, 5 & 10 hectares with the higher lot sizes either targeted for hobby farm activities or used as strategic tools for limiting subdivision activity in areas on hold until demand and infrastructure provision warrants higher density development.

A 3000m² minimum lot size for rural residential is an appropriate size, however, there are some areas where a 2000m² minimum may be warranted to enable more efficient use of land resources and infrastructure, as well as maintaining a rural character and setting.

The inclusion of a lot averaging provision in the current LEP (clause 4.1B) also provides an appropriate level of flexibility to enable a variety of lots

sizes throughout the rural residential zones. Council would be encouraged to promote best practice in subdivision design by way of DCP guidelines to ensure land developers undertake their own research and innovative design to provide an appropriate number, size and setting of lots for the local real estate market.

3.3 Staging Strategies

A general review of the current staging strategies for residential development, as proposed in the Growth Strategy Beyond 2030, has been undertaken following the analysis conducted in previous sections.

The strategies proposed, in theory, are appropriate; particularly as they relate to critical infrastructure rollout and land take up in relation to expected population growth, as discussed in the strategy document. The staging also has respect to revised strategies that aim for more consolidated land development, creation of urban character and sustainable use of resources.

As a result of the review of supply/demand and current statistical information on population change and building activity, however, the timing of the strategies may need review, as the take-up of land may take longer to occur than originally expected. From this independent review, the take up of residential and rural residential land may be extended an additional 3 – 5 years depending on locality.

Staging strategies will require review every five years once more updated data is available to ensure they remain relevant.

3.4 Industrial Land

A review of industrial land supply and demand was also undertaken as part of this project. Council undertook a comprehensive industrial lands analysis as part of the Growth Strategy Beyond 2030 study,

Griffith seems to have an abundant of industrial zoned land that is generally underutilized. Industrial land take up is driven by economic factors beyond the scope of guidance expected from strategic land use documents. For industry, land use policy must provide the opportunities for land acquisition that relates to fostering economic performance and profitability. Transport, communication, key infrastructure and access to other support industries are critical to a robust local economy.

Significantly large industrial developments will generally undertake scoping studies to identify the most appropriate parcel of land that fits all key development criteria. Any zoning issues would be negotiated with the local authority and changes made where appropriate.

It is considered the industrial lands analysis undertaken by Council adequately addresses the issues of industrial land supply and demand. Council is encouraged to pursue economic development incentives to ensure the local area's economy remains robust and attractive for expansion and innovation. The inherent benefits of job growth will then lead to supporting other local activities and residential expansion.

4 SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The adopted Beyond 2030 Strategic Plan provides a strong focus on developing urban residential nodes to ensure sustainable growth throughout the city. The data provided by Council supports this strategy and is reliant on ongoing growth in demand for serviced land, underpinned by continued rural economic growth in the region.

This review has identified that there is currently an imbalance between supply and demand of residential and rural residential land, with a significant oversupply potentially impacting on land values and incentives for further subdivision of land. Declining population growth and a slow down in dwelling unit building activity (since 2010) are both significant contributors to shrinking demand.

It is considered that the current forecasting is still over estimating growth and that expectations be focused on an average 0.5% per annum growth rate in lieu of the predictions included in the latest strategy document.

A summary of conclusions and recommendations is provided below.

4.1 Public Submissions Reviewed

In relation to the submissions review, the following recommendations are made:

Table 13: Summary of Assessment Recommendations

Submission	Recommendation
Submission No.7 - Nardo	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> At this stage, the subject land to remain RU4 with currently adopted min lot size. This position be reviewed within the next 5 years against the rollout of the urban residential expansion strategy and provision of essential infrastructure.
Submission No.8 - Catanzariti	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> At this stage, the subject land to remain RU4 with currently adopted min lot size. A further reviewed be undertaken when land opposite has been development in accordance with the urban residential expansion strategy and provision of essential infrastructure.
Submission No.23 - Mallinson Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> At this stage, the subject land to remain RU4 with currently adopted min lot size. Review this position in next 5 years in relation to rollout of urban residential expansion strategy and essential infrastructure provision
Submission No.32 - Beelbangera Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> At this stage, the subject land to retain the RU4 with currently adopted minimum lot size of 3 hectares, and Review this position in next 5 years in relation to rollout of urban residential expansion strategy and essential infrastructure provision, especially in relation to the flooding strategy.
Submission No.40 - Joekey	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> At this stage, the subject land to remain RU1 with currently adopted min lot size.
Submission No.42 - Rossetto	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> At this stage, the subject land to remain RU1 with currently adopted min lot size.

Submission	Recommendation
Submission - Lot 230 DP751728, Yenda	1. At this stage, the subject land to remain RU1 with currently adopted min lot size.

4.2 Supply & Demand of Rural Residential & Industrial Lands

4.2.1 Rural Residential Land

This review supports the conclusions contained in the Growth Strategy Beyond 2030, being that there is an oversupply of rural residential zoned land, which is having a negative impact on this sector of the local real estate market. This is evident in the poor performance of sales enquiries and general land value return on rural residential lots.

Rural residential has to be targeted at the premium end of the residential real estate market, and land values, settlement character and quality of the built environment should reflect this status.

As mentioned above, forecasting should be based on a relative conservative growth rates with interim reviews (every 5 years for a regional centre like Griffith) to ensure that strategies are adjusted in response to various local, regional and wider influences.

The dispersed settlement of existing rural residential subdivisions, particularly those partially or fully established is now a result of historic decisions. Future strategies should now concentrate on ensuring rural residential estates are complimentary to the main urban settlement areas including villages.

In respect of the review of all rural residential zoned land, detailed analysis and conclusions are included in Table 13 above. The following general recommendations are made:

Table 14: Summary of Existing Rural Residential Zone Recommendations

Map Area Ref:	Recommendation
1 – McPhersons Range	1. RU2 zoning is appropriate, however, minimum lot size should be increased to 20ha to limit further creation of lots that would not sustain extensive viable primary production,
2, 3, 4 & 5	1. These areas are appropriately zoned.
6, 7, 8 & 9	1. These areas are appropriately zoned 2. Consideration for allowing 2000m2 lots in certain areas for more sustainable development.
10 – Northern Foreshore – LW	1. Rezone this land to RU1 or E2/AE-200ha to balance demand/supply.
11 – Lakes Road	1. Further investigate the development history of this land and rezone where appropriate to RU1 to balance demand/supply.
12, 13	1. These areas are appropriately zoned.
General Recommendations	1. Council to establish & maintain a land monitoring register that is reviewed regularly. 2. Council to review the residential & rural residential staging timing as a response to the current statistical data from ABS. 3. A review of current strategies to be undertaken every 5 years to ensure relevance to the current market and local economic conditions.

4.2.2 Industrial Land

There is sufficient zoned industrial land under the recently adopted LEP2014 to cater to known and projected industrial land development.

The current industrial land review conclusions are supported.

ATTACHMENT 1: MEETING NOTES



Project: 14002 – Griffith City Council – Draft Griffith Local Environmental Plan 2013 - Independent Review of Public Submissions

MEETING NOTES

Date: 30/5/14
8.30am – 9.45am

Subject: **Nardo/Raccanello - Submission No.7**
Boorga Road, Lake Wyangan
Meeting and consultation with the subject landholders/authors of the identified public submissions.

Attendees: Louis & Maria Raccanello
(Contact: Maria Raccanello 0428694523 or Louis Raccanello 0427010243)

Details:

- Strategic discussions, zoning decisions, meetings with Council since 1999
- Landholders are weighing up options for subdivision development
- General frustration with landuse planning system since consideration of first strategy review in 2000
- Conceptual subdivision plan included in submission, not a true indication of maximum development potential and/or integration with adjoining land, put into the submission as requested by Council. Encouraged by Council to resubmit previous submission for consideration
- Noted that latest strategy includes the land within urban residential expansion of Lake Wyangan village area 2023+ release.
- New sewer main along Boorga Road to service village area.
- Current infrastructure rollout suggests future residential expansion, interim interface conflicts, esp re bikeway and farming operations, noted concerns over spraydrift, users of bikeway (young families, children etc)
- Current take-up rates for rural residential land and land values indicate reaction to oversupply of zoned rural res land, ie significant oversupply, lower realized sales value of developed land, some developments failing. Also reaction to local rural economy restructuring pressures.
- Existing dwelling located on separate small holding parcel (former concessional lot), may be disposed of separately and not form part of overall subdivision design.
- LEP2014 zoning RU4 with min lot size of 5ha. This does not represent an efficient future subdivision arrangement to realize the orderly and efficient development of future urban residential land without the inclusion of a masterplan/staging plan. At best a strategic hold on subdivision development until next zoning review.
- The 500 lot subdivision north of Lake Wyangan will not be realised as new owner has no intention of developing, bought it as a rural farming enterprise.
- Impact of "fans" in local area for controlling frost

Comments:

1. Noted all above
2. Relevance of current strategy for village expansion, timing of land release
3. Infrastructure expansion as part of urban village expansion, where relevant
4. Interface issues with encroaching urbanism to be noted in interim.
5. Consider in relation to overall strategic landuse expansion of urban areas and if rural residential is still relevant and viable under current and foreseeable future.

GS



Project: 14002 – Griffith City Council – Draft Griffith Local Environmental Plan 2013 - Independent Review of Public Submissions

MEETING NOTES

Date: 30/5/14
11.00am – 12.00pm

Subject: **Catanzariti – Submission No.8**
Antonio & Maria Catanzariti, Farm 1868, McCarthy Road, Lake Wyangan (Contact: Tony Catanzariti 0428 665 985)
Meeting and consultation with the subject landholders/authors of the identified public submissions.

Attendees: Tony Catanzariti

Details:

- Landholder has several parcels of land within current LEP RU5 Village zoning and considering future development options.
- This land zoned RU4, min lot size 5ha, and included within future urban residential expansion of Lake Wyangan village area 2023+ release.
- Previous strategy indicates land for rural farming uses only
- Landholder acknowledges merit of strategic view of landuse expansion
- Noted concern over land supply issues and failings of several rural residential developments.
- Discussed local rural economic issues, also noted.
- Discussed overall city structure plan and importance of physical constraints, natural eco systems, infrastructure imitations.\, "big picture" thinking required and commitment to implementing in a responsible manner.
- Plan for aging population, resourcing newly developing areas for young families.
- Current land used for citrus farming with existing dwelling
- Opposite new land development for residential purposes.

Comments:

1. Noted all above
2. Urban expansion of Lake Wyangan requires village centre masterplan
3. Village development strategy has merit and makes sense when considering future residential land resources for the city.
4. Timing of development, phasing of infrastructure critical to viability.

GS



Project: 14002 – Griffith City Council – Draft Griffith Local Environmental Plan 2013 - Independent Review of Public Submissions

MEETING NOTES

Date: 4/6/14
10.00am – 11.00am

Subject: **Mallinson Road (M&V Solicitors) – Submission No.23**
Mackenzie & Vardanega Lawyers for Nardo&Ballestrin / Zirilli&Agresta / Casella / Pasin / Agresta /Rinaldo / Mancini / Bonaccorsi / D'Aquino / Mancini, Mallinson Road, Griffith. (Contact: Simon Mackenzie 69668222)
Meeting and consultation with the subject landholders/authors of the identified public submissions.

Attendees: Simon Mackenzie, Messers Mancini, Zirilli, Agresta, Casella

Details:

- Land has been developed as result of strategy plan agreed to in 2000. Initial take up and development encouraged by Council, issues dealt with.
- Landholders concerned over current zoning and revised strategy, not an efficient use of land resources, uneconomic to develop
- Noted existing R5 subdivisions on southern side of Mallinson Rd. Few vacant lots left.
- Land included as general and future rural residential expansion in previous adopted strategy.
- Current strategy has part of the land included in future urban residential expansion of Lake Wyangan Village 2023+ release, with land further west to remain as existing small holdings for horticultural/viticultural use.
- Noted current slow down in land sales and issues with some rural residential developments.
- Noted merits of locations and existing investment in infrastructure to support future subdivision development.
- Landholders need certainty on future subdivision to protect their investment.

Comments:

1. Noted all above
2. Balance interests of landholder expectations and rollout of urban residential expansion strategy and essential infrastructure provision.
3. Supply/demand ratio to be kept in balance, note development and take up of R5 land.
4. Need to ensure economic/efficient use of land parcels essential to realise adopted strategy – min lot size not reflection of best use of land (strategic measure).
5. Interim need to manage interface conflicts between current rural activities and expanding urban/residential settlement.

GS



Project: 14002 – Griffith City Council – Draft Griffith Local Environmental Plan 2013 - Independent Review of Public Submissions

MEETING NOTES

Date: 4/6/14
11.00am – 12.00pm

Subject: **Beelbanger Road (Planning Matters) – Submission No.32**
Planning Matters for landowners between Clifton Boulevard & Calabria Road, Griffith.
(Contact: Martin Ruggeri 69622696)
Meeting and consultation with the subject landholders/authors of the identified public submissions.

Attendees: Martin Ruggeri, Roy Calabria, Charlie Guglielmino

Details:

- Previous strategy indicated land for future investigation for residential 2030+.
- Current strategy suggests future rural small holdings. Current zoning is RU4 with min lot size of 3ha.
- Landholders have invested considerably in developing various masterplanning models to ensure a cost-efficient subdivision of this area, including infrastructure modeling.
- Landholders suggest that 6000-8000m2 lots are preferred to ensure a cost-effective/efficient development.
- Noted that land-farming infrastructure has been downgraded over previous years since 2000 strategy released in anticipation of future residential development.
- Noted issues with current real estate market, oversupply of residential lots, valuation/rates issues, etc..
- Noted current flooding concerns for this area and that a revised flooding strategy is being developed.
- Discussed planning regulation setup, state model instrument, use of min lot sizes to control development, how Council must demonstrate responsible management of land resources to meet supply/demand pressures.

Comments:

1. Noted all above
2. Additional work needed to ensure infrastructure (esp drainage) is designed to meet carrying capacity and physical limitations of local area.
3. Landholder interests/expectations to be balanced against city needs and responsible land management.
4. Urban residential expansion strategy to ensure orderly/efficient use of resources, esp essential infrastructure provision, note difference between density suggested in current LEP and that being pushed by the landholders.
5. Interim need to manage interface conflicts between current rural activities and expanding urban/residential settlement.

GS



Project: 14002 – Griffith City Council – Draft Griffith Local Environmental Plan 2013 - Independent Review of Public Submissions

MEETING NOTES

Date: 30/5/14
10.00am – 11.00am

Subject: **Joeky – Submission No.40**
J & H Joeky, Farm 1527, Cemetery Road, Yenda (Contact: Joe 0429487489)
Meeting and consultation with the subject landholders/authors of the identified public submissions.

Attendees: Joe Joeky

Details:

- Current zoning RU1, min lot size 20ha. Current strategy indicates land for continuing rural landuses.
- Landholder considers land has opportunity for future industrial uses, in particular targeting truck depots and rail freight/warehousing activities, logistics type activity
- Growth of Casella Wines, proximity to main roads and railway are all major influences on potential support industries in the general area of Yenda.
- Not aware of current zoning of land, viewed online mapping and landuse guide
- Noted that all uses suggested are permissible on the subject site, subject to normal DA process. LEP2014 permits targeted landuses in RU1 zone
- Noted infrastructure opportunities and limitations of site.

Comments:

1. Noted all above
2. Expansion of Casella Wines has provided catalyst for other potential entrepreneurial ventures in the local area.
3. Current zoning provides reasonable flexibility to accommodate related industries, subject to appropriate investigations as necessary.
4. Note previous and current strategies that indicate land for continued rural use
5. Best to monitor in short term, including take up of existing land in and around Yenda for industrial and rural-industrial uses.

GS



Project: 14002 – Griffith City Council – Draft Griffith Local Environmental Plan 2013 - Independent Review of Public Submissions

MEETING NOTES

Date: 4/6/14
9.00am – 10.00am

Subject: **Rossetto – Submission No.42**
Eric Rossetto, Farm 797 Cremasco Road, Yenda (Contact: Eric 69641203)
Meeting and consultation with the subject landholders/authors of the identified public submissions.

Attendees: Eric Rossetto

Details:

- Existing farm unviable under current rural economic conditions, 30 acres
- Current zoning RU1, min lot size 20ha. Current & previous strategies indicate land for continuing rural landuses.
- Land is immediately opposite an R5 zoned area with min lot size of 4000m2.
- Noted existing provision of infrastructure services to support additional rural dwellings if RU4 recommended.
- Water (raw & filtered), Electricity, Telstra services, sealed road to part of existing lot frontage, all available

Comments:

1. Noted all above
2. Inclusion of RU4 zoning would provide an interface barrier between RU1 landuses. There is no RU4 land surrounding Yenda village.
3. However, note proximity of Industrial zoning and consideration also needed for land between Barracks Road and Wood Road. Potential interface issues.
4. Considering oversupply of current small lot rural land, at this stage preferred strategy would be to leave as RU1 until land market has readjusted and demand increases.

GS

ATTACHMENT 2: POPULATION & DWELLING PROJECTIONS

A – SP Model:

B – GCC/Forecast ID 2014




Griffith LGA Projections 2013-2043

Year	0.5% pa ERP	2.5 Dwellings	12% R/Res Allocation	15%	0.75% pa ERP	2.5 Dwellings	12% R/Res Allocation	15%	1.0% pa ERP	2.5 Dwellings	12% R/Res Allocation	15%	1.5% pa ERP	2.5 Dwellings	12% R/Res Allocation	15%	2.0% pa ERP	2.5 Dwellings	12% R/Res Allocation	15%
2013	25425	10170	1220	1526	25425	10170	1220	1526	25425	10170	1220	1526	25425	10170	1220	1526	25425	10170	1220	1526
2014	25552	10221	1227	1533	25616	10246	1230	1537	25679	10272	1233	1541	25806	10323	1239	1548	25934	10373	1245	1556
2015	25680	10272	1233	1541	25808	10323	1239	1548	25936	10374	1245	1556	26193	10477	1257	1572	26452	10581	1270	1587
2016	25808	10323	1239	1548	26001	10401	1248	1560	26195	10478	1257	1572	26386	10535	1276	1595	26981	10732	1295	1619
2017	25937	10375	1245	1556	26196	10479	1257	1572	26457	10583	1270	1587	26685	10794	1295	1619	27521	11008	1321	1651
2018	26067	10427	1251	1564	26393	10557	1267	1584	26722	10689	1283	1603	27390	10958	1315	1643	28071	11229	1347	1684
2019	26197	10479	1257	1572	26591	10636	1276	1595	26989	10796	1295	1619	27801	11120	1334	1668	28633	11453	1374	1718
2020	26328	10531	1264	1580	26790	10716	1286	1607	27259	10904	1308	1636	28218	11287	1354	1693	29205	11682	1402	1752
2021	26460	10584	1270	1588	26991	10796	1296	1619	27532	11013	1322	1652	28641	11456	1375	1718	29789	11916	1430	1787
2022	26592	10637	1276	1596	27194	10877	1305	1632	27807	11123	1335	1668	29071	11628	1395	1744	30385	12154	1458	1823
2023	26725	10690	1283	1604	27398	10959	1315	1644	28085	11234	1348	1685	29507	11803	1416	1770	30993	12397	1488	1860
2024	26859	10744	1289	1612	27603	11041	1325	1656	28366	11346	1362	1702	29949	11980	1438	1797	31613	12645	1517	1897
2025	26993	10797	1296	1620	27810	11124	1335	1669	28650	11460	1375	1719	30399	12159	1459	1824	32245	12898	1548	1935
2026	27128	10851	1302	1628	28019	11207	1345	1681	28936	11574	1389	1736	30855	12342	1481	1851	32890	13156	1579	1973
2027	27264	10906	1309	1636	28228	11292	1355	1694	29225	11690	1403	1754	31317	12527	1503	1879	33548	13419	1610	2013
2028	27400	10960	1315	1644	28440	11376	1365	1706	29518	11807	1417	1771	31787	12715	1526	1907	34219	13687	1642	2053
2029	27537	11015	1322	1652	28654	11462	1375	1719	29813	11925	1431	1789	32264	12906	1549	1936	34903	13961	1675	2094
2030	27675	11070	1328	1660	28869	11547	1386	1732	30111	12044	1445	1807	32748	13099	1572	1965	35601	14240	1709	2136
2031	27813	11125	1335	1669	29085	11634	1396	1745	30412	12165	1460	1825	33239	13296	1595	1994	36313	14525	1743	2179
2032	27952	11181	1342	1677	29303	11721	1407	1758	30716	12286	1474	1843	33738	13495	1619	2024	37039	14816	1778	2222
2033	28092	11237	1348	1686	29523	11809	1417	1771	31023	12409	1489	1861	34244	13695	1644	2055	37780	15112	1813	2267
2034	28232	11293	1355	1694	29745	11898	1428	1785	31334	12533	1504	1880	34757	13903	1668	2085	38536	15414	1850	2312
2035	28374	11349	1362	1702	29968	11987	1438	1798	31647	12659	1519	1899	35279	14112	1693	2117	39307	15723	1887	2358
2036	28515	11406	1369	1711	30192	12077	1449	1812	31963	12785	1534	1918	35808	14323	1719	2148	40095	16037	1924	2406
2037	28658	11463	1376	1719	30419	12168	1460	1825	32283	12913	1550	1937	36345	14538	1745	2181	40895	16358	1963	2454
2038	28801	11521	1382	1728	30647	12259	1471	1839	32606	13042	1565	1956	36890	14756	1771	2213	41712	16685	2002	2503
2039	28945	11578	1389	1737	30877	12351	1482	1853	32932	13173	1581	1976	37444	14977	1797	2247	42547	17019	2042	2553
2040	29090	11636	1396	1745	31108	12443	1493	1867	33261	13304	1597	1996	38095	15202	1824	2280	43398	17359	2083	2604
2041	29236	11694	1403	1754	31342	12537	1504	1881	33594	13438	1613	2016	38675	15430	1852	2315	44266	17706	2125	2656
2042	29382	11753	1410	1763	31577	12631	1516	1895	33930	13572	1629	2036	39154	15662	1879	2349	45151	18060	2167	2709
2043	29529	11811	1417	1772	31814	12725	1527	1909	34269	13708	1645	2056	39741	15897	1908	2384	46054	18422	2211	2763



Forecast population

Griffith City



Population and households forecasts, 2011 to 2036, prepared by id, June 2013



Forecast population, households and dwellings

Griffith City	Forecast year					
	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	2036
Summary						
Population	25,362	25,826	27,095	28,572	29,217	30,154
Change in population (5 yrs)		320	744	1,170	1,217	1,287
Average annual change		6.4	14.8	23.4	24.3	25.7
Households	9,311	9,543	9,872	10,217	10,790	11,282
Average household size	2.73	2.69	2.74	2.80	2.70	2.67
Population in non-private dwellings	340	346	376	406	436	460
Dwellings	10,000	10,289	10,633	11,067	11,563	12,072
Dwelling occupancy rate	92.83	92.75	92.84	92.97	93.11	93.20

Population and households forecasts, 2011 to 2036, prepared by id, June 2013

Forecast age structure - 5 year age groups

Griffin City - Total population	2011		2021		2036		Change between 2011 and 2036
Age group (years)	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number
0 to 4	1,371	7.4	1,331	7.3	1,312	7.3	-59
5 to 9	1,334	7.3	1,300	7.4	1,275	7.2	-59
10 to 14	1,380	7.6	1,295	6.9	1,168	6.3	-212
15 to 19	1,741	9.8	1,644	8.4	1,503	8.3	-138
20 to 24	1,737	9.7	1,707	8.6	1,663	8.8	-74
25 to 29	1,735	9.8	1,756	8.8	1,678	8.8	-57
30 to 34	1,502	8.2	1,735	8.8	1,689	9.0	+187
35 to 39	1,506	8.3	1,665	8.3	1,625	8.4	+119
40 to 44	1,732	9.8	1,615	8.2	1,673	8.9	-59
45 to 49	1,727	9.8	1,572	8.0	1,761	9.0	+34
50 to 54	1,545	8.5	1,635	8.1	1,653	8.5	+108
55 to 59	1,450	8.1	1,554	8.0	1,541	8.1	+91
60 to 64	1,189	6.6	1,324	6.9	1,374	7.0	+185
65 to 69	918	5.1	1,206	6.3	1,351	7.2	+433
70 to 74	671	3.7	1,025	5.3	1,259	6.6	+588
75 to 79	716	3.9	821	4.1	1,143	5.8	+425
80 to 84	530	2.9	694	3.6	1,042	5.1	+512
85 and over	227	1.2	518	2.7	842	4.5	+615
Total population	18,361	100	18,345	100	18,168	100	-193

Forecast household types

Griffin City	2011		2021		2036		Change between 2011 and 2036
Type	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number
Couples (alone with dependents)	2,202	11.9	2,227	12.1	2,215	12.2	+13
Couples without dependents	2,463	13.5	2,700	14.7	2,745	15.1	+282
Group households	155	0.8	284	1.5	290	1.6	+135
One person households	2,259	12.4	2,473	13.5	2,854	15.7	+595
One parent family	1,111	6.1	985	5.4	1,000	5.5	-116
Other families	771	4.2	774	4.2	795	4.4	+24

Components of population change

Griffin City	Forecast period				
Component	2012 to 2016	2017 to 2021	2022 to 2026	2027 to 2031	2032 to 2036
Births	1,997	2,017	2,286	2,182	2,223
Deaths	958	990	1,342	1,085	1,127
Net migration	1,039	1,027	944	1,097	1,096
Change in population from natural change	1,039	1,027	944	1,097	1,096
Total population change	320	744	1,171	1,277	1,285

D(1) Site Submissions

23



LAWYERS

OUR REF: ASM:CA



7 August 2013

The General Manager
Griffith City Council
Benerembah Street
GRIFFITH NSW 2680

Dear Sirs

RE: MALLINSON ROAD

We wish to advise that we act on behalf of the following persons:-

Ms J Nardo & Mrs L Ballestrin – Lot 727 DP46245 (100458)

✓ Messrs FR Zirilli & TP Agresta – Lot 115 DP 751743 (103426)

✓ Mr G & Mrs KM Casella – Lot 116 DP 751743 (103427)

Mr GG & Mrs M Pasin – Lot 679 DP39618 (100491)

Mr T P Agresta – Lot 2 DP 817588 (104458)

Mr R & Mrs LM Rinaldo – Lot 2 DP 1154593 (311648)

✓ Mr D Mancini – Lot 120 DP751743 (103429)

✓ Mr G Bonaccorsi – Lot 134 DP 751743 (103442)

✓ Mr S N D'Aquino – Lot 135 DP 751743 (103443)

✓ Mr P Mancini – Lot 136 DP 751743 (103444)

As you know the abovenamed are residents of Mallinson Road, Griffith.

Our clients have requested that we on their behalf place a submission to you setting out their objections to the proposed rezoning of the northern side of Mallinson Road, where the abovementioned properties are situate to RU4, which we understand is Primary Producer

M:\Authors\SM351874.doc

6 Kookora Street, Griffith NSW, PO Box 1143, Griffith NSW 2680 Australia DX 5903 Griffith NSW

Telephone +61 2 6966 8222 Facsimile +61 2 6962 6951 ABN 51 785 875 371 Email m&y@macvar.com.au

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation

-2-

small lots of some 5 hectares.

We would point out that this zoning is contrary to the previous GCC Growth Strategy 2030 document where Council issued documents stating that further development along the northern side of Mallinson Road would become available within the allotted time, see attached Map.

It is our clients belief that Mallinson Road Precinct has been a highly valued area and rural residential development when much interest has been given by the public for further development of this zone into rural residential lots under the old 1D Zoning. As you are aware there have been significant investments on the southern side of Mallinson Road due the growth strategies position and our clients as land holder jointly feel dismay at the proposed zoning by Council which indicates a backward step. Our clients are of the belief that Council shall make the decision to allow the zoning to be apportioned R5 large lot residential in line with previous Council statement.

We understand that Council is of the view that the market is oversupplied for rural residential lots, but we would stress that it is not possible for Council to take an overall view without giving specific consideration to the Mallinson Road area, which has proved to be extremely popular and we feel in the future will continue to be for the 1 acre developments. It is of interest to note that the majority of the land on the southern side which has been subdivided is presently occupied with houses of a very high standard. We also feel that the infrastructure presently in existence for the Southern developments will be of benefit to the Northern side.

Whilst we understand that Council has some concern that large lot residential holdings have flaws which we believe are either distance from main centre or flood fears, consideration should be given to the fact that Mallinson Road is an elevated site, with close proximity to the city centre, as well as being a very desirable residential area in which to reside. Our clients have indicated that they will be very careful in the development of the land to ensure that the whole area, if it is let remain as one acre primary producer small lots will be of considerable benefit to the town and to rate payers in general.


Our instructions are to oppose in the strongest possible way the proposed zoning for this particular area and would ask that you have your Councillors reconsider the Mallinson Road proposal as a separate matter for consideration to other areas that they feel should be zoned RU4.

We look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Yours faithfully,
MACKENZIE & VARDANEGA

Per:





7

Revised Expression of Interest

Review of Griffith City Council's
Growth Strategy 2030

KEP

Lots 726 & 727, DP 46245,
cnr Boorga Rd & Mallinson Rd, Lake Wyangan

 **Planningmatters**
DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

1.0 Description of the subject site:

- 1.1 For the purposes of this submission, the 'subject land' comprises Lots 726 & 727, DP 46245, located on the corner of the Boorga & Mallinson Roads, Lake Wyangan. The subject land is currently occupied by a dwelling in the southern corner, structure in the south-western corner and horticultural plantings on the remainder of the property.
- 1.2 The subject land fronts both Boorga Road and Mallinson Road. Whilst the existing driveway off Boorga Road is considered to be the property's primary access point, vehicular access to both allotments can be gained off either Boorga Road or Mallinson Road.
- 1.3 The subject land is relatively flat and gently slopes from south-west to north-east. An existing drainage channel adjoins the site's northern boundary.
- 1.4 Essential services such as potable water, raw water, electricity, telecommunications and natural gas are available within the locality.

- 1.5 Below is an aerial photograph identifying the subject land.



2.0 Description of the surrounding locality:

2.1 The immediate surrounding locality comprises a mixture of agricultural and rural-residential land-uses. Land to the north, west, north and east of the site is used for predominantly horticultural production, whilst land to the south-west is used for rural-residential purposes. Land further to the south of the site comprises part of the city's residential area.

2.2 The McPherson Range runs through the locality to the south-east and south-west of the site. The range comprises a significant amount of remnant vegetation that is considered to be of significance to flora and fauna communities. Future development of the site will not result in the loss of any native or remnant vegetation on the site.

2.3 The surrounding road hierarchy is considered to consist of Boorga Road and Mallinson Road. Both Boorga and Mallinson Roads are classified as 'local' roads under the control of Griffith City Council and have speed limit of 80km/h. Boorga Road is considered to be a distributor road connecting the Lake Wyangan catchment with the city centre. Whilst a couple of properties connect directly with Boorga Road, access to Boorga Road is generally via existing intersections. Mallinson Road is considered to be a connector road running between Boorga Road and Lakes Road. Mallinson Road currently services a number of rural properties and rural-residential subdivisions located to the west of the subject land.

2.4 The surrounding landscape comprises predominantly horticultural operations with scattered vegetation associated with dwellings and the nearby McPherson Range reserve. The potential rezoning of the subject land and further development for residential type purposes is considered to result in an increase in vegetation throughout the locality.

2.5 Below is an aerial photo of the locality identifying the subject land:



3.0 Description of the Proposal:

3.1 This submission relates to the proposed re-zoning of the subject land and by default, surrounding land located on the northern side of the intersection of Boorga Road with Mallinson Road. This submission supports the re-zoning of land located on the western side of Boorga Road to the immediate north and west of the subject land.

21- Village → 3.2 The subject land is currently zoned 1(d) – *General Expansion* under the provisions of the GLEP2002. Surrounding land to the north and west of the site is also zoned 1(d) – *General Expansion*. Land to the east of the site is zoned 1(i) – *Investigation*, whilst land to the south-east is zoned 7(v) *Scenic Protection*. Land to the south-west of the site is zoned 1(c) – *Rural Residential*. The village of Lake Wyangan which is zoned 2(v) – *Village* is located further to the north, whilst the city's 2(a) – *Residential* zone is located further to the south of the site.

3.3 This submission requests that the GS2030 be revised to enable development of the surrounding locality for the purpose of rural-residential type development or residential-type development on larger sized allotments (approx 2000m²) within the short term. Using the current zone table provided in the GLEP2002, this submission supports a rezoning from 1(d) – *General Expansion* to the current zoning of either 1(c) – *Rural Residential* or 2(v) – *Village*. Under the provisions of *Standard Instruments (LEPS) 2008*, this submission supports rezoning the subject land to R5 – *Large Lot Residential*.

3.4 Whilst the current zoning implies that further development of the subject land may occur in the future, it does not clearly specify the nature of this development (i.e. residential or rural-residential). Nor does the current zoning specify the expected the anticipated timing of future re-zoning/development within the locality. The purpose of this submission is to demonstrate to Council that the proponents are willing to develop the subject land should re-zoning proceed. Whilst it is acknowledged that Council is currently only seeking expressions of interest from interested parties, the proponents have already commenced preliminary investigations relating to further development of the site. A draft concept plan identifying a potential layout of future allotments should the land be re-zoning for rural-residential or residential purposes having allotments with an area of approximately 2000m² has been included in Attachment 'A'.

3.5 The attached concept plan provides for two (2) new internal public roads connecting with Boorga Road. The proposed intersections have been located with maximum separation distance between them and surrounding intersections. The internal road layout provides for a service road adjacent to Boorga Road so that Lots 30-37 do not need to gain access directly off Boorga Road. All allotments have been designed so as to enable passive solar design of future dwellings and a variety in streetscape. It is anticipated that essential services would be provided off Boorga Road and located within the road reserve of the internal road(s). Whilst a detention basin has been shown on the attached plan, this location is indicative only. Should a detention basin be required, it is anticipated that it would be located at the northern end of the site and may use part of the existing drainage reserve.

3.6 The attached plan is only indicative and has been provided to demonstrate the number of allotments that could be created if the subject land were re-zoned for rural-residential or residential purposes. Should Council re-zone the land for residential purposes, a variety of lot layout designs could be considered. These alternatives comprise a restriction of only one (1) intersection treatment off Boorga Road, more internal roads, provision for internal roads to connect with adjoining allotments. The opportunity to re-align Mallinson Road through the site could also be considered as part of further development.

4.0 Justification of the Proposal:

4.1 Justification for re-zoning of the subject land from 1(d) – *General Expansion* to rural-residential or village type residential development relates to the site's proximity to both the city of Griffith and the village of Lake Wyangan. The site not only adjoins the main access corridor between these two (2) residential areas, it is also located at the eastern-most end of the existing Mallinson Road rural-residential precinct. As such, redevelopment of the site for residential purposes is considered to complement existing land-uses within the locality.

4.2 Given the current demand for rural-residential and large area residential allotments within close proximity of the city, the southern end of the Lake Wyangan catchment is considered to be an appropriate location for future rural-residential or large lot residential type developments. The main raw water supply channel and McPherson Range located to the south of the site provide a natural buffer between smaller sized residential lots and larger sized allotments.

4.3 Redevelopment of the site and surrounding land to the north would be able to connect to existing or projected essential services running along Boorga Road. Likewise, the subject land's frontage to Boorga Road would enable the provision of a new connector road(s) without impacting upon existing intersections within the locality.

Traffic:

4.4 Boorga Road is considered to be the main 'distributor road' within the locality between the village of Lake Wyangan and the city of Griffith. Lakes Road to the west of the site is likely to be dedicated as a 'distributor road' to cater for further development in that locality and to act as a northern bypass of the city. Mallinson Road is currently the only 'connector road' between these two (2) roads. The current carriageway width, road alignment and number of corners on Mallinson Road are considered to restrict a substantial increase in traffic volumes along this road. As such, redevelopment of land located at the western end of Mallinson Road is considered to be constrained by the current design of Mallinson Road. Re-zoning and re-development of the subject land however, would enable direct vehicular access off Boorga Road without the need to undertake substantial road works in the locality.

4.5 The existing intersection of Boorga Road and Mallinson Road is also considered to restrict a substantial increase in traffic volumes along Mallinson Road. Existing problems with this intersection relate to its location, which has poor sight distances in various directions and is located within close proximity of another intersection between Abattoir Road & Mallinson Road. Even if the existing intersection of Abattoir Road & Mallinson Road were removed, the overall safety and ability of the Boorga Road intersection to accommodate large volumes of traffic is unlikely to be improved. In this regard, the proximity of this intersection to the main supply channel and the fact that it forms part of a four-way intersection with Scott Road restricts the potential effectiveness of this intersection.

4.6 Redevelopment of the subject land could provide the opportunity to re-align Mallinson Road to a point on Boorga Road approximately 200m to the north of the intersection's current location. This potential re-alignment could not only form part of a subdivision on the subject land but would also rectify current problems associated with the existing intersection. The potential location of a new intersection would not only reduce the problems associated with four-way intersections, but it would also enable the provision for turning lanes at other intersections within the locality (eg: Scott & Druitt Roads).

- 4.7 Given that further development of the subject land would require the provision of a new intersection off Boorga Road and an internal road, re-alignment of Mallinson Road would only require a short extension to a new internal road on the subject land. Whilst such an extension would result in a loss of lot yield from the subject land, the overall cost of funding an extension to Mallinson Road and a new intersection off Boorga Road could be shared by Council and the proponents. Given that re-alignment of Mallinson Road would enable further development along Mallinson Road, these works could be funded through a Contribution Plan.
- 4.8 An existing shared pedestrian/bicycle pathway runs along the site's Boorga Road frontage. This pathway connects the city's residential zone with the Village of Lake Wyangan and the lake/swamp(s) to the north. It is understood that this pathway will form part of a formalised network of pathways throughout the city. Should the current location of this pathway restrict the future construction of intersection treatments to service further development of the site, the opportunity exists to relocate this pathway to the west (inside the existing supply reserve running between the site and the road reserve) as shown on the attached concept plan. Relocation of this pathway would also cater for future road widening of Boorga Road, if necessary.

Essential Services

- 4.9 Whilst the majority of recent development within the Lake Wyangan catchment has occurred along Mallinson Road or to the north of the village of Lake Wyangan, it is considered that further development within the locality should occur to the south of the village. In this regard, the majority, if not all essential services likely to be required for further development will be sourced from the city centre and will run north along Boorga Road towards future development precincts.
- 4.10 Re-zoning of the subject land would enable further development in the locality to tap directly into existing and future infrastructure running along Boorga Road. This will not only enable more efficient use of this infrastructure, it will also enable developers along the route to assist in the cost of providing these services. Given that the subject land is located at the southern-most part of the precinct, the cost of providing essential services is considered to be significantly less than the cost to service other sites within the locality and to the north of Lake Wyangan village.
- 4.11 The subject land currently has an existing connection to Murrumbidgee Irrigation's raw water supply network and is located immediately adjacent to three (3) existing supply channels, which could adequately service future allotments on the site. Whilst it is anticipated that this open channel supply system will be replaced with a pressurised underground pipe system, preliminary discussions with MI have concluded that the pipe network would most likely be located within existing supply easements or road reserves. Given that the subject land is located adjacent to existing supply reserves and road reserves, it is anticipated that future pipes would run past the site.
- 4.12 Council's potable water supply network currently runs within the road reserves of Boorga Road and Mallinson Road. Whilst further development within the locality would require upgrading of this infrastructure, preliminary investigations have concluded that development of the subject land may be possible based on current water flow rates. The proponents are aware that further development of the site would require the submission of detailed servicing plans and support hydraulic calculations to Council.

- 4.13 Whilst there is currently no reticulated sewerage within the locality, Council is in the process extending sewerage to the Lake Wyangan catchment. Further development of the subject land is considered to be adequately catered for by this new service, which is understood to run along Boorga Road. Whilst the current fall of the site would provide for the installation of gravity sewer, it is understood that Council's preference would be for pressurised sewer. Should re-zoning of the site occur, it would be proposed to provide detailed engineers design drawings and hydraulic calculations relating to the provision of pressurised sewerage to cater for further development. Preliminary discussions with a Council accredited pressurised sewer designer have confirmed that the attached concept lot layout could be easily connected to a rising sewermain running along Boorga Road. These discussions also concluded that the connection of an reticulated sewer line throughout a subdivision of the subject land would not conflict with the opportunity for adjoining landowners to connect into a rising sewermain running along Boorga Road.
- 4.14 Other essential services such as telecommunications, electricity and natural gas are currently available within the locality and can be extended to the site should re-zoning occur. Preliminary discussions with essential service providers has concluded that adequate provision can be made for these services as part of any proposal to develop the site for residential purposes.

Site suitability:

- 4.15 It is acknowledged that the site's current land use will trigger the submission of a land capability assessment study. Should the subject land be rezoned, the proponents are aware that they will be required to submit such a study with a Development Application relating to subdivision of the subject land. This study will identify the site's soil classification(s) and the presence of any contamination associated with the farming operations. Whilst it is proposed that future allotments will be connected to a reticulated sewerage service, if required the study can demonstrate the ability to treat sewerage on each of the proposed allotments.

Lot size:

- 4.16 Existing planning instruments permit rural-residential allotments with a minimum area of 3000m² (if connected to sewerage) or 4000m² (if not connected to sewerage). The attached concept plan shows allotments with a minimum area of approx 2000m². Given that further development of the subject land can be connected to sewerage and the demand for manageable sized residential type allotments, the current restriction of 3000m² needs to be reconsidered. Larger sized residential type allotments with an area of approximately 1500m² to 2000m² can accommodate dwellings with a footprint of 250m²-400m² and would still provide for a buffer between adjoining properties. Allotments with an area of approximately 2000m² will also provide for some diversity within the market, which currently does not exist.
- 4.17 Redevelopment of the subject land based on allotments with an area of 2000m² provides a lot yield of around 37 lots whilst 4000m² allotments would have a lot yield of around 17 lots. Given that the extent of internal roadways and essential services required to accommodate 17 or 37 lots would be almost identical, the capital expense associated with developing the site is considered to be relatively similar regardless of the minimum lot size. On this basis, there would be considerable costs savings associated with 2000m² allotments that would ensure the financial viability of such a proposal. This argument is supported by the fact that the current market value of allotments with an area of 4000m² is relatively similar to that of allotments with an area of 2000m².

5.0 Constraints associated with the proposal:

- 5.1 Whilst it is acknowledged that redevelopment of the subject land for residential type purposes would result in the need to take into consideration site and locality specific issues, they are not necessarily considered to be constraints associated with the proposal. In this regard, it is considered that the majority if not all potential issues associated with development of the site can be resolved through either design alterations or engineering solutions. Rigid constraints associated with the potential for further development of the site and surrounding locality are considered to relate to existing legislative restrictions. On this basis, the following discussion is provided in relation to current restrictions listed in relevant environmental planning instruments such as the GLEP2002:
- 5.2 Clause 26 of the GLEP2002 – Flood prone land:
- 5.2.1 Clause 27 of the GLEP2002 regulates the development of flood prone land. The subject land is not considered to be identified as Flood prone land.
- 5.3 Clause 27 of the GLEP2002 – Proximity to bushfire prone land:
- 5.3.1 Clause 27 of the GLEP2002 states that Council cannot grant Development Consent to the subdivision of land that is considered to be subject to a bushfire hazard unless particular measures such as access, firebreaks and water supply are available. Whilst the subject land is located within relatively close proximity of the Scenic Hill range to the south of the site, the subject land is not identified as 'bushfire prone land' on Council's Bushfire Prone Areas map dated 4 July 2006.
- 5.4 Clause 28 of the GLEP2002 – Proximity to an existing Frost Fan:
- 5.4.1 Clause 28 of the GLEP2002 requires that land that is within the recommended buffer of an activity listed in Schedule 4 of the GLEP2002 shall not be approved unless Council is satisfied that measures can be taken to mitigate the impact of this prescribed activity. In this instance, the subject land is considered to be within the recommended buffer distance (1km) of an existing 'frost fan' device located to the east of Boorga Road. The existing 'frost fan' device consists of an elevated propeller blade that rotates 360°. The blade looks like an over-sized rear vertical blade on a helicopter. This blade is erected on a free-standing support pole approximately 10m high and can be seen from Boorga Road.
- 5.4.2 The existing 'frost fan' is located approximately 400m from the subject land's eastern boundary and 600m from the western boundary. Whilst the subject land is considered to be within this recommended buffer distance of 1km, so too is the existing village of Lake Wyangan and the established rural-residential precinct on Mallinson Road. Several new dwellings have been erected within this buffer such as a single dwelling on Scotts Road to the south-east of the subject site.
- 5.4.3 It is understood that when activated the frost fan stimulates air movement within the vicinity of the device which in turn, mitigates the potential for frost to settle on the fruit of the surrounding orange trees. This device is obviously used during winter months in the early hours of the morning when the potential for frost is high. Given the type of blade used and the fact that the device rotates 360°, it has the effect of sounding like a helicopter repeatedly coming and going in the distance. In isolation, this type of noise could be defined as "offensive noise" under the provisions of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997.

5.4.4 Whilst it is understood that this device did not receive Development Consent from Council, a subsequent hearing of the Land and Environment Court of NSW determined that the device could remain and continue to be used. On this basis, the device is considered to be an 'existing structure' that must be taken into consideration under the provisions of Clause 28 of the GLEP2002.

5.4.5 The land occupied by the existing frost fan is currently zoned 1(i) – *Investigation* under the provisions of the GLEP2002. Given the proximity of this site to the village of Lake Wyangan and Boorga Road, it is assumed that this site will be developed for either residential (village) or rural-residential land-uses in the future. If this were the case, it is assumed that the 'frost fan' device would be removed. If this were the case, the requirements of Clause 28 of the GLEP2002 would no longer apply. In saying that, it is unclear whether Council is considering re-zoning the land currently occupied by the frost fan and as such, the requirements of Clause 28 of the GLEP2002 must be taken into consideration until the device is removed.

5.4.6 Taking into consideration the distance between the subject land and the existing 'frost fan' and the direction of prevailing winds from the west, it is considered that the subject land would be affected by the existing 'frost fan'. This submission only relates to the potential re-zoning of the subject land to enable further development. As such, it is unlikely that the potential impact of the 'frost fan' on the subject land would change by simply re-zoning the subject land.

5.4.7 It is acknowledged that further development of the subject land would require Clause 28 of the GLEP2002 to be satisfied. It is considered that the requirements of this Clause can be adequately addressed at the time of submission of a DA to Council for subdivision of the subject land. As such, the requirements of Clause 28 of the GLEP2002 are not considered to affect this submission.

5.4.8 In any case, it is considered that adequate arrangements can be made to ensure that future development on the subject land (ie: dwellings) are not affected by the existing frost fan device. Examples include the requirement for dwellings to be constructed from suitable materials (eg: double brick, insulated roof and walls, double-glazed windows, etc) to reflect potential noise. Additional measures can also be taken to ensure that habitable rooms (eg: bedrooms) of future dwellings are not located on the eastern side of dwellings. Likewise, arrangement can be made to ensure that future landowners are aware of the existing 'frost fan' device and the potential impact that it could have in relation to the generation of noise. Such arrangements could include imposition of a "Restriction on User" applied to the title of each created allotment.

5.5 Clause 28 of the GLEP2002 – Proximity to an Existing Abattoir

5.5.1 Clause 28 of the GLEP2002 requires that land that is within the recommended buffer of an activity listed in Schedule 4 of the GLEP2002 shall not be approved unless Council is satisfied that measures can be taken to mitigate the impact of this prescribed activity. In this instance, Schedule 4 recommends a buffer of 500m from abattoirs. Whilst the southern portion of the subject site may be within 500m of the existing abattoir, only the existing dwelling and no future dwellings would be within this buffer.

5.6 Clause 47 of the GLEP2002 – Lake Wyangan Drainage Catchment:


- 5.6.1 The subject land is considered to be located within the Lake Wyangan Drainage Catchment identified by Figure 2 of DCP 1 – *Non-urban Development*. On this basis, Clause 47 of the GLEP2002 is considered to apply to further development of the subject land. Given that DCP 29, as referred to in Clause 47 of the GLEP2002 has been incorporated into DCP 1, the provisions of Tables 5 & 6 of DCP 1 are also considered to apply to subdivision of the subject land.
- 5.6.2 Clause 42(2) of the GLEP2002 states that Development Consent cannot be granted unless Council is satisfied that each lot will be connected to a reticulated water and sewerage system, have a minimum frontage of 45m and have a minimum building setback of 10m from all boundaries. Whilst it is appreciated that all proposed allotments would be connected to a reticulated water and sewerage system, it is contested that all such allotments should also have a minimum allotment width of 45m, let alone a building setback of 10m from all boundaries.
- 5.6.3 The reference to a minimum 45m allotment width and a 10m building setback are considered to relate to typical rural-residential style developments. Given that the subject land is currently zoned 1(d) – *General Expansion* under the provisions of the GLEP2002, it is unclear further development would be for rural-residential or residential purposes. If the subject land were to be re-zoned to accommodate large area residential allotments (as shown on the attached plan), the requirements for a 45m allotment width and 10m building setback are considered to be too onerous.
- 5.6.4 Table 1 of DCP 1 specifies certain requirements for the subdivision of non-urban land regardless of whether it is located within the Lake Wyangan Drainage Catchment. It is noted that some of the requirements listed in Table 1 are not consistent with some of the requirements listed in Clause 47 of the GLEP2002. In particular, sub-clause (a) of Table 1 specifies that a 10m building setback only needs to be provided from the front boundary. Clause 47(2)(d) of the GLEP2002 on the other hand, specifies that allotments shall have a 10m building setback from all boundaries. On this basis, this submission recommends that the criteria listed in Clause 47(2) of the GLEP2002 be deleted and that the provisions listed in DCP 1 be retained.
- 5.6.5 Table 5 of DCP 1 specifies certain requirements for subdivision of land within the Lake Wyangan Drainage Catchment. It is noted that some of the requirements listed in Table 5 are not consistent with some of the requirements listed in Clause 47 of the GLEP2002. In particular, sub-clause (b) of Table 5 specifies that allotments with a potential lot yield of three (3) lots or more shall be connected to a reticulated water supply and sewerage system. Clause 47(2)(a) & 47(2)(b) of the GLEP2002 on the other hand, specify that every new allotment shall be connected to a reticulated water supply system. On this basis, this submission recommends that the criteria listed in Clause 47(2) of the GLEP2002 be deleted and that the provisions listed in DCP 1 be retained.
- 5.7 **Clause 57 of the GLEP2002 – Provision of essential services:**
- 5.7.1 Clause 57 of the GLEP2002 states that Council cannot grant development consent to any proposal, including subdivision, unless Council is satisfied that adequate arrangements have been made for the provision of essential services. The subject land is ideally located to enable connection to existing services or new/upgraded services, which are likely to run along Boorga Road. Should Council resolve to re-zone the subject land, detailed engineers design drawings and specifications relating to the provision of essential services would be submitted to Council in conjunction with CC applications.


6.0 Conclusion:

- 6.1 The Lake Wyangan catchment has been identified as a future growth corridor for some time. In saying that, it is understood that development has not progressed within this locality for a variety of reasons such as the lack of essential services.
- 6.2 Since preparation of GS2030, a variety of new forms of technology have become available that could potentially reduce what were originally perceived to be relatively high costs associated with providing essential services to the Lake Wyangan precinct. In particular, the availability of low-pressure 'grinder pump' sewerage technology is considered to drastically reduce the cost of providing a reticulated sewerage system to the area.
- 6.3 It is understood that Council is currently in the process of providing reticulated sewerage to the village of Lake Wyangan. Given that the subject land is located directly south of the village of Lake Wyangan, it is considered that allotments fronting Boorga Road are ideally situated to enable connection to this service. By allowing land to the south of the village to tap into this new infrastructure, it is anticipated that the cost of providing sewerage would be substantially reduced. It will also enable further expansion of the village of Lake Wyangan that has previously been unachievable.
- 6.4 To enable further development of the subject land and surrounding locality, it is recommended that the review of GS2030 conclude that this area should be developed for either residential or rural residential purposes in the short term. Following completion of the review of GS2030, it is recommended that a review of GLEP2002 be undertaken and that as part of this review, the subject land be re-zoned accordingly.
- 6.5 Should this submission be successful in gaining acceptance to the next round associated with the review of the GS2030, it is requested that the client be provided with the opportunity to meet with Council staff to expand on the brief discussion provided as part of this preliminary report.


Attachment 'A'

Potential lot layout concept plan (Lots 726 & 727, DP 46245, cnr Boorga Rd & Mallinson Rd, Lake Wyangan)





D(ii) Site 2 Submissions




ABN: 95 707 366 151

23 Noorilla Street
Griffith NSW 2680Telephone: 02 6962 2696
Facsimile: 02 6962 2696

Email: info@planningmatters.net.au

32

9 August 2013

Mr B Stonestreet
General Manager
Griffith City Council
PO Box 485
GRIFFITH NSW 2680Our Ref: 2013.63
Your Ref: Draft GLEP 2013
Beelbangera Road, Griffith

Dear Mr Stonestreet,

Draft Griffith LEP 2013 – Land fronting the western side of Beelbangera Rd, Griffith

Planningmatters Development Service was engaged by the landowners of allotments fronting the western side of Beelbangera Road between Clifton Boulevard & Calabria Road, Griffith to prepare a submission on their behalf to the draft Griffith Land Use Strategy 2012 (GLUS2012). This submission requested that the properties fronting Beelbangera Road (between Clifton Boulevard & Calabria Road), Griffith be considered as a potential 'candidate site' for rural-residential development in the draft GLEP2013.

The subject allotments are currently zoned *1(i) – Investigation (Residential)* under the provisions of the Griffith Local Environmental Plan 2002 (GLEP2002). The draft GLEP2013 provides for the subject allotments to be zoned *RU4 – Primary Production Small Lots*, which permits minimum lot sizes of 3 hectares. Considering the locality's relative close proximity to the city's new residential release areas and the take-up rate of rural residential developments within the locality, the landowners believe that smaller-sized allotments should be permitted. Considering the development in recent years of pressurised reticulated sewerage systems the landowners believe that the opportunity exists to have smaller sized allotments if connected to reticulated sewerage.

The subject allotments were identified as a potential residential growth area after the year 2030 in the Griffith2030 Landuse Strategy that was prepared approximately 12 years ago and were subsequently re-zoned *1(i) – Investigation (Residential)* in the Griffith Local Environmental Plan 2002 (GLEP2002). In the interim, the landowners of these allotments have decided to hold on to their properties and wait for the land to be re-zoned for residential purposes in approximately 20 years time. Considering that the subject properties are generally too small to enable viable horticultural production some of the landowners have been forced to remove plantings that they could not afford to water. This has already detracted from the appearance of the locality when viewed from Beelbangera Road & the city's lookout and has the potential to cause dust nuisance for Neo-Collina residents. This situation is anticipated to become more severe as the remaining landowners gradually cease farming activities.

The landowners of the subject allotments are disappointed that their allotments have been allocated a 3 hectare lot size restriction and believe that there is not enough demand for large rural residential allotments. By default, this means that Council's intention for rural residential properties along the western side of Beelbangera Road is unlikely of becoming a reality. As a result, Council may find that farms in this precinct are cleared of plantings and left in an unmanaged state. Considering that this is not ideal next to the city's main residential release area, the landowners believe that Council needs to reconsider landuses on the city's eastern fringe.

Draft Griffith Local Environmental Plan 2013
Properties fronting Beelbangera Rd (between Clifton Byde & Calabria Rd), Griffith

2010.65

Whilst further development of these allotments for smaller size rural residential allotments could incorporate new internal roads and connections to local roads such as Calabria Road & Clifton Boulevard, large size rural residential allotments are likely to result in an increase in the number of driveways off Beelbangera Road. Given that the volume of traffic using Beelbangera Road will increase as the village of Beelbangera expands, the provision of more driveways off Beelbangera Road is not considered to be ideal.

The purpose of this letter is to request that Council consider reducing the minimum lot size from 3 hectares to at least 1 hectare and potentially less if connected to reticulated sewerage or a land capability assessment report indicates that adequate measures can be made for the on-site disposal of sewerage. Council's Development Control Plan No.1 – Non-Urban Development (DCP1) currently provides for minimum lot sizes of 3000m² if a site is connected to reticulated sewerage and 4000m² if adequate measures can be made for the onsite disposal of sewerage. Whilst these controls have proven to work since DCP1 was adapted in 2004 it is understood that the new Comprehensive DCP that will replace DCP1 may not include a concession for allotments connected to sewerage or where adequate on-site measures can be made. On this basis, it is considered that these concessions to the minimum lot size where adequate measures are made for the disposal of sewerage should be incorporated into the GLEP2013. In this regard, it is noted that clause 4.1(4A) of the draft GLEP2013 provides for a concession for some land and could be amended to include land located to the west of Beelbangera Road and south of Calabria Road that is zoned RU4 – Primary Production Small Lots.

Should you have any queries regarding this matter, please don't hesitate to contact me on 0427 844 374 or by email: mruggeri@planningmatters.net.au

Regards,




Martin Ruggeri
Principal
Planningmatters Development Service

6 July 2015

Griffith City Council

Neville Place

Griffith NSW 2680



Re: Land Owned by Mr C Guglielmo

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing in support of the above mentioned landowner who is intending on subdividing approximately 8-10 acres of land along adjoining Calabria & Rankin Springs Rd, Griffith NSW.

In my time residing in Griffith I have lived in East Griffith and now Collina. My family and I are seeking small acreage land (lifestyle blocks) to build on, and we wish to remain in this area on the outskirts of Griffith.

Should Mr Guglielmo be successful with his subdivision request and basic services were included, we would be very interested in committing financially.

Yours Sincerely


Chris Matthews

15 Davidson Place

Griffith NSW 2680



6th July 2015

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: C & V Gugliemino Subdivision of Farm 1690 ; Calabria Road Griffith NSW,

My wife and I have been waiting for blocks in this particular area of Griffith to come available for some time now and we were wondering why the delay in approving the DA?

We are ready to pay a deposit to secure a block in this area but are unable to do so as we believe Griffith City Council still has NOT approved this subdivision.

We are very disappointed at this never ending delay and wondering when is this approval likely to occur if at all?? I feel that this DA has been delayed too long and someone needs to take some action ASAP.

Yours Sincerely/

Alf Trefilo

Let's Travel & Cruise
59 Kooyoo Street, Griffith, N.S.W. Australia, 2680
Mail: P.O. Box 1407, Griffith, N.S.W. Australia, 2680
Tel: +61 2 6964 4644 | Fax: +61 2 6964 3464 | Email: griffith@letstravelcruise.com.au

ETNA Travel Pty Ltd
ABN: 61 137 370 364 trading
as Let's Travel & Cruise an
independently owned franchise
Lic No: 2TA 04808 TID: 9684194
AFIA 01557/ATAS 011126

To: Griffith City Council

Richard Voss
27 Dussin St
Griffith NSW 2680

RE : Subdivision Calabria Rd Griffith.
Charlie Gugliemino

To whom it may concern:

As a resident of Griffith residing in Collina we are desperately searching for an option for a larger block in the area in order to build a house and there are no options over 1000 square meters.

This land will be ideal for us and will allow us to stay in the area that we love and kids can go to the same school and we will be close to the shops and town and friends in the area.

We spoke to Mr Gugliemino regarding his land and he told us he is trying to subdivide his land into the size block we require.

Please can council consider this development application with urgency on the grounds that there are no other such like blocks available in the Collina area.

Sincerely



Richard Voss



DAVIS SANDERS
HOMES

8th July, 2015

Griffith City Council
Benerambah Street
Griffith NSW 2680

Re: Development of Farm 1690 Calabria Road

To Whom it may concern,

I would like to express support to the development of the above said property.

In our day to day operations I have found there to be genuine buyer enquiry & interest in the proposed site whether it be developed as larger lots and or smaller lots.

As the current stock of land is diminishing I feel that this would be a great time for this development to proceed.

If you wish to discuss any of the above further, please feel free to contact me.

Kindest Regards

Michael Musitano
New Home Consultant
Davis Sanders Homes
0412 915 437 – Mobile
mmusitano@bigpond.com

220 Borella Road, Albury NSW 2640
PO Box 7285, Albury East NSW 2640
Telephone 02 6041 1986 Fax 02 6041 4541
Email: albury@davissandershomes.com.au www.davissandershomes.com.au
ABN: 85 057 370 822 NSW 41767C VIC DB U25641

approved:

MIA Casa

From: Anthony Poloni [anfpol@bigpond.com]
Sent: Monday, 13 July 2015 12:11 PM
To: MIA Casa
Subject: Re: nathan gug

G'day Nathan I am interested in the subdivision that is being proposed on Calabria road please keep me up to date with process thanks Anthony Poloni

Sent from Anthony iPhone

On 13 Jul 2015, at 11:34 am, MIA Casa <sales@miacasa.net.au> wrote:

Hi anh,

1 Buccello St
Griffith NSW 2680

10th July 2015

To Whom It May Concern,

I have been looking at blocks of land in the Collina area, and am particularly interested in the location currently occupied by Farm 1690, Calabria Road.

I pass this farm every day on my way to and from work, and after it was cleared I contacted the farm owners to enquire about the state of the subdivision process. They explained at the time they were waiting on DA approval.

Many months have now passed, and I understand they are still waiting on DA approval. Can you please explain what is holding this process up, and when, if at all, I can expect to see the subdivisions made available to the market?

Regards,



Bernard Gray

Australasian Real Estate
Results Awards



10th July 2015

Charlie & Vanessa Guglielmino
Farm 1690 Calabria Road
Griffith NSW 2680

Dear Charlie & Vanessa,

Regarding your proposed land subdivision and potential lots for sale at Calabria Road Griffith.

I have had discussions with many buyers recently and received very positive interest in that location.

The common feedback is that there is very little choice currently for larger rural residential lots in Griffith. The feedback has strongly agreed that the location is highly desirable and that if in fact the lots were available for sale then there would be strong interest to purchase.

The main difference each buyer mentioned is being so close to the City and Collina was a key advantage over similar sized lots currently available in the Villages.

With such positive initial interest and word of mouth enquiry, I would be keen to see the subdivision go ahead as soon as possible, we would have buyers virtually ready immediately.

Regards,

Nathan Thomas

Nathan Thomas
Real Estate Agent
Griffith Real Estate



griffithre.com
REAL ESTATE

146 Yambil St, Griffith NSW 2680 - PO Box 2505

telephone 02 6962 1455 facsimile 02 6962 7090

info@griffithre.com

NOTES: 111 PTY LTD A.B.N. 79 061 935 189


IMPORTANT: This is not advice. Clients should not act solely on the basis of the material contained in this document. Items herein are general comments only & do not constitute or convey advice per se. This document is issued as a helpful guide to clients and is for their private information. Every effort is made to ensure that contents are accurate at the time of publication. We take no responsibility for any subsequent action that may arise from this document.

6 July 2015

Griffith City Council

Neville Place

Griffith NSW 2680



Re: Land Owned by Mr C Gugliemino

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing in support of the above mentioned landowner who is intending on subdividing approximately 8-10 acres of land along adjoining Calabria & Rankin Springs Rd, Griffith NSW.

In my time residing in Griffith I have lived in East Griffith and now Collina. My family and I are seeking small acreage land (lifestyle blocks) to build on, and we wish to remain in this area on the outskirts of Griffith.

Should Mr Gugliemino be successful with his subdivision request and basic services were included, we would be very interested in committing financially.

Yours Sincerely

Chris Matthews

15 Davidson Place

Griffith NSW 2680



6th July 2015

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: C & V Gugliemino Subdivision of Farm 1690 , Calabria Road Griffith NSW.

My wife and I have been waiting for blocks in this particular area of Griffith to come available for some time now and we were wondering why the delay in approving the DA?

We are ready to pay a deposit to secure a block in this area but are unable to do so as we believe Griffith

City Council still has NOT approved this subdivision.

We are very disappointed at this never ending delay and wondering when is this approval likely to occur if at all?? I feel that this DA has been delayed too long and someone needs to take some action ASAP.

Yours Sincerely

Alf Trefilo

Let's Travel & Cruise

59 Kooyoo Street, Griffith N.S.W. Australia, 2680

Mail: P.O. Box 1407, Griffith, N.S.W. Australia, 2680

Tel: +61 2 6964 4644 | Fax: +61 2 6964 3464 | Email: griffith@letstravelcruise.com.au

ETMA Travel Pty Ltd
ABN: 61 137 370 864 Trading
As: Let's Travel & Cruise, AU
Independently owned franchise
Lic. No. 27A 06308 TDS 9684384
ATTA 01557 ATAS A11128

To: Griffith City Council

Richard Voss
27 Dussin St
Griffith NSW 2680

RE : Subdivision Calabria Rd Griffith
Charlie Gugliemino.

To whom it may concern:

As a resident of Griffith residing in Collina we are desperately searching for an option for a larger block in the area in order to build a house and there are no options over 1000 square meters.

This land will be ideal for us and will allow us to stay in the area that we love and kids can go to the same school and we will be close to the shops and town and friends in the area.

We spoke to Mr Gugliemino regarding his land and he told us he is trying to subdivide his land into the size block we require.

Please can council consider this development application with urgency on the grounds that there are no other such like blocks available in the Collina area.

Sincerely,



Richard Voss



DAVIS SANDERS
HOMES

8th July, 2015

Griffith City Council
Benerambah Street
Griffith NSW 2680

Re: Development of Farm 1690 Calabria Road

To Whom It may concern,

I would like to express support to the development of the above said property.

In our day to day operations I have found there to be genuine buyer enquiry & interest in the proposed site whether it be developed as larger lots and or smaller lots.

As the current stock of land is diminishing I feel that this would be a great time for this development to proceed.

If you wish to discuss any of the above further, please feel free to contact me.

Kindest Regards

Michael Musitano
New Home Consultant
Davis Sanders Homes.
0412 915 437 - Mobile
mmusitano@bigpond.com

220 Borella Road, Albury NSW 2640
PO Box 7285, Albury East NSW 2640
Telephone 02 6041 1988 Fax 02 6041 4641
Email: albury@davisandershomes.com.au www.davisandershomes.com.au
ABN: 85 057 370 822 NSW 41757C VIC DB 02864F

approved: *****

MIA Casa

From: Anthony Poloni [anfpol@bigpond.com]
Sent: Monday, 13 July 2015 12:11 PM
To: MIA Casa
Subject: Re: nathan gug

G'day Nathan I am interested in the subdivision that is being proposed on Calabria road please keep me up to date with process thanks Anthony Poloni

Sent from Anthony iPhone

On 13 Jul 2015, at 11:34 am, MIA Casa <sales@miacasa.net.au> wrote:

Hi anth,

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000

1 Buccella St
Griffith NSW 2680

10th July 2015

To Whom It May Concern,

I have been looking at blocks of land in the Collina area, and am particularly interested in the location currently occupied by Farm 1690, Calabria Road.

I pass this farm every day on my way to and from work, and after it was cleared I contacted the farm owners to enquire about the state of the subdivision process. They explained at the time they were waiting on DA approval.

Many months have now passed, and I understand they are still waiting on DA approval! Can you please explain what is holding this process up, and when, if at all, I can expect to see the subdivisions made available to the market?

Regards,



Bernard Gray

Australasian Real Estate
Results Awards



10th July 2015

Charlie & Vanessa Guglielmino
Farm 1690 Calabria Road
Griffith NSW 2680

Dear Charlie & Vanessa,

Regarding your proposed land subdivision and potential lots for sale at Calabria Road Griffith.

I have had discussions with many buyers recently and received very positive interest in that location.

The common feedback is that there is very little choice currently for larger rural residential lots in Griffith. The feedback has strongly agreed that the location is highly desirable and that if in fact the lots were available for sale then there would be strong interest to purchase.

The main difference each buyer mentioned is being so close to the City and Collina was a key advantage over similar sized lots currently available in the Villages.

With such positive initial interest and word of mouth enquiry, I would be keen to see the subdivision go ahead as soon as possible, we would have buyers virtually ready immediately.

Regards,

Nathan Thomas

Nathan Thomas
Real Estate Agent
Griffith Real Estate



griffithre.com
REAL ESTATE

146 Yambill St, Griffith NSW 2680 - PO Box 2505

telephone 02 6962 1455 facsimile 02 6962 7090

info@griffithre.com

NO LICENSE REQUIRED A 811 79 051 926 189

IMPORTANT: This is not advice. Clients should not act solely on the basis of the material contained in this document. Items herein are general comments only & do not constitute or convey advice per se. This document is issued as a helpful guide to clients and is for their private information. Every effort is made to ensure that contents are accurate at the time of publication. We take no responsibility for any subsequent action that may arise from this document.

D(iii) Site 3 Submissions Lot 1791 DP 41291 Salvestrin

Debra and Dino Salvestrin
Farm 1290 Harward Road
PO Box 1603
Griffith NSW 2680
2680



12/09/2012

Dear Mr McNicol

In response to the draft version of "Griffith Land use Strategy Beyond 2030 (2012)"

Introduction

After reviewing the Griffith Land Use Strategy plan, maps indicate that part of Lot 1791, DP41291 running from behind Lot 1790 to Day street along Rose Road are already existing residential blocks.

We would like to clarify / make a submission in relation to the above Lot being bounded by Brayne and Rose Road for the development for residential purpose.

The Land

Is adjacent to residential fabric of Griffith. Both Rose Road and Brayne Road are sealed and have existing sections of residential developments. Reports indicate the proposed area is flood and fire prone free.

Water supply pipelines and the majority of drainage pipelines exist along Rose Road. The land is 4.80 hectares contained within one allotment. A house (Lot 1790) is currently located on the corner of Brayne and Rose Road that is sited on a 2025m2 allotment. There is a further rural house (Lot 988) adjacent to West End Estate Winery that has been developed into two Residential blocks within the past 12 months.

Location

The land is approximately 1km from the central business district and is adjacent to existing residential development. The subject land is well situated only a short distance from the main civic circle and the heart of the city. This represents approximately a 15 minute walk to the main shopping center in Banna Avenue. It is **not** an isolated parcel of rural land many kilometers from urban areas.

Existing land use on the opposite side of Rose Road has been developed into residential allotments that are fully serviced by water sewerage, drainage, power, telecommunications and gas. Infrastructure including Curb, Gutter and Drainage would be included in any development as specified by council.

Development of this area would be an asset for Griffith. It is within close Proximity of the CBD (3.-5mins. by car and 15mins on foot,) 2 major primary schools, one of these schools cohort with children that have disabilities (Kalinda), One high school, the local Hospital, Medical facilities and other emergency services, 3 daycare centers, I preschool, churches, sport and recreational facilities including the West Griffith Stadium, which accommodates Basketball, volleyball athletics, badminton, hockey, etc., Griffith Regional Aquatic Center, Griffith City Adventure Park situated in Kookora Street and the Griffith Show Ground.

Close to entertainment with Griffith City Regional Theater, local wining and dining with restaurants and clubs located with in the CBD

The extension of residential development on the western side of Rose Road also fits with pre-existing radial development that has occurred off Harward Road (South Griffith).

Consequently, conclusion of the land for release as residential allotments would represent good planning and abutting already established and developed residential areas. It is well situated with quick access to the town center, Medical facilities, schools and recreational facilities.

Environmental considerations.

The proposed development is located 120 meters form the boundary of the West End Estate Winery and such would be no closer than **existing residential development** locate in Brayne Road, Parkinson Crescent and Lawson Crescent.

Effluent Ponds, which are the main nuisance form the West End Estate Winery approximately 6weeks per year at Grape Harvest are situated on the western side of the winery and would be approximately 350m from proposed development.

There is a very small boutique winery situated some distance away on Harward Road Lot 811 , DP751709 147. In the years this winery has been running there has been no effluent problems as the effluent is processed off site.

In view of our surrounding we would like you to clarify /consider our submission for future development of residential blocks as outlined

(a) Future development of residential blocks of LOT 1791 DP 41291

or

(b) Future development of only of 12 Residential blocks as highlighted in the attached document ,extending from Lot 1790 Brayne Road through to Day Street.

Thank you for your clarification /consideration

Debra and Dino Salvestrin

Debra and Dino Salvestrin

