

Project Title		Calderwood Valley Urban Development Project			
Date	25 July 2016	Meeting No.	1 – 2016	Project No.	
Purpose of Meeting		Infrastructure Contributions – Wollongong City Council			
Location		Wollongong City Council, 41 Burelli Street, Wollongong.			
<u>Attendees</u>					
Tamara Rasmussen (TR) Lendlease			Andrew Carfield (AC)	WCC	
Rob Bennett (RB) Lendlease			David Green (DG)	WCC	
Sarah Kelly (SK) Lendlease			Edith Barnes (EB)	WCC	
Jennie Buchanan (JB) JBA			David Tuszyński (DT)	WCC	
Ryhan Thomson (RT) Cardno			Andrew Byers (AB)	WCC	
Annabel Teague (AT) DPE			Ron Zwicker (RZ)	WCC	
			Natasha Harras (NH)	DPE	
Item	Description				
1.	<u>Introduction</u> RB noted that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the two key matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Draft Calderwood S94 Plan 2016 (“Draft Plan”), recently exhibited by WCC• Calderwood Concept Plan S75(W) Modification No 1 – Condition C12, lodged by Lendlease and recently exhibited by DPE				
2.	<u>Draft Calderwood Section 94 Plan (Draft Plan)</u>				
	RB noted that the project team were seeking to understand the Draft Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Where it applies?• How it applies?• Seek access to the supporting documents that underlie the Draft Plan• Seek to understand costings and apportionment with West Dapto. RB outlined the difficulties in understanding application of the Draft Plan. It was not clear whether or not the plan applies to the Wollongong portion of Calderwood, the land subject to the Calderwood Concept Plan (c4,800 dwgs) or the broader Calderwood UDP (c8,400 dwgs). AC acknowledged that the draft Plan was hard to understand and that they were intending to make amendments and re-exhibit the document.				

	<p>AC stated that all of the background documents will also be exhibited with the revised Draft Plan including the detailed costings.</p> <p>AC noted that Lendlease and Council remain “poles apart” in terms of monetary contributions for road infrastructure, which has always been the key contention.</p> <p>AC confirmed that the current Draft Plan is seeking approx \$40million for road funding, a difference of some \$33+million. The cost estimates/contribution rates estimated by each party are significantly different. AC confirmed that a revised Draft Plan would not substantially depart from the current Draft Plan in its identification of road funding contributions.</p> <p>AC also noted that WCC had met with senior officers of DPE and requested that DPE provide gap funding in an attempt to resolve this issue.</p> <p>AC confirmed that WCC intends to apply the Draft Plan to the “whole” of Calderwood– i.e. c. 8,400 lots – as defined by the DPE Regional Office in the IUDP. At this stage, Council intends to prepare a “cross-boundary” plan. With any future amalgamation, WCC believe the Plan would then apply to the new, broader LGA.</p> <p>In terms of the application of Section 94 in Shellharbour, AC stated that WCC has legal advice that the Shellharbour VPA does not bind WCC.</p> <p>WCC noted that the key issue for them is the local road network and ensuring that adequate funding is available for this infrastructure. WCC (DG) is not seeking contributions for open space or community facilities [NOTE: the provision of open space and community facilities was settled during the Stage 1 Court Action].</p> <p>WCC anticipate the Draft Plan would be re-exhibited in the next 3-4 weeks (ie late August / September). JBA requested that the Draft West Dapto costings also be exhibited with the Draft Plan, to understand apportionment.</p> <p>RB requested to be directly notified (via email) to enable a timely review of the revised Draft Plan. AC stated that this would be considered by Council.</p> <p>RB noted that contributions as proposed by Council will significantly impact on land affordability – noting that the average income in the region is approximately \$75,000. Increases in Section 94 contributions will directly impact on land affordability and the ability to purchase in a tightening market. WCC noted that other landowners in West Dapto continued to increase land prices and adjust to the market (ie increases of \$10K at regular intervals).</p> <p>RB noted the LEC provided strong guidance for contributions across all the remaining stages of the project being “subject to indexation and minor adjustment”.</p> <p>WCC agreed that the key/only outstanding contention was local contributions to road upgrades (as was the case for the LEC case). There is no contention with respect to open space or community facilities, and acknowledged these are being provided / delivered by LL at Calderwood (and primarily within Shellharbour where the bulk of the new population will reside).</p>
--	---

	AC stated that WCC is not opposed to a VPA for Calderwood but cannot agree to one until the funding of the road infrastructure is agreed upon. Both parties disagree on infrastructure required for the precinct and the \$ value.
3.	<u>Road Network and IPART West Dapto Section 94 Review</u>
	<p>Council outlined the road network for Stage 5 (Yallah/Marshall Mt). Arrived at splits / apportionment for Calderwood / West Dapto Stage 5. Stage 5 is based on c. 4,000 dwellings, a community centre and a range of other facilities. Calderwood is based on c. 8,400 dwellings.</p> <p>As part of the background documentation for the draft West Dapto and Calderwood Contributions Plans, SMEC (2015) has prepared a detailed concept design of the roads which have been costed by an independent surveyor. The review included the new roads (NR1 to NR3) and the new Local Road.</p> <p>The new Local Road was to “support Calderwood” and “to bypass the proposed MM/Yallah town centre”. This local road does not front developable land and is located wholly within environmental land. The town centre bypass was the result of an <i>inquiry by design process</i> and was considered a “desirable outcome” at this workshop.</p> <p>Council noted that Y3, the highway interchange with the Princes Highway remains unfunded (approx. \$30mill). WCC planning is based on the RMS funding this interchange.</p> <p>The road infrastructure provided in the Draft Plan is the same as the road infrastructure in the Draft West Dapto S94 Plan 2016 currently before IPART (seeking some \$68K per lot/dwg).</p> <p>Council advised that the draft West Dapto Contributions Plan has been referred to IPART for review. This includes background documents which outline what road infrastructure is required for the region. Council expects a response by September 2016. Following the IPART review, WCC will potentially seek gap funding to fund any shortfall.</p> <p>Lendlease requested that WCC consider the outcomes of the IPART review before re-exhibition of the Draft Plan to address any issues or changes to road infrastructure or costings, as required by IPART. WCC declined this request and indicated they would press on with the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Council will finalise the Stage 5 Planning Proposal once the infrastructure contributions are resolved (notably part of the draft West Dapto Section 94 Plan review).</p>
4.	<u>S75W Modification - Concept Plan Amendment No 1 (C12)</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lendlease note that this is a housekeeping amendment. • Council’s position is that the principles set out in the court case should not be imposed as these related to stage 1 of the development and additional information is now available following the preparation of Council’s infrastructure plan / Draft Plan. • Council is not expecting a detailed response to all issues outlined in their submission noting this was more aimed at providing information for the benefit of the DPE. • Notwithstanding, Council’s submission noted its continued objection to the rezoning of Calderwood, particularly the “sequencing” of the project. • The key issue for the Council is ensuring that the local road infrastructure is going to be funded

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – whether this includes additional funding by the State is a matter still to be decided. • The decision by IPART will likely have a role to play in determining this. • Council agreed that the key/only outstanding contention was local contributions to road upgrades (as was the case for the LEC case). • Council feels it is in a stronger position and has completed the detailed planning and costings for local road requirements in West Dapto and Calderwood.
5.	<u>Pending Merger</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timing of the amalgamations is still unknown. • Waiting on judgement from Shellharbour Council's injunction (imminent). Shellharbour has 2 days to appeal any decision. • If amalgamated, likely to affect how contributions are dealt with. • Likely that an Administrator will be put in place. • It was agreed that it would be good to develop a positive working relationship between the two parties, particularly with respect to the on-going development of Calderwood.
4.	<u>Next Steps</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WCC will re-exhibit the Draft Plan and supporting documents in next 3- 4 weeks • WCC indicated it will not wait for the IPART determination before the re-exhibition. • WCC will notify LL (RB) in advance of the timing for the exhibition.