

**Orchard Hills
Community Consultative Committee**

Meeting No: 2

Date: 25 May 2023, 6:30 – 8 pm

Location: Online, Zoom

Attendees	
Community members Diane Azzopardi (DA) Ajmair Chauhan (ACha) Deborah Cutajar (DC) Don Feltis (DF) Tony Napoli (TN) Con Paphatzis (CP) Bree Wilson (BW) Ed Zussa (EZ) Christine Vella (CV) Independent Community Commissioner Professor Roberta Ryan, Independent Community Commissioner (RR) Kate Robinson, office of the Independent Community Commissioner (KR) Isa Crossland Stone, minute taker, office of the Independent Community Commissioner (ICS)	Government representatives Catherine Van Laeren, Executive Director, Metro West, Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) (CVL) Robert Hodgkins, A/Director, Central (Western), DPE (RH) Carolyn Scott, Manager Metro West, DPE (CS) Fiona Duncan, Communications Manager, DPE (FD) Stephanie Madonis, Communications Manager, DPE Steve Hartley, Executive Director, Resilience and Urban Sustainability, DPE (SH) Justine Kinch, Western Parkland City Director, Transport for NSW (JK) Peter Gresser, Project Manager Interface, Sydney Metro (PG) Fernando Ortego, Western Sydney – Commercial Partnerships Manager, Sydney Water (FO) Abdul Cheema, A/g City Planning Manager, Penrith City Council (AChe)
Apologies Jane Grose, A/Executive Director Metro West, DPE (JG) Elizabeth Lowe, Senior Communications Manager, Sydney Metro (EL) Natasha Williams, City Planning Manager, Penrith City Council (NW)	

Item	Description	Action
1	Welcome - RR	
	RR welcomes all attendees to the second Orchard Hills CCC meeting. RR briefly reviews the last meeting, which was the first for the Orchard Hills CCC. RR reminds attendees of the function of the minutes. She reiterates that the minutes will always be made available as a draft for review by members to provide comments. The minutes will subsequently be published online. RR explains that her office is required to have the minutes finalised within two weeks of each meeting. In each CCC meeting, two members are required to formally endorse the minutes from the previous meeting. BW and TN endorse the previous minutes.	
2	Member introductions	
	RR introduces herself; she is the Independent Community Commissioner for Orchard Hills, and the Independent Chair for the Orchard Hills CCC. RR invites all attendees to introduce themselves. AChe notes he is the City Planning Coordinator for Penrith City Council. He is filling in for Natasha Williams (NW) who is set to attend future meetings regularly. RR notes that there will be a regular attendee from the DPE Metro West team at future meetings. This presence will ensure that the community is kept informed and is able to have their questions answered. PG here is attending on behalf of Elizabeth Lowe (EL) who will be a regular attendee for Sydney Metro at these meetings.	
3	Actions from previous meeting - KR	
	RR refers to the agenda, which was shared by KR ahead of the meeting. RR talks through the actions register, which is screen shared by KR and listed below. 1. DPE to update the community on the planning process for the Orchard Hills precinct. RR confirms that CVL and her team from the DPE will present today.	

	2. Commissioner to brief the Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan (CPCP) team on the community concerns. RR confirms that she has spoken with CPCP team regarding these issues. Later in the meeting, SH will provide an overview and response to the issues raised. 3. Commissioner to follow up on the Windfall Tax. RR says that she has asked around about this tax, which was raised by BW in the previous meeting. RR has not received any information with respect to this issue. 4. Community members to provide KR with their signed Code of Conduct forms. RR reminds all members who have not yet returned these forms to KR to please do so soon. 5. KR to provide the members with the census data presentation from the previous meeting. RR confirms that this presentation has been distributed.	KR to follow up with community members for the signed code of conduct
4	Presentation: Orchard Hills draft Precinct Plan update – CVL, RH and CS	
	RH delivers a presentation on planning the future of Orchard Hills. RR explains that the purpose of this presentation and discussion is to provide the CCC with an outline of the planning process, where it is up to, and indicative timing. The focus here is on process, rather than content. RR asks about the terms of RH's presentation. Other than the metro station, what does 'infrastructure', refer to? RH clarifies that 'infrastructure' here includes what is considered 'enabling infrastructure'. This includes the roads, water supply services, schools, community services such as Councils, along with various other services delivered to support a population. RH explains that this infrastructure is delivered both by State Government and Local Government. DPE is working alongside Penrith City Council and the other government agencies that are responsible for these deliveries. RR says that the purpose of the Strategic Business Case is to support funding of infrastructure to support growth and the land use planning process. CVL adds that the Strategic Business Case is the first step to assessing how the government can fund planned land use. It is a launching pad for other government agencies to create a final Business Case, which commits to funding.	KR to distribute PPT presentation

	RR ask how these Business Cases line up in the rezoning process? CVL says that the rezoning will proceed before the Strategic Business Case is finalised. The Strategic Business Case relies on the studies and research of technical consultants that inform the rezoning process. The agencies responsible for delivering on each area will draw from this Strategic Business Case and proceed with preparing more detailed business cases to secure funding Agencies also consider the rate of population growth, which helps to ensure that infrastructure and growth align. EZ asks about the timeframe for receiving the precinct plan. RH says that the draft plan will likely be exhibited to the public in late July or August of 2023. Details on the planning process and its projected timeline are outlined in RH's presentation. CVL notes that DPE will brief the CCC in a meeting prior to this scheduled public exhibition. This way, CCC members will be well-informed and able to ask questions prior to the exhibition. They will therefore be better able to communicate with their communities. RR says that this briefing is a valuable opportunity for community members to provide observations and offer DPE advice on how best to communicate with the Orchard Hills community. With reference to RH's presentation, CVL reiterates that the exhibition phase will involve community drop-in sessions, as well as the opportunity for residents to make direct appointments with planners. CP asks if there is much flexibility with changing the plan after exhibition. RR says yes, during the exhibition period there will be a range of ways to provide input. These will include formal submissions, which RR and KR are able to assist with. Community feedback will be considered and documented, as will the Government's response to this feedback. BW asks about the public exhibition documents; will they pertain to certain districts within the Orchard Hills South or deal with the entire area? CVL says that the DPE is approaching the area of Orchard Hills in totality. CVL notes that the large size of the area presents some	
--	---	--

	challenges. The rezoning package may show an intent for the whole area and then go on to further detail of rezoning specific areas, or rezone the whole area all at once, showing the potential staging of this over time. Each approach has pros and cons. The Government will consider these options in consultation with the community. CVL refers to the case of Austral, an area that was rezoned in one go. In this case, infrastructure and services have not kept up with the new provision of housing. CVL notes that when land is rezoned, land values increase and subsequently rates and land taxes will be impacted. CV asks in what stages the rezoning will occur. Is there a planned timeline for each area? Will rezoning begin from existing development sites such as the metro station? CVL agrees with CV that due to investment around certain areas such as the metro station, there are clearly some starting points for growth in the area. CVL says that the question of staging is still under investigation by DPE. While the DPE will exhibit an intent for the entire precinct, the rezoning pattern is up for discussion. The timeline is also under further exploration. CVL says that these discussions will involve various government agencies and DPE will be trying to align development with infrastructure. There is no lead developer in the area, so this alignment is challenging to coordinate. TN cites previous observations of developments wherein metro stations are closely followed by high-rise residential buildings and detached housing. Residential development is necessary to supporting the commercial district surrounding the metro. TN is concerned about water and infrastructure contributions and would like some clarity. TN says that there is already an established water tower on Wentworth Rd, as well as a sewer treatment site on Mamre Rd. This services the surrounding industrial estate. TN speculates that DPE is perhaps more advanced in the planning process than they have expressed to the CCC. It seems that the studies are well advanced. RR assures TN that the DPE presentation reflects the current state of affairs. RR asks all members to remain respectful of the agency representatives. She directs TN's concerns to CVL. CVL agrees with TN that infrastructure planning is essential. DPE is currently scoping more work on this issue.	
--	--	--

	CVL clarifies that the Local Contributions Plan is the responsibility of Penrith City Council, but DPE works closely with them in its formation. CVL clarifies that DPE can exhibit the draft Local Planning Package without the Local Contributions Plan. The Planning Package is an important contributor to the Local Contributions Plan, as it details what is being planned. CVL says that there will be more work done to refine State Infrastructure Contributions for the delivery of state government facilities such as road upgrades. These will include a development levy/cost which are consistent with the application of charges elsewhere in NSW. CVL notes that infrastructure contributions do not cover the full costs of infrastructure with governments responsible for covering some remaining costs. DPE will work with relevant government agencies and with Council on this issue. CVL directs TN's concerns regarding water supply and water charges to FO. FO says that in servicing the Orchard Hills area, Sydney Water is working with the DPE to identify where growth will occur across the area. They will deliver infrastructure based on these assessments. There is drinking water infrastructure, but it requires an upgrade. FO says that currently Sydney Water is still assessing how best to service the area from different wastewater catchments. FO addresses the development connection charges. These are currently exhibited online and FO will provide KR with a link to the Sydney Water webpage which explains how these have been calculated. FO explains that existing water rates are not enough to build the infrastructure required to service growth. FO offers to provide more detail on these matters in a presentation at the next CCC meeting. RR agrees that this would be helpful. EZ asks if it is within the scope of the CCC to ensure that future rate rises do not occur in this area during the development process. EZ says that the last round of rates notices have shown exponential increases based on the Orchard Hills development plans.	KR to distribute the link to the webpage which outlines Sydney Water's development charges. FO to present on Sydney Water's network and water charges at the upcoming CCC meeting.
--	--	--

	EZ says that there is a sizable population of elderly retirees in the area who are asset-rich but without a strong income. These rate increases are particularly concerning for them. EZ feels strongly that there should be a cap on rates, and some provision for these residents until the planning process is over. RR agrees that this is a complex issue. It has arisen in the context of the rezoning in the Aerotropolis, and the Council has been able to provide assistance in some cases. RR suggests that this question be put on notice for Penrith Council to provide a response. EZ raises a leaking water main, which is running down the length of Lansdowne Rd. It is flooding into some residents' yards and killing trees on their land. The leak has been reported to Sydney Water. What is the status of this issue? FO says that he was not aware of this issue but will follow up immediately. EZ confirms that the issue has been reported and has an incident number. FO asks EZ to pass on the incident number, and he will follow up. EZ says that the issue is likely arising from the increased use of Lansdowne Road as a truck passage. The main pipes run under the road, and therefore strain on the road is causing strain on the pipes. DA agrees with EZ that the truck-related damage to the roads is a concern. DA says that concrete trucks and B Double trucks are on the roads each morning. The roads are not built to withstand this use, and the damage is showing. DA says that this issue is causing additional concern as residents look towards development. RR asks what route the trucks are taking currently. DA says that most seem to be coming through Homestead Road, and travelling down Calverts and Lansdowne Roads to the metro. DA says that truck drivers have been advised to use the main roads rather than taking shortcuts through Orchard Hills. While this has reduced the issue somewhat, it is still persistent. RR says that if designated truck routes are not being used, this should be followed up.	Penrith City Council to respond to enquiries about potential land rate provisions. EZ to provide KR with the incident number for the leaking on Lansdowne Road. FO to follow up at Sydney Water regarding leaking on Lansdowne Road incident, as raised by EZ.
--	---	---

	RR asks PG to follow this up as an immediate issue in the period before the next meeting. DC says that residents of The Vines area have been frustrated by the truck traffic on Kent Road. She says many residents' cars become filthy from trucks passing by. ACha says that the 2022 Greater Penrith to Eastern Creek Strategic Framework (GPEC) and the Orchard Hills discussion paper noted plans for indoor sports centres to the south of the metro. In these plans, the centres were placed on ACha's land. ACha says that the State Government and the Penrith City Council have recently announced a regional indoor sports centre near the metro station. ACha asks if, given this announcement, the plans noted in those earlier documents will be revised. RH says that the draft GPEC did include mapping which showed a general location for the planned centre. They were not intended to sit on a specific property. This map was schematic and has since been updated. RH says that following finalisation of the Strategic Framework, there will be a consultation process with Council and community about what facilities are needed and where they will be located. The finalisation of this document will likely occur by mid-2023. CVL says that the indicative layout plan for Orchard Hills will be more specific when it is placed on public exhibition. In support of ACha's earlier point, DA shows the group a pamphlet which was provided to the Orchard Hills residents last week via mail. The pamphlet outlines a plan to develop an indoor sports arena at Claremont Meadows. DA says it would be helpful to clarify the DPE's intentions and messaging on these mapped plans. JK offers a transport perspective on TN's point about infrastructure. TfNSW is working with DPE on this matter, but JK notes that the priorities in this area are yet to be determined. TfNSW will first need to understand how the precinct rezoning will be staged, and then will progress a detailed business case to secure government funding. JK notes that the contributions leave out certain transport costs, such as buses. Therefore, the investments required by TfNSW will be significant. <i>Post-meeting clarification from DPE responding to community member's query on plans for land south of the Metro station:</i>	PG to follow up about ensuring the use of designated truck routes.
--	---	---

	<i>Parts of the study area south of the Metro station may not be suitable for development as they are affected by odour associated with Patons Lane waste facility, Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan, flooding and are in fragmented land ownership.</i>	
5	Presentation: DPE's proposed communication and engagement approach - FD	
	FD presents on the DPE's communication strategy for the rezoning of Orchard Hills. This presentation is attached to the minutes. FD's presentation includes a practical walk-through of the interactive mapping system <i>Social Pinpoint</i>. EZ asks about written submissions as a community feedback mode. He notes that often, submission platforms accept only limited file sizes. This is restrictive for some people who want to include larger attachments. FD says that there are generally file size limits. She will follow up with the portal team to clarify whether this can be changed. DA refers to FD's mention of information booklets. She suggests that booklets be provided to the CCC members for distribution amongst their neighbours. RR agrees that this is a great idea. BW suggests that it would be beneficial to take a district-based approach to community communication. Community meetings and drop-in sessions would be more effective if they were more district-specific. BW suggests Penrith Anglican College as a meeting venue that would accommodate a large number of attendees and offers a large number of facilities. DC agrees with BW regarding a more district-specific approach. She says that residents of The Vines generally like to be dealt with independently of the greater Orchard Hills area, where landholders generally own larger properties. CP asks: at what point should the CCC members consult with their fellow community members? RR says that timing will be clarified closer to the exhibition date. CP concurs with BW and DC. He says that his surrounding community is in favour of smaller meetings.	FD to follow up with the DPE portal team regarding community feedback file size limits.

	CV says that the opportunity for residents to meet with planners individually is a very good idea. With reference to EZ's previous concern, CV recalls the submission process during the Sydney Metro development. There was an email address provided, which allowed community members to send larger submissions than might be allowed on a portal platform. CV asks if it would be possible to have individualised letters explaining the rezoning for specific areas. These letters could include a written description for people who are not well-versed in planning terminology. This would also be helpful for elderly residents. FD says that she would have to seek advice from the DPE Planning team on the feasibility of this proposal, given the size of this project. FD will follow this up. DA suggests that these letters could be zone-specific, if not more personalised. DA says that the map that was issued previously was overwhelming for many residents, who found it challenging to determine the implications on their properties amongst the entire population. Based on FD's presentation, DA asks why the comments submitted on social pinpoint are weighted less than formal submissions. RH says that all comments are reviewed and summarised. Valuable suggestions made on Social Pinpoint will be taken into account. TN says that Social Pinpoint seems to be a good idea. It is an accessible option for those who are comfortable on digital platforms. TN notes that newspapers such as the Western Weekender are no longer delivered in the area, and instead are only available (free) at shops. TN says he believes that newspaper advertising is valuable, as it reaches a less digitally-reliant demographic. Regarding community presentations, TN suggests the Masonic Centre on Homestead Road as a good venue. DC asks what zones are currently being used for mapping. CS says that this is still under resolution The original mapping was done early on and used the drainage corridors as definitions for neighbourhoods. CS says that mapping boundaries of the neighbourhoods will likely be refined slightly based on the unique topography of the area.	FD to seek advice from the DPE Planning team on the feasibility of property or zone-specific letter communications.
--	---	--

6	Update: Sydney Metro's activities in Orchard Hills – PG	
	<i>Due to time constraints, PG provides a verbal update.</i> PG updates that at the station site, the construction of the underground station box is still ongoing. PG says that Sydney Metro is still in final stages of preparation for tunnelling. The tunnelling will commence midway through 2023. It will begin in Orchard Hills and head north to St Marys. PG updates that at the stabling yard, earthworks are progressing and are set to be completed by Q3 of this year. PG updates that the contract for the stations and train track construction was awarded in late 2022. He notes that construction is still some way off, but the contractor has begun to conduct low-impact surveys of the area. PG says that emerging from the caretaker period, Sydney Metro has been conducting pop-ups and drop-ins at community halls and shopping centres around the area. They have recorded 1500 interactions across 900 events since caretaker. PG says that they have found a high level of base knowledge about the metro amongst the community. PG updates that the MetroConnect app was launched last week. The app provides real-time updates and notifications. The app is available on the App Store and on Google Play. RR thanks PG and informs the group that there will be consistent presence from Sydney Metro at CCC meetings going forward.	
7	All other business	
	KR summarises the key issues raised by RR with the CPCP team following the previous CCC meeting: 7.1 The scale of avoided land in Orchard Hills 7.2 The process of the mapping, and what ground truthing was involved 7.3 The communications of the draft plan, which the residents found generally unsatisfactory 7.4 Differences in biodiversity assessment between the Commonwealth and the State. Given the time constraints, SH gives a brief overview in response. RR assures the group that SH will be a continued CCC presence and will be able to address questions and concerns in future.	

	SH says that the CPCP was a precursor to development in Orchard Hills. Under the plan, the Government was the proponent for development. Development in Orchard Hills requires relevant biodiversity approval, both at the State and Federal levels. The CPCP was developed to help provide certainty to underpin master planning in areas such as Orchard Hills. SH clarifies that it is not DPE but the Minister for the Environment who is required to approve clearing. SH notes that if residents judge mapping of their property to be incorrect, ecologists from the CPCP team are able to make specific site assessments. SH acknowledges that biodiversity mapping has caused concern, and that while the mapping has generally been accurate, discussions have centered around whether particular areas of vegetation should or should not be protected. EZ says that approximately four weeks ago he made a submission to the department regarding the CPCP. He asks if SH could please follow this up. SH will follow up internally with the CPCP team. DC says that the community would like some action on the issues of noise and dust on residential roads, and noise at the stabling yards at the back of Orchard Hills. CV asks SH about the cost of having an ecologist visit individual properties, as mentioned by SH earlier. Many surrounding residents have CPCP on their properties. SH clarifies that there is no cost involved in this service. RR reiterates that community members are welcome to approach KR and RR for support in organising these kinds of processes.	SH to follow up with the CPCP team regarding EZ's recent submission.
7	Next Meeting - RR	
	RR proposes that the next meeting be scheduled for 27 July. RR notes that hopefully by this date, DPE may be in a position to present the CCC with the draft precinct plans. Community CCC members would then be able to discuss and provide feedback on this draft ahead of its planned exhibition in August. The group generally agrees on this date. EZ and BW note that they will likely be unable to attend this meeting due to overseas travel plans. They may be able to attend via	

	Zoom, depending on time differences and other variables. RR notes that for those overseas, there is a possibility for these meetings to be partially recorded. Perhaps absent members could be provided relevant parts of the recording from the meeting and could discuss any arising matter via phone or email with RR or KR. RR thanks all community members for their attendance at the meeting, which ran long. She wishes them well.	
--	---	--