

Hawkesbury City Council - Notice of Motion

For the general meeting of June 26th, 2018

Moved by: Councillor Zamprogno.

Motion:

1. Council notes the community debate about road corridors has brought into focus many questions about the medium to long-term future of the south-eastern part of our city which lays adjacent to urban growth, generally bounded by Windsor Road (both sides), Boundary Road and the river.
2. That Council recognises that development is and will continue to place significant pressure on this part of our LGA, and that it is necessary for Council's future planning to seek to be well informed about the intent of other tiers of government and their departments, however preliminary, in these areas.
3. That Hawkesbury Council write to the Greater Sydney Commission, the Department of Planning, Transport for NSW, and the State Member for Hawkesbury to seek clarification of statements that seem to indicate a desire to extend development beyond the Vineyard Precinct, and otherwise to call for transparency, disclosure and co-operation concerning how much more of the Hawkesbury's semi-rural lands are being considered for future development.

Background:

The Strategic Environment Assessment for the Outer Sydney Orbital corridor says,

"The Growth Area LUIPs [Land Use and Infrastructure Implementation Plans] have assumed that the recommended corridor will be formally identified in the future, and will inform more detailed planning for precincts yet to be rezoned. For example, the DPE [Department of Planning and Environment] is considering land immediately north of the Vineyard Precinct as providing future opportunities for employment and industry related to the future OSO infrastructure, with detailed planning to commence once the location of the recommended corridor is formalised." (March 2018, p14)

A June 2005 document titled *Managing Sydney's Growth Centres* includes a map showing the Vineyard Precinct within the North West Growth Sector (NWGS) as currently bounded in the north by Commercial Road and Menin Road in Oakville/Vineyard. However, the map also

shows that the SEPP, the planning instrument enabling the Sector, encompasses a much broader area which takes in all of Oakville, Maraylya, the rest of Vineyard and even parts of Mcgraths Hill and Mulgrave. Many of these areas are presently zoned rural, and contain prime agricultural land, equine properties, and endangered ecological communities of remnant Cumberland woodland.

There is ample justification for concern that this broader area is already succumbing to development pressure, with the area north of Old Pitt Town Road and east of Boundary road, which is *outside* the current NWGS, being developed by Hills Shire Council despite there being no imperative from the State Government for them to have done so.

A developer has widely letterboxed residents in Oakville, asking to buy their properties for the purpose of land banking.

A real-estate agent circulates a glossy brochure about the sale of an Oakville property, stating *“With Oakville mentioned as the next suburb to be re-zoned, this is the perfect opportunity to buy into Oakville before prices soar.”*

It is against this backdrop that Council approaches the review of its Residential Land Strategy later this year. It is unacceptable that Council should consider changing land use in this area without frank and co-operative disclosure from State departments and ministries about their intentions.

If we proceed in ignorance of the State Government’s medium to long term plans, our Council runs the risk of being seen as recalcitrant on the question of development pressure. Our ability to either protect our rural amenity or manage our own growth may be taken out of our hands.

The corridors issue has already revealed justifiable anger within the community about the dread brought by a lack of certainty, disclosure and consultation.

The purpose of this Motion is therefore to place the State Government on notice: If future development is intended in the Oakville, Maraylya and Vineyard areas, the community are aware of the signs now; they are seeking the right to be involved, and they will not be rebuffed. Both Council and residents in these areas need to be able to plan for the future.