



Peer Review

Accelerated Housing Delivery Program

Prepared for: Penrith City Council

Quality Assurance

Document Title:	Peer Review - Accelerated Housing Delivery Program
Project Ref No.	RP2127-00
Client:	Penrith City Council
Client Contact:	Natalie Stanowski
Report Contact:	Michael Ryan
Status of Document:	Final Issue
Date of Issue:	15 November 2017

QUALITY CONTROL

This document is for discussion purposes only unless signed and dated by a Director of Ryan Planning.



.....
Michael Ryan - Director

Disclaimer

- 1) This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of the party to whom it is addressed ("Client"). Its purposes is based on the Client's specific instructions and is not intended to be relied on by any third party who must make their own enquiries in relation to matters contained within the report.
- 2) This report must not be disclosed to any third party other than the Client or reproduced in whole or in part, for any purpose not directly related to the subject project without prior written approval of Ryan Planning.
- 3) Ryan Planning disclaims all liability to any third party for any error or loss which may arise as a result of the third party acting or relying upon or using the whole or part of this report's contents.
- 4) Ryan Planning makes no representations as to the appropriateness, accuracy or completeness of specialist reports, architectural drawings or plans, advice or information provided by the Client and or other external sources as maybe included or referenced in this report.
- 5) Ryan Planning will endeavour to check information provide to it, however, no warranty is given to the reliability, accuracy or reasonableness of the subject information.

Contents

1) Introduction	4
1.1 Background	4
1.2 Scope of this Report	4
2) Submission Details and Criteria	5
2.1 Submission Details	5
2.2 Submission Contents	6
2.3 Assessment Criteria.....	6
3) Peer Review Assessment	8
3.1 Methodology	8
3.2 Assumptions.....	8
4 Conclusions.....	16

1) Introduction

Penrith City Council has engaged Ryan Planning Pty Ltd to peer review Council's evaluation of submissions made to the Accelerated Housing Delivery Program (AHDP) by individual property owners and land developers.

The AHDP was recently initiated by Council in an attempt to accelerate the strategic planning process to accommodate approximately 3,000 additional dwellings in the LGA over the next 3 to 5 years. The new program does not apply to existing urban areas, non-urban housing proposals or proposals which are mainly for employment, retail or other non-residential uses.

1.1 Background

The population of Penrith LGA is growing at an accelerated rate with remaining new release housing areas having capacity for approximately 4,500 dwellings over the next 3 to 4 years. Preliminary investigations undertaken in preparing Council's new Local Housing Strategy (the Strategy), identified that the continuing high demand for new release housing needs to be urgently addressed, especially when considering the time frame taken to bring new release housing to fruition.

To address this continuing high demand, Council resolved to establish the Accelerated Housing Delivery Program specifically aimed at accelerating short term housing in new release locations in the Penrith LGA prior to finalising the new Local Housing Strategy.

Subsequently, Council invited land owners and/or their representatives with land greater than 100 hectares with the capability of producing 1,000+ new lots with access to immediate infrastructure to make a submission to the AHDP. Submissions were required to address the following criteria:

- 1) Is the land physically and strategically suitable for urban development?
- 2) Has the nominee demonstrated their capacity to provide and finance the appropriate infrastructure? and
- 3) Does the submission demonstrate a commitment to delivering short term housing?

1.2 Scope of this Report

This Peer Review report is not intended to provide a full and detailed assessment of the submissions received. The project brief requires:-

- 1) A review of Council's assessment of submissions;
- 2) Advice on the reasonableness and soundness of Council's recommendations pertaining to each submission; and
- 3) Advice on whether the conclusions and decisions reached by Council are consistent with the objectives of the assessment criteria.

Sites chosen by Council as satisfying the AHDP criteria will be encouraged to commence detailed planning investigations and prepare a planning proposal as soon as possible.

2) Submission Details and Criteria

2.1 Submission Details

Penrith Council's invitation to participate in the ADHP was an open submission process. A total of eleven (11) submissions were received to the AHDP ranging from individual property owners; land developers and specialist consultants on behalf of their client(s). Refer to Table 1 and Appendix A for details of the applicants and location of nominated sites.

Information provided with each submission varied considerably in detail from basic information to a comprehensive assessment of all criteria. Sites 1, 3 and 11 were deficient in not satisfying the minimum 100 hectare requirement.

Table 1: Submissions Details

Site	Site Name	Submitted by
1	Hope and Carbone	K&P Hope / J Carbone
2	Legacy Properties	Legacy Property Pty Ltd
3	Glenmore Park	MacroPlanDimasi
4	Glenmore Park Extension	GLN Planning
5	Luddenham Land Owners	MacroPlanDimasi
6	Atilol Holdings	Boston Global
7	Celestino	Think Planners on behalf of Celestino Developments SSP Pty Ltd
8	Capitol Hill	J Wyndham Prince on behalf of Serapark Pty Ltd
9	Bakers Lane 1	MacroPlanDimasi
	Bakers Lane 2	Mr. Camilleri
10	Whitegate Road	Design Collaborative Pty Ltd on behalf of Deerubbin Local Aboriginal Land Council
11	Agnes Banks	Barker Ryan Stewart Pty Ltd on behalf of the Dixon Group

2.2 Submission Contents

All submissions were required to demonstrate the nominated land was greater than 100 hectares and was capable of producing approximately 1,000+ residential lots with access to immediate infrastructure.

To facilitate a comprehensive assessment of each site, Council required the following information to be lodged:-

- Details of the land (including lot identification, lot size and dimensions and owners consent).
- Reasons for developing the land for housing, including such matters as demand and supply of housing in the area and locational advantages.
- Existing studies into the suitability of the land for housing (if any).
- A preliminary indicative layout containing sufficient information to understand the scope and spatial configuration of the housing proposal and its component parts.
- Details of proposed housing including residential density, mix and total yield.
- Availability and capacity of enabling infrastructure such as water, sewer, power and roads.
- Information related to infrastructure and services required, including schools, parks, emergency services and health facilities.
- A delivery plan for the housing, including steps leading up to dwelling production, timeframes and responsible parties.
- A dwelling production schedule for the first five years.
- Willingness and capacity to undertake planning and infrastructure associated with delivery of the housing at no cost to Government.
- A declaration of reportable political donations.

2.3 Assessment Criteria

The assessment process concentrated on three (3) main criteria that specifically focused on the ability to deliver new housing release areas in a short time frame. Each criteria had corresponding objectives and guiding principles and a number of key matters for consideration as outlined in Table 2.

The overarching criteria for evaluating submissions were:-

- 1) The land is physically and strategically fit;
- 2) Capacity to fund and provide infrastructure; and
- 3) A demonstrated commitment to delivering short term housing.

Table 2: Assessment Criteria

CRITERIA	OBJECTIVES/PRINCIPLES	KEY MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION
THE LAND IS PHYSICALLY & STRATEGICALLY FIT Suitable for urban development and strategically fit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development can demonstrate consistency with Regional, District and all other relevant planning policies. Demonstration that the land is compatible with urban housing. The location responds to Penrith's city shaping infrastructure and land use projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The physical constraints of the land can be managed to facilitate urban development. Demonstration that urban housing is the most suitable and compatible use of the land. Consistency with the Metropolitan Plan, Draft District Plan, relevant SEPPs, 117 Directions and other policies. Potential of the development to respond to, but not constrain or compromise the provision of, 'game changing' catalyst infrastructure or projects (incl. North/South rail line or Western Sydney Priority Growth Area).
CAPACITY TO FUND AND PROVIDE INFRASTRUCTURE Potential for the nominee to pay for appropriate infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development can demonstrate that all services will be provided on the land at no cost to Government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity of the nominee to fund and also enter into a development agreement for the provision of infrastructure and services. Demonstration that the land can be suitably serviced for infrastructure associated with the delivery housing. Commitment for the provision of diversity of housing types including the provision of a minimum 3% of dwellings as affordable housing (Councils current policy position).
A DEMONSTRATED COMMITMENT TO DELIVERING SHORT TERM HOUSING Proven deliverability, access to infrastructure and short lead times	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstration of the ability for viable housing construction to commence within 5 years (inclusive of planning processes). The development is viable and consistent with market demand. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstration that the land ownership or developer arrangement facilitates the efficient delivery of housing. Commitment to planning processes to deliver houses (Planning proposal, DCP/Precinct plan/S94/VPA etc). Demonstration of the capability to deliver critical infrastructure services.

Note:

Reference to the term KMCs in Table 3 refers to 'Key Matters of Consideration' as mentioned above and were matters individually evaluated and scored by Council.

3) Peer Review Assessment

3.1 Methodology

In arriving at our recommendations, a desktop review of Council's evaluation assessment report received 13 November 2017 was conducted, which comprised:-

- 1) Excel summary spreadsheet of all total scores across each of the key matters of consideration;
- 2) Individual score sheets for each key matter of consideration corresponding to the three main criteria;
- 3) The weighting/score system for each key matter was 0, 1 or 2, with 0 being the lowest score due to significant constraints or delays and 2 the highest rating in relation to ability to be developed in the short term. These scores were attributed to different criteria depending on the matter being assessed. For example, in relation to Criteria 1 (Physical & Strategic Fit), the scores were allocated as follows :-
 - **0** – *Land is significantly constrained and would either delay or not be suitable for urban housing;*
 - **1** – *Land is developable with manageable constraints, may take additional work to resolve; and*
 - **2** – *Land is easy to develop – constraints will not prevent or delay development.*
- 4) Individual summary comments and recommendations of each site/submission.
- 5) Copies of the eleven (11) submissions;
- 6) Council's meeting agenda report dated 14 August 2017 titled '*Accelerated Housing Delivery Program for New Release Areas*' – Item 2; and
- 7) Council's Probity and Evaluation Plan dated 7 September 2017.

As required, we did not inspect the 11 nominated sites. Prior to commencing our review, we attended one (1) project inception meeting with Council's City Planning Manager (Natasha Baker), Strategic Planning Coordinator (Abdul Cheema) and Principal Planner (Natalie Stanowski). Table 3 details our assessment of Council's evaluation and our recommendations.

3.2 Assumptions

The following assumptions were made:-

- Council staff have accurately interpreted the development opportunities and constraints, planning policies, planning controls and State Government plans and policies applicable to each submission site.
- The peer review was not required to independently assess each submission, instead relying on the data provided in Council's assessment report. The Brief was to advise on the reasonableness and soundness of Council's recommendations and whether the conclusions and decisions reached by Council are consistent with the objectives of the assessment criteria.
- The peer review was not required to determine whether submission sites were suitable for consideration under the alternative Local Housing Strategy. This is solely at Council's discretion.

Table 3: Peer Review Assessment

Table 3: Peer Review Assessment						
Penrith City Council's Evaluation Assessment				Independent Peer Review Assessment		
Site	Total Score (100%)	Comments & Recommendations	Is site worthy of inclusion in AHDP?	Peer Review Comments	Are Council's recommendations consistent with objectives and principles of the assessment criteria?	Is site worthy of further investigation under AHDP
1 5ha	27%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The land itself does not meet the objectives of the AHDP, however the land demonstrates strong strategic merit for the investigation of future urban housing as a corridor along this section of The Northern Road. ▪ Further consideration of this land in the Local Housing Strategy is recommended. ▪ Access and noise concerns will require further resolution through a planning proposal process. 	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Site area (5ha) is significantly non-compliant with required minimum 100ha and ability to provide 1000+ lots; 2) Submission initiated by landowner with no nominated partnering with developer 3) Despite 1) above, site is physically and strategically suitable for development having achieved one of the highest scores for Criteria 1. 4) Submission failed to indicate capacity or commitment to satisfy Criteria 2 and 3. 5) No commitment to provision of infrastructure/delivery plan; <p>No demonstrated commitment to deliver critical infrastructure services in short time frame;</p>	Agree	No

<p>2 120ha</p>	<p>73.7%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The land is adjacent to existing residential land uses and is in close proximity to Penrith Health and Education Precinct and demonstrates high strategic merit. ▪ The site is considered a suitable for the Accelerated Housing Delivery Program. ▪ It is critical that further consideration of a number of matters, particularly access and arterial connections, will need to be discussed with RMS and other government agencies during the planning proposal process. ▪ The broader Orchard Hills (North) precinct should be considered in its entirety in any future planning proposal. ▪ Due to traffic and access matters, options for staging zoning and development should be explored (i.e. commence with a logical extensions, adjacent to the immediate catchment area). 	<p>Yes</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No major constraints; 2) Scored consistently well with second highest rating across Criteria 1, 2 & 3; 3) Adjacent to existing residential area and Penrith Education & Health precinct; 4) Proven land developer who developed Caddens Lane – good track record; 5) Whilst owner has direct control of 68% of landholdings and working towards securing remaining lands, the issue of fragmented ownership needs to be further investigated in terms of short term delivery. 6) Access constraints requires discussion and resolution between nominee and NSW State Government; 	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>3 48ha</p>	<p>29.7%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The land itself does not meet the objectives of the AHDP, however the land demonstrates strong strategic merit for the investigation of future urban housing as a corridor along this section of The Northern Road. 	<p>No</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Nominee stated their submission was not a 'formal' request under AHDP; 2) Site area (48ha) non-compliant with eligibility of minimum 100ha and unlikely to produce over 1,000 lots without assistance of adjacent lots; 3) Submission failed to indicate capacity or commitment to satisfy Criteria 2 and 3; 	<p>Agree</p>	<p>No</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Further consideration of this land in the Local Housing Strategy is recommended. ▪ Access and noise concerns will require further resolution through a planning proposal process. ▪ The current policy position on the rural entry into Penrith along The Northern Road would need to be addressed. 		<p>4) No commitment to provision of infrastructure/delivery plan</p> <p>5) As not a formal submission, ADHP criteria not adequately addressed in detail.</p>		
4 215ha	78%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The land has two landowners, adjacent to existing residential land uses. The land is considered to have strategic merit and will enable efficient delivery of housing and services. ▪ The site is considered a suitable site for the Accelerated Housing Delivery Program. ▪ Further discussion with government agencies regarding the impacts of the Metropolitan Rural Area and urban expansion precinct will need to be undertaken. ▪ Discussion with RMS required in respect to the capacity of proposed intersections with The Northern Road. ▪ Rural/Urban interface to The Northern Road and Chain-O -Ponds Rd will require careful management- e.g. possibility of staging development and lot sizing. 	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Scored highest of all eleven (11) sites; 2) Scored consistently well across all 3 Criteria - scored 78% ; 3) Demonstrated constraints capable of resolution; 4) Two (2) land owners with site extension to existing Glenmore Park residential area; 5) Proven land developer; 6) Land strategically well located with no major constraints except Metropolitan Rural Area (MRA) applying to part of site. 7) Recommend further investigations and discussions with relevant government agencies to determine impact of MRA in short term delivery of housing and the dwelling numbers achievable in the short term 	Agree	Yes

<p>5 700ha</p>	<p>21%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The land does not demonstrate compliance with the objectives of the AHDP. ▪ The land is located in the metropolitan rural area and is not identified within an urban investigation area or priority precinct in the Draft Greater Sydney Regional Plan, which results in the land not demonstrating high strategic merit for urban housing. ▪ The land may be subject to future transport corridors, therefore immediate housing is unable to be supported. ▪ Future development on land would be subject to future changes to regional land use planning. 	<p>No</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Under Draft Greater Sydney Regional Plan, urban development is not consistent with values of Metropolitan Rural Area – unless identified in investigation area, which subject site is not; 2) Largest of 11 sites nominated, but fragmented land ownership may inhibit short term delivery; 3) Inadequate response to Criteria 2 and 3. 4) No provision of infrastructure/delivery plan; 	<p>Agree</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>6 125ha</p>	<p>56.4%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The application has not demonstrated how services could be delivered in an accelerated nature. Given the site is not located adjacent to existing urban housing, it is not considered immediately suitable for the Accelerated Housing Delivery Program. ▪ While the land is located within the Orchard Hills Urban Investigation area, it may also be subject to future transport corridors, therefore immediate housing is unable to be supported. 	<p>No Potential strategic merit over medium term as part of Local Housing Strategy</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Flood and bushfire constraints capable of resolution with Planning Proposal; 2) Single land owner advantage; 3) Council's summary assessment indicates 1,800 dwellings potential comprising a mix of housing styles – submission notes 640 dwelling to be delivered in first 5 years (no details provided on housing types); 	<p>Agree</p>	<p>No</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land demonstrates strategic merit and the landownership may enable future efficient delivery of housing and services. Where transport corridors have been determined, the development of urban housing may be considered appropriate. Further consideration of this land in the Local Housing Strategy is recommended. 				
7 158ha	64.6%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application has not demonstrated how services could be delivered in an accelerated nature. Given the location is not located adjacent to existing urban area, the site is not considered suitable for the Accelerated Housing Delivery Program. The land ownership may enable future efficient delivery of housing and services. The land is located within the East Luddenham Urban Investigation Area, therefore development of urban development may be considered appropriate. Further consideration of this land in the Local Housing Strategy is recommended. 	No Potential strategic merit over medium term as part of Local Housing Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Third highest ranked site; Acknowledged site not adjacent to existing urban housing and potentially reduces chance of participating in AHDP; Site is potentially affected by future rail corridor which needs further clarification; Whilst locating new housing close to public transport, it is questionable this issue will be resolved in immediate future; Short term housing accommodation on perimeter of Sydney Science Park (SSP) may potentially compromise long term planning outcome for core area of SSP 	Agree	No
8 180ha	48.4%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing land use planning framework for the site does not support urban housing land uses. 	No Potential strategic merit over medium	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Two (2) committed land owners in conjunction with nominated property developer; 	Agree	No

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noting the sites location, there is potential to provide transitional housing land uses between employment land uses and existing rural residential to the east of the site. The application has not demonstrated how services could be delivered in an accelerated nature, however the landownership may enable future efficient delivery of housing and services. Further discussion with government agencies regarding the implications of the WSPGA structure plan for the site is required. 	<p>term as part of Local Housing Strategy</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 1,800 dwellings achievable; Failed to demonstrate site can be suitably serviced and lack of capability to deliver critical infrastructure; Site identified in WSPGA in Draft Greater Sydney Regional Plan; Potential for further investigations over medium term due to site area and land ownership opportunities - however service infrastructure requires further consideration. 		
<p>9 111ha</p>	15.2%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing land use planning framework does not support urban housing land uses on the site and the application has not demonstrated how services could be delivered in an accelerated nature. Therefore the site is not considered suitable under the Accelerated housing Delivery Program. The land may be subject to future transport corridors, therefore immediate housing is unable to be supported. Future development on land would be subject to future changes to regional land use planning. 	<p>No</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No demonstrated commitment to deliver critical infrastructure services in short time frame; Low overall score reflective of failure to indicate capacity or commitment to satisfy Criteria 2 and 3 - credit only given to land ownership and agreement to development; Strategic uncertainty concerning site's future regional land uses which may jeopardise medium/long term planning outcomes. 	<p>Agree</p>	<p>No</p>

10 145ha	26%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The existing land use planning framework does not support urban housing land uses. ▪ The land is subject to a number of physical constraints that make development for the purposes of urban development unlikely to be the most suitable or compatible for the land at this current time. ▪ Discussion should occur with the land owner regarding their broader property portfolio in order to consider any possible residential opportunities. 	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Physically sensitive site (high bio-diversity quality) unlikely to be capable of redevelopment in short term; 2) One of lowest scoring site in terms of Criteria 1 (physical and strategic merit) 3) Subject to flood evacuation limitations and vegetation sensitivity; 4) Single ownership with commitment to partnering with developer, which is advantageous 5) Support view that further discussions with land owners on broader property portfolio, in relation to their other landholdings not nominated in submission; 	Agree	No
11 62ha	13.8%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The existing land use planning framework does not support urban housing land uses. ▪ The land is subject to a number of physical constraints that make development for the purposes of urban development unlikely to be the most suitable or compatible for the land at this current time. ▪ Rural Residential development may be considered as a future land use, subject to physical constraints and regional planning controls. 	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Physically sensitive site (contains sensitive vegetation and natural resource sensitive land); 2) Unlikely to be redeveloped in short term; 3) Site potentially contaminated as active quarry site therefore housing may be unachievable in short term 4) Flood evacuation limitations; 5) Submission failed to indicate capacity or commitment to satisfy Criteria 2 and 3. 6) Lowest scoring site of all 11 submissions 	Agree	No

4 Conclusions

Ryan Planning Pty Ltd was engaged by Penrith Council to review Council's assessment of submissions made under the Accelerated Housing Delivery Program.

The task was to determine whether Council's evaluation was consistent with the objectives of the assessment criteria and whether recommendations were reasonable and sound as to each site's ability to provide new release housing within the 5 year short term.

A total of 11 submissions were received for evaluation.

In summary, we conclude:-

- 1) Council's merit and quantitative based assessment of the submissions was undertaken in a comprehensive and consistent manner;
- 2) Council has consistently applied and ranked the various criteria across all sites;
- 3) Council's assessment and recommendation that Sites 2 and 4 proceed to the next stage of investigation under the AHDP is endorsed.

APPENDIX A

