

.
.
. CAPITAL .
.
. . REGION
. PLANNING
.
.
.
.
.
.

CANBERRA TOWN PLANNING T/A
CAPITAL REGION PLANNING
5/32 LONSDALE STREET BRADDON
CANBERRATOWNPLANNING.COM.AU
ABN 66 131 577 261

5 July 2019

Liz Makin
Strategic Planning Manager
Yass Valley Council
PO Box 6
Yass NSW 2582

By Email: Liz.Makin@yass.nsw.gov.au

**Response to Public Submissions in relation to Planning Proposal (pp_2018_YASSV 003_00) -
Lot 5 DP838487, No. 2090 Sutton Road, Sutton**

Dear Liz,

We refer to your correspondence dated Thursday 27 June 2019, which provided copies of the public submissions received by Yass Valley Council during the public exhibition period of the abovementioned Planning Proposal.

We have reviewed the ten (10) representations and note that the main issues raised in objection to the proposal relate to:

- Traffic,
- Provision of local services and amenities,
- Inconsistency with the character of Sutton Village and its entrance,
- Water supply and security,
- Proposed zoning and minimum lot sizes,
- Impacts to agricultural land,
- Biodiversity implications,
- Property values, and
- Precedent for further similar development.

We have prepared a summary of our responses to the matters raised in the submissions and have attached it to this correspondence for your consideration.

We trust that our responses will assist Yass Valley Council with their consideration of the submissions in responding to the Department of Planning and Environment. However, should additional information be required, please do not hesitate to contact me on 0457 786 776.

Yours Sincerely,



Elizabeth Slapp
Director - Senior Town Planner



Attachment 1: Responses to submissions received

Responses to Submissions Received

| Public Submission | Response |
|---|---|
| Traffic | |
| <p>'I would only have objections if roads are left as they currently are, it will increase traffic on the road which makes it difficult to get past on emergency situations, causes higher traffic flows and road congestion leading into the village.'</p> | <p>Potential impacts associated with the proposed rezoning and subsequent subdivision of the subject land on the capacity and function of road infrastructure was subject of detailed investigation and reporting in the preparation of the current Planning Proposal.</p> <p>The process culminated in the preparation of a report prepared by Ontoit entitled 'Sutton Re-Zoning Project Traffic Impact Assessment' dated 10 July 2018. The Report established that the subject land is serviced by existing Local and National road infrastructure having sufficient operational function and capacity to cater for the future subdivision of the land as proposed by the current Planning Proposal. The Report also acknowledged the need to ensure adequacy in the design of future roads in any subsequent subdivision and that active pedestrian and cycle travel routes should be integrated into the final subdivision design.</p> <p>Should the current planning proposal come to fruition, any future subdivision of land would be subject to the preparation and submission of a fully detailed development application to Council for consideration and determination. The process will involve a more detailed reporting and planning process which will effectively guide the design of the subdivision. The assessment and determination process would be in accordance with Council adopted policy and engineering standards which, in application, will require road upgrades to a standard which is reflective of the traffic generating potential of the subdivision.</p> <p>Road design and standards would involve input from Roads and Maritime Services.</p> |
| <p>'The Master Plan identifies a potential alignment for a bypass around Sutton. Increased commuter traffic from additional developments in Gundaroo and Murrumbateman have raised the importance of this bypass to the Sutton community. Any large-scale development in Sutton would add considerable traffic to already congested roads, raising further safety concerns with residents.'</p> | <p>As above.</p> <p>Additionally, whilst the adopted Master Plan identifies a potential Village by-pass route, it also nominates the subject land as being suitable for large residential/rural residential release. The current planning proposal in no way compromises the importance of acknowledging the need for the by-pass and/or its benefits to the local community should it come to fruition.</p> |
| <p>'Have significant concerns regarding traffic management issues resulting from such a large development. This will be an issue during construction of dwellings and residents post construction.'</p> | <p>As above.</p> <p>As a condition of development consent granted for the subdivision of the land, the Yass Valley Council can require the submission of a construction traffic management plan (CTMP) for approval prior to any construction works commencing. In short, the CTMP would assess any likely traffic impacts on the Local road network created by the construction of the development.</p> |

| Public Submission | Response |
|---|--|
| 'The increased traffic onto the Old Federal Highway would be a visual and user hazard to the current users including cyclists as to the location of the proposed road entry point.' | As above. |
| 'The Tulip farm has a minimum of 1000 cars over the opening period which has caused congestion crossing from the Old Federal highway to the new highway. Cars have been backed up on the old federal highway both to and from point of entry to the tulip farm for lengthy periods. The crossing of the New Federal Highway is a night mare with traffic travelling at 110km + and cars rushing to cross to return to Canberra. This impacts on the Macs Reef Rd intersection with cars taking risks to enter or cross the intersection due to delays and merging lane as blocking view of oncoming traffic as people have no idea as to how to use it appropriately and safely.' | As above. |
| 'The PP, if executed in it's present form, will result in considerable additional traffic onto roads that will be unable to cope. This will cause more noise and congestion and potentially compromise road safety. Of course these hazards will be greatly exacerbated during the years the proposed lots are being developed and while houses are being built. At the very least, the PP should not proceed until after the proposed village bypass has been completed.' | As above. |
| 'Road access is a major issue. Particularly; the Mac's Reef Rd southbound exit onto the Federal Highway is already an ongoing disaster (see it every day) and with an increased outflow from the development from the old Federal Highway would then place slow moving entering traffic into both lanes. The proposed development will exacerbate an existing major collision risk.' | As above. |
| Provision of Local Services and Amenities | |
| 'I am not opposed if the application factors in required extensions to land and buildings required for the local school, road upgrades. Childcare spots, bike lanes along east Tallagandra / Mulligans Flat (route into Gungahlin).' | <p data-bbox="1131 981 2042 1181">It has to be acknowledged that rezoning is the first step in the process in recognising the development strategies contained in the Sutton Village Master Plan. Should the current planning proposal come to fruition, any future subdivision of land would be subject to the preparation and submission of a fully detailed development application to Council for consideration and determination. The process will involve a more detailed reporting and planning process, which will effectively guide the design of the subdivision.</p> <p data-bbox="1131 1189 2042 1308">Coupled with the adopted Master Plan, Council's adopted Development Contributions Plan 2018 enables Council to levy developer contributions as part of the subdivision process for the purpose of effecting improvements in Council infrastructure and assets such as roads, open space and recreation.</p> |

| Public Submission | Response |
|---|---|
| | <p>The current planning proposal incorporates a subdivision design concept which incorporates the likes of an equestrian trail, pedestrian/cycle paths and nominated open space/parkland, which will connect the subdivision with the existing village.</p> <p>In relation to NSW Department of Education assets, neither Council or a proponent of a development have the ability to effect upgrades and/or expansion to existing schools. If the rezoning and subsequent subdivision comes to fruition, an increase in overall village population is likely (over the long term) to result in an increase in the school community, which may influence the Department of Education in evaluating the need for upgrades/expansion of its asset.</p> |
| <p>'Greatly increased...population will exceed the capability of existing amenities.'</p> | <p>The planning proposal incorporates a subdivision design concept comprising 67 lots generally ranging between 5,000m² and 40 hectares. The design concept is generally in keeping with the Sutton Village Master Plan and has been purposeful in recognition of the existing character of the village, the desire of the local community in preserving the village character and environmental/biodiversity constraints.</p> <p>As discussed above, should the planning proposal come to fruition, the actual subdivision process would be subject to more detailed design reflective of Council's adopted land use strategies, Codes and Policies.</p> |
| <p>'A new development as large as the size of Sutton seems an ideal opportunity to complement existing public space with additional accessible areas... Public space could take the form of green ways (as is common in neighbouring Bywong and Murrumbateman) and/or be amalgamated with a proposed wildlife corridor and landscape protection zone to reduce the visual impact of dwellings on the ridgeline overlooking Sutton.'</p> | <p>The current planning proposal incorporates parkland, equestrian and pedestrian trails and a 'green zone' along the Yass River, which is designed to effectively preclude building within 100 metres of the River albeit within individual lot entitlements.</p> <p>In context with the site's environmental and biodiversity values, the planning proposal also provides for over 100 hectares of land to be zoned E3 Environmental Management with corresponding minimum lot sizes of 20ha and 40ha. This land will be managed under a stewardship agreement/s, which will both improve and maintain the land's environmental and biodiversity values in perpetuity. This land (albeit private) will form a large expanse of open space, which will link with the open space areas to the north of Guise Street and function as a wildlife corridor.</p> <p>Public parklands and street tree plantings have also been considered desirable but, would be subject to further investigation and Council endorsement as part of any future subsequent subdivision process.</p> <p>As discussed above Council's adopted Development Contributions Plan 2018 enables Council to levy developer contributions as part of the subdivision process for the purpose of effecting improvements in Council infrastructure and assets such as roads, open space and recreation.</p> |

| Public Submission | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>'...other than the proposed fire trail, the PP (unlike the greenways provided in Murrumbateman and Bywong/Wamboin), does not appear to provide for significant public open space. The PP provides an opportunity to set aside accessible public open space including habitat corridors, perhaps linking up with the existing vacant Crown Land abutting the north of Guise Street.'</p> | <p>As above.</p> <p>The current planning proposal provides an illustrative concept plan, which depicts a possible land use/subdivision pattern. Public open space is shown to be incorporated within the concept subdivision design and it is the intent of the proponent that public open space be shown in any future subdivision design for the land.</p> <p>The provision of open space and its location and connectivity within the subdivision and to Sutton Village generally, would be subject to detailed design in accordance with Council requirements. Noting that Council is likely to have ultimate management and maintenance responsibilities.</p> |
| <p>'Lack of reticulated sewerage services for such a large residential development, combined with water stress, would undoubtedly have a negative impact on the water table and impact the environment and others.'</p> | <p>The potential impact associated with the future development of the land on local water sources has been considered by way of site-specific investigation and reporting.</p> <p>The process culminated in the preparation of a report prepared by Franklin Consulting Australia Pty Ltd entitled 'Soil and Water Lot 5 DP 838497, Sutton Land Capability Assessment' dated 29 May 2018.</p> <p>The Report concludes that the proposed land use zones and corresponding minimum lot size requirements as nominated in the planning proposal would cater for the provision of compliant, environmentally sustainable, on-site sewage management without risk to sensitive receiving catchments.</p> |
| <p>'The Sutton Primary School risks being overloaded and there's no option for a High School for new residents. As an example, the ACT have recently restricted access/enrolment to nearby northern ACT schools and new residents will need to arrange distant schooling from a suboptimal selection. There are also issues with accessing over border ACT hospitals & other services.'</p> | <p>In relation to NSW Department of Education assets, neither Council or a proponent of a development have the ability to effect upgrades and/or expansion to existing schools. If the rezoning and subsequent subdivision comes to fruition, an increase in overall village population is likely, over the long term, to result in an increase in the school community which may influence the Department of Education in evaluating the need for upgrades/expansion of its asset.</p> |
| Inconsistency with the character of Sutton Village and its entrance | |
| <p>'The proposed re-development covers an area larger than the village of Sutton itself and detracts from the village atmosphere and lifestyle'.</p> | <p>The current planning proposal provides a illustrative concept plan depicting a possible land use/subdivision pattern, which is generally reflective of the directions and goals of the Yass Valley Settlement Strategy and the development outcomes identified in the Sutton Village Master Plan.</p> |

Public Submission

Response

There is no question that the subdivision of the land and the subsequent development of individual lots within the subdivision will result in a change in the character and dynamics within the existing Village environment. However, the planning proposal has recognised the need to maintain a village atmosphere by adopting a potential lot size far in excess of that currently apparent in the Village. The size of the lots would effectively create a visual land use transition zone between adjoining rural land holdings and the Village.

Further, it would be fair to say that the Proponent has actively pursued the need to fully assess the land's development capabilities in context with its environmental and biodiversity values and the perceived desired future character of the Township of Sutton and surrounding lands.

By doing so, the Proponent has demonstrated a strong commitment to due process and the need for careful site planning and design. Should the current planning proposal come to fruition, this same commitment will continue to be pursued through the development process with the aim to produce sustainable housing and lifestyle opportunities in which the preservation and conservation of the land's environmental and biodiversity values are duly recognised and appreciated.

For instance, at the time of subdivision, suitably worded positive covenants (or Community Title By-Laws) could be created over the proposed R5 Large Lot Residential zoned allotments on which low to moderate quality Box Gum Woodland has been identified. The covenants / by-laws could:

- Require the establishment of a suitably located building / effluent disposal / APZ envelope;
- Preclude development outside of the nominated envelope; and
- Prohibit the removal of trees.

The location of the nominated envelopes would be at the discretion of Council and would be subject to site investigation prior to the preparation of the final plan of subdivision, having particular regard to the protection of existing trees and the type of boundary fencing. Such initiatives would work to reduce any potential visual impacts to the Village, particularly along Sutton Road to the south.

'While the community recognised the need for expansion of the village, there was also a strong view that the character of the village entrance should be maintained. What has been proposed, specifically the size and number of blocks along Sutton Road, will change the entrance to the village dramatically.'

As above.

There is no question that the subdivision as depicted in the illustrative concept plan will change the visual character of the Village more specifically, along Sutton Road to the south. However, the proposed lot size, suitably located building envelopes, retention of trees and potential orientation to an internal road network will effectively reduce any potential impact.

| Public Submission | Response |
|---|---|
| '...the PP envisages a truly massive development that fails to harmonise with the present village character and the present agricultural uses in the surrounding area.' | As above. |
| 'The large scale of development will destroy the quiet rural ambiance and character of Sutton Village.' | As above. |
| 'The block sizing would take away from the area of Sutton village and surrounds by subdividing this lot into such small land holdings.' | As above. |
| Water supply and security | |
| 'We would consider it essential that an investigation be undertaken by council into the impact of any further demand on the existing supply. Specifically, the impact on supply if every new resident were able to sink a bore. Consideration should alternatively be given to a community bore'. | <p>The potential impact associated with the future development of the land on local water sources has been considered by way of site-specific investigation and reporting. The process culminated in the preparation of a report prepared by Franklin Consulting Australia Pty Ltd entitled 'Soil and Water Lot 5 DP 838497, Sutton Land Capability Assessment' dated 29 May 2018.</p> <p>In part, the Report concludes that the proposed land use zones and corresponding minimum lot size requirements as nominated in the planning proposal would cater for the provision of compliant, environmentally sustainable on-site sewage management without compromising sensitive receiving catchments.</p> <p>Furthermore, future development of the subject land would not be reliant on the provision of a reticulated town water supply. Any future subdivision and development of the land would rely on roof rainwater catchment, storage and reuse, which is a viable water supply for rural/residential purposes.</p> <p>In addressing the likelihood of bore extraction, the Report concludes that the likely demand for new bores would be low given the likely adequacy of roof catchment areas and storage tank requirements, the small size of the lots (therefore limited need for non-potable water) and cost to install/operate. The requirement for a 250-metre buffer between bores and effluent disposal areas also makes bore extraction unfeasible for many of the smaller lots. The installation of a surface water storage (dam) on each, or some, of the lots would also generally be prohibited as the Harvestable Right attributable to each newly created lot would be inadequate for a feasible dam storage to be constructed.</p> <p>The augmentation of roof catchment and tank storage water supply with groundwater and/or surface water dams on the larger lots is however, a viable proposition provided the minimum 250 metre buffer from effluent disposal and/or Harvestable Rights provisions can be met.</p> |

| Public Submission | Response |
|--|---|
| | <p>The suite of measures to provide a viable non-potable water supply to each dwelling lot will be detailed as part of the detailed subdivision design process and will include possible avoidance and mitigation measures designed to limit potential impact on water sources within the immediate catchment.</p> <p>Finally, the current planning proposal is considered to be suitable noting that there is no intent to remove existing statutory land use controls as prescribed by the Yass Valley Local Environmental Plan 2013 and Council's obligations to consider potential impact.</p> |
| <p>'Landholders are entitled to sink new groundwater bores as long as they meet Water NSW distance requirements, which many of the proposal's non-village lots will. There are no limits or metering on water taken from bores for stock or domestic (including swimming pools, lawns, gardens) use.'</p> | <p>As above.</p> |
| <p>'Any additional development is likely to rely on an unguaranteed supply of potable water trucked in from the ACT, and on new groundwater bores which will further reduce an already depleted resource and impact on existing resident's water security. Indeed the Yass Valley Settlement Strategy (YVSS) states that "Any substantial increase to the village without an alternate reticulated water supply will have serious consequences for the existing residents of the village as well as the agricultural uses in the area". This alone should be reason enough for not allowing a development of this size to continue.'</p> | <p>The Yass Village Settlement Strategy was adopted by Council in September 2017. The Strategy identified that development in Sutton is constrained due a lack of secure water supply and that only limited future development would be considered.</p> <p>Following the adoption of the Strategy, the Sutton Village Master Plan was adopted by Council in December 2017. Both Strategies were subject to a public consultation process.</p> <p>The current conceptual development scheme is generally reflective of the requirements of the Master Plan. Notwithstanding, potential impacts on water supply and security has been addressed in the Report prepared by Franklin Consulting Australia Pty Ltd entitled 'Soil and Water Lot 5 DP 838497, Sutton Land Capability Assessment' dated 29 May 2018 and have been discussed above.</p> |
| <p>'We are of the opinion that within the new development that owners will pump from the river as council will not keep an eye on this.'</p> | <p>Whilst the expressed concern is acknowledged, it is not a sustainable ground on which to determine the suitability of the current planning proposal. The issue would become regulatory matter for the Department of Primary Industries pursuant to the provisions of the Water Management Act 2000.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to prohibit the creation of additional Riparian Rights along the Yass River by incorporating the entire riparian zone within one larger allotment. This would result in no net change to the number of Riparian Rights along the Yass River frontage. This proposition would be investigated further as part of the subdivision design.</p> |

| Public Submission | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>'The Sutton Rural Fire Service accesses the Yass River for fire fighting purposes and fill trucks for both, training, bush fire season and the river also filters into the Yass Town Water supply. The impact of no water for the fire service would certainly impede any protection of the village and surrounding areas and the Yass supply. With the development this would increase the demand on an already fragile river that locals do not consider or think about when overuse of water has such an impact.'</p> | <p>As above.</p> |
| <p>'...owners of lots larger than 5,000 square metres may be able to apply for sinking a bore. If this is the case, then the potential for up to 47 additional bores is a very real concern... Since 2004, the underground water supply has become much more precarious and in the most recent Summer, there were many reports of bores running completely dry. If a significant number of additional bores were to be sunk as a consequence of the proposed development, this would put our underground aquifers at risk and make local water security an even greater issue than it is at present.</p> | <p>As above.</p> |
| Proposed zoning and minimum lot sizes | |
| <p>'If the current proposal is given approval to proceed, then it would seem reasonable to consider allowing smaller block sizes on Guise and Moorong Street's. The lifestyle and outlook of residents on both these streets will be greatly impacted by the development.'</p> | <p>There is no obligation on the Council to consider a reduction in the minimum lot size of those lands mentioned in the submission. Additionally, such a reduction would be contrary to the directions and goals of the Yass Valley Settlement Strategy and development outcomes of the Master Plan.</p> <p>There is no question that if the planning proposal and future subdivision of the land come to fruition, the visual character and amenity currently enjoyed by those properties opposite fronting Guise Street and to a lesser extent, Moorong Road will change. However, potential lot size (5,000m²) and shape will provide opportunities in the siting and design of future dwellings which will help maintain established amenity, scenic quality and lifestyle choice.</p> |

| Public Submission | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>'The development proposal however indicates a ribbon of RU5 lots extending all the way along to the end of Guise Street and encroaching well into larger rural residential blocks on either side. This conflicts with the indicated lot sizes allowed by the Master Plan, as well as the Master Plan objective - To ensure that all new and infill development reflects the existing or preferred character of the surrounding neighbourhood.'</p> | <p>The Sutton Village Master Plan, if rigidly applied, has the potential to enable the subdivision of land along Guise Street into lots ranging in area from 5,000m² (R2 Zoned land) to 2.5 hectares (E4 Zone land) subject to detailed environmental investigation. However, the proposed zone boundaries and corresponding potential lot size/yield as promoted by the Plan are only indicative and have not been subject to detailed investigation and environmental reporting to the extent undertaken in support of the current planning proposal. It being noted, that the area of the subject land nominated in the Master Plan as E4 having a corresponding minimum lot size of 2.5 hectares is proposed to be zoned E3 under the current planning proposal having a minimum lot size of 20 hectares in reflection of the biodiversity values. This land-use and minimum lot size zoning is reflective of the outcomes of ongoing correspondence with the Department of Office and Environment and Yass Valley Council during the preparation of the planning proposal.</p> |
| <p>'This area south-east of Sutton consists entirely of 2.5ha lots (R5 and environmental E2) and infiltration of a tongue of village lots into a rural landscape doesn't comply with either the Master Plan or the YVSS. It also extends the village zone in new direction well away from the current core, and over a prominent treed ridgeline where it will have a significant negative visual impact when viewed from Sutton Road.</p> | <p>As above.</p> |
| <p>'The 150 lots allowed for in the Master Plan (and by extension the 70 lots allowed for in this development) are clearly set out as a maximum number, and not a target. If investigations and resulting physical and environmental constraints determine there is space for fewer lots than this in the development area then so be it.'</p> | <p>As above.</p> <p>In response to the adoption of the Sutton Village Master Plan, the proponent has worked in close collaboration with a team of technical consultants to prepare a concept re-zoning and development scheme that is sympathetic to the environmental and biodiversity attributes of the land. Whilst the proposed scheme defers from the Master Plan as it applies to nominated land use, proposed zone boundaries and minimum lot size requirements, the proposal will result in an environmentally superior outcome that generates a similar development yield.</p> <p>Specifically, the proposed scheme will avoid land identified as being unsuitable for future development and will conserve the bulk of the moderate, high and very high-quality vegetation in up to four (4) suitably sized stewardship sites. These stewardship sites will provide 'in perpetuity' protection and enhancement of the biodiversity values of the land. To further ensure optimal regulatory control over those lots, an environmental management zoning is proposed with specified minimum lot sizes of 20 and 40 hectares respectively.</p> <p>The balance of the land is noted to be of low environmental significance, although the large stand of yellow box and related trees is to be retained on large allotments. Part of this land is proposed to be zoned to accommodate a sympathetic extension to the Sutton Village, with a minimum lot size of 5,000m².</p> |

| Public Submission | Response |
|---|---|
| | <p>The proposed R5 Large Lot Residential zone will have a minimum area provision of 1.5 hectares, with the opportunity to reduce the minimum lot size to 5,000m² (where justified) to provide a more responsive design outcome. Notwithstanding that provision, the overall lot yield across that zone cannot exceed the yield possible if all lots were a minimum of 1.5 hectares. Accordingly, the number and density will be the same, but the lot layout can be more responsive to site conditions including tree retention, topography, aspect, and drainage lines.</p> |
| <p>'The proposed RU5 lots opposite and opposite the acreage lots of my neighbours, therefore do not appear to comply with either the SMP or the YVSS.'</p> | <p>As above.</p> |
| <p>'The YVC figure of 70 lots referred to above should be seen as a maximum, not a target and the final number of blocks should reflect all of the land and environmental considerations, without giving excessive weight to trying to make up any shortfall in the number of blocks caused by constraints associated with where, and how many, E3 and R5 lots can be provided by, for example, continuing the RU5 blocks down the full length of Guise Street.'</p> | <p>As above.</p> |
| <p>The SMP states that "Battleaxe allotments will only be approved in exceptional circumstances." However there is a battleaxe lot proposed One could be forgiven for feeling that this suggests that, despite what the SMP says, excessive weight has been given to maximising the number of lots in the proposed development.</p> | <p>The current planning proposal provides a illustrative concept plan depicting a possible land use/subdivision pattern which is generally reflective of the development outcomes identified in the Sutton Village Master Plan.</p> <p>Should the current planning proposal come to fruition, any future subdivision of land would be subject to the preparation and submission of a fully detailed development application to Council for consideration and determination. The process will involve a more detailed reporting and planning process, which will effectively guide the design of the subdivision. The assessment and determination process would be in accordance with Council adopted policy.</p> |
| <p>'I still believe firmly that the amount of blocks has to be reduced by increasing the size of them to a minimum 20 acres per block and section/lot number to retain the history of the area by controlling over development.'</p> | <p>This is a personal observation and should have no relevance in determining the appropriateness of the planning proposal. The proposed rezoning and corresponding lot size have been determined based on acknowledged biodiversity values and Village character.</p> |
| <p>'The YVSS recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ no significant development of Sutton ▪ protection of Sutton's village character ▪ directing the majority of growth to Yass and Murrumbateman ▪ reducing sprawl around Sutton <p>The Cartwright's proposal alone aims to more than double the area of Sutton, and add an additional 70 (75% of current population) houses. In no terms of measurement can this be considered not significant.'</p> | <p>The Yass Village Settlement Strategy was adopted by Council in September 2017. Following the adoption of the Strategy, the Sutton Village Master Plan was adopted by Council in December 2017. Both Strategies were subject to a public consultation process.</p> <p>The current conceptual development scheme is generally reflective of the requirements of the Master Plan.</p> |

| Public Submission | Response |
|--|--|
| Impacts to Agricultural Land | |
| <p>'The current proposal directly contravenes the directions and goals encompassed in the local and state planning frameworks above in that it removes rather than protects productive agricultural land for future food generation.'</p> | <p>The current planning proposal facilitates the orderly and proper release of existing agricultural lands for residential purposes in accordance with adopted strategic and statutory planning policy. The release of the land for residential purposes would have no significant impact on agricultural worth in the region and any potential land use conflict at the interface with existing agricultural lands, can be managed through sustainable subdivision design reflective of the existing land use activities and the natural environment.</p> |
| Biodiversity | |
| <p>'Ecological investigations of the proposed development site have identified a significant area of Yellow Box / Blakely's Red Gum Woodland to be rezoned as E3 and placed into stewardship. Doing so, however, will isolate this habitat from the ecologically significant Sutton "Common" bordered by Guise and Morwong Streets... A wildlife corridor should be incorporated into the proposed design to link these two habitats, where it could also function as public open space. A suggested location would be along the ridge linking the two areas, where it would include high concentrations of old-growth paddock trees, and protect the high landscape value the forested ridgeline currently affords Sutton...'</p> | <p>The subject land has established noteworthy biodiversity values, which have been subject to extensive reporting as part of the planning proposal.</p> <p>The current planning proposal acknowledges these values through the nomination of appropriate land use zones and corresponding minimum lots size requirements designed to control and regulate the orderly and proper development of the land.</p> <p>Stewardships lots having a minimum lot size ranging between 20ha and 40ha are proposed in those areas of the site recognised as having high biodiversity values. Effectively, the proposed zoning and lot size, if endorsed, would create opportunity to subdivide the area into three 20ha lots and one 40ha lot having a clear connectivity with habitat opportunities to the north of Guise Street and beyond. The size and shape of the lots would more than adequately cater for the erection of dwellings and associated outbuildings, their access arrangements, on-site sewage management and asset protection zones without significantly impacting on biodiversity values.</p> <p>Accordingly, the creation of a wildlife corridor as recommended by the submission is not considered warranted.</p> |
| Property Values | |
| <p>'Having small RU5 Village lots abutting built on 2.6ha lots such can be expected to have a deleterious impact on the value of these acreage properties.'</p> | <p>The impact on property values is not a sustainable ground on which to determine the appropriateness of the current planning proposal.</p> |
| Precedent for further similar development | |
| <p>'...any rezoning of rural agricultural land to (rural) residential land will set an undesirable precedent for all rural areas surrounding Sutton, leading to a potential further decrease in productive rural lands.'</p> | <p>The rezoning and development assessment and approval process is prescribed in legislation and are all encompassing. Due process would have to be followed. Endorsing the current planning proposal will not establish an undesirable precedent in the application of legislation.</p> |

| Public Submission | Response |
|---|-----------|
| 'If the development was passed this would then open the flood gates for major developers like Alex Brinkmeyer to reach approval easier and convert the village into a major suburb matching land titles of nearby Gungahlin suburbs.' | As above. |
