

**DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION CURRAWONG SITE**

On 18 November, 2010 Mr Shoebridge MLC asked the following question at the Budget Estimates Hearing No. 4 for Planning.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Is it correct there is a new development application for the Currawong site, which is going before a joint regional planning panel?

**Mr HADDAD:** I do not know the details of it.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** It is on Pittwater.

**Mr HADDAD:** I will have to take that on notice. I am not up to date with what is happening there, I am sorry. There is certainly nothing before the department.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Could you take on notice whether or not the department has been advised by the proponents that they had a 26 November deadline, by which time the developers' option to purchase the property expires?

**Mr HADDAD:** Yes, we will take that on notice.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** And whether or not you got that information from the proponents or from someone else.

**Mr HADDAD:** Okay. The briefing note I have here says that the heritage branch received on 5 October a further application for integrated development for the site from Pittwater. So we will take it on notice and send you all the information on this.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** And whether or not there had been any discussions between Pittwater Council, the department and potentially the residents, who I think raised some separate funding, in terms of getting Currawong into public hands.

**Mr HADDAD:** Okay. Could I please clarify: the Department of Planning?

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Yes.

**Mr HADDAD:** Certainly not to my knowledge, but we will clarify that.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** It may be the Department of Lands?

**Mr HADDAD:** It could well be; that is why I will take it on notice and clarify which discussions are which. I am not aware that discussions took place with the Department of Planning, but things happen probably without my knowing everything. But we will check.

---

**Answer:**

A development application for the Currawong site was submitted to Pittwater Council in September this year. The development application is for the community title subdivision of the land into 16 lots, alterations to the 9 existing cabins, the construction of 12 new dwelling houses, alterations and additions to 'Tuta' building and the heritage building 'Midholme', demolition of certain structures and ancillary infrastructure and landscaping works.

As the site is listed on the State Heritage Register, the proposed development is integrated development and requires the approval of the Heritage Council.

Under State Environmental Planning Policy No 71 – Coastal Protection, the applicant has asked that I waive the need for a Masterplan for this development application.

The Department of Planning is currently consulting with the Natural Resources Commission about this request.

The Sydney East Joint Regional Planning Panel is the consent authority for this development application.

The Department of Planning has not been advised by the proponents that they had a 26 November deadline, by which time the developer's option to purchase the property expires.

The Department is also not aware of any discussions between Pittwater Council, the Department and the residents regarding getting Currawong into public hands. This would be a matter for the Department of Lands.



**Tony Kelly MLC**  
Minister for Planning

**LAND CLEARING – SOUTHERN HIGHLAND REGIONAL SHOOTING COMPLEX AT HILLTOP Budget Estimates Committee No. 4 2010-2011 - Land Clearing Southern Highland Regional Shooting Complex at Hilltop**

On 18 November, 2010 Mr David Shoebridge MLC ask the following question at the Budget Estimates Committee No. 4 Hearing for Planning.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Is it correct that the amended approval also dealt with the clearing for the pistol range?

**Mr HADDAD:** I will have to take advice on this. I will have to take it on notice. As I said, I am happy to give you a copy of our assessment report.

**Mr GELLIBRAND:** I am not sure whether the amended approval related specifically to a pistol range but the information we have is that the amended approval related to the relocation of the 500-metre range and the connected 200-metre range. I am not sure whether one of those is the pistol range.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Is it true that the clearing for the 200-metre pistol range has been done in a place that they do not have approval for? It was consistent with the earlier approval but not in the modified approval.

**Mr HADDAD:** I cannot answer that.

**Mr GELLIBRAND:** I think we would have to take it on notice. My understanding is that the modified approval that has been granted reflects what they proposed to us on 19 October.

**Mr HADDAD:** We will check that and make sure it is undertaken. We are more than happy to give you this information because it is important that what we have approved is followed. It is another government agency and sometimes giving a penalty notice to another government agency is not supported but we did it to say that it should follow what we have approved. That is what we have done.

**Answer:**

The amended approval dealt only with relocation of the 500m range and attached 200m range. These two ranges are connected, so the relocation of one range required the relocation of the other. The application did not deal with the 50m pistol range.

However, following the issue of the amended approval, the proponent advised the Department that one of the approved plans incorrectly showed the 50m pistol range in a different location. This was a minor administrative error by the proponent and a second modification application was lodged with the Department to correct this. The land cleared for the 50m pistol range was correct and corresponds to the other approved plans.



**Tony Kelly MLC**  
Minister for Planning

**Question on Notice - Budget Estimates Committee No.4 2010-2011 - State Infrastructure Levy**

On 18 November, 2010 the Hon. Jenny Gardiner MLC asked the following question at the Budget Estimates Committee No.4 Hearing for Planning.

**CHAIR:** Can we turn to the State infrastructure levy? As we all know, Mr Rees made an announcement that instead of charging the State infrastructure levy upfront, it would be charged only when the lot was sold. We have been advised by developers and others in the voluntary housing industry that they are still being charged the State infrastructure levy upfront and that is contributing to the housing starts in New South Wales being the lowest for 50 years. Could you provide the Committee with an update as to why the Government's commitment has not been implemented to date?

**Mr HADDAD:** If you do not mind, I will update on this, but my understanding is the Minister has for some months now signed a direction which would put into effect the payment of infrastructure levy at a later stage. It may not have been announced, I would have to check on that, but I am certain that this direction has been signed.

**CHAIR:** If you would check on that?

**Mr HADDAD:** Yes. It has definitely been signed. It is probably a matter of communicating it.

**CHAIR:** It would be helpful to people in the industry if they knew.

**Mr HADDAD:** Yes, absolutely. I am surprised that is not happening but yes, from memory, he has signed it. It has been put to him and he has.

**Answer:**

The Minister for Planning has previously endorsed arrangements to allow applicants to elect to defer the payment of a special infrastructure contribution to the point after the subdivision certificate (strata or land) is issued; but prior to the transfer of the land.

Developers and industry associations were consulted when preparing these arrangements.

Formal consultation on the instruments to give effect to these arrangements commenced with councils and key industry stakeholders on 3 December 2010.

The councils and the key industry stakeholders have until 17 December 2010 to provide written submissions.



**Tony Kelly MLC**  
Minister for Planning