

HOLTZE URBAN AREA PLAN

Community consultation: Thematic summary

The following presents a summary of consultation outcomes that contributed to the Holtze Area Plan. Consultation feedback is categorised by theme and further segmented by issues raised. A response to each issue is provided alongside the outcome within the Land Use Plan (or the next stage of draft materials for consultation as the case may be).

The Holtze Urban Area Plan project involved two public consultation periods, the first of which was coordinated by the Northern Territory Planning Commission with the second stage being statutory exhibition managed by the Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Logistics (DIPL). Consultation occurred during the periods below:

Consultation Stage	Period	Consultation Managed by:
Stage 1 Community Consultation.	13 May 2015 – 26 June 2015 (six weeks)	NT Planning Commission
Statutory Exhibition of Planning Scheme Amendment.	4 September 2015 – 2 October 2015 (four weeks)	DIPL

Contents

Stage 1 community consultation - summary of themes	3
THEME 1: Proposed hospital and medical precinct	3
THEME 2: Proposed ‘Commercial’ area	3
THEME 3: Proposed ‘Service Commercial’ area	4
THEME 4: Impacts to the environment and existing residents	4
THEME 5: Roads	5
THEME 6: Glyde Arterial Corridor	6
THEME 7: Proposed urban development	6
THEME 8: Sport and recreation	7
THEME 9: Policy and process.....	9
THEME 10: 145 Howard Springs Road (Kowandi site)	10
THEME 11: Build Weddell.....	10
Statutory Exhibition of Planning Scheme Amendment - summary of themes	11
THEME 1: Land use certainty	11
THEME 2: Rural character and amenity	11
THEME 3: Environment	13
THEME 4: Road Network	14
THEME 5: Service and social infrastructure.....	14
THEME 6: Consultation process.....	14
THEME 7: Previous ‘Service Commercial’ area.....	15

Stage 1 community consultation - summary of themes

THEME 1: Proposed hospital and medical precinct		
Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Hospital and medical precinct location		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the location of the proposed hospital and medical precinct. • General support for aged care associated with the proposed hospital and medical precinct. • Small number opposed hospital and medical precinct in proposed location. 	Noted.	<p>Location for the hospital and medical precinct to remain as proposed.</p> <p>No change required/implemented.</p>
Issue 2: Land within close proximity to the proposed hospital and medical precinct		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for urban development and a range of social infrastructure surrounding the proposed hospital and medical precinct. • Minor opposition to urban development around proposed hospital and medical precinct. 	Noted.	Urban development shown in proximity of the hospital and medical precinct retained.

THEME 2: Proposed 'Commercial' area		
Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: location of commercial area adjacent hospital and medical precinct		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the location of the small commercial area proposed adjacent the hospital and medical precinct. • Minor opposition to commercial development in Holtze generally with concern it may compete with the Palmerston CBD. 	Noted.	<p>Location of the commercial area remains as proposed.</p> <p>No change required/implemented.</p>

THEME 3: Proposed 'Service Commercial' area

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Location of proposed 'Service Commercial' area		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally strong opposition to the proposed Service Commercial area shown and belief that it is unwarranted and inappropriately located. Small number support the Service Commercial area shown as an extension to the existing service commercial area of Yarrawonga. Other areas were suggested as better locations for Service Commercial land uses. 	<p>The Commission is of the view there is sufficient available land appropriately zoned in the general vicinity.</p> <p>Provision of Service Commercial land needs to be reviewed holistically as part of work to prepare the Litchfield Subregional Land Use Plan.</p>	Deletion of 'Service Commercial' land shown blue in the draft Area Plan.

THEME 4: Impacts to the environment and existing residents

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Impact on the environment		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General concerns for the natural environment, wildlife habitat, endangered species, sensitive environments, and water resources such as groundwater. Concerns development will create stormwater runoff issues and negatively impact natural waterways such as Mitchell Creek, and best practice stormwater management should be implemented by the Area Plan. Suggestions for the Area Plan to include conservation areas and native habitat corridors for wildlife. Suggestions the Area Plan lacks consideration of climate change. 	<p>Draft Planning Principles respond to the natural environment, landform and constraints, and drainage and stormwater issues associated with the locality.</p> <p>Open space will be provided for as required by the NT Planning Scheme.</p>	No change required/implemented
Issue 2: Impact on existing residents and the rural amenity		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern development associated with the Area Plan will negatively impact the rural amenity and lifestyle of existing residents including emotional, physical and financial impacts on residents. 	The close proximity of Holtze to Palmerston CBD and existing infrastructure make it a suitable and appropriate location for future urban development.	Deletion of 'Residential' shown as pink, from all land north of the Glyde Arterial Corridor.

THEME 4: Impacts to the environment and existing residents

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestions to retain native bushland and provide areas of open space to reflect the existing rural amenity. Suggestion existing land use of properties on Wallaby Holtze Road remain unchanged with a natural buffer behind existing lots. 	<p>The Commission is of the view the Glyde Arterial forms a natural zoning boundary; therefore property to the north of the Arterial should remain rural living.</p>	

THEME 5: Roads

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: local roads		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed local road connection between 60 and 70 Wallaby Holtze Road is not supported. Suggest putting a local road connection and drain between 50 and 60 Wallaby Holtze Road to address drainage issues 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Land north of the Glyde Arterial Corridor no longer identified for change.</p>	<p>Deletion of 'Service Commercial' blue and 'Residential' pink, and all associated road networks.</p>
Issue 2: Function of the arterial road network		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns development associated with the Area Plan will negatively impact traffic flow of the Stuart Highway in the locality. Support was given for the Planning Principle of 'limited and controlled access' to and from arterials. Suggestions to improve and plan for good public transport. 	<p>A Transport and Traffic Assessment for the Stuart Highway/ Temple Terrace intersection upgrade was conducted which includes recommendations to accommodate future growth.</p> <p>The Arterial network proposed allows for good public transport.</p>	<p>No change required/ implemented.</p>
Issue 3: Impacts of the arterial road network		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development adjacent the arterial roads should consider noise issues and respond to Traffic Noise Policy. General concern for pedestrian safety and connectivity across arterial roads. Suggestions for the Area Plan to graphically identify key pedestrian and cycle route connections to key transport routes, shared use networks, and commercial centres. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Signalised pedestrian crossings will be provided at the upgraded Stuart Highway/ Temple Terrace intersection to provide for safe crossing in all directions.</p> <p>The draft plan identifies key pedestrian/ cycle networks specifically connection points with the historic North</p>	<p>Revised Area Plan identifies additional pedestrian/ cycle networks north of the proposed hospital and medical precinct.</p>

THEME 5: Roads

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
	Australian Rail Corridor pathway.	

THEME 6: Glyde Arterial Corridor

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Alignment		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The re-alignment of the Glyde Arterial Corridor was generally not supported. The existing alignment of the Glyde Arterial Corridor was generally supported as it provides a 200m buffer to existing residents. Suggested land uses for the buffer include retaining natural bushland or providing rural residential lots. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Land north of the Glyde Arterial Corridor no longer identified for change.</p>	<p>Realignment of the Glyde Arterial Corridor to a distance of at least 150 metres south of the rear boundary of properties fronting Wallaby Holtze Road.</p>

THEME 7: Proposed urban development

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Lot sizes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for urban lots sizes in close proximity to the proposed hospital and medical precinct. Urban lot sizes were generally not supported north of the Glyde Arterial Corridor with some preference for no urban lots within the Litchfield Municipality or rural area. Suggestions included providing a transition of lot sizes from higher urban densities near the hospital and medical precinct to lower densities further away. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Commission is of the view the Glyde Arterial forms a natural zoning boundary; therefore property to the north of the Arterial should remain rural living.</p> <p>The Commission is of the view the area adjoining the proposed commercial area, and adjacent to the hospital is sufficient land to incorporate the principles of the Compact Urban Design Policy recently adopted into the Planning Scheme.</p>	<p>Deletion of 'Residential' shown as pink, from all land north of the Glyde Arterial Corridor.</p> <p>Amendment of the indicative area for higher densities around the commercial area to better illustrate the extent of the compact and walkable neighbourhood.</p>
Issue 2: Extent of urban land uses		

THEME 7: Proposed urban development

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for urban residential development in close proximity of proposed hospital site. Urban land uses were generally opposed outside of the proposed hospital and medical precinct, specifically north of the Glyde Arterial Corridor with some opposing urban land uses north of the Stuart Highway. High levels of mosquito numbers in the Holtze area was raised as argument against higher residential densities in the locality. Suggestions for the expansion of the Area Plan boundary. Suggestions for the reduction of the Area Plan boundary to not include Wallaby Holtze Road properties. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Commission is of the view the Glyde Arterial forms a natural zoning boundary; therefore property to the north of the Arterial should remain rural living and outside of the Area Plan boundary.</p> <p>Development of the Greater Holtze area depends on mosquito mitigation measures. Planning Principle 9(d) guides a reduction in residential density where land is affected by constraints such as biting insects.</p>	<p>Deletion of 'Residential' shown as pink, from all land north of the Glyde Arterial Corridor.</p>
Issue 3: Design aspects		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support was given for compact walkable neighbourhoods serviced by attractive active transport corridors and social infrastructure. Support was given to the protection of escarpment areas and the rail corridor. Aspects of tropical design, housing innovation, and sustainability were mentioned and encouraged. 	<p>The Commission is of the view the area adjoining the proposed commercial area, and adjacent to the hospital is sufficient land to incorporate the principles of the Compact Urban Design Policy recently adopted into the Planning Scheme.</p> <p>Planning Principle 9 provides for desirable housing outcomes.</p>	<p>Amendment of the indicative area for higher densities around the commercial area to better illustrate the extent of the compact and walkable neighbourhood.</p>

THEME 8: Sport and recreation

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Social Infrastructure		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support was given for the development of a sporting complex on Crown Land Suggestions were made that a Social Infrastructure Assessment should be completed for the study area and adhered to. 	<p>Principle 10 guides development to meet the social infrastructure needs of the community.</p> <p>A Social Infrastructure Assessment for the greater</p>	<p>No change required/implemented.</p>

THEME 8: Sport and recreation

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
	Litchfield Area has been conducted as part of work to develop the Litchfield Subregional Land Use Plan.	

THEME 9: Policy and process

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Planning policies		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments that policy is out of touch with Territorian values and needs. 	<p>Comments Noted.</p> <p>Specific policies referred to are unclear and may be the 'Subdivision and Development Guidelines', 'NT <i>Planning Act 1999</i>', 'NT Planning Scheme' or other</p>	No change required/implemented.
Issue 2: Draft Planning Principles		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't agree with Planning Principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Provide housing choice in appropriate locations by ... 10. Provide community purpose sites to meet the needs of Holtze future urban residents by ... 11. Provide a range of lot sizes suitable for bulky goods retail and smaller enterprises, within a development that provides an interconnected local road network and buffers to adjoining residential land. 	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Planning Principle 11 removed as it relates directly to the deleted 'Service Commercial' area shown blue on the draft plan.</p>
Issue 3: Planning process		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments that the public has little confidence in the planning process and that the government doesn't listen to residents. Comments that it is good to see NTPC out consulting with public. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Public consultation occurred over six weeks between 13 May and 26 June 2015 using varied methods of communications.</p>	No change required/implemented.

THEME 10: 145 Howard Springs Road (Kowandi site)

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Consideration of future development of 145 Howard Springs Road		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is a strategic land parcel due to location Proposed transport routes will have implications for the sites future development Consideration should be had of the site to assist in the provision for future housing and transport routes. The Area Plan should acknowledge the development potential of the site and be included within the Area Plan boundary. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Draft Area Plan identifies future road connections to 145 Howard Springs Road.</p> <p>Future strategic planning to look at the broader area.</p>	No change required/implemented.

THEME 11: Build Weddell

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Build Weddell to accommodate additional population		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various suggestions to build Weddell as an alternative to urban development within Holtze. 	<p>The government still prioritises the future development of Weddell as the next urban centre for Greater Darwin.</p> <p>The close proximity of Holtze to Palmerston CBD and existing infrastructure make Holtze a cost effective, viable and appropriate location for future urban development.</p>	No change required/implemented.

Statutory Exhibition of Planning Scheme Amendment - summary of themes

THEME 1: Land use certainty		
Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Land uses are too general.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to the proposed Zone FD / land uses shown, as they are too broad with what can be developed and development constraints should be clearly defined. • Detailed plans would give clearer understanding of the proposal and provide parameters for future development • Intended densities outside the walkable catchment should be identified. 	<p>Zone FD is an interim zone identifying an area intended for future rezoning and development in accordance with an Area Plan. It limits land uses so as to not prejudice future development, and it provides for development in accordance with the Area Plan once services are available.</p> <p>Land use categories shown on the draft Area Plan are broad to allow for future detailed masterplanning. Future development in accordance with the Area Plan will require public exhibition prior to development.</p> <p>Planning Principles provide further guidance to ensure appropriate development outcomes.</p>	<p>The proposed average density in the low density areas (10 to 14 dwellings per hectare) has been included on the Area Plan as requested.</p> <p>The land contours have been emphasised where the landscape is steeper or subject to seasonal waterlogging.</p>

THEME 2: Rural character and amenity		
Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Rural character and amenity		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposition to developing Holtze in general for urban uses and areas for rural lots should be identified. • Higher densities should be located within hospital grounds and larger rural lots should radiate outwards from there. • Suggestion for a series of village centres with rural residential living between. 	<p>The close proximity of Holtze to Palmerston CBD and existing infrastructure make it a suitable and appropriate location for future urban development.</p> <p>The draft Area Plan identifies a transition of urban residential densities out from the 'Commercial use' area. Land outside the Area Plan</p>	<p>No change required/ implemented.</p>

THEME 2: Rural character and amenity

Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
	boundary remains rural or unchanged.	

THEME 3: Environment

Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Area Plan does not address environmental issues or constraints		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Area plan does not respond to areas of natural constraints, rare flora and fauna species, or important natural environments or drainage catchments. Suggest a full EIS to be prepared, especially regarding Mitchell Creek. Urban development will lead to environmental degradation and needs to be managed particularly in relation to Mitchell Creek headwaters. 	<p>The focus of comment appeared to be on the spatial plan and less so the associated planning principles, which address many of the concerns.</p> <p>The principles require future development to demonstrate design and engineering responses to environmental and physical constraints identified by the environmental assessment process, land form, land units and drainage features, and stormwater impacts.</p>	Land contours have been emphasised where the landscape is steeper or subject to seasonal waterlogging.
Issue 2: Green Space		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community purpose, green space, and conservation land should be identified for community use, particularly around the Mitchell Creek Headwaters. A native bushland buffer should be established along the Stuart Highway. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Area Plan and Planning Principles provide further guidance to ensure appropriate development outcomes.</p>	No change required/implemented.
Issue 3: Biting insects		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic health reports indicate a high level of malaria carrying mosquito presence and risks associated. 	<p>Medical Entomology of the Department of Health has carried out baseline biting insect investigations for Holtze and advise recommendations from this report should be adhered to during future development.</p> <p>Planning Principle 9(d) guides a reduction in residential density where land is affected by constraints such as biting insects.</p>	No change required/implemented.

THEME 4: Road Network

Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Impacts on the road network		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Area Plan will increase the amount of traffic crossing the Stuart Highway. Consider off-peak activities of proposed land uses to reduce peak loads on the Highway. 	<p>A Transport and Traffic Assessment for the Stuart Highway/ Temple Terrace intersection upgrade was conducted which includes recommendations to accommodate future growth.</p> <p>Addressed by Planning Principles 4 and 5.</p>	No change required/ implemented.

THEME 5: Service and social infrastructure

Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Provide appropriate infrastructure		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban development should be supported by appropriate reticulated services, social infrastructure, and transport and pedestrian networks. Suggestion for a large multipurpose sporting complex to be located in the western area of Area Plan (Crown, Sec 4229). 	<p>Addressed by Planning Principles 5, 6, 8 and 10.</p>	No change required/ implemented.

THEME 6: Consultation process

Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Lack of confidence in the consultation process		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary consultation by the Planning Commission was delivered with bias towards the removal of the 'Service Commercial' area. Beliefs that resident's views are being ignored in favour of developers. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Changes to the Area Plan between Stage 1 consultation and statutory exhibition were in response to community feedback.</p>	No change required/ implemented.

THEME 7: Previous 'Service Commercial' area

Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Removal of 'Service Commercial' area		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support was given for the removal of the 'Service Commercial' area. Land owners of four lots previously identified for 'Service Commercial' in Stage 1 consultation wish for the plan to be reverted and again identified as an area for 'Service Commercial' development. These lots are currently zoned RL 9Rural Living). 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Changes to the Area Plan between Stage 1 consultation and statutory exhibition were in response to community feedback.</p>	<p>No change required/implemented.</p>

HOLTZE TO ELIZABETH RIVER SUBREGIONAL LAND USE PLAN

Community consultation: Thematic summary

The following presents a summary of consultation outcomes that contributed to the Holtze to Elizabeth River Subregion Land Use Plan (HESLUP). Consultation feedback is categorised by theme and further segmented by sub-issues. A response to each issue is provided alongside the outcome within the Land Use Plan produced (or the next stage of draft materials for consultation as the case may be).

It should be noted that the HESLUP project addressed a study area effectively ringing the City of Palmerston, and including areas such as Virginia, Archer and Mitchell West as well as parts of 11-Mile. This summary of consultation outcomes is limited only to the feedback relating to the Holtze District.

The HESLUP project involved three public consultation periods, with stages one and two being coordinated by the Northern Territory Planning Commission. The first stage of consultation was under the project title of “Palmerston Environs Subregional Land Use Plan” (PESLUP), while later stages utilised the ‘Holtze to Elizabeth River Subregional Land Use Plan’ (HESLUP) title. The third stage of consultation, statutory exhibition of the proposed planning scheme amendment, was managed by the Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Logistics (DIPL). Consultation occurred during the periods below:

Consultation Stage	Period	Consultation managed by:
Stage 1	27 May 2021 – 25 June 2021	NT Planning Commission
Stage 2	29 October 2021 – 26 November 2021	NT Planning Commission
Statutory Exhibition of Planning Scheme Amendment	18 March 2022 – 15 April 2022	DIPL

Contents

Stage 1 consultation - summary of themes	2
THEME 1: Rural living of Litchfield vs urban living of Palmerston	2
THEME 2: Consultation Methodology	3
THEME 3: Land use change.....	4
THEME 4: Environment	4
THEME 5: Transport	6
Stage 2 consultation - summary of themes	7
THEME 1: Social Infrastructure	7
THEME 2: Movement and transport	7
THEME 3: Environment	7
THEME 4: Location Specific	8
THEME 5: Rural and urban Living.....	9
Stage 3 (Statutory exhibition) - summary of themes	10
THEME 1: Rural living	10
THEME 2: Movement and transport	10
THEME 3: Plan Process.....	11
THEME 4: Environment	11

Stage 1 consultation - summary of themes

This stage involved information gathering and undertaking investigations of the study area. Occurring from 27 May 2021 through to 25 June 2021, Stage One included the release of a Discussion Paper for comment.

THEME 1: Rural living of Litchfield vs urban living of Palmerston		
Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Perception that the project would change municipal boundaries, moving portions of area in Litchfield to Palmerston municipality.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents noted they enjoyed rural lifestyles and did not want to incorporate into the City of Palmerston (CoP); against any compulsory changes of municipal boundaries. • Sentiments expressed that Rural issues are too dissimilar to the residents of the urban Palmerston region • Some respondents commented that the realignment of municipal boundaries in the Holtze / Kowandi area would be appropriate due to the facilities now located in this area that serve the greater Palmerston area. • Questions were received on how rates would change, and opposition expressed to rates being subject to CoP. • Plan title should not only reference Palmerston. 	<p>The title of the project (originally Palmerston Environs Subregional Land Use Plan), and misinformation disseminated by third parties raised concern within the rural community that the plan would incorporate the Litchfield part of the study area into the City of Palmerston.</p> <p>The subregional plan has no bearing on local government boundaries, the determination of which requires a separate process under the relevant legislation.</p> <p>Longstanding concerns of private land owners on Wallaby Holtze Road regarding municipal boundaries are acknowledged.</p>	<p>Stage Two engagement sought to address this concern and separate land use planning from Local Government Boundary considerations.</p> <p>The 'project title was changed to Holtze to Elizabeth River Subregional Land Use Plan (HESLUP) following Stage 1 consultation and for the remainder of the project duration.</p>
Issue 2: Future changes of land use in the Litchfield part of the study area		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern with some sites being identified as an 'investigation area' in the plan. 	<p>Part of the purpose of the project is to identify constraints and opportunities of the study area and map areas for future changes in land use.</p>	<p>Identified need to improve communication of 'investigation area' and what this entails. Future stages of consultation included more detail and explanation of the term.</p>
Issue 3: Land use considerations, urban form and potential impacts from land use changes		

THEME 1: Rural living of Litchfield vs urban living of Palmerston

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land is not capable of accommodating 5000 new blocks. Housing estates will result in clash of values and cultures. • Do not want cluttered housing like Zuccoli, is there better options than this. • Current residents are living in the area due to the rural surrounds, and do not want to be surrounded by urban blocks. • Subdivision will increase population, noise, traffic, reduce speed limits and road usage. • There are other options for high density such as infill development in Darwin. • High density should only occur around the hospital. • Current rural properties should remain rural, and consideration should be given to the surrounds of these sites and access should be limited to those rural properties. 	<p>Greater Holtze is the only rural part of the study area that includes potential change to urban land use.</p> <p>The size of lots that are eventually developed will respond to market demand and market established price-points.</p>	<p>Identified need to better communicate the importance of identifying potential for the provision of serviced land to meet the needs of a growing Darwin. Future stages of consultation included more detail and explanation of the need to identify and plan for growth fronts.</p>

THEME 2: Consultation Methodology

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Inadequate engagement		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NTPC did not engage with residents in Litchfield Council areas. • Timeframe for consultation should be extended. 	<p>Commentary primarily as a result of social media by 3rd parties, perpetuated some misinformation as to the content and intent of the planning process.</p>	<p>Stage 2 engagement provided greater clarification of the purpose of a Subregional Land Use Plan, plan development processes, and how earlier feedback has been incorporated.</p>
Issue 2: Previous engagement undertaken		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation occurred 2015-2017 for the Holtze area, and feedback should be considered and included. 	<p>The project team were cognisant of earlier work and consultation in this area. This consultation offered an opportunity to re-engage with those residents/land owners</p>	<p>Clear references included in Stage 2 documentation to the existing Holtze Urban Area Plan</p>
Issue 3: Political announcements		

THEME 2: Consultation Methodology

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political announcements indicating the expansion of Palmerston and the need for further 5,400 homes in Holtze and Kowandi 	Political announcements are separate to NTPC engagement processes.	Stage 2 engagement provided greater clarification of the processes of plan preparation vs land release and how earlier feedback is incorporated in the draft plan.

THEME 3: Land use change

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Prioritising Weddell		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing supply should be delivered in Weddell as opposed to Holtze and sprawl in Palmerston 	Weddell remains a priority within Darwin's settlement strategy, part of a co-ordinated strategy for infrastructure, transport and land supply planning.	Identified need to better communicate the importance of identifying potential for the provision of serviced land to meet the needs of a growing Darwin. Future stages of consultation included more detail and explanation of the need to identify and plan for growth fronts.

THEME 4: Environment

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Conservation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns expressed in relation to loss of habitat, remnant bushland and impact on groundwater. A need for wildlife and conservation corridors or buffer zones. A range of potentially significant environmental values are known to occur or are highly likely to occur within the study area 	<p>A key theme of a subregional plan is to identify and link areas of environmental value.</p> <p>Environmental and biodiversity issues will be addressed through the environmental assessment(s) required for development of specific focus areas.</p>	<p>Department of Health and Medical Entomology to inform preparation of a mosquito management plan that is sensitive to the receiving natural environment.</p> <p>Working group established to progress open space and natural</p>

THEME 4: Environment

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the discussion paper and intent to protect important areas of natural environment 		environment considerations and inform policy of the future Area Plan.
Issue 2: Water		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water - Aquifer is small and pristine. Sensitive areas along natural drainage lines need to be protected. Water bore numbers have increased with unchecked water usage. 	<p>No additional groundwater dependent land uses are proposed by the discussion paper and associated concepts. Any future Urban and Rural Residential development will be required to utilise serviced (water) infrastructure.</p> <p>Rural living impacts noted.</p>	Text included within Stage 2 documentation that recognises and responds to groundwater limitations
Issue 3: Green corridor and recreation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of green corridors between urban and rural development encouraged. Greenbelt between suburbs and natural creek corridors suggested. Strong advocacy for protection of the Howard Springs Reserve and Pine Forest area, noting its role as an asset in the community and for attracting recreational use. Retention of Howard River hunting reserve sought Proposal received for Mitchell Botanical Garden initiative 	<p>Riparian corridors noted, including suggested use of green corridors. Strong community values associated with Howard Springs Reserve and remnant pine forests recognised.</p> <p>The Howard Springs Hunting Reserve is outside the project study area.</p> <p>Botanical Gardens not supported.</p>	<p>Potential elements of a 'green network', following the natural drainage pattern of the landscape and the opportunity to connect riparian corridors through the Greater Holtze area discussed and mapped, with draft planning principles included in Stage 2 materials.</p> <p>Remnant Pine Forest recognised in draft Plan as an area informally adopted by public and highly valued for recreation activities, with specific discussion provided. Indicated as investigation area and opportunity for active recreation hub. .</p>

THEME 5: Transport

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Proposed rail and road network		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion of a need for rail into Darwin City or to connect to other activity areas and airport. • Mix of feedback both support and questioning of need for rail network. • Suggestions relating to wider road network, including request for pedestrian and bicycle paths in locations. 	<p>Comments referred to DIPL Transport Civil Services Division reviewing feasibility into rail study.</p> <p>Suggestions on road network also considered by DIPL Transport and Civil Services Division.</p>	<p>Transport network plans included in draft HESLUP and associated Stage 2 materials directly informed by DIPL Transport and Civil Services Division.</p>

Stage 2 consultation - summary of themes

The Planning Commission built on the information and sentiment of the community in Stage One of consultation and released a draft Holtze to Elizabeth River Subregional Land Use Plan (HESLUP) for review and comment.

The draft Subregional Land Use Plan was amended in response to feedback during this stage of consultation ahead of the Planning Commission submitting the plan to the Minister for Infrastructure, Planning and Logistics to consider as a Proposed Planning Scheme Amendment.

THEME 1: Social Infrastructure		
Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Social Infrastructure		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing coordination with Local Government recommended, in particular when it comes to Social Infrastructure, noting City of Palmerston proposed Zuccoli Community Hub • Greater Holtze focus area should endeavour to identify mixed-use community centres and encourage co-location of recreation facilities. • Possible identification of a hierarchy of community facilities. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Subregional and Area Planning Social Infrastructure consultant reports underway are being informed by consultation with Local Governments.</p>	<p>Ongoing work undertaken of Subregional and area social infrastructure assessments.</p>

THEME 2: Movement and transport		
Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Traffic		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern around the increased traffic to Howards Springs rural area and crossing at Taylor Road by current residents 	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Upgrade of Howard Springs Road is a separate project by Transport and Civil Services with specific consultation processes.</p>

THEME 3: Environment		
Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Environmental concerns		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy by some for additional green corridors, particularly on Wallaby Holtze Road. • Community members queried the impact of urban development on water and soil quality around Kings Creek. 	<p>Environment forms a key planning theme to frame policy responses / planning principles in the draft HESLUP. Open space and wildlife corridors considered, and</p>	<p>Environmental concerns will inform Green network and drainage design.</p>

THEME 3: Environment		
Feedback	Comment	Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk to water quality from stormwater entering waterways, therefore stormwater management should be designed to maintain water quality. • Importance of water flows to receiving environments within and nearby the study area. 	<p>focused on areas of environmental value and ecosystem functioning.</p> <p>Land Use Plan to support and be supported by NT Subdivision Guidelines which guide delivery.</p>	
Issue 2: Nature based recreation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued support for the retention of the Howard Springs Pine Forest and support of how this was addressed in first draft of Plan. • Howard Springs Nature Park is nearing capacity, retention of open space for new recreational spaces may be required with an increase of population in study area. 	<p>Support for Pine Forest noted as is the potential of the surrounds to provide a greater recreation offering.</p>	<p>Investigation area designated in plan, with discussion on future use potential including regional active-recreation and associated use.</p>
Issue 3: Greenfield development		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenfield development should seek to retain existing vegetation and landforms through the creation of vegetated corridors, passive open space stormwater management systems. 	<p>Noted, focusing on areas of environmental value and linkage of systems.</p>	<p>Land capability assessments informing land use structures, including riparian corridors.</p>
Issue 4: Mosquito management		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mosquito mitigation measures will be required nearby proposed future urban areas, current representations in plan are in line with general principles 	<p>Comments from Medical Entomology noted, and requires ongoing consultation.</p>	<p>Biting insects recognised in planning principle 3.</p>

THEME 4: Location Specific		
Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Robertson Barracks		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defence raised concerns of land use changes, south of Robertson Barracks, which support an operational base. A need to consider potential impact of their activities. 	<p>Reverse amenity concerns noted – also note corridors and open space buffers.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

THEME 5: Rural and urban Living

Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Rural Lifestyle		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Holtze and Kowandi identified by some members of the community as suitable for larger rural lots, along Howard Springs Road. Wallaby Holtze and Taylor Road residents maintained their desire for the area to remain rural living for future generations. 	<p>Need for intergenerational housing opportunities noted, however partly this is also relates to ensuring provision of housing for all in the Greater Darwin region.</p>	<p>Land use changes do not automatically rezone rural lots.</p>
Issue 2: Terminology		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification on terminology of urban / peri-urban 	<p>Noted. Terminology also in previous plans.</p>	<p>Definition included at start of document.</p>
Issue 3: Urban housing		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some concerns about future lot sizes and impact of increased population in proposed location. Some precincts should encourage contemporary housing choices, particularly around the Palmerston Hospital (e.g. small terrace housing) 	<p>Differing views expressed. Existing population disagree with relatively smaller lots, despite market trends. Conversely, note the need for housing supply to address costs.</p> <p>Contemporary housing choices desirable, noting limitation of the area plan to regulate the market and current housing provider delivery.</p>	<p>Focus on appropriate location of higher densities, closer to community facilities and mixed activity centres.</p>

Stage 3 (Statutory exhibition) - summary of themes

The Minister for Infrastructure, Planning and Logistics placed the draft Holtze to Elizabeth River Subregional Land Use Plan on statutory exhibition as a proposed amendment to the NT Planning Scheme 2020. The Subregional Land Use Plan was on exhibition for four weeks with submissions closing on 15 April 2022.

Following statutory exhibition and a hearing on submissions received relating to the proposed amendment, the Minister for Infrastructure Planning and Logistics made minor alterations to the Subregional Land Use Plan to clarify matters raised during statutory exhibition and amended the NT Planning Scheme 2020 to introduce the Holtze to Elizabeth River Subregional Land Use Plan.

THEME 1: Rural living		
Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Urban development		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing resident objection to urban development in proximity to block, preferring wildlife corridor or buffer zone. Not opposed to development but should occur in smart and environmentally appropriate way – for rural enjoyment. Rural living area of Wallaby Holtze road and its surrounds suggested by residents along road. 	<p>Corridors proposed of environmental values, and supporting wider open space functioning within area.</p> <p>Note differing views of reduced density in Wallaby Holtze and those supportive of density increases near existing centres and activity.</p>	Area identified as a 'far' term investigation area.
Issue 2: Lot sizes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interest in lot sizing, and proposed minimum lot size requirements to avoid small lot housing. 	Lot sizing driven by market demand, developer trends	No change, seek to locate higher density in mixed activity areas and near open space/facilities.

THEME 2: Movement and transport		
Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Traffic management		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident concerns raised for proposed Glyde Arterial, Howard River estate roads. Road connection between existing rural activity centres of Coolalinga and Howard Springs should not occur. Cumulative impacts of traffic generation should be considered. 	<p>Projects relate to Transport and Civil Services which have been ongoing</p> <p>Connection between activity centres, support connection of communities, and viability for surrounds to access services.</p>	No change, concerns noted to other projects.

THEME 3: Plan Process		
Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Exhibition		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibition difficult to access 	Exhibition advertised in accordance with legislative requirements. Consultation and multi stage process has been implemented to inform the plan development as well as provide background.	No impact.
Issue 2: Political		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decisions seem to be already made due to political announcements of potential new lots in the area. Government decision seemingly made on suburban blocks, as opposed to rural residential. 	<p>Political announcements are separate to Planning Commission engagement processes.</p> <p>The need to plan for increased population potential is well established.</p>	No change, reiterating future strategic lands planning to plan for population growth.
Issue 3: Terminology		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern over the use of urban / peri urban; peri-urban should be abolished. Support for more peri-urban exploration as opposed to urban. 	Some differing views, largely the result of interpretation of terminology.	Definition included at start of plan.

THEME 4: Environment		
Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Conservation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns that the role of the environment has been ignored in plan development. A range of potentially significant environmental values are known to occur or are highly likely to occur within the study area. Concern with the relative area of native vegetation that would need to be cleared. Concerns of development in absence of conservation strategy. Support for project enabling development Regional Conservation Strategy 	<p>Environmental planning has been key component of plan development, informing land suitability. Engagement with DEPWS and identification of areas of environmental value.</p> <p>Importance of conservation strategy noted, and benefits for wider considerations beyond immediate project.</p>	No change, natural environment informs plan and relates to several key planning principles underpinning the document.
Issue 2: Recreation		

THEME 4: Environment		
Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities to explore opportunities for indigenous bushwalks, interactive walks, and other community engagement activities around natural elements of the area. • Existing walking, cycling and quad bike trails could be expanded. • New recreational reserves should be planned to relieve pressures on existing areas. 	<p>Activities mostly relate to local authority or land owner to deliver. Relevance is noted on ensuring suitable provision and co-location benefits.</p> <p>Recreation planning informed by provisions and social infrastructure assessments, and local government engagement.</p>	<p>Investigation area of Howard Springs North to address recreational requirements and potential.</p> <p>Open Space corridors also serve such purpose.</p>
Issue 3: Open space planning		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of planning for urban open spaces, parks and recreation amenities has increased over recent years. Natural environment is of elevated importance. 	Notes, remains of relevance.	Open space corridors provide continuous opportunities and linkage.

THEME 5: Location specific		
Feedback	DIPL Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Howard Springs		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Howard Springs North may be underutilised if other land uses cannot be contemplated by the future land use concept. • Concerns that Howard Springs North Investigation Area will encroach upon Howard Springs Nature Park. • Support for land use changes in Howards Springs north to consider potential for both organised and passive recreation. 	Competing priorities (based on stakeholder) noted. General support for its retention of existing uses, with potential for other opportunities to be investigated.	Investigation area identified. Planning principles requiring land use concept to be developed.
Issue 2: Robertson Barracks		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development in the northern section of the area plan, south of Barracks should continue to have regards for defence base activity. 	Noted.	No change.

GREATER HOLTZE AREA PLAN

Community consultation: Thematic summary

The following discussion presents a summary of Stage 1 consultation outcomes that contribute to the preparation of the Greater Holtze Area Plan (GHAP). Consultation feedback is categorised by theme and further segmented by issues raised.

An interim response to each issue is provided, an outcome will be determined following approval of the draft GHAP document for Stage 2 consultation, and associated engagement strategy.

Stage 1 of consultation for the project was coordinated by the Northern Territory Planning Commission. Three stages of consultation are currently planned for this project as below:

Consultation Stage	Period	Consultation managed by
Stage 1	4 June 2022 – 1 July 2022	NTPC
Stage 2	TBD	NTPC
Statutory Exhibition of Planning Scheme Amendment	TBD	DIPL

Contents

Stage 1 consultation - summary of themes.....	2
THEME 1: Land Use	2
THEME 2: Natural Environment and Water Resources	5
THEME 3: Transport and Movement	6
THEME 4: Public Open Space and Recreation	8
THEME 5: Activity Centres.....	9
THEME 6: Social Infrastructure	10
THEME 7: Service Infrastructure.....	11
THEME 8: Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority	11
THEME 9: Defence land and Youth Detention Centre	12
THEME 10: Various.....	12

Stage 1 consultation - summary of themes

Stage One engagement on the Greater Holtze Area Plan (GHAP) was an opportunity to build on the ideas expressed by the community during the development of the Holtze to Elizabeth River Subregional Land Use Plan 2022.

Occurring from 4 June to 1 July 2022, Stage One included the release of a Discussion Paper for comment.

THEME 1: Land Use		
Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Lot size, dwelling mix and integration of land uses		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not support lot sizes between 400m² and 800m². Larger lots are consummate with rural amenity. Some criticism of ability to achieve identified dwelling yields given various constraints and contrasting figures. The Area Plan should provide for a range of housing options to provide flexibility and affordability. Some support for higher density housing and communities to promote compact and walkable neighbourhoods. Support higher residential density and transport nodes concentrated around the Palmerston Regional Hospital (PRH) and identified activity centres, with lot sizes increasing with distance from these centres. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public statements of potential lot yields have been made in political statements / media releases. Political announcements are separate to Planning Commission engagement processes. The size of lots that are developed will respond to market demand and established market price points. The draft GHAP for Stage 2 consultation will provide for higher density, mixed use development concentrated around activity centres, transport nodes and key employment hubs such as the PRH. 	
Issue 2: Transition to rural areas and buffers		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transition of land uses must be applied to new residential areas and existing and proposed industrial uses to avoid potential conflicts. Buffering should be applied through the use of major transport corridors or parklands/green corridor. Support the allocation of more intense built form outcomes within the GHAP boundary to protect the rural amenity of the broader Litchfield area from the pressures of over development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Buffers and separation distances between land uses are being investigated. New urban residential areas will be located within areas identified by the Holtze to Elizabeth River Subregional Land Use Plan for urban growth. The draft Area Plan for Stage 2 consultation will further explore potential built form outcomes with 	

THEME 1: Land Use

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
	feedback sought from stakeholders at that time.	
Issue 3: Impacts of new development on rural amenity		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for future population growth to be accommodated through infill development rather than greenfield development. Concerns that new urban development will result in a loss of character associated with rural living. General concern over additional pressures that will be placed on social services such as aged care and child care facilities. Weddell should be a focus for new development. Concerns regarding increased crime rates, pollution and traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A mix of infill and greenfield development is required to meet growing demands. Additional social infrastructure facilities will be delivered as the population grows. The draft Area Plan for Stage 2 consultation is likely to identify locations and principles around the provision of social infrastructure. Weddell remains a priority for the development of Greater Darwin as shown in the Darwin Regional and Litchfield Subregional Land Use Plans. 	
Issue 4: Wallaby Holtze Road and Taylor Road private freehold lots		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General concerns that private freehold land in the Wallaby Holtze Road area is shown as a far term investigation area. Resistance towards development landowners will maintain their lot as-is. Concerns of loss of rural amenity and intrusion from higher density urban development. Potential for land use conflicts to arise. Support buffers from private lots on Wallaby-Holtze Road and Taylor Road to new urban development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Buffers and separation distances between land uses are being investigated. Concerns of private land owners on Wallaby-Holtze Road and Taylor Road are acknowledged. There is no intent to develop private land against the owner's wishes. 	
Issue 5: Tenure		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Status of land within the Kowandi land is uncertain as it is Commonwealth land. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Subject to ongoing consultation/negotiation. 	

THEME 2: Natural Environment and Water Resources

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Biting Insects		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seasonally high mosquito populations in the Greater Holtze area, of both pest and potential disease carrying mosquitos. A biting insect management plan will be required and consideration should be given to the handover requirements to ensure design and monitoring is implemented correctly. Aerial mosquito control will be required and green corridors for drainage will need to be managed to allow access to undertake surveys. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The presence of natural environments conducive to biting insects is acknowledged. The DIPL is working with relevant departments to ensure biting insect constraints are adequately addressed in the Area Plan and any subsequent development proposals. 	
Issue 2: Conservation of wetlands and riparian vegetation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority should be given to protection of Howard Springs Nature Park and surrounding reserve. Suggest the Area Plan maintains a conservation corridor between the Holtze Landcare area and Kings Creek and ensure a buffer is implemented surrounding Kings Creek. Do not support development within or near areas containing riparian vegetation and sandsheet heath. Suggestions that Conservation zoned land could be better managed. Support recognition of the need to identify areas of environmental value and contribute to a co-coordinated response including management programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main concerns raised are in regards to impacts on riparian vegetation and sandsheet heath which provide habitat for rare and endangered fauna and flora species. The draft Area Plan for Stage 2 consultation will seek to accommodate anticipated growth and enable new development whilst minimising impacts on the natural environment. 	
Issue 3: Water resources and stormwater management		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is noted that the intended water supply for future development is established reticulated water services. Groundwater resources within the GHAP area are considered to be overused or approaching full use. Further rural subdivision in high use or over allocated areas will most likely cause water resource to be unsustainably used. Concerns over impacts of urban development to water quality from stormwater entering waterways. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No groundwater dependent land uses will be proposed by the draft GHAP. Urban and rural residential development will be connected to serviced (water) infrastructure. Detailed stormwater management design will need to be undertaken 	

THEME 2: Natural Environment and Water Resources

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
	prior to commencement of development.	
Issue 4: Seasonal waterlogging and flooding		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large areas of the study area are subject to severe waterlogging and inundation. Critical of potential overall dwelling yield given possible waterlogging constraints. Do not support development in these areas as this will be costly to developers and landowners. History of flooding in Tulagi Road industrial area and Gateway shopping centre region which needs to be considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical investigations have been undertaken. Areas susceptible to water logging have been identified and will be incorporated within drainage and green corridors within the draft GHAP for Stage 2 consultation. 	
Issue 5: Fauna and flora		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns urban development will impact rare and endangered flora and fauna species, including the black footed tree rat and typhonium. Strong support for the retention of natural environment corridors. Recommend the preservation of large areas of the study area for conservation purposes and implement necessary buffers for areas of high natural importance. The Area Plan needs to find a balance between human use and green space and conservation of important biodiversity values. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large areas of natural vegetation will be retained and incorporated within the proposed structure of the draft GHAP. The Flora and Fauna division of the DEPWS have advised through the GHAP Stage 1 consultation process that biodiversity values for the Greater Holtze Area appear to be appropriately considered at this stage of the process. 	

THEME 3: Transport and Movement

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Road Network		

THEME 3: Transport and Movement

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the planned Glyde Road Arterial Corridor with connection to existing arterial networks to relieve current congestion issues. • Some support for linkages between roads such as Madsen Road and Whitewood road and for these works to commence as soon as possible. • Some concerns over the Extension of Madsen Road to Smyth Road and Linco Road to Madsen Road. • Do not support extension of Linco Road. • Do not support the extension to Hicks Road. Consider extending Anglesey Road to Gunn Point Road instead. • Support for wider road corridors to provide for nature strips and footpaths. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments and suggestions specific to the road network will be considered by the Transport and Civil Services Division of the Department. • The Draft Area Plan for Stage 2 consultation will be informed by advice from the DIPL Transport and Civil Services Division 	
Issue 2: Traffic		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over increased traffic volumes at Howards Springs Road and Stuart Highway, resulting in heavy vehicles traversing to Gunn Point Road or Glyde Point Arterial Road. • Use of the Centre for National Resilience Centre will need to give consideration to additional traffic impacts on the road network. • Do not support further intensification of Howard Springs Road as this is already subject to high volumes of traffic and there are surrounding sensitive land uses. • General non-support for new development as this will result in increased traffic volumes and impacts to existing residents across the study area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments and suggestions on the road network and traffic related issues will be considered by the Transport and Civil Services Division of the Department. • The Draft Area Plan for Stage 2 consultation will be informed by advice from the DIPL Transport and Civil Services Division 	
Issue 3: Public and active transport		

THEME 3: Transport and Movement

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the improvement of public transport to reduce environmental impact of travel and transport. Support for public transport routes to be strongly considered in this area plan and all dwellings to be located within comfortable walking distance of a bus stop. Support inclusion of a comprehensive pedestrian and cycle network. Implement car free zones, particularly surrounding recreation facilities. Given proximity to large employment centres, there is an opportunity to create neighbourhoods which allow residents to walk and cycle thereby reducing car dependency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. 	
Issue 4: Road names and missing detail		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that Taylor Road is not shown on plans within the discussion paper. Gunn Point Road should be referred to as Glyde Point Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Plans in the draft Area Plan and associated materials for Stage 2 consultation will be updated to correct this administrative error. 	

THEME 4: Public Open Space and Recreation

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: The Green Corridor		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for the use of natural assets within the GHAP study area that can be retained as open space for the community. The Area Plan needs to identify and preserve open space and conservation areas for the green corridor whilst surrounding areas become urbanised. Investment may be required with a focus on protecting the existing natural character of the green corridor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Green Corridor is a key element of the GHAP study area and will be retained. 	
Issue 2: Provision of Open Space		

THEME 4: Public Open Space and Recreation

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for adequate public green and open space to be provisioned within the area plan, to account for proposed smaller lot sizes. Note that investment is required to enhance the amenity of areas into parks and green spaces. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Area Plan for Stage 2 consultation will retain large conservation areas and will incorporate the use of natural environment for open space through the development of a Green Corridor. 	
Issue 3: Howard Springs Remnant Pine Forest		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong support for the pine forest to be retained as it is utilised by a variety of user groups for activities including mountain biking, horse riding, hiking and bird watching. It should be preserved as a low-cost recreational mountain biking venue. Strong opposition to any urban development within the pine forest. Support formalising outdoor recreation activities at the Pine Forest. One submission suggested development of certain areas of the pine forest for rural living and rural residential purposes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The importance of the Howard Springs Pine Forest is recognised and there are no intentions to develop this land for urban land uses. 	

THEME 5: Activity Centres

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Provision of activity centres and impacts on existing centres		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding potential impacts of new retail and commercial floorspace on existing activity centres. Support the use of floor space caps and land use limitations to ensure that new centres do not compete with existing centres including Palmerston CBD and Coolalinga Rural Activity Centre Assumptions on demand per capita are optimistic and are outdated, recommend the assumption used by the NTPC is re-examined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Macroplan were engaged to undertake a review of Greater Darwin Activity Centres which makes recommendations for the provision of activity centres and commercial floorspace within the GHAP study area. The size and location of proposed activity centres included in the draft GHAP for Stage 2 consultation will be in accordance with the findings of the review. 	

THEME 5: Activity Centres

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 2: Types of activity centres		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly support provision of small, local centres which would establish neighbourhood character, community and promote walkability. Neighbourhood activity centres should be developed in a main street style to reduce impacts of car parking and increase walkability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. 	

THEME 6: Social Infrastructure

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Provision of Social Infrastructure and Support Services		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support provision of specialised support services, given existing presence of facilities such as the youth detention centre, Darwin Correction Facility and PRH. Land surrounding the PRH should be reserved to support an aged person's precinct. Pleased to see consideration of existing social infrastructure in determining future needs of Greater Holtze. Need to include future community facilities associated with the Centre for National Resilience in the Area Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fyfe were engaged to undertake social infrastructure assessments (SIA) for the HESLUP and GHAP study area. These assessments provide the basis for provision of social infrastructure. The draft Area Plan for Stage 2 consultation is likely to identify locations and principles around the provisions of social infrastructure. 	
Issue 2: Funding and Delivery		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear how social infrastructure will be implemented into the GHAP Ensure that existing facilities located close to the GHAP study area are utilised to their full potential. Support for suitable land and programs to be developed to enable timely delivery of required social infrastructure. Do not support the use of development levies as a sole source of funding for major items of social and community infrastructure Critical for the provision of infrastructure to be planned, developed and implemented in a 	<p>The SIA identifies the need, the draft Area Plan for Stage 2 consultation is likely to identify potential locations and principles, while an implementation plan will be part of the land release and ongoing management.</p>	

THEME 6: Social Infrastructure

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
coordinated manner by all levels of government in consultation with industry.		

THEME 7: Service Infrastructure

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Funding of Key Service Infrastructure		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical to the successful implementation of the GHAP is the detail design for stormwater drainage and trunk infrastructure. • Do not support delivery costs for main infrastructure being transferred to developers or homebuyers. • Oppose development levies as a sole source of funding for major infrastructure items. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. 	
Issue 2: Existing Infrastructure		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing waste transfer station on Howard Springs Road is not identified in the Area Plan. The future of this facility needs to be protected. • A regional waste facility is not within the Area Plan boundaries, it should be identified along with access to the facility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. 	

THEME 8: Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Sacred Aboriginal sites within the GHAP study area.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of sacred sites within and surrounding the GHAP study area has been identified and it is recommended an Authority Certificate be obtained for any proposed works not yet covered by existing Authority Certificates. • The Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority will work with relevant agencies and future developers to ensure protection of sacred sites within the GHAP study area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of Aboriginal archaeological and sacred sites is recognised. The Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority provides advice in relation to Aboriginal sacred sites. It is noted that an Authority Certificate is required prior to any development. 	

THEME 9: Defence land and Youth Detention Centre

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Proximity to Robertson Barracks		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over proximity of new urban development to Robertson Barracks. Defence activities result in excessive noise and vibrations which could cause nuisance to future residents, hindering the Defence's ability to conduct operations without disruptions. Support use of an open space buffer along southern boundary the Barracks or retention of the rural zone. Request that future planning and development near Defence bases/training areas considers aircraft noise, training area noise and vibrations, bird strikes, security and traffic and access. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity of new urban development to the boundary of Defence land will be appropriately considered. Ongoing consultation with Defence to occur. 	
Issue 2: Land adjoining Don Dale Youth Detention Centre		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not support urban development adjacent to the Don Dale Youth Detention Centre. Should be rural residential only. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. 	

THEME 10: Various

Feedback	Comment	Outcome
Issue 1: Transparency, Community Engagement and criticism of decision-making progress		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NTPC should be open and transparent and the GHAP discussion paper is not. Misinterpretation and misleading information, owners and occupiers are not given reasonable timeframes to review the discussion paper. Important to provide Litchfield residents with the surety they need to plan for the future. Disappointing that the discussion paper mentions land supply but doesn't mention Weddell as an alternative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An engagement strategy was prepared which included media releases, mail-outs, online surveys and public information stalls. Stage one consultation was overtaken over a period of 4 weeks. Perhaps prior notice of consultation to be given to provide additional time to stakeholders. Political announcements are separate to Planning Commission engagement processes. 	