

Attachment K1: Submissions Report – Precinct Plan Package

The table in this document indexes all submissions received during the public exhibition of the draft precinct plans which were on exhibition from November 2020 to March 2021. Submissions have been categorised using key issues that were raised during the exhibition period. The submission numbers in the first column identify the submissions that raised the key issue. A list of all public submissions (excluding those that sought confidentiality) can be found on the DPE website at the following page: <https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/WSAPP>

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
125, 157, 228, 229, 321, 349, 407, 411, 415, 425, 438, 439, 440, 441, 443, 450, 452, 465, 477, 480, 490, 491, 498, 547, 560, 571, 575, 577	Heritage	A number of submissions raised concerns about the inclusion of potential heritage items/ unlisted heritage items within the Precinct Plan and the implications for landowners and developers.	The potential heritage items were identified through a Cultural Heritage Assessment. The potential items have been retained in the Precinct Plan with further work is to be undertaken at the development stage to confirm the heritage significance. See section 4.4.18 for more detail.
349, 407, 455, 480, 487, 490, 498, 543, 568, 568, 571, 575	Recognise Country	Submissions raised the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the acknowledgement to Country statement on the opening page of the draft Precinct Plan • Requests for a holistic approach to the draft Precinct Plan in terms of Recognising Country 	Extensive engagement with Aboriginal stakeholders has informed the Precinct Plan, SEPP and DCP. The draft Phase 2 DCP is supported by Recognise Country Guidelines. It is intended that the DCP and Guidelines will be finalised in 2022. The SEPP amendment will require consideration of

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived lack of engagement and concerns about legitimacy of the engagement process with Aboriginal organisations and communities 	the draft Guideline in the assessment of DAs. See section 4.4.15 for more detail.
349, 407, 490, 571	Aboriginal Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests for Aboriginal cultural centres and social infrastructure; Employment target for Aboriginal people and transport planning to assist cultural tours; Requests for targeted and ongoing engagement with Aboriginal groups, organisations and communities. It is a clear opportunity to enrich design responses in applying elements of Connection to Country. 	The draft Phase 2 DCP is supported by Recognise Country Guidelines. It is intended that the DCP and Guidelines will be finalised in 2022. See section 4.4.15 for more detail.
583, 579, 565, 527, 505, 352, 321, 263, 234, 235, 151, 149, 148, 7	Wianamatta-South Creek (WSC) Corridor	Submissions raised concern about the amount of land proposed in the WSC corridor and the lack of justification for locating land in the corridor.	Land with the WSC precinct has been rezoned back to its former zoning under the <i>Liverpool Local Environmental Plan 2008</i> , which applied to the land prior to the commencement of the Aerotropolis SEPP and would form part of the non-initial precinctto See section 4.4.3

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
579, 509, 483, 487, 415, 431, 463, 464, 462, 438, 365, 291, 284, 303, 201, 193, 195, 166, 144, 132, 118, 119, 90, 106, 2, 15, 14, 582, 581, 580, 575, 577, 570, 515, 538, 483, 453, 324, 325, 365, 359, 295, 285, 291, 259, 195, 118, 580, 570, 509, 487	Infrastructure sequencing and delivery	A number of submissions raised concerns regarding the Staging and Sequencing of the Initial Precincts and identified that the plan did not have regard for property boundaries.	Minor changes have been made to land within Priority 1 and the Precinct Plans have been amended to consider the existing cadastral pattern. See section 4.4.10 and 4.4.12
2, 13, 19, 30, 31, 34, 41, 45, 46, 47, 50, 51, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 70, 84, 89, 91, 93, 103, 104, 107, 114, 116, 119, 122, 123, 124, 128, 137, 140, 143, 144, 145, 151, 154, 157, 161, 162, 163, 165, 167, 171, 175, 182, 183, 184, 187, 189, 196, 197, 198, 200, 201, 210, 211, 213, 225, 228, 229, 233, 234, 235, 237, 238, 239, 240, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 251, 253, 263, 269, 273, 286, 287, 288, 292, 296, 298, 314, 529, 530, 544, 499, 502, 518, 531, 525, 494, 552, 537, 558, 547, 512, 508, 533, 513, 539, 495, 454, 474, 479, 406, 460, 434, 457, 432, 433, 465, 435, 436, 467, 472, 437, 422, 445, 442, 482,	Valuation and Rates	<p>Submissions raised concerns regarding impacts on land values as a result of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of land for open space • Identification of land for Existing Native Vegetation (ENV) • Identification of land for road infrastructure • Lack of detail regarding timing of acquisition of land 	<p>Acquisition of land will occur in line with the <i>Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991</i>.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the land identified for open space, ENV and stormwater has been reduced as discussed in Section 4.4.1, 4.4.2 and 4.4.13.</p>

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
430, 411, 348, 406, 404, 400, 399, 396, 395, 393, 392, 390, 382, 380, 371, 373, 378, 368, 366, 327, 326, 340, 357, 374			
562, 480, 577, 565, 520, 497, 509, 553, 536, 543, 515, 524, 456, 459, 483, 489, 477, 480, 439, 425, 487, 458, 409, 452, 407, 465, 450, 423, 443, 471, 441, 478, 410, 348, 385, 361, 256, 157, 131, 100, 83, 97, 34, 61, 101, 144, 148, 260, 254, 360, 349, 362, 520, 409, 452, 407, 465, 441, 348, 570, 391, 410, 380, 289, 529	Environmental Values	<p>Submissions raised the following concerns regarding environmental values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over the feasibility of undisturbed soil networks (USN) and the lack of ground-truthing of land identified as containing undisturbed soil networks. USN should be retained to known riparian corridors. • Amount of open spaces and water bodies proposed and the conflict between wildlife hazards and airport operations. • Lack of ground-truthing of existing water bodies (such as farm dams), undisturbed soil networks, biodiversity and existing waterways and their actual contribution to the blue-green grid. • Submissions raised concern that controls that focused on environmental value (such as undisturbed soil networks and large pervious areas) were not compatible with large format retail development anticipated as the first wave of development within the Aerotropolis. • Lack of discussion of the issue of salinity across the Aerotropolis and the need for 	<p>The open space network and stormwater infrastructure within the Precinct Plan has been reviewed and reduced based on a multi-criteria analysis that considered several site opportunities and constraints, including locating open space and ENV within the 1 in 100-year flood zone and along streams and riparian corridors. This has also been reflected in the SEPP amendment.</p> <p>Furthermore, urban typologies, permeability and site coverage requirements have been moved to the Phase 2 DCP.</p> <p>See Section 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.11 and 4.4.13 for more detail.</p>

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
		greater controls to ensure salinity (especially because of additional run-off caused by new development) is appropriately managed.	
61, 581, 583, 579, 577, 570, 565, 566, 529, 536, 543, 544, 555, 526, 531, 525, 561, 505, 534, 533, 408, 480, 460, 470, 439, 487, 443, 419, 395, 328, 352, 401, 404, 385, 357, 263, 285, 283, 301, 254, 255, 247, 195, 34, 154, 46, 47, 73, 128, 132, 144, 171, 177, 187, 211, 234, 235, 237, 244, 248, 263, 276, 279, 280, 301, 309, 321, 32, 328, 359, 367, 385, 401, 402, 411, 424, 441, 453, 460, 470, 482, 483, 472, 480, 485, 499, 505, 520, 523, 533, 536, 555, 554, 543	Flood and Water Management	<p>Submissions raised the following concerns regarding flooding and water management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites have different levels of flood affectation between the Liverpool South Creek Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan 2004, and the draft Wianamatta-South Creek Flood Study 2020, and lack of clarity regarding which plan to rely on to determine flooding impacts. • Lack of confidence in the 2004 study, and it being used to define the Environment and Recreation zone given its age, and that there has been a considerable amount of change in the locality that will lead to changes, such as a reduction in some areas affected by flooding. In addition, concerns were raised that no Flood Impact Assessment accompanied the Precinct Plan. • Lack of clarity on who would own and manage the proposed stormwater infrastructure and whether the land on which the infrastructure is located would be subject to acquisition by the 	The South Creek Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan 2004 (Liverpool City Council) remains the current adopted information. A Flood Impact Assessment has been prepared and accompanies the Precinct Plan which Councils can utilise to inform future flood planning. See Section 4.4.1 and Section 4.4.14 for more detail on stormwater land and flooding and 4.4.17 on aviation safeguarding and wildlife strike.

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
		<p>government or remain in private ownership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submissions raised concern on the lack of clarity on how the quantum of land identified for stormwater infrastructure was determined and why so much land for this purpose is needed. • Lack of clarity in relation to stormwater infrastructure identified on private land and whether this would remain in private ownership or be acquired by the Government. • Submissions raised concerns on the role and use of farm dams and their potential to increase wildlife attraction so close to the future Western Sydney Airport, and the overall inconsistency with the Airport Safeguarding Framework. 	
579, 570, 568, 500, 559, 524, 468, 452, 423, 485, 395, 354, 345, 262, 270, 221, 255, 259, 236, 198, 209, 171, 138, 144, 132	Resilience	<p>Submissions raised concerns that the Precinct Plan did not include clear and tangible controls for urban cooling and reducing the heat island effects and raised concerns over the long-term resilience of the Aerotropolis.</p> <p>Submissions also raised concern over the basis and methodology used in arriving to the adopted waterway quality and health objectives developed</p>	The NSW Government is planning for the Aerotropolis to be resilient and adaptable. Planning for resilience enables the Aerotropolis to resist, absorb, accommodate and recover from the effects of a hazard. The Precinct Plan has introduced provisions relating to urban heat island effect. The Phase 2 DCP includes performance

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
		for the Aerotropolis to support Wianamatta South Creek.	<p>outcomes and benchmark solutions regarding resilience and pollutant load reduction.</p> <p>The waterway and health objectives have not been amended as part of the finalisation package as they are integral to the delivery of the vision for the Aerotropolis.</p>
138, 155, 415, 441, 438, 439, 440, 443, 452, 456, 504, 568, 581	Public Domain	<p>Submissions raised the following concerns regarding public domain matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthy active transport should be provided and promoted and public transport should be as seamless as possible • Disagrees with the extent of open space allocated for workers, parks will overlook transport routes with low visual value, extensive earthworks will be needed to facilitate at grade construction • Need for further assessments to verify vegetation quality and potential for recovery • Need for further investment in parks, trees, community gardens, footpaths, cycleways 	Agree that healthy active transport should be provided and this is embedded in the Precinct Plan. The extent of open space has been developed in accordance with the revised Open Space network.
3, 17, 28, 77, 100, 101, 128, 144, 171, 195, 198, 209, 212, 236,	Green Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetation mapping was not field validated and, in some cases, incorrect; 	The open space network in the precinct plan was delineated based on a multi-

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
244, 245, 246, 247, 348, 423, 459, 471, 452, 487, 488, 501, 504, 509, 566, 568		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetation on site is sparse and/or exotic and/or of poor quality; • Sites mapped on the Open Space network despite being mapped as low condition Cumberland Plain Woodland • Request that biodiversity offsets/credits are applied in lieu of biodiversity retention • Owners of existing certified land absorb the removal of ENV from current non-certified land is unfair 	criteria analysis that considered several site opportunities and constraints, including locating open space and ENV within the 1 in 100-year flood zone and along streams and riparian corridors. See section 4.4.2 in relation to open space planning and 4.4.13 regarding Endangered Native Vegetation Land and Cumberland Plan Conservation Plan.
22, 74, 125, 131, 144, 242, 349, 363, 370, 415, 417, 422, 452, 458, 480, 483, 490, 494, 510, 547, 560, 568, 577, 579, 582	Social Infrastructure	<p>Submissions raised the following concerns regarding social infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making locations of social infrastructure provision indicative on maps • Social infrastructure locations provided in the draft precinct plan do not reflect future land use of the site and the likely demand for that infrastructure • Community facilities should be designed to support a range of management models to best facilitate activation • Locations of social infrastructure be in areas of high amenity • The need for a specialised indigenous health facility by 2056 	The locations of social infrastructure provision are being shown indicatively on all relevant maps. This provides flexibility in provision of these facilities. See Section 4.4.20.

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
502, 524, 535, 559	Aviation	Concerns were raised in regard to the aviation safeguarding considerations including wildlife strike, aircraft noise impacts and protected airspace.	The Aviation Safeguarding Guidelines will accompany the Phase 2 DCP once finalised and have been incorporated into the SEPP amendment. See Section 4.4.17 for more details.
498, 439, 425, 465, 455, 450, 443, 438, 256, 255, 257, 144, 577	Scenic Values	Concerns were raised regarding the view lines that have been identified in the Precinct Plans and Urban design reports. Further, these submissions raised concerns that the view corridors were not reflective of site characteristics and therefore did not accurately inform the location of open space.	A review of open space locations has been undertaken
575, 195, 157, 106. 250, 238, 377, 365, 462, 464, 483, 513, 508, 519, 496, 543, 568	Hierarchy of Centres	<p>Concerns were raised in submission regarding the allocation of sites within the hierarchy of centres including local and neighborhood centres. These submissions were reviewed in detail and the main issues are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From community: <p>The mapping of centres does not include ample consideration of the potential conflict between centres and adjoining land uses.</p> <p>The identification of centres must be supported by evidence-based technical</p> 	A review of centres has been undertaken and is reflected in the final Precinct Plan.

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
		<p>investigations and an understanding of existing and future market needs.</p> <p>The draft Precinct Plan must remove detail of local centres and their locations across the Aerotropolis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From Council: <p>Local and neighbourhood centres must incorporate development controls for lot sizes and floor space area in each centre to ensure its future development</p> <p>The Precinct Plan must have development controls for the connections between centres to encourage walkability.</p> 	
577, 568, 498, 228, 229, 252, 195, 195, 177, 144, 132, 111, 113, 108, 19	Open Space (typologies)	Submissions raised concerns that the open space typologies were unclear.	The open space typologies have been simplified to confirm their future use. See Section 4.4.2
455, 195	Roofscapes	Submissions included suggestions to provide guidance on roofscapes including the provision of green roofs and use of green cover on the built form to achieve sustainability goals.	This will be considered in the finalisation of the DCP
570, 509, 538, 487, 538, 538, 570, 15, 156, 219, 285, 360, 365, 395, 485, 487, 418, 547, 509, 570, 567, 577	Water and Electricity	<p>The following concerns were raised regarding water and electricity provision in the Aerotropolis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timing and delivery of infrastructure 	This has been addressed in Section 4.4.12 and 4.4.16.

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of water and sewer infrastructure to existing properties 	
<p>61, 582, 581, 580, 575, 543, 577, 507, 519, 520, 496, 568, 512, 509, 494, 547, 515, 506, 443, 423, 450, 461, 480, 449, 457, 439, 487, 417, 458, 426, 427, 415, 465, 447, 422, 455, 463, 461, 452, 450, 474, 486, 413, 483, 441, 438, 462, 478, 453, 416, 493, 444, 464, 440, 331, 345, 335, 336, 338, 388, 377, 334, 349, 359, 111, 337, 329, 333, 389, 365, 383, 363, 330, 339, 351, 332, 344, 321, 314, 302, 300, 299, 304, 284, 294, 291, 297, 275, 305, 237, 259, 193, 214, 199, 195, 166, 177, 158, 156, 154, 155, 146, 132, 145, 144, 138, 118, 111, 108, 73, 44, 40, 62, 106, 59, 2,</p>	<p>Built Form</p>	<p>Submissions raised concerns about site coverage / permeability, lot amalgamation / subdivision and block pattern, through site links, Hob and FSR controls, yield and built form controls in the Precinct Plan. Specifically, submissions raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A few submissions argued that there is no consistency in the application of FSR and HoB controls The majority of submissions from the landowners within the proximity of Metro stations raised concerns that the nominated HoB and FSR controls will not deliver expected development yield Many submissions raised that the HoB controls of the draft APP are not justified by any planning reasoning/basis. It was raised, in relation to certain lots, that the OLS controls allow for much taller building heights than currently prescribed by the draft APP. A few submissions argued that the HoB and FSR controls need to consider first mover land uses within the Aerotropolis, such as 	<p>A number of amendments have been made to the FSR and HoB controls contained in the Precinct Plan with a number of built form matters moved from the Precinct Plan to the Phase 2 DCP. See section 4.4.11 for more detail.</p>

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
		<p>warehouse and distribution centres, data centres, and manufacturing uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A suggestion that the built form parameters be removed from the draft Precinct Plan and contained in the Phase 2 DCP. The aim of this suggestions is to provide the consent authority guidance on built form controls but not restrict development to innovate and meet market demand. • Concern was raised that the draft Precinct Plan specifies ranges for HoB and FSR, and not the exact standards. 	
<p>3, 4, 8, 10, 13, 19, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 45, 49, 50, 51, 57, 62, 64, 71, 73, 74, 80, 84, 89, 103, 107, 108, 111, 116, 118, 122, 128, 129, 132, 139, 144, 148, 149, 154, 156, 164, 165, 170, 175, 176, 177, 182, 187, 188, 195, 198, 201, 203, 204, 205, 210, 211, 213, 214, 219, 220, 221, 223, 225, 226, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 237, 239, 240, 241, 244, 245, 246, 247, 250, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 260, 264, 267, 270, 271, 273, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 292, 294, 297, 298, 299, 300, 302,</p>	<p>Open Space (Location and Quantum)</p>	<p>Submissions raised the following concerns regarding the amount of open space proposed in the draft Precinct Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was little support for the amount of open space proposed, particularly when impacting privately owned land. • The rationale and the process used to locate proposed open space was not available for public review. • The many types and descriptions of open space were confusing. There was preference for a simplified definition of open space. 	<p>A comprehensive review of the open space network has been undertaken with a focus on refining and rationalising open space. The open space network has been assessed against benchmarks and open space locations have been prioritised to serve a variety of purposes and the amount of open space within the Aerotropolis initial precincts has been reduced and is also reflected in the SEPP amendment. See Section 4.4.2 for more detail.</p>

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 344, 347, 351, 354, 355, 356, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 367, 368, 369, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 382, 387, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 396, 397, 398, 399, 401, 402, 403, 405, 406, 408, 410, 411, 413, 414, 415, 416, 420, 421, 422, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 435, 438, 439, 440, 441, 443, 444, 445, 449, 450, 453, 455, 457, 458, 459, 465, 471, 474, 476, 487, 494, 495, 496, 498, 499, 509, 513, 515, 516, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 524, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 537, 539, 540, 543, 544, 548, 555, 561, 577, 580, 581, 583, 584		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many submitters raised concerns about who would acquire the open space and when this would happen. • Landowners preferred their land to be zoned for Enterprise or Mixed Use. • Some smaller landowners raised concerns that the draft Precinct Plans favoured larger landholders. • There was confusion expressed between land identified for open space and land that has been zoned as Environment and Recreation, including in some instances an assumption that the government would acquire land that is zoned Environment and Recreation. 	
2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 13, 19, 31, 34, 35, 39, 62, 63, 64, 68, 71, 73, 80, 89, 91, 93, 103, 108, 111, 114, 132, 137, 144, 148, 149, 154, 157,	Land Use Change Request	A number of submissions were received requesting land use change on their property. In particular submissions requested land uses changes for the following reasons:	A number of changes have been made to the land use zone in the Wianamatta-South Creek Precinct as discussed in Section 4.4.3.

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
<p>164, 168, 176, 177, 181, 184, 187, 196, 197, 220, 225, 243, 248, 252, 254, 255, 256, 257, 260, 271, 273, 274, 275, 294, 297, 298, 299, 300, 302, 304, 305, 327, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 344, 347, 351, 355, 361, 367, 368, 369, 373, 377, 380, 381, 382, 383, 385, 387, 388, 389, 392, 393, 395, 398, 399, 401, 402, 404, 408, 412, 416, 417, 425, 426, 442, 447, 457, 458, 459, 461, 465, 470, 473, 483, 487, 491, 495, 496, 498, 499, 503, 505, 508, 509, 510, 520, 526, 527, 528, 547, 562, 577, 583, 584</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental land constraints have been incorrectly identified • Extent of open space is considered excessive • Land zoning and location of open space hasn't been field validated • Unclear whether property will be acquired 	<p>Furthermore, clarification has been provided on land that will be used for open space as discussed in Section 4.4.1 and 4.4.2.</p>
<p>39, 42, 47, 50, 51, 57, 60, 61, 63, 70, 73, 93, 98, 123, 124, 138, 154, 165, 168, 172, 173, 175, 181, 182, 184, 189, 190, 196, 197, 198, 200, 214, 220, 222, 223, 224, 227, 233, 234, 235, 238, 249, 261, 263, 265, 269, 271, 272, 274, 287, 288, 290, 293, 296, 298, 309, 310, 316, 321, 328, 340, 341, 342, 343,</p>	<p>Environment and Recreation Zone</p>	<p>The Environment and Recreation zone created uncertainty for landowners regarding the implications for land that falls within the zone and the uses that could be carried out within this land. Landowners were concerned with the extent of the Environment and Recreation zone across the Precinct.</p>	<p>The Environment and Recreation land use zone for a portion of land south of Elizabeth Drive, along the eastern edge of Wianamatta-South Creek and the entirety of Kemps Creek has been rezoned back to its former rural zoning under the <i>Liverpool Local Environmental Plan 2008</i>. See Section 4.4.3 for more detail.</p>

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
352, 353, 368, 371, 373, 374, 378, 379, 381, 382, 384, 395, 400, 403, 419, 422, 424, 442, 444, 446, 451, 454, 482, 484, 487, 492, 497, 498, 499, 500, 503, 505, 509, 510, 511, 516, 520, 525, 526, 527, 529, 530, 531, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 542, 552, 554, 556, 557, 558, 561, 562, 580, 583, 585			
2, 13, 15, 19, 30, 34, 39, 42, 43, 45, 47, 49, 50, 51, 57, 61, 63, 70, 84, 87, 89, 91, 92, 98, 102, 103, 116, 123, 124, 128, 129, 137, 140, 143, 144, 145, 156, 161, 162, 163, 165, 167, 168, 170, 172, 173, 174, 175, 177, 181, 187, 189, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 211, 214, 217, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 226, 227, 232, 234, 235, 238, 239, 240, 241, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 253, 256, 260, 261, 263, 264, 265, 267, 268, 269, 270, 272, 273, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 286, 287, 288, 290, 292, 293, 295,	Land acquisition	Submissions raised concerns about the lack of clarity around the NSW Government's proposals for land acquisition, in particular what land will be acquired and when, and how land will be valued.	Any land identified for open space and stormwater will be acquired by Government. This issue is addressed in Section 4.4.1 and 4.4.2. The Government is committed to working with landowners to provide a clear framework on how land will be acquired for a public purpose.

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
296, 298, 309, 310, 314, 321, 327, 341, 342, 343, 348, 352, 353, 355, 356, 357, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 367, 368, 369, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 382, 383, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 394, 397, 400, 401, 402, 403, 405, 406, 408, 409, 410, 411, 413, 414, 415, 420, 422, 425, 427, 428, 429, 430, 432, 433, 434, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 448, 451, 452, 454, 457, 458, 460, 461, 465, 473, 474, 476, 482, 484, 494, 497, 498, 499, 500, 502, 508, 509, 511, 512, 516, 518, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 529, 530, 531, 533, 534, 537, 539, 542, 544, 545, 547, 548, 550, 551, 552, 553, 556, 557, 560, 562, 575, 578, 580			
119, 131, 195, 198, 243, 287, 291, 361, 419, 424, 425, 454, 462, 463, 464, 465, 479, 483, 510, 527, 547, 567, 579	Existing Use Rights	Submissions raised concerns about whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing land uses would be able to continue, and be altered/expanded as a result of changes to land use zones; and 	<i>A new Guideline to Existing Use Rights and Previously Permissible Land Uses</i> was published on the Department's website in October 2021 to inform and educate landowners on

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether a reduction in the range of permitted land uses might impact the value of land. 	existing use rights. See Section 4.4.5 for more detail.
407, 147, 88, 215, 462, 463, 464, 452, 491, 581, 88, 87, 129, 132, 144, 153, 185, 298, 321, 317, 415, 418, 449, 538, 513, 556, 506, 581, 68, 259, 395, 348, 487, 469, 509, 568, 577, 106, 487, 459, 509, 132, 487, 496, 543	Movement, Access and Connectivity	<p>Submissions raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarifications regarding the active transport network Ensuring connectivity to the public transport network, in particular Metro stations Concerns about the siting of roads and the impact of this on the orderly development of land Support for the timely delivery of various aspects of the planned transport network The need to ensure precinct planning is aligned with detailed road layouts being planned around the Sydney Metro stations Ensuring alignment with transport planning and assumptions with work on the Western Sydney Airport Issues outside the scope of the precinct planning such as the definition of major transport corridors and planning for the freight network across Greater Sydney and NSW. 	<p>Mode share targets across the Aerotropolis have been reviewed to include staged targets for 2026, 2036 and 2056 to provide clarity.</p> <p>The Precinct Plan has been adjusted to ensure a higher level of flexibility for the fine grain street network so that suitable adjustments may be made at the DA stage.</p> <p>See Section 4.4.9 for more detail regarding the road network and layout.</p>

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
28, 33, 77, 132, 138, 144, 171, 193, 202, 259, 303, 345, 415, 423, 468, 480, 483, 503, 504, 509, 543, 559, 568, 570	Sustainability	<p>Submissions raised the following concerns regarding sustainability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about the identification of open space in the plans • Opportunities for waste and recycling facilities • Opportunities to strengthen provisions in the Precinct Plan related to air quality, noise, water, waste management and contaminated lands. • Concern about a lack of flexibility in the application of sustainability targets and circular economy initiatives • Specific options to mitigate the urban heat effect 	<p>See Section 4.4.2 regarding identification of land for open space.</p> <p>See Section 4.4.20 regarding sustainability and heat.</p>
12, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24, 27, 38, 39, 47, 51, 87, 99, 102, 103, 111, 116, 118, 119, 125, 128, 131, 132, 137, 144, 145, 165, 174, 182, 193, 194, 198, 200, 201, 206, 209, 211, 219, 221, 223, 224, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 234, 234, 235, 235, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 250, 252, 253, 254, 255, 257, 259, 261,	Consultation and Ground Truthing	<p>Submissions raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback needed to questions raised in webinars and other forums • Consultation process around property acquisition • Process for informing people affected • Concern about lack of site specific on-site technical investigation 	<p>A review of technical matters including flooding impacts, Existing Native Vegetation, urban design matters, open space, stormwater land have been undertaken to confirm recommendations and conclusions previously made. A number of amendments have been made the Precinct Plan and technical studies as a result of the findings which are</p>

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
262, 263, 263, 267, 270, 272, 273, 275, 278, 281, 282, 283, 287, 291, 293, 294, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 309, 310, 326, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 347, 348, 351, 352, 353, 355, 356, 357, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 368, 369, 370, 373, 374, 377, 378, 379, 380, 384, 385, 387, 390, 394, 398, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 407, 411, 413, 415, 416, 417, 419, 421, 422, 424, 425, 426, 428, 430, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 458, 459, 461, 465, 467, 470, 471, 473, 474, 475, 478, 479, 483, 484, 485, 487, 488, 490, 492, 495, 496, 497, 498, 500, 502, 503, 505, 507, 509, 510, 511, 512, 516, 518, 520, 523, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 535, 537, 542, 543, 545, 550, 551, 552, 553, 555, 556, 561,		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to account for existing development • Vegetation and biodiversity land identified without visiting properties • Concern about the application of the undisturbed soil network • Difficulty understanding the application of open space at a property level • Concern that areas shown as flood affected do not actually flood • Concern about consistency of information shown in different reports • Requests for further specific consultation and engagement regarding Luddenham village • The need for stakeholders to clearly see how the proposals in the Precinct Plan are overlaid with property boundaries 	discussed throughout the finalisation report.

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
562, 566, 575, 577, 579, 581, 583, 584, 215, 321, 515, 73			
61, 584, 581, 506, 580, 575, 575, 562, 577, 577, 568, 566, 528, 520, 509, 562, 543, 496, 541, 532, 503, 516, 498, 515, 560, 535, 539, 538, 459, 406, 413, 483, 449, 418, 509, 488, 425, 458, 452, 415, 465, 465, 447, 445, 461, 461, 485, 444, 453, 410, 348, 387, 324, 325, 323, 382, 386, 349, 360, 322, 317, 320, 318, 319, 312, 311, 315, 321, 295, 266, 306, 291, 308, 307, 281, 256, 220, 255, 257, 259, 250, 199, 215, 201, 212, 193, 195, 192, 183, 182, 180, 153, 154, 152, 139, 145, 144, 125, 131, 121, 118, 119, 69, 44, 91, 77, 49, 65, 53, 90, 106, 94, 66, 84, 13, 26, 25, 5, 3, 10, 5, 1, 21, 19, 73, 73	Road Network and Widths	<p>A significant quantum of submissions questioned the amount of detail and fine-grained road layouts proposed in the 2020 draft Precinct Plan. The draft Precinct Plan depicted a road network that showed minor and local road network arrangements. Often these layouts did not consider cadastre lines and other environmental context matters. Further, the level of detail prescribed in the plans also depict an assumed road, block and land use pattern that precinct planning at this level could not preempt.</p> <p>A decision was made to omit the road network detail from the Precinct Plan to only show the higher road hierarchy, such as Collector and above.</p> <p>The road sections depicted in the draft Precinct Plan also showed sections that may not have been congruent to the Western Sydney Street Design Guide. Often these road layouts were wider than they needed to be and generally not aligned to the principles of the WSSDG. The inclusion of prescriptive and land consuming road reserve requirements in the absence of final development proposals, layouts and assessment</p>	<p>Certain road sections and road layouts are now indicative and no longer a statutory requirement in the Precinct Plan to promote the necessary flexibility and design evolution for future development.</p> <p>See Section 4.4.9</p>

Submission Number	Key Issue Raised	Summary of Issue	The Departments Response and relevant section of Finalisation Report
		was considered inappropriate for precinct planning.	
118, 177, 193, 199, 285, 359, 377, 480, 503	Associated Documents Outside Scope	The majority of concerns raised under this triaging code largely relate to the prescribed design detail in the draft Precinct Plans.	As discussed throughout the finalisation report a number of built form and urban design matters have been removed from the Precinct Plan and included in the Phase 2 DCP. See Section 4.4.11 for more detail.