



WESTERN SYDNEY AEROTROPOLIS

Aerotropolis Phase 2 Development Control Plan

Finalisation Report

November 2022



Published by NSW Department of Planning and Environment

planning.nsw.gov.au

Title: Western Sydney Aerotropolis Phase 2 Development Control Plan

Subtitle: Finalisation Report

First published: November 2022

© State of New South Wales through Department of Planning and Environment 2022. You may copy, distribute, display, download and otherwise freely deal with this publication for any purpose, provided you attribute the Department of Planning and Environment as the owner. However, you must obtain permission if you wish to charge others for access to the publication (other than at cost); include the publication in advertising or a product for sale; modify the publication; or republish the publication on a website. You may freely link to the publication on a departmental website.

Disclaimer: The information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing (November 2022) and may not be accurate, current or complete. The State of New South Wales (including the NSW Department of Planning and Environment), the author and the publisher take no responsibility, and will accept no liability, for the accuracy, currency, reliability or correctness of any information included in the document (including material provided by third parties). Readers should make their own inquiries and rely on their own advice when making decisions related to material contained in this publication.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary and Introduction	3
1. Introduction.....	5
1.1 Aerotropolis planning background	5
2. Exhibition Details.....	6
2.1 Exhibition and Submissions Period	6
2.2 Exhibited Materials	6
2.3 Public Notice.....	7
2.4 Notification to Landowners	7
2.5 Engagement Activities	7
3. Submissions Summary	8
3.1 Number of Submissions	8
3.2 Issues raised	9
4. Consideration of issues	10
4.1 Structure	10
4.2 Built form	11
4.2.1 Interfaces and setbacks	11
4.2.2 Tree canopy cover and deep soil	11
4.2.3 Building signage	11
4.2.4 Earthworks and cut and fill	12
4.3 Stormwater management and water quality	12
4.3.1 Permeable surfaces	12
4.3.2 Waterway health targets.....	13
4.3.3 Riparian streets	14
4.3.4 Regional stormwater approach	14
4.3.5 Retention and restoration of natural waterways and farm dams	15
4.4 Transport	15
4.4.1 Road corridor design and widths	15
4.4.2 Maximum block sizes and mid-block connections.....	16
4.4.3 Car parking design and siting.....	16
4.5 Recognising Country	16
4.5.1 Recognise Country Guidelines.....	16
4.6 Other.....	17
4.6.1 Airport safeguarding controls	17
4.6.2 Feasibility of controls.....	18
5. Summary of post-exhibition amendments to the DCP.....	18
Appendix A – Post – exhibition changes to the Aerotropolis Phase 2 DCP	20

Executive Summary and Introduction

The initial precincts of the Western Sydney Aerotropolis were rezoned in October 2020 to support the planning for the Aerotropolis. This rezoned land benefits from major infrastructure investment by government, including the Sydney Metro Western Sydney Airport.

The rezoning was supported by the finalisation of the Western Sydney Aerotropolis planning package, which included the:

- Western Sydney Aerotropolis Precinct Plan (WSAP) – this plan sets the strategic direction including broad principles and objectives and the vision for each precinct.
- *State Environmental Planning Policy (Western Sydney Aerotropolis) 2020* (the Western Parkland City SEPP) – this plan establishes land use zones and detailed objectives including airport safeguarding provisions.
- Phase 1 Development Control Plan (DCP) – this plan identified the precinct planning principles, objectives, and performance outcomes to allow precinct planning to progress. The Phase 1 DCP is an interim document that will be superseded by the final Phase 2 DCP.

The Western Parkland City SEPP implements the WSAP through the rezoning of the initial precincts. The initial precincts were chosen to align with the anticipated development of land and the associated provision of infrastructure. A Precinct Plan for the initial precincts has been adopted (March 2022) to enable development to proceed in the Aerotropolis. The Phase 2 DCP supports the Precinct Plan and provides the level of detail required to prepare and assess development applications across the Aerotropolis. The Western Parkland City SEPP also identifies a separate master-planning process that can be undertaken by landowners in the Aerotropolis.

Following on from the above package, the Aerotropolis Precinct Planning package was prepared for the initial precincts of the Aerotropolis to provide finer grain (precinct and lot scale) detail for development. The precinct planning package supports delivery of the development across the Aerotropolis and the key objectives of the WSAP, including the Blue and Green Infrastructure Framework, landscape led approach, connection to Country, safeguarding airport operations, embedding circular economy principles and ensuring the Aerotropolis will be resilient and adaptable into the future.

Table 1 outlines the Western Sydney Aerotropolis planning framework consultation phases, where the Phase 2 DCP fits in and the remaining stages in the planning process.

The final Phase 2 DCP (the DCP) will support delivery of the Western Sydney Aerotropolis planning framework, in accordance with the vision identified in the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan. The DCP provides detailed planning controls for development within the initial precincts of the Aerotropolis to be considered as part of the development application process.

In particular, the DCP includes:

- An Aerotropolis-wide focus on Connection to Country, with considerations on Heritage and Connecting to Country being at the forefront of the draft DCP;
- A landscape-led approach with specific controls provided for management of Blue and Green Infrastructure to ensure they are considered at the start of the design process;
- Built form controls with a strong focus on activation of all facades visible from the public realm, not just areas within centres, as well as encouragement of public art and wayfinding signage;
- A focus on how people will travel to and within the Aerotropolis encouraging sustainable travel choices through strong active transit controls and provision of maximum parking rates; and

- Controls to limit the site coverage of developments and ensure a high level of site permeability so water can enter the groundwater system.

The Department prepared the draft Phase 2 DCP (the draft DCP) in collaboration with the Western Sydney Planning Partnership, Liverpool City Council, Penrith City Council and other State government agencies. The draft Phase 2 DCP was exhibited from 8 October until 5 November 2021 with 33 submissions were received from the following stakeholders:

- 15 submissions from local landowners
- 9 submissions from developers and industry groups
- 9 submissions from Government agencies, including Liverpool and Penrith councils.

This report summarises the draft DCP consultation process, issues raised in the submissions and how those issues have been addressed in the final DCP and supports the endorsement and publication of the following key planning documents for the Aerotropolis:

- Western Sydney Aerotropolis Phase 2 Development Control Plan (the final DCP)
- Recognise Country: Guidelines for Development in the Aerotropolis (the Recognise Country Guidelines)
- Aviation Safeguarding Guidelines: Western Sydney Aerotropolis and Surrounding Areas

This report (Section 4) also discusses the key issues raised in submissions, the Department's response and the following changes to the draft DCP:

- Changes to the structure of the document (detailed in Section 4.1)
- Amendments to the wording of controls throughout to improve clarity and ease of use
- Amendments to built-form controls dealing with building setbacks, tree canopy and deep soil requirements, buildings signage and cut and fill (detailed in Section 4.2)
- Amendments to stormwater and waterway health provisions including adjustments to permeable surface requirements for large format industrial uses, clarification on meeting waterway health targets, the delivery of riparian streets and connection to the regional stormwater system (detailed in Section 4.3)
- Changes to transport planning controls including road cross sections for the Enterprise and Agribusiness zones that better accommodate the movement of heavy vehicles and flexibility in street layouts to accommodate large format industrial uses (detailed in Section 4.4)
- Amendments to the Recognise Country Guidelines and supporting DCP controls, including the removal of the \$20m capital investment threshold (detailed in section 4.5)

Post-exhibition changes to the draft DCP are summarised in Section 5 of this report and detailed in Appendix A. Appendix A also provides a comparison between the structure of the exhibited draft DCP and the final DCP.

1. Introduction

1.1 Aerotropolis planning background

Planning for the Aerotropolis requires the consideration of several strategic and statutory documents. The following table provides a summary of documents that have been prepared and released in relation to the Aerotropolis.

Table 1: Aerotropolis documents prepared and released

Timeline	
August 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publication of the Western Sydney Aerotropolis – Land Use and Infrastructure Implementation Plan - Stage 1: Initial Precincts.
September 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan finalised Aerotropolis Phase 1 Development Control Plan finalised.
October 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Environmental Planning Policy (Western Sydney Aerotropolis) 2020 gazetted and initial precincts rezoned (now known as the Western Parkland City SEPP).
November 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Precinct Planning package and supporting technical studies for initial precincts released for community consultation Draft SIC and Draft Local Infrastructure Contributions Plan released for community consultation.
November 2020 - March 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public consultation - 673 submissions received.
May 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appointment of Independent Community Commissioner for the Aerotropolis, Professor Roberta Ryan.
August 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent Community Commissioner provides recommendations to the Minister.
October 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aerotropolis Phase 2 Development Control Plan released for community consultation, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Recognise Country: Guidelines for Development in the Aerotropolis Draft Aviation Safeguarding Guidelines Explanation of Intended Effect (EIE) released for community consultation with proposed SEPP amendments Luddenham Village Discussion Paper released for community consultation.
October 2021 – November 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public consultation - 33 submissions received on the Phase 2 DCP EIE and Luddenham Village Discussion Paper considered separately and addressed as part of the Responding to Issue 2 report).

Timeline	
December 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Master Plan Guidelines published on the NSW Planning Portal.
1 March 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consolidated SEPPs amendment comes into effect. The existing Aerotropolis stand-alone SEPP was consolidated into <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts – Western Parkland City) 2021</i>.
March 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments to Aerotropolis SEPP made Precinct Planning package, including supporting technical studies finalised for initial precincts Luddenham Village Interim Strategy released Master Planning Guidelines come into effect SIC finalised.
November 2022 (we are here)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Aerotropolis Development Control Plan finalised</i> <i>Recognise Country: Guidelines for Development in the Aerotropolis finalised</i> <i>Aviation Safeguarding Guidelines finalised.</i>
Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Liverpool and Penrith Councils to finalise their Local Infrastructure Contributions Submission of master plans and development applications to relevant planning authorities Ongoing work on the Luddenham Village Plan, as per the Interim Strategy.
Longer term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Precinct planning for remaining precincts e.g. North Luddenham, Dwyer Road, Rossmore and Kemps Creek.

2. Exhibition Details

2.1 Exhibition and Submissions Period

The draft DCP was exhibited from 8 October to 5 November 2021 and 33 submissions were received. All submissions have been considered in preparation of the final draft DCP. A summary of the key issues raised and responses to these issues is provided in Section 3 of this report.

2.2 Exhibited Materials

The following documents were publicly exhibited

- Draft Phase 2 Western Sydney Aerotropolis Development Control Plan
- Draft Recognise Country: Guidelines for Development in the Aerotropolis
- Draft Aviation Safeguarding Guidelines
- Draft Western Sydney Aerotropolis Development Control Plan – Phase 2 – Frequently Asked Questions.

These documents were available on the Department's website:

<https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/Plans-for-your-area/Priority-Growth-Areas-and-Precincts/Western-Sydney-Aerotropolis/Western-Sydney-Aerotropolis-Development-Control-Plan>

2.3 Public Notice

A media release announcing the public exhibition was issued on 5 October 2021 as a joint release by the then Minister for Planning and Public Spaces, Rob Stokes, and the then Minister for Western Sydney, Stuart Ayres.

Advertisements were placed in the Penrith Western Weekender and the Koori Mail advising of the details of the public exhibition. Digital advertising also ran on the Liverpool Leader website during the exhibition period.

Social media posts on LinkedIn and Twitter also announced the start of the exhibition period with follow-up posts in week 3 of the exhibition, encouraging people to have their say on the draft DCP.

2.4 Notification to Landowners

The Department sent 2,231 notification letters to landowners and residents within the Aerotropolis and surrounding areas (this includes those who own land in the Aerotropolis but live elsewhere). The letter provided details of the exhibition period and engagement opportunities and invited submissions on the draft DCP.

The Department also sent notification emails to key industry stakeholders, councils, and relevant Commonwealth and State agencies advising of the exhibition.

2.5 Engagement Activities

The following community engagement activities occurred during the exhibition period:

- Three electronic direct mails (EDMs) were sent throughout the exhibition campaign to 2,749 subscribers who were registered on the Department's database
- Dedicated webpages were maintained on the Department's website, which included all exhibition documents, technical reports, and information about community session times
- A dedicated, 1800-number, call and email service was set up that the community could contact to arrange for a planner to call them back
- Due to the COVID-19 restrictions in place at the time, the Department hosted virtual community and stakeholder information sessions.

Following the exhibition period, further workshops were held with industry and Government stakeholders including Liverpool and Penrith councils. These workshops, related to specific themes and are outlined in the following table.

Table 2: DCP workshops

Date	Topic
8 April 2022	Controls relating to industrial land (predominantly the Enterprise zone but also including the Agribusiness zone).
29 April 2022	Transport, car parking and road sections.
4 May 2022	Recognise Country Guideline and supporting DCP controls.
3 June 2022	Combined workshop with Liverpool and Penrith councils.

Date	Topic
17 July 2022	Waterway health.
12 September 2022	Council workshop - page turn of the revised draft DCP.
14 September 2022	Industry workshop - page turn of the revised draft DCP.

Key issues raised that these workshops are listed below and Sections 4 and 5 outline how these matters have been considered in the finalisation of the Phase 2 DCP:

- The DCP structure, including whether content should be divided up based on themes or be specific to land
- Options to allow greater flexibility for large format industrial uses
- The need to clarify pervious surface requirements, for the full range of land uses envisaged in the Aerotropolis, including large format industrial
- Consideration of street setbacks and whether to apply controls consistent with comparable areas
- Need for greater flexibility where basement parking is encouraged, and acknowledgement basement parking is not always suitable in industrial development
- Consideration of street sections and the need to balance the requirements for heavy vehicle movements and pedestrian and cyclist amenity in the Enterprise and Agribusiness zones
- The need for greater guidance on how to achieve water quality targets and how these relate to the regional stormwater system
- Thresholds for considering the Recognise Country Guidelines should be higher than proposed to ensure traditional custodians have the capacity to provide input to development at the right scale
- The need for additional guidance regarding how to respond to the requirements of the Recognise Country Guidelines.

3. Submissions Summary

3.1 Number of Submissions

The Department received 33 submissions in response to the formal exhibition. Copies of all non-confidential submissions received during the exhibition period are on the Department's website and Table 3 provides a summary of submissions as grouped into major stakeholder groups. Section 3.2 of this report outlines the key matters that arose out of submissions and Sections 4 and 5 outline how these matters have been considered in the finalisation of the Phase 2 DCP.

Table 3. Summary of submissions

Stakeholder group	Number of submissions
Landowners and community	15
Government authorities and utility providers	9
Developers and industry groups	9

Stakeholder group	Number of submissions
Total	33

The 9 submissions from Government agencies and utility providers were received from:

- Penrith City Council
- Fairfield City Council
- Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils
- NSW Environment Protection Authority
- DPE – Public Spaces Division
- Heritage NSW
- Water NSW
- Liverpool City Council
- School Infrastructure NSW.

3.2 Issues raised

All submissions received were reviewed by the Department and, where required, in consultation with councils and State agencies.

The key issues raised in submissions include:

- Structure and general usability of the DCP
- Interfaces and building setbacks, particularly for industrial uses
- Tree canopy and deep soil targets
- Prescriptive controls for buildings signage
- The need for further controls to guide cut and fill to accommodate the range of envisaged land uses in the Aerotropolis, including large format industrial
- Concern that waterway health targets are too high and a lack of clarity in how they are to be met
- Permeable surface requirements and the need to accommodate the full range of land uses envisaged for the Aerotropolis
- The need for further clarity on the regional stormwater system for the Aerotropolis and how development is to respond
- Concern about the design of road corridors and the need to ensure they can suitably accommodate heavy vehicle access and movement, where appropriate
- Conflict between maximum block size requirements and the need to accommodate large format industrial uses
- Concern that the application of the Recognise Country Guideline and supporting controls in the DCP are too broad and further guidance is required on how to address this issue
- Concern about car parking design, including for basement parking and access and loading
- Concern about the tension between landscaping controls and airport safeguarding measures to minimise wildlife attraction
- Concern about the feasibility of controls.

4. Consideration of issues

This section discusses the key issues raised in submissions and the Department's response.

The post-exhibition changes to the draft DCP are summarised in Section 5 of this report and detailed in Appendix A. Appendix A also provides a comparison between the structure of the exhibited draft DCP and the final DCP.

4.1 Structure

Numerous submissions, including those from industry groups, landowners and Council, made comments on the structure and layout of the draft DCP, including:

- The volume of information contained would have made it difficult to apply in the detailed design and assessment of development proposals. There was also concern the draft DCP was too prescriptive and contrary to the principle of allowing for a performance based approach
- Some Performance Outcomes and Benchmark Solutions are not direct enough and too open to interpretation
- The structure of the draft DCP makes it challenging to determine which sections apply to each development proposal or specific land use.

Department comment

A performance-based approach has been retained in the final DCP. The wording of Performance Outcomes and corresponding Benchmark Solutions have been amended to improve clarity and intent. The final DCP also clarifies that Benchmark Solutions must ensure consistency with the intent of the objectives and performance outcomes. Where alternative solutions are proposed, the applicant must justify how the development is meeting the intent of both the objectives and performance outcomes.

The post-exhibition review identified several parts that could be reduced or removed due to issues being dealt with in other policies and regulations (e.g. Australian Standards and the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan). This review has substantially reduced the length of the document (i.e. the draft DCP was 143 pages long and the final DCP is 91 pages long).

It is acknowledged that the overall structure of the draft DCP was challenging to navigate and determine which provisions apply to each form of development. The final DCP now has six chapters, including controls that apply to all development across the Aerotropolis and specific controls for the different land use areas. The revised structure is outlined below:

- Chapter 1 – Introduction and Administration: provides information about the administrative provisions of the DCP
- Chapter 2 – General Controls: contains objectives and controls which are designed to manage the natural and built environment and need to be considered for all development
- Chapter 3 – Development for Enterprise and Agribusiness: contains specific objectives and controls for enterprise and industrial development on land identified for Enterprise and Agribusiness
- Chapter 4 – Non-Residential development within Centres: contains specific objectives and controls for non-residential commercial development in the mixed use zone and local neighbourhood centres
- Chapter 5 – Residential: contains specific objectives and controls on for residential development in the mixed use zone
- Draft Western Sydney Aerotropolis
- Development Control Plan – Phase 2

- Chapter 6 – Certain Land Uses: contains specific objectives and controls for additional land uses that are not identified in Chapters 3 to 5.

4.2 Built form

Multiple submissions raised concerns in relation to proposed built form and design controls within the draft DCP. In general, submissions suggested the controls were not sufficiently tailored to the full range of development envisaged for the Aerotropolis, including larger scale industrial and warehousing development.

4.2.1 Interfaces and setbacks

Submissions raised the following issues regarding building interfaces and setbacks:

- Setbacks in the draft DCP were greater than in comparable employment areas in Western Sydney, reducing the amount of site area available for building footprints/development
- Inconsistency in setbacks identified in different parts of the draft DCP.

Department comment

In response to the submission, the interfaces and building setbacks for Enterprise and Agribusiness zones in the adjoining Mamre Road Precinct were reviewed and considered suitable for the Enterprise and Agribusiness zones in the Aerotropolis. Building and landscape setbacks in the final DCP have been simplified and included in Section 3.6.3 Landscape Setbacks. Setbacks can also be investigated further in the context of master plans.

4.2.2 Tree canopy cover and deep soil

Submissions raised the following issues regarding tree canopy and deep soil targets:

- Tree canopy targets, including 25% for industrial lots and 35% for business parks are too high
- Deep soil targets (i.e. 15% for industrial lots and 25% for business parks) are not feasible for industrial and business park uses which typically require large floorplates or development pads.

Department comment

Tree canopy and deep soil targets form a key part of realising the landscape led approach to planning and design in the Aerotropolis. These targets also support the vision for the Western Parkland City by including water in the landscape and cooling Western Sydney.

It has been confirmed that the exhibited tree canopy targets remain achievable, even with the reductions to permeable surface requirements outlined in Section 4.3.1 of this report. For example, where tree canopy targets are greater than the corresponding deep soil and pervious surface requirement, the target is achievable, as this accounts for mature canopy extending over hard surfaces.

Tree canopy targets have therefore been retained at 35% for commercial development and 25% for large format industrial and light industrial development. The relevant section in the final DCP is Section 2.4.1 Deep Soil and Tree Canopy.

4.2.3 Building signage

Submissions raised the following issues regarding building signage:

- Signage controls were too prescriptive, would limit options available for appropriate business signage and are more suitable to town centre settings rather than larger format uses likely in the Enterprise and Agribusiness zones

- Limiting signage to one business identification sign per building is unsuitable for large format uses where multiple signs on a larger building are needed for wayfinding purposes.

Department comment

Standards for signage have been reviewed and included in sections relevant to different land use contexts throughout the final DCP, including:

- Section 3.7 – Signage in Enterprise and Agribusiness settings
- Section 4.4 – Signage in Centres

Given the potential for large format development in employment settings, the following changes have been made, post-exhibition:

- greater flexibility has been allowed for larger business identification signs by scaling the size allowed with the size of the site (e.g. signage may have an area up to 0.5 sqm for every metre of street frontage)
- the limit in the number of business identification signs permitted on larger buildings has been removed.

4.2.4 Earthworks and cut and fill

Submissions highlighted that extensive cut and fill will be needed in the Aerotropolis, particularly for larger format buildings and that guidance should be provided in the DCP.

Department comment

The draft DCP did not provide guidance for cut and fill given that the preference is for site planning respond to natural topography by minimising cut and fill. However, it is acknowledged that there will be a need for cut and fill in parts of the Aerotropolis, in particular to accommodate larger scale industrial development. To address this new content has been added to guide cut and fill in chapter 2 of the final DCP.

To mitigate the landscape impacts of retaining walls they have been limited to 2m in height. Where retaining walls are tiered, there must be a 1.5m deep soil zone between each retaining wall and the maximum cumulative height of retaining walls adjoining the public domain is 6m.

Further, in order to ensure that cut and fill is minimised to only what is required to accommodate final development outcomes, limits to the cut and fill permitted at the subdivision stage have been included. This limitation applies to applications for subdivision only where cut and fill will be limited to road corridors and to within 15m of each newly created property boundary.

4.3 Stormwater management and water quality

Multiple submissions raised concerns in relation to the approach to stormwater management and water quality targets within the draft DCP.

4.3.1 Permeable surfaces

Submissions raised the following issues regarding the permeable surface targets:

- Maximum site coverage limits of 70% and a minimum requirement of 30% pervious surfaces would impact on the development feasibility of industrial projects. These permeable surface requirements are beyond industry standard and greater than comparable employment areas such as the Mamre Road Precinct
- Industrial lands often require large hardstand areas surrounding warehouse for truck parking and manoeuvring and storage of goods
- The way permeable surface requirements were expressed in the draft DCP was difficult to interpret.

Department comment

The implementation of permeable surface requirements is closely linked to the achievement of waterway health targets for the Aerotropolis.

In response to concerns raised by stakeholders, and following additional consultation with Sydney Water, the following changes have been made post-exhibition:

- Permeable surface requirements have been simplified and included in Section 2.3.2 Stormwater Management and Water Sensitive Urban Design as follows:
 - Development in the Mixed Use Zone:
 - Mixed Use Centre (over 2:1 FSR) – 30%
 - Mixed Use Centre (up to 2:1 FSR) – 35%
 - Development in the Enterprise and Agribusiness Zone:
 - Employment – business, commercial, light industrial (three storeys and above) – 30%
 - Employment – Large format industrial and light industrial (up to two storeys) – 15%.

The reduction in permeable surface requirement for large format industrial uses from 30% to 15% can be achieved while meeting overall waterway health targets for the Aerotropolis and aligns with comparable employment area controls for the Mamre Road Precinct.

These permeable surface targets have been extensively tested by Sydney Water and it has been confirmed that they are required to achieve waterway health targets associated with the regional stormwater framework for the Aerotropolis. Further reductions to these targets would result in the need for additional land to be acquired for the regional stormwater system.

4.3.2 Waterway health targets

Submissions raised the following issues regarding waterway health targets:

- Waterway health targets seem high in general
- It is unclear what is expected of applicants in terms of the extent of land required for water sensitive urban design measures and drainage basins on site.

Department comment

The achievement of waterway health targets contained in the final DCP is critical to realising a landscape and waterway health (blue green) led approach to planning in the Aerotropolis. Accordingly, the targets have not changed, from those in the draft DCP.

It is acknowledged that the avenues to achieve waterway health targets through on-site measures and/or connection to the regional stormwater system lacked clarity in the draft DCP. Through detailed consultation with stakeholders, the pathways for achieving stormwater quality and flow targets have been refined, and are set out in Section 2.3.2 Stormwater Management and Water Sensitive Urban Design of the final DCP.

Further guidance is being made available by the Department with release of the *Technical guidance for achieving Wianamatta-South Creek stormwater management targets*. This guideline has now been released and is used to:

- Support State Significant Development (SSD) applications, State Significant Infrastructure (SSI) applications and Development Applications.
- Support practitioners or proponents involved in planning, design, approval, delivery and operation of WSUD strategies
- Demonstrate compliance with the water quality and water flow objectives and targets in the Aerotropolis.

4.3.3 Riparian streets

Stakeholders have raised the following issues regarding riparian streets:

- Whether watercourses could be piped where riparian streets have been identified
- Lack of clarity on riparian street width and how much land will be taken up that could otherwise be developed.

Department comment

A total of 13 riparian streets are identified in the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan. Riparian streets have been identified where there is an opportunity to align new streets with watercourses in a way that realises places with high levels of amenity, retains water in the landscape and achieves waterway health targets for the Aerotropolis. The piping of waterways in the place of riparian streets would prevent achievement of these targets.

The total width of riparian streets is determined by the width of the roadway, plus the riparian element on that street. The width of the riparian element is guided by the Natural Resources Access Regulator (NRAR) riparian corridor guideline which requires widths ranging from 20m (plus channel width) for Strahler Order 1 streams through to 60m (plus channel width) for Strahler Order 3 streams.

To reduce the overall width of riparian streets, elements such as footpaths that are usually accommodated within the street reserve, can be accommodated within parts of the riparian elements of riparian streets.

To further reduce impacts on landholders the amount of space required for the road corridor element of the riparian street has been reduced to 13.6m in the Mixed Use zone and 14.1m in the Enterprise zone.

A map has been prepared and included at Appendix C that shows the Strahler Order of all riparian streets. This will guide the amount of land required for each riparian street in accordance with the NRAR riparian corridor guideline.

4.3.4 Regional stormwater approach

Submissions raised the following issues regarding the regional stormwater approach:

- Need for greater clarity of Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) measures to be accommodated on lot in addition to relying on the regional basins.

Department comment

Sydney Water has been working with the Department to establish a regional stormwater approach for the Aerotropolis. This has resulted in the identification of land to be acquired for stormwater infrastructure in the Western Parkland City SEPP. Affected properties will be acquired over time to implement the regional stormwater network for the Aerotropolis.

The final DCP clarifies the options available to meet the water quality objectives contained in the Precinct Plan. These are detailed in Section 2.3.2 Stormwater Management and Water Sensitive Urban Design of the DCP and involve two scenarios.

- Scenario 1 - targets are met by confirming, to the Stormwater Management Authority and the consent authority's satisfaction, that stormwater will flow into the regional stormwater system
- Scenario 2 - where the regional stormwater system is not available to service the development, interim on-site measures must be included to achieve the waterway health objectives. When the regional stormwater system does become available to the site it is expected that development will connect to it. This will generally enable the development of additional parts of the site that had been used for the interim on-site measures.

4.3.5 Retention and restoration of natural waterways and farm dams

Submissions raised the following issues regarding the restoration of natural waterways and retention of farm dams.

- Objection to requirement that Strahler Order 1 watercourses with a catchment of greater than 15 hectares be re-instated in natural state
- Consideration and determination of farm dams to be retained should be left to the DA stage.

Department comment

The role of natural waterways and retention of farm dams has been determined by the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan. The DCP does not alter this determination and only provides some additional detail.

Strahler Order 1 watercourses outside High Ecological Value areas in a catchment less than 15 ha can be re-constructed and /or piped. All other watercourses must be reinstated to their natural form. No change is proposed to this control, guidance is provided in Section 2.3.1 Waterway Health and Riparian Corridors

Technical studies were undertaken for the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan which assessed farm dams and recommended dams to be retained. The outcome of this work is reflected in the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan and no change is proposed to this approach.

4.4 Transport

Multiple submissions raised concerns in relation transport planning matters within the draft Phase 2 DCP.

4.4.1 Road corridor design and widths

Submissions raised the following issues regarding road corridor design and widths.

- Street sections are not tailored to employment and industrial settings. Street sections should be similar to those that apply in comparable areas such as in the Mamre Road DCP
- In industrial areas, the active transport elements in the street sections will result in safety issues and unreasonable conflict with the safe and efficient movement of heavy vehicles.

Department comment

The street cross sections will be kept in the DCP to establish clear expectations and understanding of the features to be accommodated within road corridors. There is also a need to identify how various street types throughout the Aerotropolis are to function e.g. streets being great places for people in the mixed use centres and streets that balance amenity outcomes with the need to allow for the safe and efficient movement of heavy vehicles etc.

Revised street cross sections have been included in the following sections of the DCP:

- Section 2.6 Road Design for Arterial and Sub-arterial roads – provides guidance for the design of higher order roads throughout the Aerotropolis
- Section 3.1.1 – contains street cross sections for enterprise, industrial and agribusiness areas that are consistent with those in the Mamre Road Precinct. These cross sections allow for the safe and efficient movement of heavy vehicles
- Section 4.1.1 and Section 5.1.1 – applies street cross sections for residential and non-residential development for centres including all areas zoned for Mixed Use.
- Section 2.3.1 contains street cross sections for riparian streets in the Mixed Use and Enterprise zones.

4.4.2 Maximum block sizes and mid-block connections

Submissions raised the following issue regarding block sizes:

- Limiting block sizes to 350m in length in industrial settings does not meet current market requirement for large format developments.

Department comment

While the road network set out in the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan establishes the general layout of street blocks, it is also acknowledged that a greater degree of flexibility in block layouts and sizes is warranted to provide the flexibility needed to accommodate large format developments.

Accordingly, maximum block size requirements and the requirement for mid-block connections have been removed from the final DCP. The indicative street network in the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan will still adequately guide street block layouts and provide flexibility to adjust the location of some local and collector roads.

Applicants will still be required to demonstrate how sufficient levels of accessibility are maintained to allow workers and other visitors to move around the precinct and access services and public transport infrastructure.

4.4.3 Car parking design and siting

Submissions raised the following issues regarding car parking design:

- Basement car parking for large format industrial development is impractical and unfeasible
- Servicing and loading requirements are suitable for mixed use and residential development but not suitable for industrial developments
- Car parking should be allowed within the front setback of sites, provided appropriate screening is provided.

Department comment

Standards for car parking design have been reviewed and incorporated into Sections 3 to 5, to ensure they are suitable for their respective contexts e.g. Enterprise and Agribusiness (Section 3.5), development in centres (Section 4.3) and residential development (Section 5.4). Key changes made include:

- Removal of preference for basement parking in Enterprise and Agribusiness settings (Section 3.2). This will provide greater flexibility for how parking is provided on site.
- Servicing and loading requirements have been reviewed to ensure they are fit for purpose for all forms of development and have been included in Section 2.9.
- Flexibility has been provided in the siting of parking areas including the ability to provide at grade parking. Additional public domain or amenity design guidance for at grade and above ground parking has been provided in Section 2.7 Parking Design and Access.

4.5 Recognising Country

4.5.1 Recognise Country Guidelines

Submissions raised the following issues relating to the Recognise Country Guidelines and supporting DCP controls:

- There is a limited availability of suitable qualified consultants to prepare reports and undertake the engagement activities needed to satisfy these guidelines
- The \$20m Capital Investment Value (CIV) threshold is arbitrary and may be set too low which could unintentionally capture some small development

- Traditional Custodians and knowledge holders may be overburdened by the number of projects requiring their input
- Need for greater clarity and detail on how the Recognise Country process will work in practice

Department comment

The Recognise Country Guidelines and associated DCP section (section 2.1) have been refined to respond to comments and following further engagement with Traditional Custodians and Cultural Advisors. The key changes include:

- Removal of the \$20 million CIV criteria for applying the Guidelines and DCP standards
- Addition of the following criteria:
 - Development applications progressing under the design excellence process
 - Development applications located within or intersects areas of high Aboriginal heritage sensitivity (where deemed appropriate by the responsible planning authority).
- Amendment to the requirement for the number of Aboriginal stakeholders - from two stakeholders to a 'range' of stakeholders and inclusion of an 'engagement requirements' subsection, clarifying key stakeholder types, their roles and relevance to the project.
- Amendment to the planning pathway section within the Guidelines to provide greater detail and guidance of how the Recognise Country process is integrated into existing planning pathways, including Master Plans, State Significant Development Applications, State Significant Infrastructure and Development Applications.
- Identification of documents that are required to be submitted for applications for each planning pathway to support achieving the objectives and standards for Recognising Country.
- Addition of a *Recognise Country Response Template* to fulfill the requirement for the 'statement', which is required to be prepared by the applicant, with input from Aboriginal Stakeholders. The template seeks to consolidate the Recognise Country response to enable simpler navigation for Aboriginal Stakeholders when reviewing the application and supports assessment officers in their recommendation for determination.
- General restructuring of the DCP controls to provide clarity for when the Guidelines and associated DCP section applies.

4.6 Other

4.6.1 Airport safeguarding controls

Submissions raised the following issues regarding airport safeguarding:

- Landscaping requirements and airport safeguarding provisions are in conflict
- Canopy cover and stormwater infrastructure both have the potential to increase wildlife hazard risks by attracting bird life, surrounding the Western Sydney Airport

Department comment

Airport safeguarding is a critical planning objective that has informed every aspect of the Aerotropolis planning framework, including the sighting of zones that allow for residential development and other noise sensitive uses and the approach to landscaping and watercycle management to minimise wildlife strike risk. No change has been made as landscaping controls

have already been prepared with careful consideration of airport safeguarding. This includes the identification of tree species in Appendix B of the final DCP that minimise wildlife attraction.

4.6.2 Feasibility of controls

Submissions raised the following issues regarding the feasibility of controls:

- Some controls in the draft DCP, in particular around permeable surface requirements and water cycle management, will impose a high cost on development
- The cost of development may be higher in the Aerotropolis compared with other parts of Sydney and Australia. These higher costs may make the Aerotropolis uncompetitive as a destination for development and investment.

Department comment

The economic feasibility of development outcomes in the Aerotropolis has been tested through the *Western Sydney Aerotropolis Economic and Market Feasibility Report* prepared to support the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan. This report found that lower intensity employment uses such as warehousing and light industrial uses, will be particularly viable uses in the earlier stages of development in the Aerotropolis and the viability of higher intensity uses will develop over time.

Development feasibility is influenced by a wide range of factors beyond the scope of the final DCP, including assumptions around the value of land and the land use zone and other controls contained in the Western Parkland City SEPP and Aerotropolis Precinct Plan.

The Department is confident that the final DCP will form part of a robust planning framework that will enable feasible development outcomes in the Aerotropolis now and into the future, when the airport and associated infrastructure is completed and as the precincts and markets in the areas grow and mature.

5. Summary of post-exhibition amendments to the DCP

This section summarises post-exhibition changes in response to feedback during exhibition of the draft DCP. The final DCP comprehensively responds to the submissions, as outlined in Section 4. Key post-exhibition amendments include:

- Restructuring the DCP to clearly define the content relevant for all development to address (Chapter 1 and 2) and controls relevant to specific forms of development (Chapter 3-6)
- Sections have been removed from the DCP that are sufficiently dealt with by other policies and regulations
- Clarification has been provided on waterway health targets and the achievement of these through connection to the regional stormwater systems and on-site measures
- Amendments to pervious surface requirements in the Enterprise and Agribusiness zones that are more suitable to development that will occur in these areas, while still achieving the objectives of the regional stormwater network.
- Street cross sections for the Enterprise and Agribusiness zones have been amended to generally align with those contained in the Mamre Road
- Maximum block lengths and requirements for mid-block connections have been removed. to allow the flexibility needed to accommodate large format industrial and warehousing uses in the Aerotropolis and merit-based assessments of requests to adjust the street network that ensure sufficient levels of accessibility are achieved

- The Recognise Country Guidelines have been amended, including the removal of the \$20m capital investment threshold to ensure that development at the right scale is being considered
- Development standards for lower density residential development in the Sydney Science Park have been carried over from the site-specific Penrith DCP that has applied to the Sydney Science Park site since being endorsed in 2014
- General adjustments to the wording of controls to correct errors, confirm intent and clarify meaning have been made throughout the DCP.

Further details on the post-exhibition changes are provided in Appendix A.

Appendix A – Post – exhibition changes to the Aerotropolis Phase 2 DCP

Final DCP - Section	Draft DCP - Section	Summary of post-exhibition changes
Chapter 1 Introduction and Administration		
1.1 Name of this Development Control Plan	1.1 Name of this Development Control Plan	No change
1.2 Aims of this DCP	1.2 Aims of this DCP	The objectives of the DCP have been consolidated (i.e. reduced from 11 to 6): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Facilitate development which is appropriate to the unique natural characteristics and desired future outcomes for each precinct of the Aerotropolis; 2. Safeguard the airport operations of Western Sydney International (Nancy-Bird Walton) Airport (Airport); 3. Support high levels of local accessibility, quality place and amenity outcomes to drive business relocation and economic growth; 4. Encourage design that maintains and enhances the character and heritage significance of Aboriginal and European heritage items and heritage conservation areas; 5. Encourage ecologically sustainable development and reduce the impacts of development on the environment; and 6. Deliver development in accordance with the principles of Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD).
1.3 Land where this DCP Applies	1.4 Where this DCP Applies	Land application updated to include Luddenham Village and exclude areas that have been rezoned from Environment and Recreation to the underlying Council LEP zone as they adjoin non-initial precincts.
1.4 Using this DCP	1.5 Using this DCP	Outline of the revised (i.e. changed into 6 chapters) structure of the DCP and a description of the purpose of each chapter. Minor change regarding the performance based flexible approach to the DCP to clarify there is limited flexibility in areas such as airport safeguarding.
1.5 Adoption and Commencement	1.3 Adoption and Commencement	Updated to reflect the date the plan as adopted and came into force.
1.6 Review of the DCP		No change
Chapter 2 General Controls		
2.1 Recognise County	2 Recognise Country	Changes made:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement to the criteria for applying the Recognise Country Guidelines, including removal of the \$20m CIV threshold. Two new criteria were added to ensure relevant applications were captured, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development applications progressing under the design excellence process ○ Development applications located within or intersects areas of high Aboriginal heritage sensitivity (where deemed appropriate by the responsible planning authority). • Clarification of engagement requirements including a breakdown of the different Aboriginal stakeholder groups and their role in the Recognise Country process. Revised engagement model includes the identification of the following stakeholders that can be engaged and their roles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dharug Traditional Custodians (also Traditional Owners) ○ Other Traditional Custodians (also Traditional Owners) ○ Knowledge holders ○ Local Aboriginal Land Councils ○ Broader Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community ○ Aboriginal service providers / businesses ○ Registered Aboriginal Party (RAP) • Reference included to the <i>Recognise Country Response Template</i>, which will be required to be completed by applicants with input from Aboriginal Stakeholders when submitting a development application. • Controls generally refined for clarity to guide the preparation and assessment of applications.
2.2 Heritage	<p>3.1 Aboriginal Cultural Heritage</p> <p>3.2 Non-Aboriginal Heritage</p>	Reference included to guidance on the preparation of Heritage Impact Assessment contained in the Appendix to the guide the consideration of specific impacts of developments on heritage items.
2.3 Stormwater, Water Sensitive Urban Design and Integrated Water Management	<p>4.1 Waterway Health and Riparian Corridors</p> <p>4.3 Stormwater Management and Water Sensitive</p>	Street cross sections for Riparian Streets have been updated in response to concerns about a lack of certainty on the widths that would be required and that they would require excessive amounts of land. Widths of the roadway elements of Riparian Streets have been reduced as much as possible to 13.6m and 14.1m for Mixed Use and Enterprise zones respectively. To achieve this, the figures have been updated to show that the outer 50% of the

	<p>Urban Design</p> <p>4.4 Management and Maintenance of Stormwater Infrastructure</p> <p>14.1 Targets for Site Coverage, Perviousness and Quantum of Public Domain by Typology</p>	<p>riparian corridor would comprise of certain elements such as landscaping and pedestrian and cycle paths. The width of the riparian corridor element is guided by the <i>Guidelines for Controlled Activities on Waterfront Land—Riparian Corridors</i> and determined by the respective Strathler order of each waterway. A detailed breakdown of the Strathler order of each riparian street has been included in Appendix C of the DCP.</p> <p>Pervious surface targets have been consolidated based on land use zone and the intensity of development proposed. Pervious surface targets have been tested by Sydney Water and are based on what is needed to achieve waterway health targets across the Aerotropolis. The key change to targets is a reduction in pervious surface targets for large format industrial and light industrial (up to two storeys) from 30% down to 15%. A note has also been included to clarify that for applications that include the delivery of streets, streets are also to be included in the pervious area calculations.</p>
<p>2.4 Native Vegetation and Biodiversity</p>	<p>5.1 Deep Soil and Tree Canopy</p> <p>5.2 Protection of Biodiversity</p> <p>5.3 Protection of Trees and Vegetation</p> <p>5.4 Preferred Plant Species</p> <p>5.5 Street Tree Planting Requirements</p>	<p>Tree canopy and deep soil targets have been broadly retained but with the following adjustments to Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements for detached dwellings removed. The only areas where detached dwellings are permitted is the Sydney Science Park and Luddenham Village and existing Penrith DCP controls have been brought across for these areas • non-residential requirements consolidated to just include commercial and industrial development. <p>The biodiversity protection controls have been refined to improve clarity and specific guidance for the protection of Koala habitat has been included.</p> <p>The tree protection controls have been refined to improve clarity. A note has also been added to direct applicants to the respective tree removal permit policies of Liverpool and Penrith Councils.</p> <p>Controls for landscaping and plant species have been refined to improve clarity and remove repetition. Controls dealing with landscaping in car parking areas have also been moved into this section from the car parking design (Section 2.7) as this content is a better fit here.</p>

		The only change made to street tree planning requirements is the inclusion of an objective for soil to be de-compacted to ensure it is suitable to support the growth of trees.
2.5 Flooding and Environmental Resilience Management	9.1 Flood Risk Management 9.2 Mitigating the Urban Heat Island Effect 9.4 Salinity 9.5 Acid Sulfate Soils 9.6 Erosion and Sediment Control	Minor wording changes to improve clarity have been made to flood management controls Minor refinements only to assist with clarity for controls on Mitigating the Urban Heat Island Effect, Salinity, Acid Sulfate Soils and Erosion and Sediment Control.
2.6 Road design for Arterial and Sub-Arterial Roads	6.1 Street Network Functions and Design	Road design controls have been refined to remove unnecessary repetition and controls that are not assessable. Reference to maximum street blocks have also been removed as this has been removed from elsewhere in the DCP. The requirement for the section to apply to all development over 5,000m ² has also been removed and replaced with provisions that will only apply to applications that include the delivery of arterial and sub-arterial roads as identified in the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan.
2.7 Parking design and access	7.3 Parking Design/Access and End of Trip Facilities	Parking design controls have been amended to remove unnecessary repetition of Australian Standards car parking design. Adjustments have been made to prioritise basement parking only in mixed use areas and centres, in recognition that basement parking is not always suitable in the Enterprise and Agribusiness zones.
2.8 Travel Demand Management	7.1 Travel Demand Management	No change
2.9 Service and loading design	7.4 Servicing and Loading Design	Provisions relating to loading areas in the public domain have been removed as the location and requirements for these loading areas are a matter for public authorities.
2.10 Airport Safeguarding	10.1 Protection of Operational Airspace 10.2 Noise	No change

	10.3 Wildlife Hazards	
2.11 Services and Utilities	12.1 Services and Utilities Design	Refinement and consolidation of controls to clarify intent.
2.12 Sustainability and Circular Economy	11.1 Energy	Emissions reduction controls have been simplified to just require proponents to demonstrate 100% renewable energy supply can be achieved by 2030, whether on or off site.
2.13 Smart Places	13.1 Smart Places Design	Refinement and consolidation of controls to clarify intent.
2.14 Design for Safe Places	8.3 Design for Safe Places	No change
2.15 Universal Design and Access	8.2 Universal Design and Access	No change
2.16 Waste Management	11.3 Waste Management and Recovery	Refinement and consolidation of controls to clarify intent.
2.17 Subdivision Design	New section	New section to guide subdivision including the need to minimise cut and fill and respond to the natural topography. Where a proposal is for subdivision of land only, benching to level sites is limited to road layouts and to within 15m of each newly created or proposed lot.
2.18 Earthworks and retaining walls	New section	To mitigate the landscape impacts of retaining walls they have been limited to 2m in height. Where retaining walls are tiered, there must be a 1.5m deep soil zone between each retaining wall and the maximum cumulative height of retaining walls adjoining the public domain is 6m.
2.19 Public Art	14.3 Public Art	No change
Chapter 3 Development for Enterprise and Industry, and Agribusiness		
3.1 Local road network and design	6.1 Street Network Functions and Design	Content has been refined and consolidated to guide the delivery of Collector Roads and Local Streets for Enterprise and Agribusiness development. Amendments were made to incorporate road cross sections consistent with those in the adjoining Mamre Road precinct. These cross sections are more suitable for accommodating the safe and efficient movement of heavy vehicles which will be a key requirement of the Enterprise and Agribusiness zones.
3.2 Parking and travel management	7.2 Bicycle and Car Parking Rates 7.3 Parking Design/Access and End of Trip Facilities	Parking rates for industry and warehousing and distribution centres are unchanged. A minor discrepancy was also corrected by grouping warehouses with distribution centres for the purpose of applying parking rates.

		<p>Parking rates for the following land uses that are expected in the Enterprise and Agribusiness zones have also been included and are consistent with those in the adjoining Mamre Road precinct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freight Transport Facilities • Vehicle Body Repair Workshops/ Vehicle Repair Stations • Ancillary office space • Neighbourhood shops <p>Minor clarification for end of trip facilities included that bicycle parking and storage areas should be located near entrances and change and shower facilities located closer to workspaces.</p>
3.3 Built form	<p>8.1 Building Setbacks and Interfaces</p> <p>15.2 Industrial, Agribusiness, Specialised Retail/Bulky Goods Uses</p>	<p>Setbacks in the Enterprise and Agribusiness zones have been consolidated into one section to avoid any confusion or inconsistencies. Additional guidance has been included by providing setbacks to secondary road frontages (corner lots), rear and side boundaries and Lots adjoining land zoned Environment and Recreation. These are in addition to setbacks to arterial and sub-arterial roads, collector streets and local streets which were already included in the draft DCP. Along with building setbacks, guidance has been added on landscape setbacks to ensure that a suitable amount of land within the building setback is suitable for landscaping.</p>
3.4 Signage	8.5 Signage and Wayfinding	<p>Greater flexibility has been provided to allow for larger business identification signs in employment settings by scaling the size allowed with the size of the site (signage may have an area up to 0.5 sqm for every metre street frontage).</p> <p>Limits in the number of business identification signs permitted on larger buildings have been removed as multiple signs are often required to assist with wayfinding.</p>
3.5 Lighting	New section	<p>Guidance on lighting has been added, based on feedback from Western Sydney Airport that seeks to ensure lighting installed as a part of development does not impact airport operations.</p>
3.6 Fencing	New section	<p>Guidance on fencing has been added given that fencing is often featured in land uses typically anticipated in the Enterprise and Agribusiness zones.</p>
3.7 Noise and amenity	Various	<p>Content on noise and amenity impacts for industrial development included in various parts of the draft DCP have been consolidated and refined into Section 3.10 for clarity and ease of use. Consolidating controls in this section will guide the preparation of acoustic reports, where they are required.</p>
Chapter 4 Non-Residential development in Centres		

4.1 Road network and design	6.1 Street Network Functions and Design	Content has been refined and consolidated to guide the delivery of Collector Roads and Local Streets in Centres. Street cross sections that have been prepared to support the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan have been included here to provide guidance on the elements to be included within road corridors.
4.2 Built form	8.1 Building Setbacks and Interfaces 15.1 Mixed Use Development, Residential & Commercial Development	Guidance on built form in centres has been consolidated into the one section to avoid any confusion or inconsistencies. Controls have been generally refined to improve clarity.
4.3 Parking and travel management	7.2 Bicycle and Car Parking Rates 7.3 Parking Design/Access and End of Trip Facilities	Bicycle and car parking rates have been unchanged and inform the achievement of mode share targets outlined in the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan. Minor clarification for end of trip facilities included that bicycle parking and storage areas should be located near entrances and change and shower facilities located closer to workspaces.
4.4 Signage in Centres	8.5 Signage and Wayfinding	Greater flexibility to allow for larger business identification signs in employment settings by scaling the size allowed with the size of the site (signage may have an area up to 0.5 sqm for every metre street frontage). Removal of the limit in the number of business identification signs permitted on larger buildings.
Chapter 5 Residential Development		
5.1 Road network and design	6.1 Street Network Functions and Design	Content has been refined and consolidated to guide the delivery of Collector Roads and Local Streets that support residential development.
5.2 Built form	8.1 Building Setbacks and Interfaces 15.1 Mixed Use Development, Residential & Commercial Development	Controls have been consolidated to avoid duplication and inconsistency. The controls in this section have also been reviewed and refined to improve clarity. Controls for low density residential development in the Sydney Science Park have been added that align with existing approved controls in the Penrith DCP.
5.3 Parking and travel management	7.2 Bicycle and Car Parking Rates	Minor change to ensure all parking rates for attached and detached dwellings are expressed in whole numbers.
Chapter 6 Certain Land Uses		

6.1 Social and cultural infrastructure	14.4 Social Infrastructure	Controls have been refined and consolidated to clarify intent.
6.2 Night time economy uses	15.3 Night-time Economy Uses	Minor change removing controls for activation of the public domain as this is a matter for local authorities and not a consideration at the DA stage.
6.3 Animal boarding or training establishments	15.8 Animal Boarding or Training Establishments	No changes
6.4 Tourist and visitor accommodation	15.12 Tourist and Visitor Accommodation	The maximum distance that tourist and visitor accommodation can be located from public transport services has changed from 400m to 800m, as 800m is still a reasonable walking distance.
6.5 Telecommunication facilities	12.2 Telecommunication Facilities	No changes
6.6 Additional land uses	New section 15.5 Childcare Centres 15.6 Education Facilities 15.7 Places of Public Worship 15.9 Roadside Stalls 15.10 Sex Services and Restricted Premises 15.11 Boarding Houses	A new section was added to refer to Council DCP controls for the following forms of development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Childcare centres • Educational facilities / establishments • Places of public worship • Roadside stalls • Sex services and restricted premises • Boarding houses • Alterations and additions to existing residential dwellings • Development within the Luddenham Village, prior to the finalisation of the Luddenham Village Strategy
Sections removed from Draft DCP		
	4.2 Existing Artificial Waterbodies	This is covered in the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan, where waterbodies to be retained are mapped.
	6.2 Active Transport Network	The active transport network is mapped and detailed in the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan.
	8.4 View Sharing	The retention of key view corridors and sight lines has been considered at the Precinct Planning stage and is reflected in the street and open space layout contained in the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan.

	9.3 Bushfire Hazard Management	Removed as content is not necessary in the DCP. Areas that are bushfire prone are already identified in the SEPP and requirements for development to respond to bushfire risks is dealt with by other regulation.
	9.7 Contaminated Land	Provisions for contaminated land are already covered by the <i>Contaminated Land Management Act 1997</i> , SEPP and Contaminated Land Management Guidelines.
	9.8 Odour	This is dealt with by other regulations including <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i> and other Environmental Protection Authority guidelines for odour management.
	9.9 Air Quality	This is dealt with by other regulations including <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i> and other Environmental Protection Authority guidelines for air quality.
	10.4 Communications, Navigation and Surveillance Systems	Western Sydney Airport confirmed that these controls are not needed in the DCP as they are dealt with by other regulations.
	11.2 Reducing Waste and Supporting the Circular Economy through Design and Construction	These provisions were removed as these are matters that can be addressed as conditions of development consent.
	12.3 Precinct Integrated Water Management	Sydney Water have done this work upfront to inform precinct planning so there is no need to repeat it in the DCP
	14.2 Street Patterns	Prescriptive block size controls are not needed as the road network is set out in the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan. There is also the opportunity to vary the placement of some local and collector roads which provides the flexibility to accommodate large format industrial uses in the Aerotropolis.
	15.4 Outdoor Dining	Outdoor dining on footpaths is exempt development under the Codes SEPP and is not a matter for the DCP.
	15.14 New and Upgraded Waste or Resource Management Facilities	Largely removed. Relevant provisions added to waste management section