



INGHAM MASTER PLAN

Conditions for the draft Ingham Master Plan to proceed to lodgement

Table 1 IPG Master Plan – conditions for lodgement

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
General and mapping			
1.	Prior to lodgement, the draft master plan and supporting documents are to be reviewed and edited to ensure correct references to figures and controls, and to ensure it addresses the matters raised by the TAP.	All figures, tables, controls and appendix references have been reviewed to ensure consistency across the technical reports.	Master Plan, Planning Report and supporting appendices
2.	Prior to lodgement, the draft master plan report is to be updated to:		
2a.	Ensure the colouring and labels within the draft master plan mapping is consistent with the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan, where relevant.	All Precinct Plan map amendments have been checked for consistency against the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan in relation to colouring and labelling	Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps Section 9 and 10 of Planning Report
2b.	Remove any reference to 'additional controls' where the proposed control is consistent with the Development Control Plan (DCP).	Noted. All 'Additional Controls' referenced within the Master Plan Report are additional controls to the DCP. 'Additional Controls' consistent with the DCP were removed prior to the TAP 8 Meeting, as requested by DPHI.	Appendix C – Master Plan Report

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
2c.	Include a legend with the proposed Structure Plan on Page 4.	A legend has been added to the Structure Plan in the Executive Summary.	Section 1 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
2d.	Include super-lot numbering on the Subdivision Strategy Plan at Figure 24.	The Subdivision Strategy Plan in Section 6.2 has been updated to include super-lot numbering.	Section 6.2 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
2e.	Rectify error in reference to landmark buildings and identify the wind shear area on the Proposed Height Controls Plan at Figure 25.	The Proposed Height Control map in Section 6.4 has been updated to include the wind shear area affecting the area where high-bay warehousing is permissible.	Section 6.4 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
2f.	Include a key for the Local Centre Height Distribution Plan (Figure 26) on Page 41.	A legend has been added to the Local Centre FSR map in Section 6.5 of the Master Plan.	Section 6.5 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
2g.	Include indicative finer grain roads following the Active Transport Plan (Figure 36) by reinstating the 'Legacy Plan' from Tranche 4, (Figure 17).	<p>The Active Transport map in Section 7.1 of the Master Plan and Section 6.8.5 of the Urban Design Report has been amended to include indicative finer grain connections which there is the potential for greater permeability for active transport as the site evolves, subject to future market demands. These finer grain connections references the 'Legacy Plan' from Tranche 4, however has been updated to reflect the latest version of the Master Plan layout and road structure.</p> <p>As referenced in Condition 18b below, the text provided in this Condition 18b which references these finer grain connections has been included within Section 7.1 of the Master Plan, and amended slightly to read:</p> <p><i>The current layout does not allow road permeability within the blocks for safety and security reasons. However, in the future there could be opportunities to create mid-block road</i></p>	<p>Section 7.1 of Master Plan Report Appendix C</p> <p>Section 6.8.5 of Urban Design Report, Figure 39. Appendix D</p>

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<i>connections if there is a demand for commercial buildings instead of warehouses. These mid-block connections will allow additional permeability through the site. Refer to indicative future legacy road connections within the Active Transport Map in Figure 36. The provision for mid-block connections must not impact warehouse operations and access arrangements within the site.</i>	
2h.	Include all share path active transport routes on the Active Transport Plan (Figure 36).	The Active Transport map in Section 7.1 of the Master Plan and Section 6.8.5 of the Urban Design Report has been amended to include all share path active transport routes within the industrial areas, local centre and along road corridor.	Section 7.1 of Master Plan Report Appendix C Section 6.8.5 of Urban Design Report, Figure 39. Appendix D
2i.	Rectify errors with the colouring of the legend to what is shown on the plan and include a key for signalised intersections for Figure 36.	The legend for Active Transport map in Section 7.1 has been updated to reflect consistent colouring and the information shown on the map.	Section 7.1 of Master Plan Report Appendix C Section 6.8.5 of Urban Design Report, Figure 39. Appendix D
2j.	Ensure that the High Biodiversity Vegetation to the north and south of the sites mapped under the Western Parkland City SEPP (2021) are identified and mapped on the Blue Green Strategy Plan (Figure 44),	High Biodiversity Vegetation to North and South of Sites mapped under Western Parkland City SEPP (2021) has been updated on Figure 44 in Section 8.1 of the Master Plan.	Section 8.1 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
2k.	Identify the Strahler Stream orders for all riparian corridors on the Stormwater and Basin Strategy Plan at Figure 59.	Figure 59 has been updated to identify the Strahler stream orders for all riparian corridors.	Section 8.4 of Master Plan report Appendix C

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
2l.	Ensure that the numbering from the legend is reflected on the Local Centre Plan at Figure 72.	The numbering within the Local Centre diagram legend is reflected in the diagram in accordance with this condition.	Section 9.1.3 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C
2m.	Amend the wording in the legend for Figure 75 to read "indicative amenity node locations".	The wording within the Figure 75 legend has been updated in accordance with this condition.	Section 9.3 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C
2n.	Remove references to classified roads in Figure 88 and replace with either 'main roads' or 'Arterial and Sub-Arterial roads' as these roads are not yet classified.	The wording within the Figure 88 legend has been updated in accordance with this condition. 'Classified Road' reference in legend updated to 'Main Roads' for Figure 88.	Master Plan Report Appendix C Section 12.2
2o.	Identify the connections to main roads as excluded from complying development in Figure 88.	The Complying Development Road Network Map has been updated to identify the sections of road that are excluded from the complying development process.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework This is attached at Appendix A of the Complying Development Report
2p.	Remove references to classified roads and replace with either 'main roads' or 'Arterial and Sub-Arterial roads' in Table 13.	The reference to 'Classified Road' has been updated to read 'Main Roads' in Table 13 in Section 12.2 of the Master Plan. This update is consistent with the legend for Figure 88.	Appendix C – Master Plan Report Section 12.2 of the Master Plan.

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
2q.	Review the employment floor space amount of 625,467m2, to ensure it is correct and consistent with all relevant technical studies. It is noted that this figure has increased from Tranche 4 without justification.	An incorrect figure has now been updated. There was no change to the employment floor space. The amount of 625,467m2 is the correct figure which is used consistently across all documents.	Appendix D – Urban Design Report Figure 55 and Figure 56.
3.	Prior to lodgement, all street cross sections within the draft master plan (Section 7.3.1 - 7.3.5) are to be updated to improve readability and to ensure consistency with the DCP in relation to quality and labelling. In particular:	All typical street sections have been amended to improve readability and consistency with the Aerotropolis DCP. The sections have also been updated in the Public Domain and Landscape Strategy prepared by Site Image. Refer Section 7.3 of the Master Plan Report.	Appendix C – Master Plan Report, Section 7.3 Appendix QQ – Public Domain and Landscape Strategy
3a.	These plans are to be in landscape orientation to ensure detail can be read. The plans should be high resolution to ensure detail is legible.	All typical street sections have been amended to improve readability and consistency with the Aerotropolis DCP. The sections have also been updated in the Public Domain and Landscape Strategy prepared by Site Image. The scale and orientation of the typical street sections has been updated to improve legibility. Refer Section 7.3 of the Master Plan Report.	Section 7.3 of Master Plan Report Appendix C Appendix QQ – Public Domain and Landscape Strategy
3b.	Dimensions are required for each of the uses within the sections (i.e. footpaths, landscaping etc) and should be consistent with the level of detail shown in the DCP.	All typical street sections have been amended to improve readability and consistency with the Aerotropolis DCP. The sections have also been updated in the Public Domain and Landscape Strategy prepared by Site Image. The dimensions and labelling within the typical sections are illustrated in a consistent format to the Aerotropolis DCP. Refer Section 7.3 of the Master Plan Report.	Section 7.3 of Master Plan Report Appendix C Appendix QQ – Public Domain and Landscape Strategy

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
3c.	Light poles are not to be included in the footpath or cycle paths (including shared paths). In the current street sections due to the resolution and lack of dimensions, it makes it difficult to see if this has been updated.	As above. Light poles have been excluded from the footpath or cycle paths, as per this condition. Refer Section 7.3 of the Master Plan Report.	Section 7.3 of Master Plan Report Appendix C Appendix QQ – Public Domain and Landscape Strategy
3d.	The street sections are to include consistent labelling (i.e. have the dimensions of paths, roads, planting areas).	All typical street sections have been amended to improve readability and consistency with the Aerotropolis DCP. The sections have also been updated in the Public Domain and Landscape Strategy prepared by Site Image. The dimensions and labelling within the typical sections are illustrated in a consistent format to the Aerotropolis DCP. Refer Section 7.3 of the Master Plan Report.	Section 7.3 of Master Plan Report Appendix C Appendix QQ – Public Domain and Landscape Strategy
4.	Prior to lodgement, the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan amendment maps are to be updated to:		
4a.	include the active open space (sports field) identified in the southern part of the site to align with the draft master plan on the Blue Green Infrastructure Framework Plan (Figure 5).	The riparian corridors within the amended Blue-Green Infrastructure Framework Plan for the Master Plan are mapped entirely as 'Stormwater Infrastructure'. The provision for a sport field under the Precinct Plan within the central riparian corridor has been removed and is not shown within the amended map. The removal is justified as it was an isolated outcome which was not integrated with surrounding land uses. The alternative approach is to rely on the Public Domain and Landscape Strategy, prepared by Site Image (Appendix QQ). The approach for delivering public recreation amenities within the central riparian corridor, under the Master Plan, is much more flexible and is designed in	Section 11 of Planning Report Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Map

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<p>accordance with the central riparian corridor configuration, stormwater infrastructure and its relationship with the consolidated local centre.</p> <p>In addition, it should be noted that the original location of the sports fields identified under the Precinct Plan is proposed along the riparian corridor on the eastern portion of the site which is characterised by steep topography that is not appropriate or conducive to providing level sports fields. This would also contradict the need to respect topography and levels within the site.</p> <p>Whilst the provision for a sport field has not been allocated in the Master Plan, the Site Image Landscape Master Plan delivers a range of recreational amenities areas which respond to the community needs assessment in the Social Impact Assessment, prepared by Urbis (Appendix TT). The proposal will deliver interconnected system of open space corridors to provide recreational amenity for the community. It also provides opportunities to accommodate active open spaces and playgrounds. Riparian corridors are revitalised to deliver a high order water course which also allows for buffers from the top of the bank on each side. It travels through the centre of the site and wholly integrated into the open space network.</p>	
4b.	amend the legend to ensure errors are rectified and that the legend has total consistency with the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan, including the wording of "planned signalised intersections" for the Active Transport Network Plan (Figure 9).	<p>All legends within the proposed SEPP and Precinct Plan amendments have been updated to ensure total consistency with the Precinct Plan and also the WPC SEPP maps.</p> <p>The reference to 'Planned signalised intersection' is not relevant for the Active Transport Plan, as all intersections</p>	Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		under the Precinct Plan is referenced as 'Key Intersections' only. The 'Planned signalised intersection' is only relevant for the Street Hierarchy Map and Transport Network Map.	
4c.	remove the east west collector road shown on Road 7 (parallel to the Riparian Street in the north-east of the site) on the Active Transport Network Plan (Figure 9).	The duplicate of the east-west collector road along Road 7, has been removed from the Active Transport Map.	Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps
4d.	locate the Badgerys Creek (BCR) and Eastern Ring Road (ERR) intersection "dot" over the intersection on the Active Transport Network Plan (Figure 9).	The intersection 'dot' has been shifted across to sit over the intersection between BCR and ERR.	Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps
4e.	establish a new category of 'amenity node' and map the indicative location of these in the master plan site on the Centres Hierarchy Map (Figure 11)	The four amenity nodes, as per the Master Plan, has been added to the Centre Hierarchy Map and legend. This map is supported by Section 9.3 of the Master Plan which outlines the relevant controls for amenity nodes.	Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps
4f.	align with the requirements of Condition 10 below for the Height of Building Map (Figure 12).	<p>As per Condition 10 below, the proposed amendments to 52.5m in height in the Master Plan are only in relation to areas where high-bay warehousing is considered suitable, and also the for the consolidated local centre. All other areas within the Master Plan, outside of the local centre, where high-bay warehousing is not proposed retains the existing height control of 24m under the Precinct Plan.</p> <p>These areas deemed suitable for high-bay warehousing have been tested from an urban design, aviation and architectural</p>	<p>Section 11 of Planning Report</p> <p>Appendix G – Discussion Paper</p> <p>Appendix D – Urban Design Report</p>

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<p>perspective to ensure there are no impacts to the surrounding areas, as detailed in Section 7 of the Urban Design Report.</p> <p>The proposed height map in Section 5.2 of the Master Plan and the Precinct Plan Height Map amendment (which are consistent) reflect this approach.</p>	
4g.	reflect the agreed areas and authorities for acquisition following discussions required in Condition 45 below.	<p>Ingham has engaged with Liverpool City Council and Sydney Water in relation to Land Acquisition and the confirmation of the Land Reservation Acquisition Map on a Teams meeting 22 May 2024.</p> <p>In following email correspondence with Sydney Water, Sydney Water have flagged that they are working with NSW DPHI to understand the process and steps required to resolve land ownership and recreational land requirements. A resolution has not yet been reached and may take longer than anticipated. It was acknowledged by Sydney Water that in order not to delay the IPG Masterplan MP01 going out on exhibition it is recommended by Sydney Water that we defer a decision on open space ownership until after the exhibition followed by a separate announcement.</p> <p>Ingham are still awaiting a confirmation email to be received from Liverpool City Council, however it was confirmed and agreed that no land will be dedicated to Council for acquisition, similar to what is currently in the Precinct Plan for the IPG site.</p>	<p>Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps</p> <p>Appendix F – EIE</p> <p>Updated Land Reservation Acquisition Map. <i>(Please note Sydney Water response to Condition 45, explaining that a letter will not be available until after the exhibition of the Master Plan)</i></p>
5.	At lodgement, the draft master plan is to be submitted with an accompanying document clearly demonstrating how the draft master plan has considered the matters raised in all Tranche 5	A response table to the Tab A (Tranche 5 RFIs) has been prepared to support the Master Plan lodgement. Refer Appendix O of the Planning Report.	Appendix O – Response to Tab A, Planning Report

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	Technical study review comments (refer Tab A). Reference to where this has been considered in the draft master plan should be clearly identified.		
6.	The proposed DCP amendments are to be in accordance with those identified in Tab B, unless identified otherwise in conditions below. It is noted the draft master plan and amendments to the DCP were updated prior to the final TAP meeting and the TAP considered Tab B in their deliberation.	<p>Noted. The proposed variations to the Aerotropolis DCP for the Master Plan will be consistent with Tab B.</p> <p>The only additional controls to Tab B are those requested in the following conditions:</p> <p>Condition 18b:</p> <p><u>Addition control to Section 3.3.1 (PO1)</u></p> <p>8. The current layout does not allow road permeability within the blocks for safety and security reasons. However, in the future there could be opportunities to create mid-block road connections if there is a demand for commercial buildings instead of warehouses. These mid-block connections will allow additional permeability through the site. Refer to indicative future legacy road connections within the Active Transport Map in Figure 36. The provision for mid-block connections must not impact warehouse operations and access arrangements within the site.</p> <p>Condition 19a:</p> <p><u>Additional control to Section 2.8 PO2:</u></p> <p>4. Left-in-left-out access for Road 09 onto the Eastern Ring Road is temporary until other road access is available. The cul-de-sac for Road 09 is to be in place when Road 09 is constructed, with line marking to indicate the temporary left-in-left-out access. When other access is available, Road 09</p>	<p>Section 10 of Planning Report</p> <p>Section 7.3 of Master Plan Report Appendix C</p> <p>Appendix G – Variation to DCP</p>

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		temporary left-in- left-out will be closed and operate as the cul-de-sac.	
7.	Prior to lodgement, the draft master plan be amended:		
7a.	to acknowledge that the Dharug people first as the Traditional Custodians for the land, and then acknowledge the convergence of three clans with the Dharug, Dharawal and Gandangara groups.	<p>The acknowledgement of Country on page B of the Master Plan has been updated to read:</p> <p><i>“We acknowledge Country and the Cultural Landscape that we are working upon. This Master Plan site is located on Dharug Country. We acknowledge the Dharug people as the Transitional Custodians of the land and pay our respects to the traditional custodianship of its people and the privilege and responsibility to Connect with Country.</i></p> <p><i>We acknowledge the Dharug, Dharawal and Gandangara people and their ongoing connection to culture, lands and waters and their valuable contribution to the community. We recognise and acknowledge the surrounding clans to the North, South, East and West whilst honouring and celebrating their Elders past, present and emerging.”</i></p>	Page B of Master Plan Report Appendix C
7b.	to update the proposed control 3 in Section 10.1 to read as follows: <i>"Consult with Dharug Traditional Custodians and knowledge holders to identify and embed site specific stories into future cultural infrastructure within the local centre. When planning for and designing cultural infrastructure, consultation should also occur with the broader Aboriginal community where required".</i>	An additional control has been added to Section 10.1 of the Master Plan, in accordance with this condition.	Section 10.1 of Master Plan Report Appendix C

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
8.	A Recognise Country Response Template (as required by the Recognise Country Guidelines) be completed and submitted with the draft master plan at lodgement.	Recognise Country Response Template has been populated by Yerrabingin for lodgement. The Recognise Country Response Template now sits within Appendix 7.5 of the Designing with Country Framework.	Section 7.5 of Connecting with Country Framework Appendix BB
9.	Prior to lodgement, the Designing with Country Framework is to be updated to include a detailed stakeholder matrix that provides a breakdown of the stakeholder type and number of stakeholders engaged with for each engagement activity undertaken.	First Nations Engagement Matrix has been included within updated Designing with Country Framework Report. This features a list of engagement sessions, date, organisations and attendees.	Page 103 of Section 7.4 Connecting with Country Framework Appendix BB
10.	Prior to lodgement, the Discussion Paper for the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan and DCP amendments is to be updated to identify that the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan Height of Buildings map (Figure 12) and associated requirements in Section 5.2 are proposed to be amended to:	N/A	N/A
10a.	increase the maximum height of building control on areas of the master plan site from 24m to 52.5m.	The proposed amendments to 52.5m in height in the Master Plan are only in relation to areas where high-bay warehousing is considered suitable, and also the for the consolidated local centre. All other areas within the Master Plan, outside of the local centre, where high-bay warehousing is not proposed retains the existing height control of 24m under the Precinct Plan. The areas deemed suitable for high-bay warehousing have been tested from an urban design, aviation and architectural	Section 6.2 of Planning Report Appendix G – Discussion Paper Appendix D – Urban Design Report

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<p>perspective to ensure there are no impacts to the surrounding areas, as detailed in Section 7 of the Urban Design Report.</p> <p>The proposed height map in Section 5.2 of the Master Plan and the Precinct Plan Height Map amendment (which are consistent) reflect this approach.</p>	
10b.	Identity the site on the height of building map as a 'master plan site'.	All legends within the SEPP and Precinct Plan map amendments have been updated to reference 'Master Plan Site' for the site boundary.	Appendix X – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps.
10c.	introduce a new requirement (H3) in the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan that for land mapped as 'master plan site', the maximum building height in Figure 12 may only be achieved for certain uses in line with an approved master plan.	<p>The following additional control has been added to Section 6.4 (Height of Building) of the Master Plan:</p> <p><u>Enterprise and Industry</u></p> <p>The maximum height of enterprise and industrial buildings within the Master Plan site, as mapped in Figure 25, may only be achieved for high-bay warehousing development which are consistent with the approved Master Plan provisions and Design Quality Strategy.</p> <p><u>Commercial</u></p> <p>The maximum height of commercial and business enterprise buildings within the Master Plan site, as mapped in Figure 25, may only be achieved for commercial office buildings which are consistent with the approved Master Plan provisions and Design Quality Strategy.</p>	Section 6.4 of Master Plan Report
11.	Prior to lodgement, the draft master plan and supporting studies be updated to include:		

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
11a.	Multi-storey warehousing as a building typology.	<p>As per previous discussions with the Department, Ingham is not pursuing this land use in the Master Plan. Ingham has been informed by recent economic analysis that multi-storey warehousing is not a feasible typology within the site in the short-medium term.</p> <p>Multi-storey warehouses will be excluded from the CDC pathway and any multi-storey warehouse schemes will be subject to an SSDA with DPHI. The proposal of multi-storey warehousing subject to any future SSDAs will be outside of the Master Plan provisions and require the preparation of technical studies in accordance with the SEARs to justify the proposal.</p> <p>Any future proposals for multi-storey warehousing under a SSDA will be located within the areas within the Master Plan with a height control of 52.5m, where the heights have been tested, and where it is appropriate to exceed the 24m height limit.</p>	N/A
11b.	Controls and parameters around the maximum building footprint and height requirements, preferably based on case studies of multi-storey warehousing.	As above, Inghams is not pursuing this land use.	N/A
11c.	Provide design considerations for the multi-storey warehousing typology, like other building types.	As above, Inghams is not pursuing this land use.	N/A
11d.	Engage with the Urban Design Branch of the Department within the Government Architects Office as to the suitability of the proposed principles and controls for multi-storey warehousing. The proposed	As above, Inghams is not pursuing this land use.	N/A

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	<p>principles and controls within the draft master plan are then to be updated in accordance with the amendments required by the Department's Urban Designer.</p> <p>It is noted that multi-storey warehousing is an anticipated use on the site and to be addressed within the master plan.</p>		
12.	<p>Prior to lodgement and exhibition, the draft master plan is to include a site-specific provision, replicating the intent of the controls in BG6-BG8 in Section 4.5.3 in the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan to enable the FSR transfer to be undertaken.</p>	<p>The following additional controls have been added to Section 6.5 of the Master Plan, in relation to the application of the FSR control within the Local Centre.</p> <p>It should be noted that the park within the Local Centre will remain in private ownership and form part of a larger strata/community titled outcome.</p> <p>The local park is intended to remain in private ownership by IPG and will form part of a larger strata/community titled outcome.</p> <p><u>Commercial</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>"The maximum FSR for the portion of land identified is a gross FSR and is taken to include the area of land proposed to be used as open space. The maximum FSR control is only applicable to developable areas within the Local Centre only where buildings are to be sited under. Whilst the maximum FSR control is mapped for the entire Local Centre, development within the Local Centre must not exceed the indicative GFA capacity outlined in Section 6.5.2."</i> 	<p>Section 6.5 and Section 9.1 of Master Plan Report Appendix C</p>

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “The area of land identified for open space within the Local Centre is to comply with the open space provisions within Section 9.1.” 	
13.	Prior to lodgement, Planning Report and DCP Discussion paper are to be updated to provide justification to the proposed setback for the Bradfield Metro Link Road from 20 metres under the Aerotropolis DCP to 6 metres under the draft master plan. This is in relation to Section 3.3.2, Solution 1, Table 6 of the Aerotropolis DCP.	<p>A new additional control has been added to Section 6.6 of the Master Plan specifically for the local centre, relating to building setback provision along BMLR. The additional control reads:</p> <p>Addition control to Section 3.3.2 (PO1):</p> <p>1. Lots within the local centre fronting the Bradfield Metro Link Road is to achieve a building setback boundary of 6m.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>The reduction of the proposed setback along BMLR from 20m to 6m is to achieve a more suitable interface and public domain outcome between the proposed local centre built form and the public transport corridor along BMLR. Delivering a built form interface closer to the public transport corridor improves pedestrian amenity and also passive surveillance, in accordance with CPTED principles. The buildings also enhance the sense of enclosure and a human scale along the BMLR interface.</p>	Section 6.6 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
Centres and amenity nodes			
14.	Prior to lodgement, Section 9.3 Amenity Nodes of the draft master plan is to be updated to include an additional control which requires amenity nodes to be provided concurrent with the staged site delivery identified in the draft master plan. The additional control is to read as follows:	<p>The following additional controls has been added to Section 9.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “The amenity nodes identified within the Structure Plan in Figure 7 will be provided concurrent with the staged site delivery in accordance with the Stages 1, 3, 4 and 6, as detailed in Section 11.1.” 	Section 9.3 of Master Plan Report Appendix C

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	"An amenity node will be provided concurrent with staged site delivery of Stages 1, 3, 4 and 6 <i>in approximately the locations shown in Figure xx [where 'Figure x' is the Structure Plan, which is currently shown as Figure 7].</i> "		
Design Quality			
15.	Prior to lodgement of the draft master plan, the proponent is to engage with the Urban Design branch of DPHI within the Government Architects Office to resolve outstanding matters raised by DPHI and the TAP Independent Urban Designer in relation to the proposed design quality review process, key site location map and the design quality verification checklist.	<p>Ingham has engaged with the Urban Design Branch of the Government Architects office, and this resulted in the following changes to the Design Quality Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of riparian and Eastern Ring Road considerations within an additional map. • Additional illustrations which show the intended design outcomes. • Changes to the GFA thresholds in relation to small, medium and large developments and peer reviews and design panels. <p>The IPG team met with David Burge and Olivia Hyde on 17 June 2024 to discuss additional comments on the Design Quality Strategy and further justifications requested.</p> <p>David Burge issued comments on the DQS, in consultation with Olivia Hyde, on 14 June 2024. The Design Team addressed these comments in the latest update to the DQS and presented the changes to David and Olivia on a Teams meeting on 17 June 2024.</p>	<p>Master Plan Report Appendix C</p> <p>Section 13 – Design Quality Strategy within the Master Plan Report Appendix C</p>

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		A detailed response table to the commentary issued by David and Olivia is currently being finalised and will be issued to the DPHI Assessment team during the Test of Adequacy period.	
16.	<p>Prior to lodgement of the draft master plan, Table 22, Principle 4 in Building Compositions and Siting, is to be updated to read as follows:</p> <p><i>"Developments within the Master Plan are to be designed in accordance with the minimum building setbacks in Figure 95 below".</i></p>	This design quality principle has been updated in Table 22 to reflect suggested wording in this condition.	Table 22 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
Public Art			
17.	<p>The proposal to deliver public art via complying development is not supported at the TAP stage. Prior to lodgement of the draft master plan, discussions are to be held with Liverpool City Council and DPHI in relation to the proposed public art strategy and monetary value in order to determine the most appropriate approval pathway for the delivery of public art.</p>	<p>Ingham has engaged with Liverpool City Council and DPHI. A meeting was held with DPHI on 21st May, 2024 and a meeting was held with Liverpool City Council on 7th June 2024.</p> <p>This resulted in the following changes to the Public Art Strategy to enable a Precinct wide approach to the delivery of Public Art via Complying Development.</p> <p>IPG is now awaiting further written feedback from Peter Nelson. Updated Strategy issued to Council on 7th June.</p>	Public Art Strategy Appendix PP
Transport			
18.	Prior to lodgement, the draft master plan is to be updated to:		
18a.	Include indicative pedestrian access connections/paths for workers to be able to access	The Road Network Plan in Section 7.3 of the Master Plan has been amended to include pedestrian connections and pathways for workers from the road to the ancillary office and	Section 7.3 of Master Plan Report Appendix C

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	<p>all adjoining roads on the Road Network Plan at Figure 38.</p> <p>The block sizes within the draft master plan are bigger than the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan and where allotments have frontages to more than one street, they must provide pedestrian access to all streets to ensure workers can use adjoining roads to directly access broader site facilities and amenities.</p>	<p>communal areas within the lot. These connections into the lots are indicative only, as the future design of warehouses will be subject to further detailed design.</p> <p>In an industrial environment, access points are critical to the facility's functionality, security, and safety. However, having access points at differing boundary interfaces is generally discouraged for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Security Reasons <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Surveillance</u>: Centralized access points, typically near active frontages with ancillary offices, allow for better monitoring and control. These offices provide natural surveillance, enhancing the security of the premises. Multiple access points can dilute the effectiveness of security measures, making it harder to monitor all entries and exits. 2. <u>Access Control</u>: Managing fewer access points simplifies the implementation of security protocols such as identification checks, vehicle inspections, and gate operations. This reduces the risk of unauthorized access and improves overall security. ▪ Safety Concerns <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <u>Truck Movements</u>: Industrial facilities often involve significant truck and machinery movement, particularly in loading and unloading areas. Concentrating access points helps manage and direct traffic flow, reducing the risk of accidents. 4. <u>Pedestrian Safety</u>: Minimizing access points limits the interaction between pedestrians and heavy vehicles. Designated paths and controlled crossings improve pedestrian safety within the site. 	<p>Please also refer to Pedestrian Access, page 32, Architecture Design Statement Appendix T.</p>

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Operational Efficiency 5. <u>Traffic Flow Management</u>: Centralized access points streamline the flow of vehicles, preventing congestion and bottlenecks at multiple entry points. This enhances the efficiency of goods movement and reduces delays. 6. <u>Resource Allocation</u>: With fewer access points, resources such as security personnel, barriers, and monitoring systems can be concentrated, optimizing their effectiveness and reducing operational costs. ▪ Logistical Considerations 7. <u>Loading and Unloading Coordination</u>: A limited number of access points allows for better coordination of loading and unloading activities. This ensures that trucks are directed to appropriate bays without unnecessary waiting times or cross-traffic issues. 8. <u>Emergency Response</u>: In case of emergencies, having clearly defined and fewer access points can expedite emergency response and evacuation processes, improving overall safety. 	
18b.	<p>Include the following detail in Section 7.1 Active Transport as follows, which is to reference the 'Legacy Plan' from Tranche 4 (refer to Condition 2(g) above):</p> <p><i>"The current layout does not allow road permeability within the blocks for safety reasons. However, in the future there could be opportunities to create mid-block road connections if there is a demand for commercial buildings instead of warehouses. These mid-block connections will allow additional</i></p>	<p>The Active Transport map in Section 7.1 of the Master Plan and Section 6.8.5 of the Urban Design Report has been amended to include the following.</p> <p>The text provided in this condition has been included within Section 7.1 of the Master Plan, and amended slightly to read:</p> <p><i>The current layout does not allow road permeability within the blocks for safety and security reasons. However, in the future there could be opportunities to create mid-block road connections if there is a demand for commercial buildings instead of warehouses. These mid-block connections will allow</i></p>	Master Plan Section 6.8.5 and Figure 39 Appendix C

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	<i>permeability through the site. Refer to Legacy Plan at figure x.x".</i>	<i>additional permeability through the site. Refer to indicative future legacy road connections within the Active Transport Map in Figure 36. The provision for mid-block connections must not impact warehouse operations and access arrangements within the site.</i>	
19.	Prior to lodgement, the draft master plan is to be updated, including the Variation to DCP appendix (where relevant) to:		
19a.	<p>Include an additional control in Section 7.3 Road Network to read as follows:</p> <p><i>"Left-in-left-out access for Road 09 onto the Eastern Ring Road is temporary until other road access is available. The cul-de-sac for Road 09 is to be in place when Road 09 is constructed, with line marking to indicate the temporary left-in-left-out access. When other access is available, Road 09 temporary left-in- left-out will be closed and operate as the cul-de-sac."</i></p>	<p>This additional control has been added to Section 7.3 of the Master Plan, Section 11 of the Planning Report and the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>The Planning Report and Discussion Paper contains this additional control, along with the justification for its inclusion.</p> <p>The justification is as follows:</p> <p><i>Temporary access via Road 09 onto the Eastern Ring Road is critical for interim access to Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 in the initial stages of the Master Plan delivery. This additional control clearly outlines the timeframe which this left-in-left-out arrangement will be operational, and the transition period where it will be closed and operate as a cul-de-sac. This temporary access provided via Road 09 is essential for access to the Zone Substation on Lot 1 for Endeavour Energy to undertake maintenance works. Once Road 09 becomes a cul-</i></p>	<p>Section 7.3 of Master Plan Report Appendix C</p> <p>Section 11 of Planning Report</p> <p>Appendix G – Discussion Paper</p>

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<i>de-sac, access to Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 will be provided via Road 01 and the Bradfield Metro Link Road.</i>	
19b.	<p>Amend the wording of the proposed control (dot point 2) in Section 7.3.7 to read as follows:</p> <p><i>"Direct vehicle access to properties from Aerial or Sub-Arterial roads is not permitted, except for Lot 23 where temporary access will be required until alternative access becomes available through adjoining lands. Development of Lot 23 shall consider options for current and future access from adjoining lands and any temporary access granted shall be removed when other access becomes available. Approval for the temporary access must be obtained from the relevant roads authority."</i></p>	The wording for the relevant alternative benchmark solution has been updated in Section 7.3.7 of the Master Plan Report.	Section 7.3.7 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
19c.	Remove the proposed control at dot point 3 in Section 7.3.1 as the existing DCP control allows access in this instance.	<p>This condition references dot point 3 of Section 7.3.1 which reads –</p> <p><i>"The Sub-arterial road (Badgerys Creek Road) within the Master Plan is to be delivered in accordance with the alignment within Road Network Map in Figure 38 below".</i></p> <p>We believe this has been incorrectly referenced and not the relevant control which this condition is implying.</p> <p>We believe the reference was to dot point 3 of Section 7.3.7 (which has been removed in accordance with this condition) which reads –</p>	Section 7.3.7 of Master Plan Report Appendix C

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<i>"Temporary access to Lot 23 within the Master Plan (refer Figure 32), can be provided off BMLR through a left-in, left-out access arrangement."</i>	
19d.	<p>Include additional wording for the proposed control at dot point 1 in Section 7.3.8:</p> <p><i>"... Access to Lot 23 will be further investigated when access becomes available through adjoining lands. Access via adjoining allotments is to be considered in the first instance".</i></p>	The additional wording to this control in Section 7.3.8 has been updated in accordance with this condition.	Section 7.3.8
20.	The Planning Report and Discussion Paper are to provide further justification for the proposed master plan controls in Section 7.3.7, dot point 4 and in Section 7.3.9, dot point 2, specifically for lot 14 to have only a single point of access as this site has a dual frontage and could provide for separate light and heavy vehicular access.	<p>The following justifications have been provided within the Planning Report and Discussion Paper for the controls referenced in this condition.</p> <p><u>Section 7.3.7 (dot point 2)</u></p> <p>Additional Control:</p> <p>Heavy vehicle access and staff and visitor parking access can be provided through the same driveway for Lot 2 and Lot 14 within the Master Plan (refer Figure 32), only.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Hardstands for heavy vehicles have been located away from staff and visitor parking. For Lot 2 and Lot 14 require visitors and staff to enter the site using the same driveway as heavy vehicles however the parking is separated from the hardstand.</p> <p>Staff/visitor vehicle parking is located at the western side of the proposed facility, with all heavy vehicle movements,</p>	<p>Section 11 of Planning Report</p> <p>Appendix G - Discussion Paper</p>

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<p>including loading and unloading on the eastern side of the warehouse.</p> <p>This isolated instance of heavy vehicles mixing with passenger vehicles is typical of small unit industrial.</p> <p><u>Section 7.3.9 (dot point 2)</u></p> <p>Additional Control:</p> <p>Loading and unloading areas within Lot 2 and Lot 14 of the Master Plan will have heavy vehicle and staff/visitor parking using the same driveway, however staff/visitor parking areas must be separated from the loading and unloading areas.</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>Separate Light Vehicle and Heavy Vehicle access points are proposed for all large warehousing lots greater than 15,000m².</p> <p>The indicative layout for Lot 14 shall be subject to further detailed design but is intended to provide a smaller unit sizes for which it is typical to see some car parking within hardstand areas. However, it should be noted that such development typically serviced by smaller Heavy Vehicles with reduced inherent safety risks associated. Where possible, future detailed design shall ensure that any Heavy Vehicle reversing areas are isolated from Light Vehicle and pedestrian movements.</p>	
21.	The final alignment in respect to the locations of roads 2, 4 and 10 is to be determined by an assessment of the engineering drawings at the	Noted. The location of roads 2, 4 and 10 have been carefully considered and assessed by an 18 month TAP process. The riparian corridor has been sufficiently sized to allow high	Section 7 of Master Plan Report Appendix C

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	master plan assessment stage, to ensure there is adequate area within the riparian corridor for environmental restoration and stormwater management and quality.	quality environmental restoration and stormwater quality management. The resulting riparian corridor is a significant improvement to the Precinct Plan which does not have a continuous riparian corridor. The existing riparian corridor is in a highly degraded condition. The proposed outcome is a significant improvement which much improved riparian conditions.	Appendix AA – Civil engineering Drawings
22.	Prior to lodgement of the draft master plan, the Transport Management and Access Plan (TMAP) is to be updated to:	N/A	N/A
22a.	Demonstrate that the staging of the development, including staged delivery of roads, allows for buses to access the site and turnaround within the site. Facilities such as roundabouts (permanent and temporary) are to be considered, including in the scenario that roads planned within adjacent development sites are yet to be constructed, preventing buses from crossing the subject development and instead needing to turnaround within the site. The report is to also indicate how buses could service the development as it develops in stages.	<p>The proposed bus access routes for the key infrastructure delivery stagings are provided in Figures 48-50 of the updated TMAP (r06v5), with reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy report (prepared by IDC).</p> <p>Further, proposed civil plans have also been reviewed, which demonstrates that adequate permanent and temporary turning area (Road 3 and 4 roundabout, Road 8 Cul-de-sac) have been provided to support bus circulation and turnaround within the Site.</p>	<p>Appendix WW – TMAP</p> <p>TMAP 1492r06v5 Section 9.5</p> <p>Figures 48 – 50 of TMAP</p>
22b.	Address the TfNSW LoS advice for the draft master plan as referred to on page 14 of the Modelling Methodology Report.	The performance target approach as agreed with TfNSW with reference to the endorsed MMR sought an overall intersection performance of LoS C for modelling purposes. However, the MMR also acknowledged that this may not be achievable in all circumstances in which case <i>“TfNSW proposes the modelling</i>	<p>Appendix WW – TMAP</p> <p>TMAP 1492r06v5 Section 8.3</p>

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<p><i>be utilised to inform subsequent discussions to reach a reasonable (value for money) outcome in each case”.</i></p> <p>Master Plan Scenarios:</p> <p>Refer Section 9 of the updated OAR (1492r07v04) in relation to the Master Plan Aimsun modelling and LoS targets.</p> <p>It is noted that some intersections operate outside of the target performance; however this is generally deemed acceptable noting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary nature of the modelling network outside of the site and key TfNSW roads such as Eastern Ring Road, Bradfield Metro Link Road and Fifteenth Avenue which are subject to further detailed design by TfNSW. • Master Plan modelling shall be subject to further review as part of a future DA for the Local Centre. <p>Interim Scenario:</p> <p>In response to TfNSW's request during the TAP process, further SIDRA intersection analysis was undertaken to ascertain the interim site access and network capacity. This analysis found that the network can generally support full development of the industrial warehousing component of the master plan (Stages 1-6, with a total GFA of 507,050m²) in the absence of further infrastructure development in the area.</p> <p>With reference to performance target outlined in the endorsed MMR, the analysis found that all key intersections along Badgerys Creek Road (BCR), with exception for The Northern</p>	

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<p>Road (TNR) / BCR intersection during PM peak, are able to fully comply with all performance targets including overall intersection performance at LoS C and above.</p> <p>Further, the TNR / BCR intersection is able to achieve overall LoS D (during PM peak) which indicates the signalised intersection is “operating near capacity” with reference to Table 4.2 of the RTA Guide.</p> <p>Therefore, the intersection performance is deemed acceptable for the purpose of the interim network capacity analysis noting there are known works in planning, despite some works (such as Badgerys Creek Road widening) are not officially allocated committed funding or timing.</p>	
22c.	Clarify and update the report to provide an explanation for the use of 2026 and 2041 horizon years. Figure 41 of the TMAP indicates that all development will be complete by 2031.	<p>As detailed in the endorsed MMR, the horizon year of 2026 has been selected for traffic impact assessment of the initial (“Stage 1”) development, whilst the full masterplan development underwent Aimsun modelling assessment for the horizon years of 2036 and 2041.</p> <p>Based on inputs from TfNSW (included as Figure 4 in the MMR), it is understood that no major infrastructure changes are planned in the vicinity of the site between 2031 and 2036. As such, the 2036 was adopted as the more conservative period for assessment of ‘medium-term’ horizon. Longer-term assessment in 2041 seeks to ascertain network performance for the standard horizon of 10-years from project completion, which includes traffic associated with background growth and the full masterplan development.</p>	<p>Appendix WW – Transport Options Assessment Report</p> <p>The MMR is situated within Appendix VV of the Transport Options Assessment Report.</p> <p>Refer Table 6 of the MMR (P1492I05v9) details Phase 2 (Aimsun) scenarios.</p>

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		Therefore, the 2036 and 2041 assessment years represent more critical horizons than that of 2031.	
22d.	<p>Amend the wording of Section 12.1 that requires TfNSW to respond within 21 days, to read as follows:</p> <p><i>"TfNSW will be issued the draft Travel Plan for review and comment, and endorsement will be provided by TfNSW in writing".</i></p>	<p>TMAP Section 12.1 has been updated to reflect the following wording:</p> <p><i>"TfNSW will be issued the draft Travel Plan for review and comment, and endorsement will be provided by TfNSW in writing. TfNSW has a timeframe goal of 28 days to respond."</i></p> <p>This is a similar approach to other approvals under the EP&A Act.</p>	Appendix WW – TMAP Section 12.1
23.	Prior to lodgement, the following matters in relation to servicing and staging are to be resolved:	N/A	N/A
23a.	Phasing in the TMAP is to be reviewed to include one description for each stage and each phase. It is noted Phase 1 is described as Lots 5 to 11 (as per Section 2.2), while other section refers to it as Stages 1-4, which comprises Lots 1-14 (as per Table in Executive Summary). The report is to be updated to provide clarity and avoid future ambiguity.	Phase 1 development, as defined within Section 2.2 of the TMAP, refers to Development Stages 1 and 2 (lots 5-11). The table detailing the Staging and Sequencing Plan in the Executive Summary has been updated to avoid ambiguity.	Appendix WW – TMAP TMAP Section 2.2
23b.	The TMAP identifies thresholds for access based on stages/phases of development. This detail is to be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy with a statement regarding the delivery of development post phase 1.	The TMAP has been updated to include thresholds for access per the findings of the latest Interim Site Access and Network Capacity Analysis.	<p>Appendix WW – TMAP TMAP Section 9.2</p> <p>Section 8 and Table 10 of the Infrastructure</p>

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<p>In summary, the interim site access and the road network is expected to be able to accommodate full industrial warehouse development of the IPG masterplan (GFA of 507,050m²).</p> <p>This has also been included in the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy</p>	Delivery Strategy Appendix LL
23c.	The TMAP and IDS do not use consistent wording regarding the new roundabout on the BCR. The IDS under Stage 1 includes the roundabout on BCR. The TMAP includes priority-controlled intersection. The TMAP needs to be updated to identify a roundabout on BCR.	<p>The revised TMAP (r06v5) has been updated which identifies the modelling assessments conducted as "Phases" (Phase 1 - SIDRA model, Phase 2 - Aimsun model).</p> <p>Subsequently, as part of the Phase 1 (SIDRA) modelling, we have undertaken assessment of multiple access "Sequence" to test thresholds of development yield as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sequence 1 - priority-controlled site access = 146,000m² of warehouse GFA – Sequence 2 - roundabout site access = 507,050m² of warehouse GFA <p>The wording and tables detailing the Staging and Sequencing Plan have been updated throughout the TMAP to avoid ambiguity.</p>	Appendix WW – TMAP Section 9
24.	Prior to lodgement, the Options Assessment Report be updated to:	N/A	N/A
24a.	Remove the mitigation to close a bus lane during the peak period and replace with the alternative mitigation discussed on page 63 to provide an additional through land while retaining the bus lane in Section 5.4 (page 63).	Both section 5.4 Future Project Case Mitigation Development, and Section 10 Conclusion have been updated to propose inclusion of an additional through lane as a mitigation, while retaining the existing bus lane.	<p>Appendix VV – Transport Options Assessment Report</p> <p>Sections 5.4 and 10 of the updated Transport</p>

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<p>It is deemed unnecessary to update the model to reflect this change. Model updates would provide the following insights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the bus lane removal was only included in the PM peak, updating the model to provide an additional lane instead would require this to be included in the AM peak as well. Noting that the Northern Road/ Badgerys Creek Road intersection operates at a LoS B generally in 2041, providing an additional lane would only improve performance further, and would not significantly impact network congestion or project findings. In the PM peak, model updates would result in improved bus performance for services which would use the bus lane. As the bus lane is continuous, these benefits are known, and modelling is not required to confirm that bus efficiency would be improved if the bus lane was maintained. The SB bus lane on TNR, north of BCR services between 1-2 busses per hour. South of BCR bus frequencies are higher, between 16-17 per hour. Given the low number of buses affected, remodelling affected buses would not result in impact to overall network performance metrics <p>In the PM peak, model updates would result in 3 general traffic lanes provided. This is consistent with current modelling. Any difference in model results would be driven by the removal of the buses from the general traffic lanes, as they would use the bus lane. Given the high general traffic flows, total vehicle</p>	Options Assessment Report (1492r07v04)

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		volumes in the general traffic lanes would be reduced by less than 1%. Again, this is highly unlikely to impact model findings	
24b.	Include the average queue lengths and maximum queue length for key intersections for the particular scenarios in the report.	<p>Section 8 has been added to the updated OAR providing discussion around queueing performance across the Master plan scope. Given limitations in queue reporting in Aimsun, discussion focusses on turn bay capacity, and highlights any risk that the currently modelled turn bays may overflow. Charts have been included in Appendix E, showing a comparison between turn bay queue and turn bay length for all modelled turn bays.</p> <p>It should be noted that Aimsun reports time average queues. These are not comparable to typical queueing metrics such as average cycle queue reported by other packages as they are not linked to the signal controller in any way. These are not an intuitive output, and typically heavily underrepresent queueing. Average queue has not been reported, and all assessment is undertaken based on the max queue.</p>	<p>Appendix VV – Transport Options Assessment Report</p> <p>Section 8 of updated Transport Options Assessment Report (1492r07v04)</p>
24c.	Include the various levels of self-containment tested that reflect a range of likely retail uses and the resulting level of self-containment that could be expected.	<p>The OAR (Section 2.1.2) has been updated to include further discussion in relation to the significance of linked-trip assumptions to the overall modelling.</p> <p>In summary, the 'linked trip' assumption is expected to change overall traffic volumes by less than 2% in 2036/2041 horizon years which is not considered material to the overall assessment.</p>	<p>Appendix VV – Transport Options Assessment Report</p> <p>Section 2.1.2 of the updated Transport Options Assessment Report (1492r07v04)</p>
25.	Prior to lodgement, the Corridor Alignment Justification Report (CAJR) be updated to:	N/A	N/A

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
25a.	Remove any specific costs in the CAJR. A general statement of reduced costs based on the vertical alignment and bridge vs culvert crossing can be provided.	The Corridor Alignment Justification Report has removed reference to specific costs	Appendix E – Corridor Justification Report Corridor Alignment Justification Report has been updated to remove any specific costs throughout.
Blue-green infrastructure			
26.	<p>The proposed alternative benchmark solution for section 2.4.1 Deep soil and tree canopy, POI (1) is not supported. The existing benchmark solution should be amended as follows in red to apply to the draft Master Plan:</p> <p><i>Tree canopy and deep soil is provided in accordance with Table 2. Applicants must also have regard for the site coverage and relevant pervious surface targets in this DCP. Should advice be received that aviation safeguarding measures and wildlife risk hazards will be compromised, development is to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintain deep soil targets as per Table 2. ▪ Demonstrate that the lower canopy cover is at the highest percentage possible whilst adhering to wildlife and aviation safety outcomes. ▪ Include an appropriate landscape response that provides shelter and reduces urban heat. 	Canopy Coverage targets have been reassessed through the riparian corridors as well as within on-lot landscaping. A further breakdown/ analysis has been provided in the updated public domain landscape strategy. In order to increase Canopy Coverage, whilst following aviation safeguarding measures, on-Lot landscaping has increased in carpark areas and within boundary setbacks. In these areas, only tree species that are categorised as low risk for wildlife attraction in the DCP will be proposed. Additionally, further consideration has been given to optimizing canopy trees in locations where they shade hardstand areas and mitigate Urban Heat Island effect. Further detailing of cooling/ reduction of UHIE is provided in the Public Domain Landscape Strategy.	Appendix QQ – Public Domain Landscape Strategy Refer to page 18 in the Public Domain Landscape Strategy

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
27.	The draft master plan, supporting ecologist report and public domain landscape strategy be updated prior to lodgement to demonstrate:	N/A	N/A
27a.	that the spacing out and general placement of trees, is needed to ensure acceptable wildlife safety outcomes.	The proposal has considered the DCP and the targets for canopy coverage as well as the need to rehabilitate the corridors to a more natural Cumberland Woodland/ River Flat community. The spacing of canopy trees across the project works hard to maximise canopy coverage, achieve biodiversity targets and mitigate wildlife risk.	Appendix YY – Wildlife Hazard Assessment (Section 3.3.5)
27b.	that the canopy cover is at its highest percentage possible whilst adhering to wildlife and aviation safety outcomes.	Note Canopy Coverage plans have been updated to show the highest possible canopy coverage percentage whilst maintaining wildlife safety mitigation measures.	Appendix QQ – Public Domain Landscaping Strategy Refer to page 18 in the Public Domain Landscape Strategy
27c.	Where tree canopy targets are not complied with, other measures to address urban heat and provide cooling have been included within the draft master plan.	A statement addressing how the masterplan mitigates Urban Heat Island effect has been added to the Public Domain Landscape Strategy.	Appendix QQ – Public Domain Landscaping Strategy
28.	Consultation with the Western Sydney Airport Corporation should be undertaken in relation to the proposed alternative landscape species list and impacts of wildlife attraction to the operation of the Western Sydney Airport.	Information was sent to WSA on 7 th June, 2024 and a meeting was held with the Western Sydney Airport Corporation on 24 th June 2024 to discuss wildlife attraction in relation to the alternative landscape species list. A general update on the Master Plan was also given at this meeting.	Appendix QQ – Public Domain Landscaping Strategy Appendix YY – Wildlife Risk Assessment.

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
29.	The draft master plan and supporting studies be updated prior to lodgement, to remove any structural works, including those for roads, recreation and public art within the land mapped as High Biodiversity Vegetation (HBV) under the Western Parkland City SEPP (2021).	The Master Plan and supporting studies do not have any structural works within the High Biodiversity Vegetation Area.	Appendix C – Master Plan Appendix QQ – Public Domain Landscaping Strategy Appendix AA – Civil Engineering Drawings Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy.
30.	Prior to lodgement, the draft master plan is to be updated to:	N/A	N/A
30a.	remove references to the HBV being in the developable lot.	The HBV needs to be located in a developable area, not because it will be developed, but because the long-term ownership of the HBV needs to be linked to one landowner. As State or Local Government ownership of the HBV is unlikely, it cannot be defined by its own lot. The High Biodiversity lot will have further protection via a notation on an 88B instrument on the title of the relevant lot.	Section 5.4.1 of Planning Report Appendix V – Biodiversity Assessment Report.
30b.	ensure that all local centre maps show where the sports field and active transport links are within and adjoining the local centre.	Active transport links to the local open space adjacent to the Local Centre have now been included.	Appendix C – Master Plan Report
30c.	Include the staging (aligned with development staging) for the riparian corridors within the open space delivery plan.	The open space delivery plan has been updated to include this.	Appendix C – Master Plan, Figure 36 Active Transport Plan

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
30d.	Provide detail on Riparian Corridor 3, similar to that provided for Riparian Corridors 1 and 2.	The masterplan includes the details on Riparian Corridor 3, under Section 8.3 of the Master Plan.	Appendix C – Master Plan, Section 8.3
31.	Prior to lodgement, the civil and landscape drawings within the draft master plan are to be updated to reflect the most recent riparian drawings submitted to the TAP in support of the draft master plan on 12 April 2024 and 19 April 2024.	The civil and landscape drawings have been updated to reflect this condition.	Appendix AA – Civil Engineering Drawings Appendix PP – Public Domain and Landscape Strategy
Flooding			
32.	Prior to lodgement and exhibition, the flood modelling for the master plan site should be reviewed to include an assessment of the changes to land outside of the urban development footprint including within the flood ways and flood storage areas. The post development modelling for hydrology and hydraulics must include any proposed use of the land, including but not limited to, urban development, earthworks, drainage infrastructure, proposed detention basin network and any proposed vegetation and use of land within the green/blue corridor and open space areas (as described in the Riparian Assessment Report).	The previously submitted IWCMP included an amendment to land outside of the urban development footprint to include paths and maintenance tracks to the already modelled basins, change in vegetation and passive recreation spaces. This included: Amending the hydrologic model (DRAINS_XP-RAFTS) to increase the imperviousness of the catchments within the non-urban land use areas, mostly riparian and vegetation zones. Amending the materials file within the TUFLOW hydraulic model to better reflect the basins, footpaths, vehicle maintenance tracks/paths within the drainage corridor.	Appendix MM – IWCMP Report Refer to Figure 27 of the IWCMP report for the amended materials and imperviousness for areas outside of the urban development footprint.
33.	Based on the revised flood modelling, the flood assessment report must be updated to address the Aerotropolis DCP requirements/provisions for the	The IWCMP has been amended to include all three categories related to flooding provisions from the Aerotropolis DCP (1% AEP Floodway and Critical flood Storage Areas; Between 1%	Appendix MM – IWCMP Report

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	whole master plan area which includes the three categories of the floodplains identified by the DCP.	AEP Floodway / Critical Flood Storage and Flood Planning Area; and; Outside Flood Planning Area to Probable Maximum Flood). These have been tabulated and a response provided to each item within the IWCMP.	Refer to Section 5.6 of the IWCMP for the included Aerotropolis DCP flood category summary and commentary.
Exempt and Complying Development			
34.	That prior to lodgement and exhibition, the draft master plan report be updated to include the complying development code for the draft master plan as an appendix.	The Master Plan includes the Complying Development Code which is situated within Appendix B of the Master Plan	<p>The Complying Development Code and Framework sits within Appendix B of the Master Plan (Appendix C)</p> <p>A standalone version of the code and framework is at Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework</p>
35.	The draft complying development code (as amended post TAP) be submitted by the proponent for further review by DPHI prior to exhibition.	The Complying Development Code is to be submitted to DPHI for further review.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework
36.	That prior to lodgement, the draft complying development code be amended to:	The Complying Development Code is updated and the matters below are addressed in turn.	Appendix H – Complying

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
			Development Code and Framework
36a.	Remove all references to finished ground levels and replace with existing ground level.	This has been actioned.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework
36b.	Remove references to technical studies prepared by the proponent and include the complete development controls (excluding the SLR Framework in Appendix B).	There remains a requirement to make reference to other documents that will inform the IPG Code, such as Noise Report, Air Quality Assessment, Bushfire Assessment, Civil Drawings, Biodiversity Management Plan and the Construction Environmental Management Plan. These are needed as reference documentation for the Code and are readily referenced with the Complying Development Report. These documents are all appended to the Planning Report and will be approved as part of the Master Plan.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework
36c.	Add all maps, technical detail, tables, other relevant supporting information and appendices into the complying development code.	Relevant technical information is either in the body of the Code or referenced within is an Appendix to the Masterplan.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework
36d.	Include clear reference to lodgement of approvals and other required documents within an Aerotropolis Certificate.	<p>The <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts – Western Parkland City) 2021</i> indicates at Part 4.7, Division 3, Section 4.44 that:</p> <p>An application must be in the form approved by the Planning Secretary and include the following information—</p> <p>(a) the name and address of the applicant,</p> <p>(b) the address, and particulars of title, of the subject land,</p>	Appendix I – Exempt and Complying Development Justification Report

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<p>(c) a description of the development.</p> <p>It is also anticipated that depending on the form of development proposed, additional supporting information will be required to demonstrate that the development is consistent with the Master Plan.</p> <p>This is identified in Section 3.7.3 of the Exempt and Complying Development Justification Report and will also comprise the documentation for the CDC application.</p>	
36e.	Remove bespoke controls for bushfire prone land and replicate Bushfire Prone Land Clause 1.19A of the Codes SEPP on which complying development may not be carried out.	This bespoke wording has been removed and the Codes SEPP wording has been added with an additional clause relating to the provision of APZs for staging which addresses a TAP comment.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework (Section 2.3.3)
36f.	<p>Update the note in Section 4.2.1 (General Standards) to be read as follows:</p> <p>a. <i>Where a Notice of Requirement is required from Sydney Water under the Sydney Water Act 1994 in relation to a new building or addition under this Code, this must be obtained prior to an Aerotropolis Certificate complying development certificate being issued.</i></p> <p>b. <i>Where development comprises 'Traffic Generating Development' as per Section 2.122 if of State Environmental Planning</i></p>	This has been updated in the Complying Development Code at Section 4.2.1.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework (Section 4.2.1)

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	<p><i>Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021, a referral response in accordance with section 2.2 (3) of this Code is to be provided with the demonstrated in the Aerotropolis Certificate.</i></p> <p>c.</p>		
36g.	Remove all references to multi-storey warehousing.	Reference to multi-storey warehousing has been removed.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework
36h.	Update subclause (2) of Section 14.2 Development Standards (Tree Removal Code) to be read as follows <i>"complying development must not be carried out on land that is shown as "existing native vegetation" on the High Biodiversity Value Areas Map which forms part of State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts - Western Parkland City) 2021".</i>	This has been added as a new subclause (3) in the Tree Removal Code.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework
36i.	<p>Remove control 2 relating to cut and fill provisions in the subdivision and bulk earthworks code and insert a new control 2 to read as follows:</p> <p><i>"Cut and fill controls for any complying development application are +/- 6 metres plus a +/- 2 metre tolerance from existing ground level. For any development that proposes cut and fill above the provisions, a Development Application must be sought."</i></p>	This has been updated in Section 6.1 of the IPG Complying Development Code.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework (Section 6.1)

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
36j.	<p>Update the Retaining Walls Code to contain the following regarding retaining walls:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Any retaining walls fronting the public domain must comply with the provisions for retaining walls within the Phase 2 Development Control Plan or provisions within an approved master plan for the site. ii. Retaining walls within any setback area (i.e. edge of the road corridor boundary to the wall of the building) adjacent to the Eastern Ring Road, Badgerys Creek Road, Bradfield Metro Link Road or Fifteenth Avenue, are not to be more than 3 meters below ground level (existing) and not more than 2 meters above ground level (existing). iii. Any internal retaining walls not visible from the public domain can achieve a height of 7m (from existing ground level). 	This has been updated in Section 7.2 of the IPG Code.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework (Section 7.2)
36k.	<p>Include the following wording at Section 10.1(v):</p> <p><i>"Construction of local roads can be constructed as complying development, excluding a road (the connecting road) that connects between the access point, of the Eastern Ring Road, Badgerys Creek Road, Bradfield Metro Link Road or Fifteenth</i></p>	This has been added as a new point 10.1.3 in the Code	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework (Section 10.1)

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	<i>Avenue and the nearest local road intersection (as per the Road Network Complying Development Map),"</i>		
36l.	Update the 'Road Network Complying Development Map' on Page 51 to reflect the updated wording in Point k. above, which excludes the connecting road that connects between the access point of the Eastern Ring Road, Badgerys Creek Road, Bradfield Metro Link Road or Fifteenth Avenue and the nearest local road intersection.	This map has been updated and will form Part of Appendix A to the updated IPG Code.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework (Appendix A)
36m.	<p>Include the following referrals in Section 2.2(3):</p> <p>Under State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ section 2.120 Impact of road noise or vibration on non-road development ▪ Under State Environmental Planning Policy (Industry and Employment) 2021: ▪ section 3.16 Advertisements greater than 20 square metres and within 250 metres of, and visible from, a classified road Under State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts - Western Parkland City) 2021 ▪ section 4.27 Transport corridors <p>It is noted that in some instances these referrals may not apply to the Master Plan in its current form,</p>	These have been included in Section 2.2 of the IPG Code and within Section 3.7 of the Exempt and Complying Justification Report.	<p>Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework (Section 2.2)</p> <p>Appendix I – Exempt and Complying Development Justification Report (Section 3.7)</p>

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	however, the TAP wishes to ensure all potential referrals be included.		
36n.	<p>Include the following concurrences in Section 2.2(4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ section 61 Road works on certain classified roads ▪ section 87 Traffic control facilities ▪ section 125 Approval to use road for food or drink premises. <p>It is noted that in some instances these concurrences may not apply to the master plan in its current form, however, the TAP wishes to ensure all potential concurrences be included.</p>	These have been included in the Section 2.2 of the IPG Code	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework (Section 2.2)
36o.	<p>Include the following wording:</p> <p><i>"In accordance with the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan, complying development applications must demonstrate that essential road infrastructure is available when required for the proposed development. To satisfy this requirement, it must be demonstrated that essential road and active transport links together with necessary network upgrades, will be in operation for the proposed development. The Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (TMAP) has established that</i></p>	The control in the IPG Code (4.2.1 (5)) retains the gross floor area of 507,050sqm which has now been agreed with TfNSW.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework (Section 4.2.1)

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	<p><i>sufficient network capacity is available to support a maximum gross floor area of 245,000m².</i></p> <p><i>Further justification is required to support applications for additional development under the Master Plan as follows:</i></p> <p><i>a. For complying development applications, a comprehensive addendum TMAP is to be prepared and include transport modelling as agreed with TfNSW in terms of modelling methodology. Endorsement of the updated TMAP by TfNSW is to be demonstrated prior to the application for an Aerotropolis Certificate. The updated TMAP must demonstrate that essential road infrastructure and network capacity is operational to support traffic generated by the proposed development."</i></p>		
37.	<p>That prior to lodgement and exhibition, the proponent is to receive confirmation in writing that Liverpool City Council is satisfied with the bold text from Section 2.3.6 (Certification) of the draft Complying Development Code:</p> <p><i>"... that Council would be the certifying authority (or an alternate certifying authority as approved by Council)."</i></p>	An e-mail has been received from Lina Kakish at LCC on 20/05/24 confirming that Council supports this wording.	<p>E-mail dated 22/05/24 from Lina Kakish at LCC (Appendix ZZ)</p> <p>A copy of the e-mail is attached to this response document.</p>
Concurrences and referrals			

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
38.	<p>Prior to lodgement, Section 12 of the draft master plan is to be updated to include a statement which clearly identifies that all concurrences and referrals still apply in the complying development process. The following wording is to be included:</p> <p>"Development which ordinarily requires authority referrals pursuant to other environmental planning instruments must obtain the relevant referral prior to lodging an application for an Aerotropolis Certificate. Evidence of the referral response and details of how it has been adequately addressed are to be demonstrated in the Aerotropolis Certificate.</p> <p>Referrals to be met include (but are not limited to):</p> <p>As per State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021:</p> <p>section 2.118 Development on proposed classified road</p> <p>section 2.119 Development with frontage to classified road</p> <p>section 2.120 Impact of road noise or vibration on non-road development</p> <p>section 2.121 Excavation in or immediately adjacent to corridors</p> <p>section 2.122 Traffic-generating development</p>	<p>A new section for concurrences and referrals has been added to the Master Plan Report.</p> <p>The suggested wording has been incorporated in Section 12.3 of the Master Plan Report.</p>	Appendix C – Master Plan Report Section 12.3

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	<p>section 4.7 Development in future infrastructure corridor for previously permitted uses of land</p> <p>section 4.9 Excavation in, above, below or adjacent to future infrastructure corridors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under State Environmental Planning Policy (Industry and Employment) 2021: <p>section 2.34 Development of land within or adjacent to transport investigation area</p> <p>section 3.16 Advertisements greater than 20 square metres and within 250 metres of, and visible from, a classified road Under State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts - Western Parkland City) 2021</p> <p>section 4.27 Transport corridors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development which ordinarily requires authority concurrence or consent pursuant to other legislation must obtain the relevant concurrence or consent prior to lodging an application for an Aerotropolis Certificate. Concurrence or consent to be met include (but are not limited to): <p>Roads Act 1993</p> <p>section 61 Road works on certain classified roads</p> <p>section 87 Traffic control facilities</p>		

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	<p>section 125 Approval to use road for food or drink premises</p> <p>section 138 Works and structures"</p>		
39.	<p>Prior to lodgement, the draft master plan is to be updated to include the following controls in relation to requirements for Aerotropolis <i>Certificates in Section 12</i>:</p> <p><i>"In accordance with the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan, development applications and/or complying development applications must demonstrate that essential road infrastructure is available when required for the proposed development. To satisfy this requirement, it must be demonstrated that essential road and active transport links together with necessary network upgrades, will be in operation for the proposed development. The Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (TMAP) has established that sufficient network capacity is available to support a maximum gross floor area of 245,000m².</i></p> <p><i>Further justification is required to support applications for additional development under the Master Plan, or development that occurs after 5 years of approval of the Master Plan as follows:</i></p>	Confirmed by TfNSW in an email of 14 th June 2024. This confirmed a threshold amount of 507,000 m2 with a TMAP review once 407,920m2 has been delivered.	Appendix AAA – Email from TfNSW confirming GFA threshold (14-06-24)
39a.	<p><i>For development applications a comprehensive addendum Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (TMAP) is to be prepared and include transport</i></p>	Confirmed by TfNSW in an email of 14th June, 2024. This confirmed a threshold amount of 507,000 m2 with a TMAP review once 407,920m2 has been delivered.	Appendix AAA – Email from TfNSW confirming

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	<i>modelling, with the modelling methodology agreed to by TfNSW. The analysis to demonstrate that essential road infrastructure and network capacity is operational when required to support the proposed development. The updated TMAP is to be endorsed by TfNSW prior to development consent being granted.</i>		GFA threshold (14-06-24)
39b.	<i>For complying development applications, a comprehensive addendum TMAP is to be prepared and include transport modelling as agreed with TfNSW in terms of modelling methodology. Endorsement of the updated TMAP by TfNSW is to be demonstrated prior to the application for an Aerotropolis Certificate. The updated TMAP must demonstrate that essential road infrastructure and network capacity is operational to support traffic generated by the proposed development."</i>	Confirmed by TfNSW in an email of 14th June, 2024. This confirmed a threshold amount of 507,000 m2 with a TMAP review once 407,920m2 has been delivered.	Appendix AAA – Email from TfNSW confirming GFA threshold (14-06-24)
40.	Prior to lodgement, the draft master plan is to be updated to identify that the threshold amount for complying development is 245,000m ² of GFA. This threshold amount is to be used until updated SIDRA analysis demonstrates the existing road network can accommodate any additional GFA. Should SIDRA analysis support additional GFA, TfNSW in consultation with DPHI will advise in writing (including any additional controls that may be required) and this control may be updated.	Confirmed by TfNSW in an email of 14 th June, 2024. This confirmed a threshold amount of 507,000 m2 with a TMAP review once 407,920m2 has been delivered. Section 6.5.2 of the Master Plan (Indicative Gross Floor Area) has been updated	Appendix C – Master Plan Report (Section 12.3)

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
41.	<p>Prior to lodgement, the draft master plan is to be updated to include an additional control in Section 12, that reads as follows:</p> <p><i>"For each complying development application, a travel plan must be prepared by the proponent and endorsed by TfNSW in writing, prior to the issue of an Aerotropolis Certificate",</i></p>	<p>Section 12.3 has been updated to incorporate the wording suggested in this condition.</p> <p>An additional statement has been added in relation to timing, which includes:</p> <p><i>"TfNSW will be issued the draft Travel Plan for review and comment, and endorsement will be provided by TfNSW in writing. TfNSW has a timeframe goal of 28 days to respond."</i></p> <p>This is a similar approach to other approvals under the EP&A Act.</p> <p>Given the Master Plan is supported by the Complying Development Code and Framework (Appendix H) which purpose is to enable an efficient and streamlined approval process, hence having a step in the process that is be open ended and is not supported by a specified timeframe would defeat the purpose of the CDC.</p>	<p>Appendix C – Master Plan (Section 12.3)</p> <p>Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework</p>
Explanation of Intended Effect			
42.	<p>The proponent is to submit an Explanation of Intended Effect (EIE) with the draft master plan for statutory assessment. This EIE is to identify any SEPP amendments relating to exempt development and updated mapping.</p>	<p>The EIE is updated to meet the requirement.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the WPC SEPP in relation to SEPP mapping and the supporting justifications, as well as exempt development have been incorporated into Section X of the EIE.</p>	Appendix F – EIE
Noise			

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
43.	The proposed approach to noise planning assessment is not objected to by the TAP. However, further detailed assessment of the appropriateness of the proposed noise levels and proposed wording of the complying development controls pertaining to noise within the site-specific complying development code will be undertaken at the time of statutory master plan assessment.	Noted. The outcomes of a meeting between the EPA and DPHI in relation to Intrusive Noise Criteria held on 3 April 2024 have been minuted and form the basis of the revised noise assessment (v6) as per email DPHI dated 22 May 2024.	Appendix NN – Noise Planning Assessment – Section 5
44.	Prior to exhibition, the draft master plan is to be updated to note that any applications for scheduled activities within the site will be assessed and undertaken by the Environment Protection Authority and do not form part of the approach to noise planning assessment as proposed by the draft master plan.	NPA v6 updated to exclude scheduled premises and would require application and assessment undertaken by the NSW Environment Protection Authority.	Appendix NN – Noise Planning Assessment – Section 6
Infrastructure and acquisition			
45.	Prior to lodgement, the proponent must engage with Liverpool City Council and Sydney Water and obtain written confirmation to agree on the appropriate areas within the master plan site to be acquired by each authority. The amended Land Reservation Map is to be updated to reflect the written agreement.	Ingham has engaged with Liverpool City Council and Sydney Water in relation to Land Acquisition and the confirmation of the Land Reservation Acquisition Map. A meeting was held on 22 May 2024 with both Sydney Water and Liverpool City Council. At this meeting, LCC stated their position that they would not support any changes to the LRA for land that they would be responsible to acquire (i.e. no land acquisition under the SEPP) and that any land dedication for open space of public benefit would be required to be negotiated in a future VPA.	Section 7 of the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy Appendix LL

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<p>Sydney Water were unable to confirm their position in the meeting and have since advised us and the TAP that:</p> <p>“This is in relation to Inghams Property Group (IPG) seeking written confirmation from Sydney Water and Liverpool City Council in relation to the adjusted acquisition areas as a result of the Masterplan process.</p> <p>We are aware of Liverpool City Council's solid position for the IPG Masterplan MP01 not to increase the acquisition layers for council from the Aero SEPP.</p> <p>At present we are seeking support from the NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI) on an appropriate resolution and way forward to assisting IPG Masterplan MP01 progress to exhibition. Note this will serve as precedent for the rest of the Aerotropolis area while continuing to achieve the Western Parkland City vision.</p> <p>Unfortunately, we have not reached a position and won't be able to provide our written response at this stage. We anticipate that by early June we should provide a formal response.</p> <p>We will keep you posted, thank you for your patience and understanding”.</p> <p>A further email from Sydney Water on 13th June, 2024 explained:</p> <p>In relation to Inghams Property Group (IPG) seeking written confirmation from Sydney Water and Liverpool City Council to</p>	

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		<p>the adjusted acquisition areas as a result of the IPG Masterplan MP01 process.</p> <p>Considering the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Liverpool City Council's solid position for the IPG Masterplan MP01 to not increase the acquisition outlined in the Aero SEPP, and – Sydney Water's position to not acquire stormwater infrastructure that we do not need to meet the waterway health targets. <p>Sydney Water have flagged and are working with NSW DPHI to understand the process and steps required to resolve land ownership and recreational land requirements. A resolution has not yet been reached and may take longer than anticipated. Not to delay the IPG Masterplan MP01 going out on exhibition it has been recommended by Sydney Water that the decision be deferred on open space ownership until after the exhibition followed by a separate announcement.</p>	
46.	Prior to lodgement, the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy (IDS) and Planning Report (where relevant) be updated to:	N/A	N/A
46a.	Consider the ongoing ownership, access, management and maintenance of the easternmost part of the site within Wianamatta-South Creek. The strategy should outline how the draft master plan has addressed the zone objectives and the Aerotropolis objectives for this part of the site and if a public easement is proposed.	<p>The easternmost part of the site, fronting Wianamatta South Creek is not part of the Badgerys Creek Precinct and has not been nominated for acquisition under the SEPP. The IDS has stated that this land will remain in private ownership until such time that Stage 6 is delivered.</p> <p>We note that the delivery of Stage 6 is at least 5 years away and at this point in time we will negotiate land acquisition with the appropriate authority.</p>	<p>Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy – Section 7.2 of the IDS has been updated to include this.</p> <p>Appendix C – Master Plans – Section 11.2 of Master Plan</p>

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
		No public access will be permitted while the land is in private ownership.	
46b.	Address the proponent's intent to enter into a works-in-kind agreement and/or voluntary planning agreement. It is unclear if the proponent's previous WIK proposal from December 2022 to upgrade Badgerys Creek Road and Martins Road still is current or if it has changed to deliver some local roads and parts of the Eastern Ring Road. Additional commentary and clarification should be included in the IDS ahead of lodgement of the draft master plan with DPHI.	<p>IPG is currently discussing a WIK agreement with TfNSW for safety and resilience works to BCR which is yet to be formally agreed. If this agreement is reached it will be subject to separate agreement and is not a part of the master plan application.</p> <p>There has been no discussion for IPG to do any works on Martins Road.</p> <p>The IDS report has been updated to provide more clarity on the delivery responsibility of all infrastructure. This update is throughout the report and summarised in Table 27 of Appendix A.</p> <p>IPG will consider a WIK for part works of the ERR (Commencing in Stage 3). However, as the details of the road design, delivery dates, etc. we would decide on the delivery responsibility and nature of the works when this information is at hand.</p>	<p>Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy</p> <p>Throughout the IDS and summarised in Table 27 of Appendix A.</p>
46c.	Include some additional background commentary on discussions that have taken place with Sydney Water, Liverpool City Council, Transport for NSW and DPHI to deliver infrastructure on the site and how this aligns with the proposed development staging.	A new Section 1.4 has been added to the IDS to elaborate on discussions and engagement that has taken place throughout the TAP process and how this has informed the development and infrastructure staging plans.	<p>Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy</p> <p>Section 1.4 of the IDS</p>
46d.	State that the proponent is responsible for constructing the new roundabout on BCR and Road 03. The civil plans are to also show this roundabout,	IPG acknowledges that it is willing to deliver the construction of the roundabout on Badgerys Creek Road and Road 3. Due to the fact that both roads are nominated as Collector Roads	Appendix AA – Civil Engineering Drawings

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	with a label that it is indicative and with a note that states 'subject to further detailed design and acceptance by the road authority'.	<p>in the Section 7.12 Plan, IPG would be seeking reimbursement for these works.</p> <p>A Development Application will be lodged with LCC in future for the delivery of the new roundabout. Civil Plans and other related studies have been prepared and a pre-Development Application meeting with Liverpool City Council will occur in June 2024. This has been included in the IDC</p> <p>A label has been included in the civil plans for the roundabout to indicate that it is subject to further detailed design and acceptance by the road authority.</p>	<p>Label reference in Civil Plans.</p> <p>Section 8 Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy</p>
46e.	Clarify the who will be responsible for the construction of the half width of the ERR in Stage 3 in Section 11.3. The text implies TfNSW however, Table 15 implies the developer via SIC or Housing and Productivity Contribution. Please also note, the relevant mechanism may include a VPA or a WIK, subject to timing of the works.	Section 12.3 (Stage 3) of the IDS explains that the half road width construction of the portion of ERR may be undertaken by the developer. Once details of the road designs, potential staging and delivery dates/funding this commitment will be made. This is also reinforced in Table 15 in Section 12.3 and Table 20 in Appendix A of the IDS.	<p>Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy</p> <p>Section 12.3 – Stage 3, Table 15 and Table 20 of the IDS</p>
46f.	Address if a works agreement cannot be reached with the adjoining landowner, what implication does this have for the delivery of access (relating to Figure 17).	Section 12.7 (Stage 7) of the IDS explains that if an agreement cannot be reached with the adjacent landowner, that an alternative temporary road will be provided to facilitate access.	<p>Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy</p> <p>Section 12.7 – Stage 7 of the IDS</p>
46g.	Address and assess the additional length required by Fifteenth Avenue to meet with the new alignment of Bradfield Metro Link Road (BMLR). TfNSW notes that this impacts land outside of the IPG site	Section 7.3.2 (Transport for NSW) in the IDS has been updated to include the changes to Fifteenth Avenue (despite it not being contained on the Site).	Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
	however, the changes proposed in the master plan will result in additional land acquisition for Fifteenth Avenue.	The endorsed alignment for Fifteenth Avenue is 133m longer while the endorsed alignment for BMLR is 480m shorter compared to their respective original precinct plan alignments. The increase in land acquisition and construction cost for 15th Ave will be more than offset by the reduction in length and relocation of BMLR into the IPG site.	Section 7.3.2 Transport for NSW, Figure 10, Tab 9 and Table 10 in the IDS. Appendix E – Corridor Justification Report Section 2 Road Corridor Comparison of the AT&L Report appended to the Corridor Justification Report
46h.	State that assumptions included in the Traffic Modelling, as completed by the Proponent for 2036 and 2041, do not represent commitments of Government for that infrastructure.	Section 1.3 of the IDS has been updated and states: <i>“It should be noted that the assumptions included in the traffic modelling for 2036 and 2041 do not represent commitments of Government for that infrastructure”</i>	Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy Section 1.3 of the IDS
46i.	In the various tables for proposed mitigations, short- and long-term categories are not explained within Appendix A of the IDS. Detail is to be included about what the proposed mitigations are. (see Tab A).	An explanatory note has been added to Appendix A to provide indicative timeframes for the short, medium and long-term priorities.	Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy Appendix A of the IDS
46j.	Include the proposed phasing within the strategy.	The IDS clearly shows the infrastructure phasing and how it relates to the development staging plan.	Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy Throughout the IDS

Number Reference	Comment	Response	Reference
46k.	The GFA in Table 10 is incorrect and is to be updated to 625,467m2 (consistent with the Tranche 5 TMAP and Urban Design Report).	This has been reviewed and updated against the current urban design report, in particular Table 12	Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy Table 12 of the IDS
46l.	Clarify when stages will be delivered in the IDS to confirm that Phase 1 of the TMAP and the Stages of development in the IDS are aligned. The IDS does not include forecasts of when stages will be complete however, TfNSW notes the Civil Report includes these forecasts.	A new section has been added to the IDS that describes the Phasing of the TMAP and shows how this relates to the IDS development staging plans.	Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy Section 8 of the IDS
47.	Clarification on when stages will be delivered in the IDS is needed to confirm that Phase 1 in the TMAP and the Stages of development in the IDS are aligned.	We confirm that the development staging plan in the IDS accurately reflects the Phases in the TMAP.	Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy Section 12, Infrastructure Staging of the IDS
48.	Prior to lodgement, the draft master plan is to be updated to provide additional detail and clarity to the plans at Sections 11.1 and 11.2, to demonstrate how the infrastructure and utility delivery links to the staging plan.	Section 11.2 of the Master Plan has been updated to provide the staging overlay onto the Infrastructure and Utilities Plan. Section 12 of the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy (IDS) a detailed breakdown of each infrastructure and utilities stage. Section 12 of the IDS details the funding source and delivery timeframe of each infrastructure item for every development stage.	Section 11.2 of Master Plan Report Appendix C Section 12, Infrastructure Staging of Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy