



INGHAM BRADFIELD MASTER PLAN

RFIS FOR THE DRAFT INGHAM MASTER PLAN TO PROCEED TO LODGEMENT

Table 1 IPG Master Plan – RFIs

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
Draft Master Plan					
1.	LCC		Ensure ERR is shown as a bridge with active transport running underneath the ERR along the riparian corridor in all supporting documents.	The Eastern Ring Road is elevated above the central riparian corridor to allow active transport along the riparian corridor. Key relevant diagrams have been updated to show this. This was a significant design intervention to allow for continuous connections through the central riparian corridor, under the ERR, and into the local centre.	Section 7.1 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C Appendix AA – Civil engineering drawings, Appendix QQ – Public Domain and Landscape Strategy Section 6.8 of the Urban Design Report Appendix D
2.	LCC	Local Roads are located within LRA Regional Stormwater Mapping. Batters and retaining walls supporting local roads are also located within the riparian corridor.	Amend Master Plan to detail Local roads outside both riparian corridors and land mapped under the SEPP Land Reservation Acquisition Map as Stormwater Infrastructure (i.e. for acquisition by Sydney Water), except in instances where Local roads are required to bridge a watercourse where such a bridge is perpendicular to the watercourse.	There are no local roads proposed within the Master Plan LRA area.	Master Plan Report Appendix C Urban Design Appendix D Civil Engineering drawings Appendix AA
3.	LCC	The Masterplan does not specifically address the objectives on page 92 to 96 of the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan 2020.	The Masterplan must specifically address the objectives on page 92 to 96 of the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan 2020.	Each of these planning principles within the WSAP have been considered in a new Appendix to the Planning Report This is Appendix K to the Planning Report.	Appendix K of the Planning Report.
4.	LCC		The Master Plan must demonstrate how Advanced Manufacturing and High-Tech Industries can be accommodated within the site and this must inform relevant controls relating to built form and urban design.	The aerotropolis DCP anticipates this type of development and these controls still apply to the Master Plan. Advanced Manufacturing and High-Tech Industries can be accommodated in any warehouse typology shown in the master plan.	The planning package does not preclude any Advanced Manufacturing and High-Tech Industries
5.	LCC		Either reinstate mapped “Educational” land under Figure 3 of the WSAPP or include minimum GFA controls for the provision of “Educational” uses within the Local Centre.	The proposed amendment to Figure 3 (Land Use and Structure Plan) of the Precinct Plan is to remove the mapping for ‘Educational’ land uses. A standalone education facility is not proposed within the Master Plan, however educational facilities are proposed to be accommodated within the Local Centre. The proposed Local Centre has been specifically designed to allow for commercial floor space for an educational centre. It is a	Section 10 of Planning Report

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
				<p>permissible use within the Western Parklands City SEPP. Minimum GFA controls are not required to facilitate this use.</p> <p>The education facilities which the Local Centre can accommodate will be for tertiary education which will be subject to further engagement with educational institutions and will require further design considerations and consideration of market demand/factors. A minimum GFA control for 'educational' uses within the Local Centre would not be appropriate, before these requirements are further discussed and known.</p>	
6	LCC		Mapping supporting technical studies are to be consistent with the Master Plan report.	A consistency check has ensured that mapping within all technical reports is consistent with the Master Plan.	Master Plan and supporting Technical Studies.
7	LCC		<p>If the Master Plan is not relying on a subdivision plan, controls relating to subdivision must require all lots to provide a gravity connection to a local or regional stormwater disposal system. Where such a system requires drainage over adjacent property, a suitable easement will be required. The controls must also specify that no change to existing catchments and sub catchments is permitted.</p> <p>Should the Subdivision Plan included under Appendix 36 of the Tranche 5 response be proposed to be included within the Master Plan, Council repeats recommendations provided as part of the Tranche 4 response in relation to the proposed subdivision plan.</p>	All proposed lots have been designed to drain by gravity directly to either a local or regional stormwater drainage system and does not require drainage over adjacent properties. It is not necessary to create additional controls to prevent catchment diversion as Council's Development Design Specifications and the WSPP's Western Sydney Engineering Design Manual already provide sufficient catchment management controls.	Appendix MM – Integrated Water Cycle Management Strategy
8	LCC		Council recommends that the Master Plan considers this, noting that the Complying Development Code still includes a "Finished Ground Levels Map" under Appendix A. It is further recommended that the Master Plan related to existing ground levels.	The Complying Development Code has been updated to refer to existing ground levels.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework
.2 Draft Master Plan					
1	LCC	It is uncertain how the increase in building height to 52.5m is a site opportunity and will: "Create a sensitive built form that maximises the amenity of the public domain regarding solar access. And provide sensitive interfaces with the natural environment". Compared to the approved height.	The height strategy should provide a comprehensive consideration of site constraints and opportunities and identify if, following this site analysis, the site is suitable for high bay warehouses. Should the site be suitable, the strategy should identify how the proposed built form is capable for resulting in a better outcome than envisaged under the existing strategic planning framework.	<p>The suitability of the Precinct for high bay warehousing was established through the TAP process. The following make the proposed estate an ideal location for high bay</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proximity to the airport facilitate the typologies - Availability of large area of land - Through the master plan, better infrastructure will be provided to serve the typologies - Designated employment land 	<p>Appendix C – Master Plan Report (Section 13 –Design Quality Strategy)</p> <p>Appendix T Architecture Design Statement (page 75 & 76).</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		The proponent's response indicates that the Height Strategy included within the Urban Design Report should be reviewed in relation to this issue. In summary, Section 7 of the Urban Design Report indicates that setbacks in excess of the minimum required under the DCP are proposed and this is sufficient to warrant the increase in height from 24m to 52.5m.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The scale of the high bay will complement the adjoining new airport. <p>Through the master plan pathway, the Urban Design Principles, landscape-led approach and the integration of Connection with Country will lessen the impact of high bay development via restoration of the Riparian Corridors, provision of amenity to support workers and provision of the Design Quality Strategy.</p> <p>All areas designated for potential high bay developments in the western parcel of the estate will need to comply with the 10m landscape setback from Road 2 and 3 as stipulated in the Design Quality Strategy. The increased landscape setback from 6m (as required in the DCP) to 10m will enhance the public domain and reinforce the creek-to-creek connection. Through the master plan, a dedicated naturalised channel and landscape area were lined along north of Road 7 at the pan-handle, which will improve the public domain and lessen the visual impact of the potential high bay development. This arrangement will also prevent over-shadowing over the naturalised channel.</p> <p>A comprehensive review was undertaken as part of the TAP process that identified 2 parts of the site for high-bay warehouses. Appropriate controls have been outlined in the Design Quality Strategy relating to the height strategy.</p> <p>The TAP's recommendation in relation to the suitability of the proposed height strategy is noted in the Panel Decision Report dated 3 May 2024.</p>	
2	LCC	<p>The proposed amendments identified in the Tranche 5 documentation do not propose to achieve the minimum deep soil and canopy coverage targets of the DCP.</p> <p>The Master plan can achieve similar perviousness compliance by complying with the DCP landscape setback controls. This statement has not been demonstrated.</p>	Council encourages the proponent to provide a high percentage of landscaping and tree planting areas within the extra setback. A high percentage of paved areas in the additional setback is not a supported outcome.	<p>The perviousness targets of the DCP have been achieved in the proposal.</p> <p>The perviousness diagram and tabulation in the ADS report demonstrate that all potential developments are capable of achieving 15% and 25% perviousness for both Enterprise + Industry and Local Centre developments respectively.</p>	Page 26-27 of the Architectural Design Statement (Appendix T).
3	LCC	Additional Building Setback for Potential High Bay / Multilevel Warehouses do not allocate a	To reduce the impact of the increased building height on the public domain, minimum landscaped areas should be allocated	All areas designated for potential high bay developments in the western parcel of the estate will need to comply with the 10m landscape setback from Road 2 and 3 as stipulated in the Design	Appendix T –Architectural Design Statement



RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		minimum landscaped area in comparison with the required DCP setback, as shown in Page 102, section 6.11.5 Building Setbacks, in the Urban Design Report. It is also demonstrated by the High Bay perspective on page 65 that the proposed additional setback area does not increase the lot landscape setback area.	<p>for the additional setback proposed for Potential High Bay / Multilevel Warehouses.</p> <p>The provision of a minimum landscaped setback should also include how landscaped setbacks are to be achieved in relation to retaining walls and any required driveway provision for building circulation by Rural Fire Service/Fire and Rescue vehicles.</p>	<p>Quality Strategy. The increased landscape setback from 6m (as required in the DCP) to 10m will enhance the public domain and reinforce the creek-to-creek connection. The subdivided lots along the pan-handle are relatively smaller and therefore the landscape setback as per the DCP will suffice. 15m building setback as per the DQS instead of 13m (DCP) will apply to any potential high bay developments at the pan-handle, further lessening the amenity impact to the street.</p> <p>Additionally, any car parking fronting the road will need to provide a min 2.5m wide island planter bed for every 10 car parking spaces as stipulated in the Design Quality Strategy. This arrangement with the size increased to the island planter will allow more trees to be planted, further lessening the impact of the potential High Bay developments. Furthermore, any potential high bay development is subject to control in the Design Quality Strategy;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where a high bay warehouse development is proposed, the footprint associated with the high bay part of the warehouse component which is more than 35m in height but less than 52.5m in height, must not exceed more than 60% of the building gross footprint. <p>The above control, in addition to the increased building setback specific to this typology, will further reduce visual bulk.</p> <p>All details of the retaining walls have been provided by the civil engineer. Exact details of the driveway to mitigate level difference have been allowed for at the high-level for the master plan but can be detailed at a later stage during design development.</p>	Section 13 of Master Plan Report in Appendix C (Design Quality Strategy).
4	LCC	It is evident that many of the existing views from high points on the site have been lost because of the proposed subdivision and built form arrangement. The remaining views from east-west streets represents a small fraction of these views.	It is recommended that the Urban Design Report must identify how views from proposed Lots will encourage the provision of these views from the proposed future built form.	<p>There are no definite number of mandatory views nominated in the SEPP nor the Precinct Map. Through the Designing with Country, quality visual axis has been maintained and enhanced via integration of creek-to-creek principles and the pedestrian focused promenade in the Local Centre. This includes Road 2 and Road 3 (views to the Riparian Corridors and the Blue Mountains), Road 7 (Views to Wianamatta South-Creek) and the Local Centre Promenade (view to the Riparian Corridor).</p> <p>The referenced master plan with indicative built forms has shown that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All potential industrial buildings with ancillary offices are positioned to maximise outlook to the Riparian Corridors and naturalised channels. 	<p>Appendix BB –Connecting with Country Framework,</p> <p>Section 6.11.6 of Urban Design Report (Appendix D)</p> <p>Appendix T –Architectural Design Statement</p>


RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All Local Centre buildings will have views to the Riparian Corridors, Local Park and the 28m wide Promenade. - Given that the Blue Mountains occupy the entire westerly field of view of the estate, any east-west road grid or elevated rooftop garden will allow view corridors to the Blue Mountains. 	
5	LCC	The Urban Design Report indicates on p42 that "Wind safety and pedestrian wind comfort assessment will be considered and incorporated in the Draft Master Plan design." The Urban Design Strategy appears to be silent in relation to how this issue will be addressed in the design and in specific controls relating to CDC's.	It is recommended that Wind safety and pedestrian wind comfort is addressed in the Urban Design Strategy and that this provides guidance for the drafting of specific design controls for the Complying Development Code.	<p>Wind Safety and Pedestrian Wind Comfort have been considered in the Master Plan.</p> <p>The indicative built forms respond to the Connection with Country framework are embodied in the indicative built forms, citing the following considerations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design should consider the natural movement of wind throughout the site. - Reference cultural knowledges associated with seasonality and weather patterns in design. - Design built form appropriate to changing wind conditions. - Building form, materiality and density to be designed with consideration of local weather conditions. - Design built form to benefit from the cooling and ventilation benefits of wind <p>The following strategies have been considered at high level when designing the indicative building mass for the masterplan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enterprise + Industry <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Generous natural landscaping within the Riparian Corridor, roads and landscape setback to mitigate horizontal wind acceleration. o Wider landscape setback between buildings allows for planting of trees to mitigate direct exposure to wind as well as wind funnelling between buildings. o Industrial typologies usually have large span of awnings to provide weather protection over the operational areas. o There are no known wind issues associate with industrial estates as accessible outdoor areas for 	<p>Appendix T –Architectural Design Statement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wind Safety and Pedestrian Wind Comfort Considerations (page 33) - Design with Country, Wind Country (page 45) - First Nations Community Feedback Session (Appendix B of Connecting with Country Framework in Appendix BB)


RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
				<p>users seldom exceeds 4 storeys. Any elevated balconies will have impermeable balustrades.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no confined sections as building separations are more than 50m along all roads, reducing the possibility of wind venturi effect or street canyon effect. <p>- Local Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linear continuation of dense block structures is broken down with building separation, height controls and articulation along the streets to avoid canyon effect that traps hot air and pollution within the centre. Use of awning over the streets will protect the pedestrian from the downdraught effect near taller buildings within the Local Centre. Combination of planting on structure and balustrade to elevated outdoor areas to reduce wind downwash. <p>All of the above have been allowed for in the Design Quality Strategies.</p>	
6	LCC	<p>Building Height – the Urban Design Report must discuss how proposed earthworks will impact on building heights and public amenity when viewed from the public domain. Building heights will be calculated on the basis of existing ground level. Examining and mitigating any negative impacts of proposed earthworks proposed to be permitted under the masterplan and additional proposed earthworks proposed to be permitted under the Complying Development pathway must be explored. Where sites and adjoining streets experience significant excavation there is the potential for building heights and podiums to exceed the 26m podium and 52.5m</p>	<p>Council recommends that the Urban Design report must provide additional detail in this regard.</p> <p>This issue could be overcome by ensuring that the civil plans are amended to detail roads at (or as close as possible to existing ground level.</p>	<p>All height limits have been measured from the existing ground level and impacts from the earthworks will be mitigated through the landscape treatment of the embankments and retaining walls. This has been explored in detail during the TAP process. The ground line and corresponding heights have been demonstrated via sections and general arrangement plans.</p>	<p>Section 9.1.2 Appendix C – Master Plan Report</p> <p>Appendix QQ – Public Domain and Landscape Strategy</p> <p>Appendix T – Architectural Design Statement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shadow Impact Analysis for Overall Estate, page 28-31 Local Centre Sections, page 36-38 Shadow Impact Analysis with high Bay Massing, page 82-85 <p>Urban Design Report Appendix D</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference																								
		<p>overall heights resulting in amenity issues within the public domain. This requires further consideration as part of the master plan.</p> <p>Section 6.12.6 of the Urban Design Report provides an Earthworks plan. The Urban Design Report Does not provide any exploration as to how earthworks may impact on the Urban form nor does it provide any insight as to how associated issues could be minimised through the Master plan and proposed controls.</p>																											
3.3 Stormwater																													
1	LCC	<p>Suitability of the site – The land set aside for stormwater infrastructure is insufficient, based on the incomplete engineering plans provided, noting that sections have not been provided for basins MO1, MO2 & MO3, MO5a, MO5b, MO6, MO7, MO9, MO10, MO12 and MO13.</p> <p>In relation to the above basins, the current available sections, provided as part of the Tranche 4 documentation detail the following:</p> <table><tr><th>Basin No</th><th>Height of Maintenance track above inflow level</th><th>Local Road Impacted</th></tr><tr><td>M01</td><td>1.77m</td><td>Road 01</td></tr><tr><td>M02 & MO3</td><td>2.06m</td><td>Road 03</td></tr><tr><td>M05A (North)</td><td>2.21m</td><td>Road 02</td></tr><tr><td>M05B (South)</td><td>3.34m</td><td>Road 02</td></tr><tr><td>M06</td><td>1.65m</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>M07</td><td>2.68m</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>M08</td><td>1.68m</td><td></td></tr></table>	Basin No	Height of Maintenance track above inflow level	Local Road Impacted	M01	1.77m	Road 01	M02 & MO3	2.06m	Road 03	M05A (North)	2.21m	Road 02	M05B (South)	3.34m	Road 02	M06	1.65m		M07	2.68m		M08	1.68m		<p>Council recommends that the proposed LRA Mapping under the SEPP for stormwater drainage is not adopted, and that Lot 11 is reinstated as “Stormwater Infrastructure” and the supporting civil plans provide additional regional stormwater infrastructure in this area.</p> <p>It is further requested that long-sections are provided for basins 1, 2, 3, 5a, 5b, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 13 and that cross-sections through the Local Road reserve and all adjoining basins area provided.</p> <p>These sections must demonstrate that the Master Plan has allowed for the provision of sufficient area for the establishment of regional basins with appropriately graded batters and that watercourse velocity will not impact on the capacity of these batters to support all adjacent local road reserves.</p>	<p>Civil drawings for all basins have been provided. More detailed drawings and sections to be provided in detailed design phase.</p> <p>It has been made clear in previous responses and workshops that reallocating Lot 11 into LRA will not improve the regional drainage and WSUD solution. Note that additional land has already been provided for the basins as shown in the proposed LRA map.</p> <p>The latest Civil and Landscape drawings clearly demonstrate a landscape led approach with minimal retaining walls.</p> <p>The width of the central riparian corridor has been maintained, with careful integration of the related road alignments.</p> <p>The actual riparian corridors will be totally naturalised. The remaining areas are specifically for stormwater basins which require significant areas of level ground within and undulating topography. The revised civil plans have been able to provide these basins whilst greatly reducing the need for retaining walls.</p>	Appendix AA – Civil Engineering drawings.
Basin No	Height of Maintenance track above inflow level	Local Road Impacted																											
M01	1.77m	Road 01																											
M02 & MO3	2.06m	Road 03																											
M05A (North)	2.21m	Road 02																											
M05B (South)	3.34m	Road 02																											
M06	1.65m																												
M07	2.68m																												
M08	1.68m																												

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference										
		<table><tr><td>M09</td><td>2.42m</td></tr><tr><td>M10</td><td>2.26m</td></tr><tr><td>M11A (North)</td><td>3.63m</td></tr><tr><td>M12</td><td>4.7m – 5.5m</td></tr><tr><td>M13</td><td>1.57m</td></tr></table> <p>The use of retaining walls within regional basins is not in keeping with the “landscape led approach” under the strategic planning framework. It appears that insufficient area has been allowed for a naturalised riparian and regional basin design as regional basins require the extensive use of retaining walls to achieve required volumes.</p>	M09	2.42m	M10	2.26m	M11A (North)	3.63m	M12	4.7m – 5.5m	M13	1.57m			
M09	2.42m														
M10	2.26m														
M11A (North)	3.63m														
M12	4.7m – 5.5m														
M13	1.57m														
2	LCC	<p>The master plan proposes to locate local roads within land reserved for Sydney Water acquisition for stormwater infrastructure under the SEPP LRA map, reducing land available for regional stormwater infrastructure. There is no justification to push local road reserves to within this land and for the provision of heavy engineering works (retaining walls) in the riparian corridor for the support of local roads.</p> <p>Council also note that the proposed land take for Sydney Water identified under the Tranche 5 Infrastructure Delivery Strategy notes that this is being reduced from 343971m² to 194856m² or a reduction of 149115m². Council does not support this reduction in land available for regional stormwater infrastructure on the basis that it results in regional stormwater basins that are over engineered and</p>	<p>All local roads (including earthworks/retaining walls supporting road reserves) that run parallel to riparian corridors are to be relocated outside of both the riparian corridors and land currently identified as “Stormwater Infrastructure” shown on the Land Reservation Acquisition Map layer in State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts – Western Parkland City) 2021. Those roads that propose (or are recommended to require) a crossing over waterways, associated riparian corridors and land mapped as Stormwater Infrastructure under the SEPP LRA mapping, including Road 1 (portion crossing the central riparian corridor), Road 3, Road 10, Road 11 (see comment 1 under 3.4 below), Road 7 and road 8 are permitted to locate local roads within riparian corridors/LRA mapped Stormwater infrastructure land, however these roads may not progress via the CDC pathway and must be determined by the development application pathway.</p> <p>Road 1 (western portion adjacent to Basin M01), Road 2, Road 4 and Road 5 are to be located outside both the riparian corridor and the current SEPP LRA map layer for stormwater infrastructure. Council notes that the DCP permits the outer 50% of the riparian zone to accommodate pedestrian and cycle paths (or shared paths) street furniture (including lights and seating), landscaped verges and water sensitive urban design elements that are normally part of the street verge. However this area is not to be used for the provision of either batters/retaining wall support for road</p>	<p>The LRA map has been amended to align with the proposed regional trunk stormwater infrastructure. The amended map shows the roads outside the LRA areas and provides additional land for the basins.</p>	<p>Updated Land Reservation Acquisition Map in Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps</p>										

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		require significant retaining wall works. Council does not agree to be the de-facto acquisition authority for this land by including local roads within these areas.	reserves. Council does not agree to the provision of retaining walls to support road reserves and appropriate batters are to be used.		
3	LCC	This Civil General Arrangement Plan shows that Basin M11B will require access directly from Bradfield Metro Link Road.	TfNSW comment is required in relation to the identified access.	M11B has no direct connection to BMLR. It is assumed that this is referring to Basin M11A and the ERR. Shared paths and maintenance access to Basin M11A may be connected to either the ERR's shared paths and/or off Lot 23.	Civil engineering set.
3.4 Traffic and Transport					
1	LCC	<p>The existing collector road to the north and south of the eastern panhandle of the site is severed by the proposed road layout. See image below:</p>  <p>Source: "Figure 8 Transport Network" (Appendix 36 Tranche 5 Documentation).</p> <p>It is understood that this Figure cannot amend collector roads on the adjoining properties, however insufficient consideration has been provided in relation to the provision of this collector road and local bus route and the potential impact on neighbouring properties. It also appears that there is no link from the northern collector road to any road on the subject site (there is</p>	<p>It is recommended that either Road 11 be relocated to the east to form a direct link between each of the adjoining collector roads, or another road be provided, in accordance with the current alignment under the WSAPP, which details a direct link through the site, see:</p> 	<p>The proposed Precinct Plan map amendment for Figure 8 – Transport Network has been amended to show a continuous connection to the north and south.</p> <p>All Precinct Plan amendments which show the north-south road connections through the panhandle have been amended to reflect these indicative alignments (i.e. Active Transport Map, Street Hierarchy Map).</p> <p>The Master Plan has been designed in consultation with adjoining landowners including CSR to the north and GDC to the south. The realignment of the collector road within the IPG site is informed by the Co-Design process with the TAP and responds to site-specific conditions and lot configurations. Consultation with adjoining landowners confirms the connections to the north and south will be continuous. The proposed alignment of the local bus corridor through the panhandle was discussed and agreed with TfNSW at a TAP Transport Workshop meeting on the 15th November 2023.</p>	Appendix J – Amended Precinct Plan and SEPP Maps

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>no indication of a connection over the riparian area associated with Road 07 and furthermore there is no on-site connection from the alternative proposed on site through route at Road 11, back to the adjoining collector road on the southern neighbour, see:</p>  <p>Source: “Figure 10 Street Hierarchy” (Appendix 36 Tranche 5 Documentation) including annotations by Council.</p>			
2	LCC	<p>Insufficient information has been provided within the Civil plans to detail how public safety will be addressed where regional stormwater basins and associated batters, elevated pits and retaining walls directly adjoin local roads. The provision of pedestrian safety fencing/balustrades is shown but roadside vehicle crash barriers are not shown. Sections through the regional</p>	<p>Local roads 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 (intersection with Road 4) are to be moved outside LRA mapped stormwater infrastructure land and associated Basins M01, M04, M05A, M05B, M09, M10, M08 respectively are to be redesigned so as not to impact on adjacent local roads. In this regard it is recommended that Roads 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are moved further away from both riparian corridors and LRA mapped stormwater infrastructure land to ensure that safety fences and crash barriers are not required within the design.</p> <p>The civil plans must be amended to show sections through the regional stormwater basins and immediately adjoining road reserve (including road pavement and footpath) and these plans are to clearly identify how public safety for users of the local road reserve is considered.</p>	<p>The LRA map has been amended to align with the proposed regional trunk stormwater infrastructure. The amended map shows the roads outside the LRA areas and provides additional land for the basins. Safety fences, balustrades and crash barriers will be reviewed and designed in detailed design phase.</p> <p>The information requested requires a much higher level of design detail not typically required during master planning or DA stage. Civil drawings for all basins have been provided. The civil road cross sections extend beyond the road reserve boundaries, have been provided at regular (20m) intervals along all roads, and show retaining walls and parts of basins. A 3D model of the civil engineering design was also provided, per TfNSW and Council request to assist with their assessment.</p>	Appendix AA – Civil Engineering Drawings.

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>stormwater basins and immediately adjoining road reserve (including road pavement and footpath) are not shown.</p> <p>Council does not support designs that would result in addition risk in this regard. Additionally, the Masterplan is silent on what authority would be responsible for public safety in relation to these regional stormwater works immediately adjacent to road reserves. Council does not support a design that would increase local road reserve maintenance costs and increased public safety risks.</p> <p>Council does not consider that the current design results in a superior planning outcome.</p>	<p>It is also recommended that when road 02 is relocated 20.3m to the west and Road 04 is relocated 19.6m to the east, there may be additional capacity for the Road 03 crossing of the central riparian corridor to be provided as a bridge with an active transport link provided along the riparian corridor, under the road bridge. The relocation of Road 02 and Road 04 outside the LRZ mapping is shown below:</p>  <p>Source: General Arrangement Plan, Drawing No 22-1002-C2005, Issue D, dated 04-03-2024, prepared by at&I, with annotations by Council.</p>	<p>More detailed drawings and sections will be provided in detailed design phase.</p>	



Proponents Response on the Design of the Riparian Corridors and the landscape led approach

Since the inception of the Master Planning process with the Master Plan request in May 2022, the protection and enhancement of the three riparian corridors within the Master Plan has been a key design consideration and driven by a landscape led approach.

The Strahler classifications of the streams have been respected and the respective corridors fulfil the requirements of the Water Management Act. Basins and retaining walls have been carefully designed and landscaped to respect the Riparian Corridors as well as enabling effective active transport in the form of walking and cycling trails.

The Aerotropolis Precinct Plan anticipates both riparian outcomes and regional stormwater locations along this corridor. The outcome has been guided by riparian restoration principles, water sensitive urban design and softer engineering outcomes.

Section 8.3 of the Master Plan comprehensively documents the design principles which have guided the outcomes, an extract of which is shown below.

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
<p>8.3.2 Riparian Corridor 2 – Central Corridor</p> <p>Design Elements</p> <p>Riparian Corridor 2 runs along the central spine of the site and provides large areas of amenity and shareway for site users. Similarly to Riparian Corridor 1, the amenity areas are consolidated to key junction points that are easily accessible and sit, where possible, outside the inner 50% of the riparian corridors. These zones will offer varied program including BBQ and outdoor dining facilities, open managed lawn areas for flexible use, multi-use sports courts, a children's playground and viewing decks that interact with wetland ponds and the watercourse. The rest of the corridor will be dedicated to revegetating the edges of the existing watercourse and providing storage basins and wetland ponds to treat the storm water runoff.</p> <p>Legend</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01 Pedestrian Connection across Road 3 02 Pedestrian Connection to Eastern Ring Road 03 Small Amenity Node (turf space, gym amenity node, gathering) 04 Large Amenity Node (large covered BBQ/ dining facility, flexible space to facilitate community events/ educational activities) 05 Large Turf Areas Suitable for Sports or Events 06 Riparian Corridor Planting 07 Wetland Basins and Storage Ponds 08 Pedestrian connection under Eastern Ring Road <div style="display: flex; align-items: center;">  <div style="margin-left: 10px;">  </div> </div> <p>Figure 54 Riparian Corridor 2 Source: Site Image</p> <p style="text-align: right;">1:7,500 @ A4 0 20 40 60 80 100 120</p>					
3	LCC	Local Road 10 appears to cross a Strahler order 1 watercourse linking proposed basin 11A to the west and basin 11B to the East of Road 10. It is unclear from the sections provided how road 10 is to function from a pedestrian safety perspective. Additionally, the recommended realignment of Road 04 will allow Road 10 to be realigned so as to adopt a more perpendicular crossing of the east-west running Strahler order 1 watercourse.	The section for Local Road 10 is to be taken through both proposed adjoining regional stormwater basins and the entirety of the Road 10 road reserve to demonstrate how this road is proposed to be treated so Council can consider public safety.	It is proposed to intercept flows from the Perich Estate and draining into the Strahler Order 1 watercourse with Basin M11A. Overflows from this basin is then proposed to be piped across the ERR and discharging South of basin M11B. The piping of Strahler Order 1 watercourses is allowed in the DCP.	Appendix AA – Civil Engineering Drawings Refer stormwater line M1104 in civil drawings 22-1002-C2307 and 22-1002-C2308.

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
4	LCC	The Active Transport Link along the central riparian corridor and underneath the Eastern Ring Road (ERR) is not shown consistently within all supporting technical studies.	Ensure that Active Transport corridors are consistent across all documents.	The active transport corridors have been updated and shown consistently across all documents.	Section 7.1 of Masterplan Report Section 6.8 of Urban Design Report Appendix D Planning Report and supporting technical document set.
5	LCC	A letter of endorsement is not suitable for the purpose of any future applications for the creation of public roads on adjoining properties. The master plan does not apply to adjoining land.	A Development Application (or similar) is required for works on adjoining properties. Suitable easements must be created in relation to this land. This matter is of some importance as if it is not addressed at the Master Planning stage, it may result in delays at a later stage.	Throughout the TAP process the Proponent has maintained discussions with the adjoining owners. The letters of support demonstrate that future road connections will be addressed in the respective planning processes for the two adjoining sites.	Appendix E – Corridor Justification Report Refer Appendix A and B of the Corridor Justification Report for the Landowner consent letters.
6	LCC	Council's concern is that the Master plan is not detailed enough to require that CDC's not be permitted to be determined on the site when the capacity of the surrounding road network is reached.	The masterplan staging and controls must include suitable provisions that only permit future stages when surrounding infrastructure can support the additional traffic volumes.	The Complying Development Code includes a floor space threshold which relates to the capacity of Badgerys Creek Road. This threshold has been endorsed by TfNSW.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code
7	LCC	Identified 400m and 500m walking catchments require additional clarity in relation to the Disability Discrimination Act.	In order to demonstrate appropriate consideration of the Disability Discrimination Act is recommended that suitable real life pedestrian movements must be considered in the Masterplan. If a 400m and 800m catchment is possible by using stairs but this equates to a 600m and 1200m accessible catchment then this consideration is not equitable and must be reconsidered.	All stair locations are supplemented with nearby accessible ramps and/or paths. However, the ramps are located in such a way that they support movement in key desire lines so that the broader walkability catchment is only marginally impacted. For example, the northward path from Road 03 along the riparian corridor is only 30m longer using the DDA path vs. the stairs. See Figure 28 in the TMAP regarding the difference between standard and DDA walkability catchments.	Appendix WW – TMAP Figure 28 in the TMAP
8	LCC	As indicated in the TMAP, the current mode share for car usage is 90%. In 2026, the average is 80% for the aerotropolis precincts.	Council recommends that consideration should be given to calculate vehicular trip generation based on the number of employees in AM/PM peak hours for commercial, industrial, and warehousing developments.	The endorsed vehicular trip generation rates for industrial development have been agreed upon with TfNSW during the TAP review process. Therefore, the trip generation rates adopted within the TMAP are considered appropriate. In relation to LCC's request to assess future reduced mode share for car usage, the adopted industrial trip generate rates are established from surveys of the existing warehouse developments throughout Western Sydney, which have similar mode share characteristics to the proposed site. In this regard, the assessment of industrial warehouses is not influenced significantly by changes in mode share. Indeed, the MMR and associated modelling has	Appendix WW – TMAP TMAP Section 7.1

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
				<p>adopted no discount to trip generation rates over time, despite assumed improvements in services to support the Aerotropolis.</p> <p>Therefore, the SIDRA assessment adopting the endorsed industrial development trip rates are conservative and further assessment for varying mode share and trip generation is unnecessary.</p>	
9	LCC	The traffic demand forecast for 2026 could be underestimated as it doesn't include developments within the airport business park. In 2026, 80%-90% trips to/from the Bradfield City Centre and the Aerotropolis precincts/airport business park will be made by cars.	Council recommends that the traffic demand forecast for 2026 is amended to include developments within the airport business park.	As detailed in TMAP Section 9.2, the 2026 baseline traffic flows are established based on STFM data supplied by TfNSW. Therefore, it is considered that reasonable background traffic associated with other developments (such as the airport business park) are accounted for within the STFM.	Appendix WW – TMAP TMAP Section 9.2
10	LCC	The delivery timing of ERR is unknown. The initial developments will rely on the access at the roundabout intersection of BCR/Road 3. The traffic demands used in the current models for 2026 are likely to be underestimated (refer to the comments above).	Council recommends that consideration should be given to make provision for a dual circulation roundabout or additional approach lanes. In addition, pedestrian/cyclist access/crossing should be provided at the intersection. Confirmation is required with TfNSW on the scope of work for Badgerys Creek Road. If the section of Badgerys Creek Road between the ERR and Road 03 is not to be constructed as part of the Badgerys Creek Road upgrade by TfNSW. Shared path/kerb/gutter should be constructed along the eastern side of Badgerys Creek Road on the frontage of the subject site.	The construction of the roundabout on Badgerys Creek Road will be assessed through a Local Development Application. This will be supported by detailed engineering designs and will draw upon the modelling prepared by Ason Group as part of the Master Planning process. A pre-DA meeting with Liverpool Council has been scheduled for 26 th June 2024.	N/A Subject to Future Local Development Application.
11	LCC	AIMSUN models developed for ultimate developments are primarily focused on the arterial road network around the site but not intersections along internal network for vehicular circulation within the subject site.	Council requests the provision of the forecast traffic flow plots from AIMSUN models in 2026/2036/2056 in the TMAP for Council to identify and consider traffic control devices and pedestrian/cyclist crossing facilities.	<p>2026 and 2056 scenarios are not included in the Aimsun modelling which is included in the OAR.</p> <p>Similarly, extracted volumes for all roads is not within the scope of the reporting for this Master Plan (as set-out in the original MMR). Notwithstanding, traffic volumes for key roads are included within Appendix C of the OAR from which Council can make informed judgements. These volumes support the proposed character of the future roads with the Master Plan proposing 'standard' DCP cross-sections and intersection treatments throughout the industrial precincts (Stages 1-6).</p>	Appendix WW – TMAP Noted
12	LCC	Council expresses concern in relation to potential queueing at intersections and roundabouts. Insufficient information has been provided to allow for consideration of this issue.	Council requests the provision of traffic demand forecasts for all local road intersections in order to identify suitable intersection treatments. In addition, a copy of network SIDRA models should be provided to Council for review on the proposed intersections along R03 including the proposed roundabout on Badgerys Creek Road. The proposed bus zone location should be shown on the civil drawing design plans.	As above, extracted volumes for all roads is not within the scope of the reporting for this Master Plan (as set out in the original MMR). Notwithstanding, traffic volumes for key roads are included within Appendix C of the OAR from which Council can make informed judgements. These volumes support the proposed character of the future roads with the Master Plan proposing 'standard' DCP cross-	Appendix VV –Transport Options Assessment Report in Appendix C

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
				sections and intersection treatments throughout the industrial precincts (Stages 1-6). Further to the above, it is expected that additional detail will be provided in support of the future detailed design, post Master Plan approval.	
13	LCC	Any proposed interim access roads require separate Council approval.	Council notes that any interim access road, which is open to the public requires Council's approval under Section 138 application.	Noted, any interim access roads will be separately assessed.	Noted
14	LCC	The Masterplan does not demonstrate how items required to be considered by Council's Local Traffic Committee are to be undertaken.	Council requires that any proposed pedestrian crossing, bus zone, intersection treatments and associated signage and line marking plans must be submitted to Transport Management team in order to be presented to Liverpool Council's Local Traffic Committee Meeting for endorsement and Council's meeting for approval.	The proponent will liaise with Council's Local Traffic Committee where required.	Noted
15	LCC	It is unclear how the provision of street furniture and other infrastructure within the road reserve is to be provided.	Council recommends that Bus stop/shelter/seating be provided as part of the road work in accordance with the master plan.	Noted. The location of future street furniture will be addressed as part of the detailed design.	Noted
16	LCC	A Travel Management Plan has not been submitted in relation to the Masterplan.	<p>Council recommends the provision of a Travel Management Plan.</p> <p>The Travel Plan is to include the following: The proponent is to be nominated a travel coordinator for travel demand management action plans in the precinct. Contact details of the coordinator(s) should be provided to Council once a building is operating. The strategy is to be reviewed every 2-3 years with travel behavior surveys to be carried out as part of the review.</p> <p>It is recommended that an online green travel plan lodge platform is to be established to monitor transport usages with Western Sydney Parkland Authority for the subject site, the Bradfield City Centre and other aerotropolis precincts as well as provide effective tools and measures to improve public and active transport usage. The platform is to include the following (but not to be limited):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Transport mode share targets for different types of land uses b) Access and Servicing Plan for the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Precincts and Bradfield City Centre c) Guidelines and framework for government organisations, business, school, and other building owners to develop and prepare a green travel plan 	<p>Noted. However, the preparation of a detailed Travel Management Plan is considered to be a post-master plan approval matter.</p> <p>Nevertheless, a Travel Plan is provided in Section 12 of the TMAP, which details the existing and target mode shares with reference to the Aerotropolis Plan, implementation measures in addition to communication and monitoring strategies.</p>	Section 12 of the TMAP Appendix WW

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
			<p>d) Registration of green travel plans by building users and implementation plans</p> <p>e) Transport mode and usage surveys every five years within the Bradfield City Centre</p> <p>f) Public transport information</p> <p>g) Active transport and wayfinding information</p> <p>h) Public car park locations</p> <p>i) Shared car parking services Micro-mobility parking facility and services</p> <p>k) EV charging station locations</p> <p>(17)An Emergency Evacuation Plan is to be prepared and approved by Council/SES and other relevant agencies.</p>		
17	LCC	The Master Plan is to identify emergency service access and evacuation route(s) as well prepare an emergency evacuation plan for all staging developments.		<p>This can be conditioned, if deemed necessary.</p> <p>However, our view is that such a Plan is not strictly necessary. Evacuation routes via future public roads will be readily appreciated by future persons on-site noting the limited options available.</p>	Noted
1	LCC	<p>The relocation of Gas mains is to be undertaken in consultation with the relevant utility authority requirements and in accordance with the requirements under State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021. The Planning Report notes that:</p> <p><i>Gas: gas services within the area: include a 110mm diameter PE (300kPa) main on the eastern side of Badgerys Creek Road along the Site frontage and a 200mm diameter Steel (1050kPa) high pressure main traversing across the northern extents of the site. This main will need to be relocated/removed. The existing 150mm main located within Badgerys Creek Road is insufficient. Pending the</i></p>	Should the Gas Pipeline relocation work not be Development permitted without consent, a suitable application will be required for these works. Additionally, the Master Plan should identify an indicative route for the relocation of this pipeline to demonstrate that it can be provided in a suitable area on the site.	Ingham Property engaged with Jemena regarding the relocation of the gas pipeline in 2022 and is currently working through the approval process to relocate the pipeline. The new alignment has been designed to accommodate the proposed Master Plan and has received in principle endorsement from Jemena. The physical relocation of the asset will occur prior to the commencement of the stage 1 and 2 civil earthworks.	Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<i>final layout of development and full economic evaluation of demand for natural gas at the site, the availability of natural gas to the site will be further assessed subject to a Commercial Connection Application</i>			
2	LCC	<p>Temporary IOP - In relation to the IOP, the Civil Infrastructure Report notes the following:</p> <p>"The sizing and ultimate location of the IOP will need to be assessed at the detailed design phase once the extent of the initial stages and the end user flows have been determined. This is subject to planning approval timing and will need to align with ultimate delivery strategy of Sydney Water for the Trunk Gravity services. The IOP will be similar to those being delivered elsewhere within the Aerotropolis and Mamre Road Precinct and will be subject to Sydney Water approval."</p> <p>This identification of the IOP is vague and does not indicate whether the interim solution will be a piped system or if it will depend on road access for pit pump out. Additional detail is required.</p>	<p>Council does not support any interim solution that would require onsite storage and road transport of on-site generated sewerage and wastewater as this would impact on Local Roads and may have unforeseen environmental impacts that have not been considered in the Master Planning documentation. It is requested that details of the IOP are provided at the Masterplan Stage.</p> <p>Council strongly recommends that development on site is not permitted until a reticulated sewerage connection is provided to the site.</p>	<p>Sydney Water has stated their support for the provision of an IOP and instructed Ingham to submit an application for Minor Extension to initiate discussions. The application was submitted on 2 April with the initial response from SW received on 16 May. Discussions with SW regarding the IOP are ongoing.</p> <p>Ingham are proposing to use the Pump Out (Tankering) method for the IOP. Similar systems have been approved with at least one now operational in the Mamre Road precinct. It is also proposed to be used for Bradfield CBD.</p> <p>All necessary approvals and licences from Sydney Water and the EPA will be obtained for transport and disposal of wastewater.</p>	Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy
3	LCC	<p>The Civil Infrastructure Report notes the following in relation to retaining walls:</p> <p>These walls will be structurally designed and built to the manufacturers' specifications to suit the required heights and loading. All retaining walls >900mm high will have pedestrian barriers and vehicular safety barriers for walls >600mm high (where necessary), in accordance with the Australian Standards and Austroads Guidelines. (pp11-12).</p>	<p>As detailed in 3.3 Recommendation 1, above, the Civil plans are to be amended to remove retaining walls and replace with 1:4 batters and show how this is achieved by providing appropriate long and cross sections through regional basins and associated local roads.</p> <p>Council does not support the provision of retaining walls within Councils Road reserve.</p>	<p>The Roads Act and Conveyancing Act allows the provision of support structures including retaining walls in adjacent land to support roads.</p> <p>Retaining walls for the development are designed in accordance with the Aerotropolis DCP.</p>	Noted Appendix L – DCP Compliance Table

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>As detailed in 3.3 Recommendation 1, above, the Civil plans</p> <p>Council has serious concerns that the additional safety fencing and crash barrier protection required will result in additional maintenance and liability burdens that would not have occurred if the Master Plan adopted a landscape led approach. This is not considered to be a superior outcome.</p> <p>Additionally, the Civil Infrastructure report notes that: Where changes in level within the public domain are too large and would result in steep and unstable batters, retaining walls are to be constructed in accordance with the DCP requirements. (p11).</p> <p>Again, any proposal to include retaining walls within Council's Local Road Reserve is a safety, maintenance, cost and liability issue and does not represent a superior outcome.</p>			
4	LCC	<p>The proponent has indicated that "Fire and Rescue NSW advised that the site would be appropriately serviced by the planned fire station network. As outlined in the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Social Infrastructure Assessment prepared by GHD (2022), this includes four new fire stations in the Western Sydney Aerotropolis by 2056, with a fire station in the Aerotropolis Core recommended by 2036."</p>	<p>The Master Plan is to indicate if any of the 3 Fire Stations required within the Western Sydney Aerotropolis required by NSW Fire and Rescue between 2036 and 2056, are intended to be provided within the Ingham site.</p>	<p>No fire station is proposed to be located within the Ingham site. Whilst the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Social Infrastructure Assessment prepared GHD identifies the need for one Aerotropolis Core Fire Station, the Precinct Plan does not identify the need for one within the IPG site.</p>	<p>Section 5.2 of Social Impact Assessment Report Appendix TT</p>
5	LCC	<p>The Master Plan has included a multipurpose community centre, childcare (70 places) and private medical centre in the proposed Local Centre which is a reflection of Council's initial consultation with</p>	<p>The Master plan should detail at what stage of the development the multipurpose community centre, childcare centre (70 places) and private medical centre will be provided and what trigger will be used for its provision within the Masterplan controls.</p>	<p>The provision of childcare, a multipurpose community hall and private medical centre will be staged as part of the delivery commercial buildings within the consolidated Local Centre proposed within the Master Plan. This is likely to be in the later stages of the delivery of the Master Plan. The location and design</p>	<p>Section 11 of the Planning Report.</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>Urbis. The delivery of the centre is unclear. The updated Master Plan report refers to an indicative location of social infrastructure & community facilities (p.126). However, the proposed long day care adjacent to the intersection of a classified road would be potentially impacted by environmental health and safety concerns.</p>	<p>The proposed long day care is adjacent to the intersection of a classified road. It is recommended that the tentative location should be interchanged with any other component like the Local Park.</p>	<p>of the childcare centre will take into consideration the proximity to the Eastern Ring Road.</p>	
6	LCC	<p>In Council's previous referral, we requested more breakdowns on the approximate size of social infrastructure and community facilities. We also recommend an increase in the floor space for health care and extended hours to cater for the needs of the 24/7 shift workers and any emergencies. The updated Master Plan report indicates, the GFAs of large pharmacy and medical centre have been slightly increased (Ref below). The SIA has recommended extended operating hours of health centre to cater for the shift workers. The proponent has indicated that "The floor areas for the proposed multipurpose community centre, childcare centre and health facility will be determined during the preparation of the complying development certificate/s for the local centre with input from a social planning consultant and Council." Council is concerned that there are no triggers for the provision of this development.</p>	<p>The Masterplan should detail at what stage of the development the proposed large pharmacy and medical centre will be provided and what trigger will be used for its provision within the Masterplan controls.</p>	<p>The Master Plan allows for the provision of a large Pharmacy and Medical Centre, but not commit to a specific trigger as this will be market driven by the development of the Local Centre.</p> <p>The consolidated Local Centre proposed within the Master Plan allows for a range of community facilities and social infrastructure in a highly accessible location. The intention is that the commercial and retail floorspace created in this location can allow for these amenities to locate, subject to market demand and the ultimate delivery of the Local Centre.</p>	<p>Section 11 of the Planning Report</p> <p>Appendix TT – Social Impact Assessment</p>
3.6 Acquisition					
1	LCC	<p>The proposed land take for Sydney Water identified under the Tranche</p>	<p>Council will not agree to the acquisition of any land currently Mapped as "Stormwater Infrastructure" under the SEPP LRA Mapping layer.</p>	<p>Ingham has engaged with Liverpool City Council and Sydney Water in relation to Land Acquisition and the confirmation of the Land</p>	<p>Appendix LL – IDC</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		5 Infrastructure Delivery Strategy notes that this is being reduced from 343971m ² to 194856m ² or a reduction of 149115m ² so it is inaccurate to suggest that the masterplan is providing "additional land for stormwater infrastructure."		<p>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.</p> <p>Sydney Water were unable to confirm their position in the meeting and have since advised us and the TAP that:</p> <p><i>"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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>We will keep you posted, thank you for your patience and understanding"</i></p>	Section 7 of the IDS.
2	LCC	Council will discuss future ownership of land within the Master planning site when suitable information is provided. At present the "Blue – Green Infrastructure Framework" figure on page 79 of the Planning Report only identifies indicative local open space within the local centre. This figure details all riparian corridor land as "stormwater infrastructure."	Council notes that any land mapped under this figure that is not acquired by Sydney Water as the regional stormwater authority will not be acquired by Council unless such land is not impacted by regional stormwater infrastructure, has a demonstrated local open space outcome and is in alignment with Council's Draft Aerotropolis 7.12 Contribution Plan.	Council's comments in relation to Local Open Space and the 7.12 Contributions Plan are noted. Ingham will engage with Council in future Voluntary Planning Agreements in relation to Open Space.	<p>Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps (Land Reservation Acquisition Map)</p> <p>Appendix F –Explanation of Intended Effect - SEPP Amendments</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference																
3	LCC	The proposed cost of works/CIV is not consistent across all documents.	All cost of works in accordance with Clause 208 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021 are to be included.	The cost estimates are consistent across all documents.	Cost Estimates in the Appendix Y – CIV Report																
4	LCC	<p>The “Draft Infrastructure Delivery Strategy” notes the following (pp21-22):</p> <p><i>.2 Open Space and Stormwater Master Plan Land Acquisition</i></p> <p><i>The initial modelling by Sydney Water informing the precinct plan has been updated as part of the Integrated Water Cycle Management Report for this Master Planning process by IDC. This IWCMP has been based on site-specific designs, layouts, land uses, etc. This represents a more accurate and appropriate scenario for a revised land acquisition proposal and is shown in Figure 9 below. These basin sizes and locations will achieve the water management targets with the following land acquisition required.</i></p> <table><caption>Table 8 - Land Acquisition Areas</caption><thead><tr><th>Acquisition Authority</th><th>S7.12 or SEPP Land Acquisition (m²)</th><th>Master Plan (MP01) Acquisition (m²)</th><th>Difference (m²)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Sydney Water</td><td>343,971</td><td>194,856</td><td>-149,115</td></tr><tr><td>Liverpool City Council</td><td>68,364</td><td>281,127</td><td>+212,763</td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>412,335</td><td>476,983</td><td>+64,648</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>This considerable increase in land to be acquired by Council has not been justified. Furthermore, there is no funding mechanism proposed to enable such acquisitions to occur.</p>	Acquisition Authority	S7.12 or SEPP Land Acquisition (m²)	Master Plan (MP01) Acquisition (m²)	Difference (m²)	Sydney Water	343,971	194,856	-149,115	Liverpool City Council	68,364	281,127	+212,763	TOTAL	412,335	476,983	+64,648	Council does not support the proposed 213 753m² increase in land acquisition for Council.	Council’s comments in relation to Land Acquisition are noted.	<p>Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Amendment Maps (Land Reservation Acquisition Map)</p> <p>Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy</p>
Acquisition Authority	S7.12 or SEPP Land Acquisition (m²)	Master Plan (MP01) Acquisition (m²)	Difference (m²)																		
Sydney Water	343,971	194,856	-149,115																		
Liverpool City Council	68,364	281,127	+212,763																		
TOTAL	412,335	476,983	+64,648																		
5	LCC	There are inconsistencies throughout the Tranche 5 supporting documents in relation to who is the nominated acquisition authority.	Council requests that the SEPP Land Reservation Acquisition Map includes map labels consistent with the SEPP LRA map labelling that clearly indicates the acquisition authority for each mapped parcel of land. Council does not support the addition of any new land reservation acquisition for local open space and drainage (i.e. Council acquisition) given the absence of any funding mechanism.	The labelling of the Land Reservation Acquisition Map has been update and removes the notation “open space”.	<p>Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Amendment Maps (Land Reservation Acquisition Map)</p> <p>Appendix F –Explanation of Intended Effect - SEPP Amendments</p>																
3.7 Biodiversity, Hazards and Conservation																					

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
1	LCC	The update to the landscaping plans is encouraging, however the landscape led outcomes need to be demonstrated within the civil drawings. As indicated elsewhere in this response, the Tranche 5 Civil plans are incomplete and do not set out the treatment of all basins within the Masterplan. This information is required prior to Council providing final comment.	The Tranche 5 Civil plans are incomplete and do not set out the landscaped treatment of all basins within the Masterplan. The landscaped treatment should be shown both in plan and in section and cross-sections and long sections of the basins are to be provided, including any adjacent Local Road reserve. This information is required prior to Council providing final endorsement.	The full civil engineering set of plans has been updated to capture the landscape led outcomes which were worked through with the Technical Assurance Panel. This is also reflected in the Site Image Landscape Plans.	Civil Engineering Drawings Appendix AA Landscaping Plans Appendix QQ
2	LCC	The temporary irrigation (Page 85, Biodiversity Management Plan) should not be drafting water from nearby rivers, dams and other water sources without the appropriate approvals. If approval is not granted, an external water source should be either installed on the worksite or water sources need to be brought on the site during watering visits. The BMP has not been updated to include this wording; however, it has indicated that approval will be sought for water usage.	The Master Plan must set out clearly the process by which consent will be sought for any use of on- site water for irrigation purposes.	Water for temporary irrigation can be sourced from the temporary sediment basins, the permanent MARV reduction basins or carted in from external reuse water sources.	Noted
3	LCC	Complying Development should not be undertaken on waterfront land referenced under The Water Management Act 2000, which prescribes 40m from the top of bank of the waterway, meaning any works proposed within 40 metres of the top of bank of a riparian area require	Council notes that both the Master Plan Report and the CDC controls are silent in relation to integrated development. Council further notes that Aerotropolis Certificates cannot be used to require compliance with legislation. The function of an issued Aerotropolis Certificate demonstrates that the Planning Secretary is satisfied that the development is consistent with the master plan. Council will provide additional comment in this regard following consideration of the DPHI approach to Master Planning and Complying Development. For the	Under the 'General requirements for complying development' at Section 2.2 of the IPG Code, it is identified that where any concurrence is required under the Water management Act 2000, this must be obtained where needed ahead of the issue of an Aerotropolis Certificate. It is considered that as this requirement is stipulated in the Code which will be endorsed as part of the Master Plan, this matter can be readily considered by the Secretary in taking a view as to	Section 2.2 of the Appendix H – Complying Development Code

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		consideration under the WM Act 2000.	purpose of the Master Plan, Council recommends that the CDC pathway is not permitted for integrated or designated development.	whether the proposal is in accordance with the approved Master Plan, under Section 4.45 of the WPC SEPP.	
4	LCC	All trees identified for retention are to be fenced at the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) to be determined by the site consulting arborist.	Council recommends that CDC works are not permitted within the TPZ and any work within the TPZ must be undertaken with appropriate DA consent. The Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) may be located beyond the HBV and AHCVV. This should be confirmed.	Complying development is not permitted in the HBV or AHCVV location as the site. Other trees at the site can be considered where necessary through the Construction Environmental Management Plan measures.	Appendix H –Complying Development Code
5	LCC	<p>The Salinity response has not provided sufficient borehole testing samples for either the site as a whole or the land identified as of potentially high salinity. An updated Salinity response has not been submitted in relation to the proposal.</p> <p>This response is not adequate as insufficient representative borehole samples have been provided. Potentially high salinity soils are located in and around riparian areas. Roads and public infrastructure that are required to be handed over to Council are located in these areas. Without the provision of suitably detailed salinity, sodacity and soil aggressivity information there may be issues in relation to Council agreeing to the handover of public infrastructure in these areas.</p>	<p>Council again requests that an appropriate representative site bore hole sample is provided in relation to salinity, sodacity and soil aggressivity as this will be required to consider how the Masterplan is to respond to on-site earthworks and the requirements for design specifications for road and drainage infrastructure and any in ground works.</p> <p>The bore hole testing initial Phase 1 Salinity reporting, and the Phase 2 Salinity response must be in accordance with the reporting and sampling requirements included in the ‘Department of Land and Water Conservation (2002) Guide: Site Investigations for Urban Salinity’; https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/research-and-publications/publications-search/site-investigations-for-urban-salinity and Western Sydney Salinity Code of Practice prepared by Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils (WSROC) https://wsroc.com.au/media-a-resources/reports/summary/3-reports/122-western-sydney-salinity-code-of-practice-march-2003</p> <p>Table 1 of the ‘Department of Land and Water Conservation (2002) Guide: Site Investigations for Urban Salinity’ provides a sampling guide for the initial site investigation (phase 1) and detailed site investigation (phase 2). The current supporting information is not in accordance with these requirements.</p>	<p>The geotechnical engineers, Stantec, has advised that they have tested locations most susceptible for saline soils and found that there's only a “low risk” of saline soils being found onsite. Per Stantec’s advice, further sampling will be carried out as part of detailed site investigations in accordance with DWLC Salinity Guidelines. The results of the detailed site investigations shall be provided prior to construction. A salinity management plan will be prepared prior to construction if saline conditions are encountered during detailed site investigations.</p> <p>It is also noted that proposed civil works and structures can be designed to manage saline soils and runoff if detected after further testing and/or during construction.</p>	Appendix JJ – Stantec Geotechnical Investigation Report
6	LCC	The civil plans require further consideration to bring it into accordance with the Public Domain Master Plan. The Masterplan must also provide a consideration as to how applications for the active transport links through riparian corridors are to be determined, what authority is to acquire these active transport networks and who is to manage and maintain these corridors long-term. If	Consideration as to how issues in relation to the Public Domain Masterplan and active transport links through multiple land ownership is to be overcome must form part of the Master planning approach.	Long term maintenance of the active transport corridors through the riparian corridors will require further discussion with Liverpool City Council and Sydney Water.	Noted

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		consideration is removed from the DA process and Council have no determination and certification oversight of these assets, Council will not choose to have any ongoing maintenance role of these assets.			
7	LCC	Section 4.5 Biodiversity and Riparian Corridor in the Urban Design Report does not identify the central riparian area as a proposed biodiversity link. The WSAPP (May 2023) requires improvement and reestablishment of biodiversity and this should be included in the central riparian corridor.	It is recommended that the Central riparian corridor is identified as a proposed biodiversity link.	The Urban Design Report has been updated to recognise the biodiversity values of the riparian corridor.	Section 8.3 of the Master Plan Report.
8	LCC	Planning for bushfire protection is required to be complied with throughout each stage of the proposal, noting that as part of early stages, there will remain significant portions of unmanaged land on the site.	The Masterplan should demonstrate how each stage of the proposal is to comply with "Planning for Bushfire Protection." The Masterplan should provide advice as to how exactly it is envisaged that compliance with "Planning for Bushfire Protection" is proposed to be achieved through the CDC process throughout all stages of the development.	The Complying Development Code describes how Planning For Bushfire Protection will be achieved for the Precinct. This is reflected in the Bushfire Assessment Report.	This has been addressed in Section 2.2.3 of the Complying Development Code, reflecting Section 18 pages 52-61 and Appendix 4 (page 67) in the Bushfire Assessment Report Appendix X
9	LCC	The wildlife hazard assessment provides a comprehensive assessment of the species present, the habitat available and the risk of bird and bat strike to aircraft. From the species identified it appears that the risk of airstrike cannot be eliminated due to birds present in multiple habitats, including the urban environment. Council queries how wildlife that is attracted by the urban/built form that results in a wildlife strike risk will be addressed as part of the CDC approach? How will compliance with WSACo requirements under the SEPP	Council recommends that the Master Plan and CDC approach are amended to include provisions for the built form that will discourage wildlife that are attracted to the built/urban form.	<p>The Landscape Strategy for the Master Plan reflects carefully selected species which seek to minimise wildlife attraction. These have been assessed in the updated Wildlife risk assessment.</p> <p>Further consultation is occurring with Western Sydney Airport in relation to Wildlife Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Provisions for the built form to discourage wildlife that are attracted to the built/ urban form;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fencing: Ensure selected permeable fence does not entrap animals. - Building Design: Minimise ledges and crevices that can serve as nesting sites. - Waste Management: Establish regular waste collection and build secure waste storage to prevent access to food waste. 	<p>Appendix QQ –Landscape Plans,</p> <p>Appendix YY –Wildlife Risk Assessment.</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		be achieved for CDC's for wildlife attracting building works?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitoring: Regular inspection of fences and installation of remote monitoring system - Lighting: Use of controlled lighting ie motion sensors; dimmers or dusk to dawn triggers to minimise light pollution. 	
10	LCC	The landscaping provision nominated for the site (10% on lot and 1 tree per 50m ² in riparian areas) is insufficient to satisfy both strategic vision for the site and the numerical 40% landscape coverage for the site. The DCP permits unlimited tree planting if the canopies do not touch and does not include provisions for the planting of shrubs.	Council recommends that the minimum canopy coverage and deep soil targets identified under the DCP are achieved.	The Landscape Plans have been updated to achieve increased tree canopy based on the approved tree species list. This has been assessed by an updated Wildlife Risk Assessment.	<p>Appendix QQ –Landscape Plans,</p> <p>Appendix YY –Wildlife Risk Assessment.</p>
1	LCC	The site has identified items of Indigenous Heritage; however, a Heritage Interpretation Strategy has not been provided. A Heritage Interpretation Strategy "applies to all types of environmental heritage: natural and cultural (Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal) and also to movable heritage – any natural or manufactured object or collection of heritage significance. The umbrella term item means a place, building, work, relic, movable object, precinct or landscape" (Interpreting Heritage Places and Items Guidelines, published by the NSW Heritage Office).	A Heritage Interpretation Strategy is recommended to be provided.	<p>Heritage Interpretation has been achieved in the Connecting with Country Strategy, the Urban Design Strategy, the Architectural Design Statement, the Design Quality Strategy and the Public Art Strategy.</p> <p>The need for a Heritage Interpretation Strategy was not identified as a Master Plan Requirement and has been addressed in the outcomes of a range of studies.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>There is no need for a specific Heritage Interpretation Strategy for the project</p>
2	LCC	As part of connection to country considerations, Council questions whether the current civil engineering approach has been discussed with the indigenous community and that the outcomes of these discussions are presented	Council recommends that evidence that the current civil engineering approach has been discussed with the indigenous community and what the outcomes of this discussion were. It would be appreciated if both the relevant report and specific section could be referenced in this regard.	The full master plan and the water management which underpins it were discussed with First Nations Stakeholders on 12 February 2024. This is referenced in the Connecting with Country Framework Report in Section '2.9 Community Endorsement Session'.	Appendix BB – Connecting with Country Framework Report, p. 25

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		to the TAP. The proponent has indicated that this has been undertaken in the CWC report however it is unclear what this report is and what specific section is being referred to.			
3.9 Open Space					
1	LCC	The Urban Design Report does not include all identified areas for flexible use/sports identified in the Public Domain Landscape Strategy. All documents should be consistent in this regard.	The Urban Design Report is to be consistent with all identified areas for flexible use/sports identified in the Public Domain Landscape Strategy.	<p>This consistency is now reflected in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The urban design report Section 6.10.5. The masterplan report Section 8.3 	Section 6.10.5 of Appendix D – Urban Design Report
2	LCC	The location of formalised flexible use/sports areas must be considered in relation to riparian corridors and stormwater infrastructure. The majority of identified areas for flexible use/sports are located within and adjacent to riparian corridors, flood affected land and stormwater infrastructure works. It is unclear how such works will be determined at the detailed design stage and what involvement will Council have in this process.	In relation to the identified flexible use/sports areas, it is recommended that the Master Plan provide clarity in relation to what role Council will have in the process in instances where these areas are in riparian areas. Council further recommends that this is considered prior to the determination of the Masterplan to avoid potential acquisition/handover issues.	It is recognised that there is the need for further discussions with Council on the flexible use areas. The local open space would be subject to future Voluntary Planning Agreement discussions with Council.	Section 6.3 of Appendix TT – Social Impact Assessment.
3	LCC	The ownership and maintenance roles for Active transport links within riparian corridors is uncertain as these links are located both on private land and within land mapped as Stormwater Infrastructure under the SEPP LRA mapping.	The Masterplan is to provide details as to how ownership and maintenance roles for Active transport links within riparian corridors is to be resolved.	The ownership and maintenance of the active transport links within the riparian corridors will require further discussion with Council and Sydney Water. These discussions form part of the meetings which are currently occurring with Sydney Water and Council on the Land Reservation Acquisition Map.	Noted
3.10 Public Art					
1	LCC	Council still has concerns about having two separate streams of public art delivery (i.e. delivered by	Council recommends that these deliveries are all focused on addressing the building bulk across the site.	<u>The master planned approach to public art in lieu of the DCP trigger</u>	Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		the masterplan within the public domain, and the delivered by individual developments). In line with the Aerotropolis DCP all individual sites which exceed 20 hectares or \$20 million are required to deliver public art within the footprint of their sites.	<p>Council recommends that public art murals and facades should be employed in place of detailed design for individual developments to ensure requirements are met. Council identifies that there are multiple ways to address bulk facades that have not been considered. The BMPAS identifies many such suitable public art treatments (i.e. light/ projection artworks, embossed pre-cast concrete walls, woven artwork fencing, sand blasting, engraved glass).</p> <p>The BMPAS identifies the need for addressing building bulk by identifying "certain size" and "key building facades" but this has not been defined and should be to ensure consistency and best outcomes for audiences (i.e. staff, visitors, vehicular / pedestrian passers-by).</p> <p>The IPG Badgerys Creek Road Masterplan identifies 20 x lots whose height will reach 52.5m and 16 lots at 24m, in all the BMPAS identifies 4 large scale wayfinding artworks to address this building bulk and the recommended artwork dimensions are 5m(h) x 3m (w). Council recommends this is manifestly insufficient in relation to what would be required to address this item.</p> <p>From discussions with BMPAS it is apparent that landscaping will play a critical role in addressing the lower levels of building bulk and so public art should be identified in the masterplan to address this concern at heights which would exceed the landscaping.</p>	<p>As discussed with Council the BMPAS has been developed to support the masterplan, and to guide the delivery of high quality, site specific artworks that contribute to the public domain. The BMPAS proposes the master planned approach to the delivery of public art in lieu of the Aerotropolis DCP trigger which requires a lot by lot approach based on the capital investment value of individual lots.</p> <p>The masterplan approach has been proposed to ensure that public art is delivered strategically across the site, that it is integrated into the development and contributes to the principles of the masterplan by adding positively to the landscape and public domain. It will do this by enhancing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Placemaking, Identity and Character - Wayfinding and circulation - Knowledge sharing and site discovery - Engagement with the site and others - and help activate spaces <p>In a meeting held between Liverpool Council and IPG on the 7th of June 2024 relating to the Public Art Strategy Council confirmed their agreement of the Master plan approach to the location of artworks.</p> <p><u>Artworks and built form</u></p> <p>In regard to Councils comment relating to public art murals and facades, the BMPAS has been updated to encourage consideration of artwork integration with built form where appropriate. As previously requested the BMPAS has taken care not to be prescriptive. The realisation of artworks will be subject to artists proposals, the artwork development process and input from the Public Art Panel to ensure artworks achieve the best possible outcomes.</p> <p>We appreciate your highlighting that the BMPAS does outline a broad range of facade expression opportunities, and note that Artists initiative through the concept and design development process may produce a further range of creative treatments.</p> <p>It is understood that Council is concerned about the size of the built form and the bulk and massing of buildings and see public art as a way of addressing this. In addition to the nominated locations for artworks outlined in the BMPAS the Masterplan for the site responds to this through the Design Quality Strategy (DQS).</p> <p>The DQS has a tiered trigger system that identifies when built forms require additional treatments including feature walls, colour changes and articulations to address and reduce massing and scale of the structure towards the public domain. The starting points and guidelines outlined in the BMPAS will be applied to these built forms.</p> <p>Regarding specifying detailed facade opportunities and the scale of elements, we note that future building design will generate outcomes and that this information will be provided by the Public Art Consultant</p>	Refer to page 32 for a new section to the report addressing artwork visibility, location, scale and encouragement to integrate art with built form

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
				<p>in briefing information packs to artists as suitable for each general artwork locality / opportunity.</p> <p><u>Artworks Size and Scale</u></p> <p>With regard to achieving appropriate size, scale and visibility of artworks, the BMPAS has been updated to include a new section that addresses artworks contribution to the Public Domain.</p> <p>This new section outlines baseline requirements for public art that will form part of artists briefs and be used by the Public Art Panel and Estate Public Art Consultant when assessing public art proposals and determining winning concepts. It requires Public Art to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add positively to the public domain - Be Visible from the public domain - Be of an appropriate size and scale relative to surrounding context - Be Visible now and in the future – which means its siting needs to consider the size of mature vegetation and future stages - Support wayfinding and orientation - Benefit as many audiences as possible, and maximise visual presence and place-making <p>This section also encourages the utilisation of built forms for artworks where appropriate</p> <p>In relation to building height Council's comment that 20 lots will reach heights of 52.5 metres and 16 lots at 24 metres is not accurate. The change to height controls is only to ensure that should a high bay use be identified, it can be accommodated in select areas of the site. At no stage has it been represented that all lots will be developed to the maximum building heights. It is expected that the majority of lots within the increased height area will be developed into standard industrial facilities with a height of less than 15m</p>	
2	LCC	Council notes the BMPAS still does not identify the responsibility of individual developers to undertake public art in line with the Aerotropolis DCP requirements.	Council recommends that the BPMAS acknowledge the requirement of individual developers to deliver public art that is viewable to audiences in the public domain as a priority.	<p>The Master Plan proposes an amendment to the Aerotropolis DCP which does not have a public art requirement for each site, but instead adopts a precinct wide approach to Artwork. In a meeting held between Liverpool Council and IPG on the 7th of June 2024 relating to the Public Art Strategy Council confirmed their agreement of the Master plan / precinct wide approach to the location of artworks.</p> <p>The Design Quality Strategy allows for individual design responses for façade and building treatment.</p>	<p>Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy</p> <p>Appendix C – Master Plan</p> <p>Section 13 of Master Plan Report (Design Quality Strategy)</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
3	LCC	The BMPAS still does not identify, “The Commercial Centre is envisaged as a community-focused hub.” Council does not recommend that a “community-focused hub” would be a space overseen by the Estate Public Art Consultant (pg. 10).	Council recommends that a public artwork be identified, through meaningful community consultation, to identify, celebrate and ensure a unique space that reflects the communities expected to access and utilise the space.	<p>The exact location of the community focused hub will be defined through the detailed design of buildings and spaces for that precinct. Multiple public artworks have been nominated for the local centre precinct, and these could be purposed and specifically located to relate to the community facility / spaces when confirmed.</p> <p>The emerging community will be consulted as part of the Design Quality process to guide the formulation of suitable public art response.</p> <p>The BMPAS outlines potential use of the community focused hub for specific public art related events. The multi-purpose community centre would not be controlled or managed by the Estate Public Art Consultant.</p>	<p>Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy</p> <p>Refer to page 25 of the Public Art Strategy</p>
4	LCC	Council notes that increasing passive surveillance through public art will be identified in the BMPAS. This has not been addressed.	In relation to Councils initial comment ‘The design of facades along the primary street frontage(s) should strengthen passive surveillance and streetscape character ‘Council recommends that instead of noting “passive surveillance” as a benefit (pg. 26). Artwork locations are identified specifically to support this.	The BMPAS has carefully identified artwork locations at highly focal locations to actively create passive surveillance benefits through increased viewing, creating destinations, enhancing wayfinding and increasing activation and interaction.	<p>Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy</p> <p>Refer to pages 30-35 and 40 for the master planned approach to artwork locations and the proposed contribution of artworks to the public domain</p>
5	LCC	In relation to Councils initial comment: “Building facades to adopt a feature wall with colours and finishes designed to mitigate height differences and to modulate form.” The use of public art to support wayfinding for entry points, is beneficial for staff and visitors and provides opportunities for developers to create unique and successful aesthetic outcomes. This has still to be clearly addressed.	Council recommends that the BPMAS address this item and ensure the requirement of individual developers to deliver public art that is viewable to audiences in the public domain as a priority.	See response to Artworks and built form and Artworks Size and Scale in response to RFI No. 1	Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy
6	LCC	Council notes that the BPMAS public domain deliveries are still prescriptive, Council supports high level strategic guidance in combination with guidance on various options for public art deliverables for delivery of public art on individual	To support the proposed lack of prescription Council notes that the BPMAS could note that for individual developments “typologies” identified should address these in some form, not limited to coordinating.	See response to Artworks and built form in RFI No. 1	Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		developments. Once the BMPAS addresses private development deliveries the BMPAS can then note that individual lot deliveries should take into account existing and/or future identified public domain artworks. In relation to Council's initial comment 'To create aesthetically pleasing façades inspired by local First Nation communities in response to Connection with Country'. This WPC SEPP Design Excellence Consideration for Industrial Estates is not identified in the BMPAS. It is noted that the 'State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts - Western Parkland City) 2021 (WPC SEPP)' is noted but not the reference in relation to façades. This is still to be clearly addressed.	Council recommends that individual development sites are provided context by the master builder and prior to Council approval of concept design this is provided advice and support from the proposed panel		
7	LCC	In relation to Council's initial comment "Perceived bulk of industrial buildings along/fronting the street should be broken down to avoid long monotonous façades and complement the aesthetic and be sympathetic to scale of the office component." This is an opportunity to innovatively employ public art across the individual development to create unique and composed outcomes for transient audiences, visitors and workers." The BMPAS has yet to address this.	Council repeats recommendation (2) above.	See response to Artworks and built form and Artworks Size and Scale in response to RFI No. 1	Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy
8	LCC	Council supports an objective panel, separate from Council, the master builder and Estate Public Art Consultant and associated staff, to oversee planning and decisions for public art within the public	Council recommends this process is not applicable to individual lots. Council also notes that the proposed CDC process requires 24 steps to the 13 required for a DA.	The Master Plan proposes an amendment to the Aerotropolis DCP which does not have a public art requirement for each site, but instead adopts a precinct wide approach to Artwork. The masterplan proposes to deliver public art via a CDC process in lieu of the DA assessment and approval process.	Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy For the requirement of maintenance and deaccessioning to be developed

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		domain. Council will then provide recommendations and conditions at each stage of delivery. Council acknowledges the proposed process in relation to public art commissioned and delivered within the public domain in light of required Council conditions of consent and approvals.	<p>In addition, where public art is to be delivered on land that will not be held by the Master developer (i.e. roads, Sydney Water etc) approvals, requirements, limits and exemptions must be fully agreed before progressing within the public domain.</p> <p>Council also requests clarity on public art development on land which may fall under the remit of Council be managed (i.e. maintenance, deaccessioning).</p>	<p>The proposed CDC process has been designed to achieve best possible outcomes by including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regular reviews and input from an expert panel to guide artist and artwork selection and artwork development - It is proposed that Council's input and advice is integrated into the process via dedicated workshops and via participation in the Public Art Panel to ensure local interests and enterprise are integrated into the delivery of public art throughout the site <p>With regard to the delivery of public art, the BMPAS is considered to be a streamlined process that will flow smoothly. The number of CDC steps does not suggest the process to be more onerous than the DA process, but instead provides a diverse expert panel to guide the best artwork outcomes. Council is integrated with this process via participation in the expert panel along with a broad range of specialists and stakeholders. The unilateral process of DA assessment is not considered to be a better process than the collaborative process outlined in the BMPAS, as the proposed CDC approach provides the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The artwork development and approval process will be more integrated into the development of the estate as a whole rather than via individual lots and artworks - And artwork selection and development will have the benefit of a broader base of industry expertise and input <p>As part of the process approvals from asset holder are to be obtained.</p> <p>With regard to maintenance and deaccessioning of artwork, the BMPAS does substantially describe these processes, noting that specific specification of these is required to be developed as appropriate to the detail of each artwork.</p>	for each artwork please refer to page 49, 56, 59 and 60
9	LCC	<p>On preliminary view public art would not meet any developments under the code SEPP so there would have to be a condition of consent imposed for public art. Division 2 Exempt and complying development does not list public art under the general exempt development code.</p> <p>Council notes that the proposed approval process requires an average of 24 steps whereas the average DA process requires 13.</p>	Council's recommendation is still for DA Assessment. Council strongly recommends that individual developers across the site deliver public art in line with the Aerotropolis DCP requirements for public art and that the BMPAS is reworked as a guide for individual developers. Council recommends that site consistency will be best delivered through a DA process for the site, surrounding suburbs, future development and within the scope of the LGA.	See response to Public Art RFI No. 8	Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>On top of a number of stakeholders & authorities public art will involve Development lot project Team, Estate Project Team, 6 people on the public art delivery team and 6 people on the public art panel.</p> <p>Council notes that this significant burden of stakeholders will require unnecessary time implications for public art delivery and placing unnecessary burden on individual developers.</p>			
10	LCC	The BMPAS does not support opportunities for service providers to deliver public art. The BMPAS identifies (pp 57 - 58) “Ensure approval of the proposed artwork from any relevant stakeholders that may be affected by the artwork such as utility companies and TfNSW, etc.”	Council recommends that coordination is achieved through providing high level strategic direction through a public art strategy and providing information to individual developers and utility services on existing and future public art to provide context and cohesive responses. This will also be provided through required approval processes.	Service providers are welcome to provide public art treatments to their respective infrastructure and service elements. The BMPAS provides a suitable briefing document for service provider proposals. It is understood that service providers will approach the Estate Managers to coordinate their proposals.	Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy
11	LCC	Council does not share the view that size and capital investment triggers would lead to an ad-hoc outcome across the site. By providing high level strategic direction and updated information regarding public art this would be avoided. Council agrees that providing guidance on various options for delivery will also secure a robust delivery of creative, innovative and cohesive outcomes for the site.	Council recommends that requirements for delivering public art align with the Aerotropolis. Council recommends that delivery of public art within the public domain be in addition to DCP requirements and does not negate this responsibility. Council recommends that requirements for delivering public art align or exceed the Aerotropolis DCP.	The Ingham Master Plan intends to supersede the individual lot controls for Public Art within the Aerotropolis DCP with a Precinct wide approach.	Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy
12	LCC	Council notes that Interpretative Art / Educational is located within private developments. With an indicative size of 3 x 3m this does not provide access to many audiences. In relation to lot size and height the proposed public	Council recommends that the large-scale wayfinding, within the scale of construction, a reasonable scale for transient audiences within the public domain. The BMPAS identifies 16 non 3D artworks and of these the largest is 30m2 with 14 under 20m2.	See response to Public Art RFI No. 1 and 8	Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		art does not allow benefit to many audiences.			
13	LCC	The Urban Design Masterplan for the site identifies areas of High and Moderate Aboriginal Cultural Sensitivity. Council recommends that any public art in and adjoining these areas is undertaken by First Nations artists. Within these culturally sensitive areas Council recommends integrated and / or functional public art which does not require additional footprint and therefore additional environmental impact. Council recommends that blank building / wall / fence facades overlooking these areas are mitigated by the incorporation of large scale First Nations public art.	Council does not share concerns around consistency through the DA process. Council recommends that public art murals and facades should be employed in place of detailed design for individual developments to ensure requirements are met. This will ensure that blank building / wall / fence facades overlooking these areas are mitigated by the incorporation of large scale First Nations public art. Council notes that these comments, provided previously have not been addressed.	See response to Public Art RFI No. 1 and 8	Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy
14	LCC	Council notes that the “Indigenous Artwork Additional Requirements” identify the need selected artist to have a connection to South Western Sydney. Council acknowledges that this will provide opportunity for First Nations artists who are often underrepresented. Where this is not possible, Council recommends that reasoning is provided and mandated collaborations with Local First Nations artists are mandated.	<p>Council recommends that in relation to “for First Nations artworks where collaborations are undertaken between Lead artists and local artists, both or one of these artists should identify as “First Nations” that “should” be replaced with “will or must.”</p> <p>Council recommends that the approval process identified does not support a collaborative approach. For First Nations artworks this coupled with additional approval in relation to cultural authority is unlikely to be supported.</p>	<p>The BMPAS has been updated to use the word 'must' as requested by Council.</p> <p>The BMPAS has been updated to address previous comments.</p> <p>We believe the BMPAS has addressed First Nations artist / collaborators selection, but agree that this is a difficult area where specialist advice will assist achieving Council's concerns. The BMPAS has been amended to specify that for First Nations nominated thematic artworks, that the public art consultant is to be, or include in their team, a specialist ATSI Curator.</p>	<p>Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy</p> <p>Refer to page 19 for word update</p> <p>Refer to page 13 and 57 for the inclusion of a specialist ATSI Curator required for First Nations nominated thematic artworks</p>
15	LCC	<p>Council notes that the scale of the proposed artworks does not meet the new additional point that;</p> <p><i>“Artworks should be designed to ensure that the potential for distraction is minimised. Artworks located along road corridors are to be of a suitable size for the scale of the space so that they are easily visible. The must also be simple,</i></p>	Council recommends that deaccessioning is addressed in line with replacement conditions to ensure identified sites for public art are always provided.	<p>See response to Public Art RFI No. 1</p> <p>With regards to artwork life expectancy - our apologies we have made a mistake referring to life span rather than expected maintenance cycles and have adjusted the report to rectify this. The update clarifies that artworks are to be designed and detailed for long-term ‘permanent’ installations. It is acknowledged that different artworks will require different maintenance cycles to maintain and retain intended mature appearance (including aging as inherent artist intent).</p>	<p>Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy</p> <p>Refer to page 46 for design life requirements</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p><i>effective and easily understood with a glance to minimise distraction.”</i></p> <p>Council notes that nominated public artworks are only expected to last between 2 - 10 years. As such, within a decade all public art will likely be absent from the site.</p>		The artists brief makes clear the requirements for durability.	
16	LCC	<p>Council acknowledges that this has been included as an option, however, Councils position is that all public art should provide a collaborative opportunity for a Local artist. This will ensure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Themes are narratives are meaningful and relevant; - The LGA’s creative industry is supported and nurtured; - There are outcomes and benefits for local communities. <p>The current amendments make this an option, which considering the complex and time heavy approvals and processes will ensure that this option is not a priority or preference.</p> <p>In addition, Council notes that under “Expression of Interest Process” the BMPAS notes; “Local artists in the Liverpool area interested in participating in JV with experienced artists, with a view to developing a local resource with genuine connection with local issues and community” can apply for open EOI’s.</p>	Council recommends that all public art required by the Aerotropolis DCP in relation to individual developments must provide paid collaborations with local artists. In relation to EOI’s, Council’s commitment to ensuring legacy opportunities for local artists is undermined by this process as it does not allow for authentic engagement and does not address significant barriers faced by such artists. Council does not recommend or support this implementation.	<p>The BMPAS has been previously amended to address Council’s requests for participation of local artists with a section added to the report relating to Artist Collaborations.</p> <p>The further request for ‘authentic engagement’ implies an equal partnership between collaborating artists. Public Art is a specialist field where artistic skills are blended with materials science and fabrication, as well as artistic interpretation of place so that artwork is integral with landscape or structure. Developing experience and expertise in the SW Sydney art community will take time, and progression to senior artist will occur through genuine and authentic involvement, and learning. With all respect, the mentor / teacher role and student / emerging artist role needs to be adopted. The willingness of all parties is hard to specify and define in the BMPAS, but certainly providing the collaboration opportunities is essential.</p> <p>Having made this point, the roles of senior and emerging artists is critical. The role of artistic leadership is fundamental to the delivery of complex public artworks, and indeed many established artists will not agree to participate if collaboration is ‘required’. The BPMAS provides opportunities and has been updated to encourage artistic collaboration with a local artist to support Council’s commitment to ensuring legacy opportunities for local artists. However, the added of requirement that an ‘authentic’ artistic partnership experience be provided is not something that the BPMAS can reasonably define.</p> <p>To further support the artistic community of the area and Council’s commitment to ensuring legacy opportunities for local artists the BMPAS has been updated to require all artworks to either collaborate with a local artist or provide mentorship as part of the process to ensure the continual development and upskilling of local enterprise.</p>	<p>Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy</p> <p>Refer to page 19 of the BMPAS relating to Artist Collaborations and mentorship of local artists</p>
17	LCC	Council does not assess on a site-by-site basis. Assessments are based on the micro to the macro.	Council does not support participating on the panel as Council does not support the CDC pathway for public art. For transparency and to avoid conflict of interest, Council notes the panel discussions and decisions should remain separate from Council and individuals employed or	See response to Public Art RFI No. 8	Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>Council identifies the site as well as surrounding sites within the Aerotropolis, surrounding suburbs and the context of existing public art across the LGA. Council encourages all individual developers to identify artists and aids wide cast nets to identify suitable artists. Council would not limit individual developers from approaching the public domain public arts panel for suggestions.</p> <p>Council's DA input and assessment in relation to public art has been highly regarded and provides timely support above and beyond expectations.</p> <p>Councils experience of public art DAs has shown that the process is effective, efficient and provides excellent outcomes for investors, developers and communities.</p> <p>Council notes the merit of the BMPAS as providing guidance around options and the requirement for additional support to deliver public domain public art. In relation to individual lots, developers would be required access to the BMPAS and support from the panel or associated consultants whereby they individually nominate that.</p> <p>However, the proposed CDC process is cumbersome, with multiple layers of approval and re- approval. Council notes that this complexity will impinge on the artists capacity to undertake creative expression and as such will not provide meaningful outcomes.</p> <p>Council notes that there are multiple opportunities for professional public artists to undertake the role of a consultant and thus the engagement of one, may / will be unnecessary and add additional time and cost delays to projects where it is / may not be required.</p>	<p>contracted by the relevant master builder. An advisor and minute taker can be on hand to provide support and/or clarification to the panel so as to provide advice on updates to guidelines and BMPAS to Council.</p> <p>Furthermore, the CDC process is not supported as it is cumbersome and the additional complexity will not encourage positive artistic outcomes.</p>		

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		Having discussed with several public artists, once a DA has been conditioned, it is realistic to undertake 140m2 mural through a collaboration with a local artist on the design in under 4 months (includes contingency time).			
18	LCC	<p>In relation to artwork budgets, Council notes, \$10 million is identified for public art across the estate. However, based on the figures provided 12.5 million may be required for delivery. Council would like this shortfall addressed.</p> <p>Council also notes that under the Aerotropolis DCP up to 36 lots would likely be required to deliver public art. Under the current figures in the BMPAS, at a minimum this would add an additional \$4.5 million.</p> <p>Approx 21 of these sites could undertake large murals (140m2) at a cost of between \$42,000 - \$70,000. This price is as a collaboration with a local First Nations artist and with the professional artist being able to undertake all approval requirements with individual developers under a DA.</p> <p>Council notes the BMPAS would severely limit the opportunity for large scale murals that would address the bulk building facades at a much lower price point, whilst still maintaining coherent, complementary, and unique artworks that would dramatically improve the outcomes within the public domain.</p> <p>In addition, Council identifies that the allocated \$10 million of proposed</p>	<p>The BMPAS does not identify outcomes that represent value for money. The current DA process offers better value for money and it is recommended that this process remains in place.</p>	<p>Regarding public art budgets, the table provides a range of budgets. Individual artwork budgets will be in this range and confirmed based on the winning concepts. The overall budget nominated for artworks in the BMPAS is \$10 million.</p> <p>The BMPAS has been prepared to provide opportunities for a wide range of artists and the delivery of a range of artforms. Councils comments imply that murals are the preferred artwork expression for the site which is prescriptive and limits opportunities for artists. The BMPAS has proposed locations for artworks that best respond and complement the estate masterplan. There is the opportunity for artworks to be in the form of murals / incorporated in the built form where appropriate and if considered the best outcome. The BMPAS has been updated to encourage the incorporation of artworks into the built form, but has not been prescriptive to ensure artist creativity and input is not limited.</p> <p>See response to Public Art RFI No. 1 regarding the CDC process in lieu of the DA process</p>	<p>Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy</p> <p>Refer to page 32 for visibility of artworks and encouragement to consider the use of building facades</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		works would not meet scope requirements under a DA process. Assessment of individual artworks per lot in line with Aerotropolis DCP requirements of 20 hectares or \$20million.			
19	LCC	<p>The DA Assessment process does not require many of these costs in the BMPAS and still ensures innovative and creative public artworks of the highest quality which reflect endemic local stories of our past, present and future communities. Council notes the lack of community consultation in creating the BMPAS and identifies that this is a significant risk that needs to be addressed and amended for future public art requirements. Council notes that the “Artwork Budgets” group “Consultant Fees” incorporates artists and consultant fees. This does not provide the transparency or clarity Council has requested.</p> <p>Professional Lead artists or Developer selected art consultants engaged by individual developers would have capacity to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meet the BMPAS - This is an administrative role or could be uploaded by individual proponents. - Acknowledge and respond to surrounding artwork at micro and macro level within the site and LGA - Undertake collaborations - Facilitate delivery and coordination - Undertake community consultation and engagement programs - The current BMPAS does not identify “engagement programs.” - The current BMPAS does not identify “artist (or) community enterprise.” 	Council has provided draft documentation to compare the proposed process of approvals with the DA process which is shorter and likely require less financial resources. As the DA process is less complex and costly, Council recommends that Public Art be provided by way of the DA pathway.	<p>See response to Public Art RFI No. 1 regarding the CDC pathway.</p> <p>Regarding the services of artists it is agreed that many artists have the capability to deliver the full role of public art consultant and public artist. However the competitive process proposed (via RFP's) for all artworks prohibits this opportunity. A public art consultant is required prior to the engagement of an artist for the formulation of briefs and calling for expressions of interest, managing the RFP process and engaging an artist.</p> <p>The BMPAS is unable to further define artists fees as these are dependant on the services they are offering to provide. The Artists Fees section of the BMPAS has been updated to request that Artist proposals include specific nominated fees for each stage of the work and outline the scope of works they will provide for this fee. Upon acceptance agreed fees will form part of the engagement contract. In this way artists will outline the scope of works they are comfortable and capable of fulfilling and be suitably paid for all services rendered.</p>	<p>Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy</p> <p>Refer to page 54 and 55 of the BMPAS for updates to artists fees and briefs</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
20	LCC	Every public art opportunity across the site is undertaken in collaboration with an artist with strong local connections to the Liverpool LGA.	Council notes the BMPAS has been updated to provide potential opportunities however there are no commitments to do so. Council recommends this is clarified to ensure local artists and the Liverpool LGA creative industry is engaged.	See response to Public Art RFI No. 16	Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy
21	LCC	<p>The supporting information noted that “the Public Art Delivery Consultant is responsible for the delivery of individual public art pieces and can be engaged directly by the estate or as part of individual lot projects teams.” Council does not support this and instead identifies that many professional public artists can oversee the successful delivery of significant public artworks through direct engagement with individual developers and through the DA process.</p> <p>Council notes that the proponents response; <i>We agree that there are instances where professional public artists can oversee the successful delivery of significant public artworks, however there are many cases where artists require a Public Art Delivery Consultant to assist in managing and navigating the construction process and realisation of artworks in the public domain. The BMPAS will be updated to note that the Public Art Delivery Consultant role can be undertaken directly by artists who have suitable qualifications that include coordinating with development project teams, preparing suitable submissions for sign off and have a proven track record of successfully managing the</i></p>	<p>In relation to “suitable qualifications” Council seeks clarity that this will be a decision based on individual artists and private developers for public artworks not delivered in the public domain.</p> <p>Council notes the “Delivery Process Outline” does not allow for a professional/ experienced public artist to undertake delivery without a Public Art Delivery Consultant. Council recommends this is addressed.</p> <p>Council does not support participating on the panel as it does not support CDC for public art. For transparency and to avoid conflict of interest, Council notes the panel discussions and decisions should remain separate from Council and individuals employed or contracted by the relevant master builder. An advisor and minute taker can be on hand to provide support and/or clarification to the panel.</p> <p>Council recommends the public art panel has clear terms of reference to ensure transparency and responsibility of role. Clarity around the make-up of the panel should be provided to support the aims and outcomes expected from the panel. Barriers for participating in the panel should also be identified and amended. Whereby the public art is to be delivered by a private developer they should have a representative on the panel. Minutes should be maintained, circulated and adopted prior to moving forward with the process.</p>	<p>With regard to artist engagement, role and fees, refer to response for Public Art RFI No. 19</p> <p>With regard to Council’s participation on the Public Art Panel and the CDC process please refer to response for Public Art RFI No. 1</p> <p>The role of the Public Art Panel and the members to make up the panel have been further outlined in the BMPAS</p>	<p>Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy</p> <p>Refer to page 14 of the BMPAS for the Public Art Panels roles and members</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p><i>design and development of public art works.</i></p> <p>Council notes the commitment to update. Council notes the “Delivery Process Outline” does not allow for a professional/ experienced public artist to undertake delivery without a Public Art Delivery Consultant.</p> <p>Council also notes that many, if not all of the artwork envelopes indicated in “Summary of Artwork Briefing Requirements” would be more than manageable for a professional/ experienced public artist.</p>			
22	LCC	Council notes that the BMPAS identifies that the storylines are “a starting point.” However, it also notes they are “guideline” which implies they are to be followed.	Council recommends that this is amended.	The BMPAS has been amended to remove the word 'guideline' and replaced it with 'starting point'	<p>Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy</p> <p>Refer to pages 38 and pages 40-41 of the BMPAS</p>
23	LCC	<p>Council notes that the proponent has indicated that "The BMPAS will be updated to ensure that public art opportunities identified in other specialist reports for the site have been coordinated.”</p> <p>Council notes that the BMPAS addresses ‘Suitable integration with landscape, urban setting, architecture or natural systems as is appropriate’ in relation to “artwork Proposals Assessment Process and Criteria” and “Concept Artwork Assessment Criteria Checklist” . This should be expanded.</p>	Council recommends that this is also addressed in terms of “Design Considerations” , “Public Art Triggers for Delivery” and as a core criteria for “Appendix B” .	The design requirements and considerations section of the report has been expanded to outline and address integration requirements of artworks. In addition to this a section outlining Artworks Contributions to the Public Domain has been added to the report.	<p>Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy</p> <p>Refer to pages 43-45 of the BMPAS for updates relating to design requirements and considerations</p> <p>Refer to page 32 of the BMPAS for the new section outlining how artworks are to contribute to the public domain</p>
24	LCC	Council notes page 47 addresses the Triggers for Public Art. Council notes	Council recommends the BMPAS identifies that;	The BMPAS public artwork triggers have been updated.	Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		that each lot should be delivering public art to align with DCP. The BMPAS does not exceed the DCP requirements and does not represent a superior planning outcome.	<p>- Lots are triggered predevelopment. Artwork should be considered prior to any construction being carried out.</p> <p>- In terms of public domain Council recommends 50% may provide confusion and or lost opportunities. Where there are an odd number of lots within a stage how will this be measured? Council also notes that in terms of coordinating installation in the public domain whilst construction is ongoing this may negatively impact artworks already installed. It must also be aligned to clear delivery to ensure that the deliveries are achieved.</p> <p>Council recommends that artworks on private developments are delivered in line with Lot OC. Artworks located in the public domain are triggered by OC for the associated lot with delivery tied to OC for the next development.</p>	<p>The design and development of artworks located in development lots will be triggered at the commencement of the concept design stage of the development lot.</p> <p>The design and development of artworks located in the public domain or riparian corridors will be triggered at the commencement of the concept design of an area proposed to contain an artwork.</p> <p>Artworks are to be delivered in line with Lot OC and public domain and riparian corridor PC.</p>	Refer to page 48 of the BMPAS
3.11 Complying Development					
1	LCC	<p>The CDC includes the following section:</p> <p><i>17.1.7. Construction Environmental Management Plan</i> <i>A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be prepared relating to development to be constructed under this Code in accordance with criteria outlined within the Site Wide Framework CEMP endorsed as part of the Master Plan and to the satisfaction of the registered certifier. The CEMP is to include the preparation and implementation of a Construction Biodiversity Management Plan which align with the recommendations of the Biodiversity Management Plan prepared by Site Image (February 2024).</i></p> <p>It is unclear from the CDC report at what stage a CEMP and accompanying Biodiversity Management Plan would be required. Would this be required for all Complying Development Applications? Additionally, what are the requirements for DA's and SSDA's?</p> <p>Finally, without being aware of the content of a VEMP, how can it be</p>		<p>The requirement to prepare a CEMP is a condition of the IPG Code to be met ahead of development commencing.</p> <p>As noted in the wording of the condition, the Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP) includes the Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) as well as other management plans which will need to be considered in the preparation of the CEMP.</p> <p>Any requirements in the BMP or VMP for matter such as pre-clearance surveys or re-use of native plants/seeds can be observed as part of this process.</p>	Appendix H –Complying Development Code

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		demonstrated that preclearance surveys and the reuse of native plants and seed banks is to be considered as part of the CDC pathway?			
2	LCC	The Complying Development Code includes a “Finished Ground Levels map” under Appendix A. Council requires clarity as to whether the Master Plan is an instrument to determine site earthworks.	Council seeks clarity from the Department in relation to the function of the Master Plan to determine site earth works. Should the Masterplan be determined to not serve this role, it is recommended that the “Finished Ground Levels map” is deleted and references within the Complying Development Code are reworded.	The Finished Ground Levels Map has been removed from the IPG Code. The code refers to existing ground level.	Appendix H –Complying Development Code
3	LCC	Council is currently reviewing advice from the Department’s Draft CDC position for Master planning in the Western Sydney Aerotropolis. In order to avoid duplication, Council will provide separate comments in relation to this document when providing comments in relation to the CDC determination pathway.	Council recommends that its comments provided in response to the Department’s Draft CDC position for Master planning in the Western Sydney Aerotropolis are considered when provided.	The comments have been considered in preparing the latest version of the IPG Code, along with the TAP Conditions, many of which are replicated.	Appendix H –Complying Development Code
4	LCC	Section 2.2 of the Complying Development Code must stipulate that to be complying development, the development must not be carried out on land that is significantly contaminated land within the meaning of the Contaminated Land Management Act 1997. However, this requirement only captures sites known to the NSW EPA where contamination is significant enough to warrant regulation under the Contaminated Land Management Act 1997. Clause 4.6 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021 requires	Council notes that it is important for development under any Complying Development Code to be assessed in a manner consistent with guidelines made and approved by the NSW EPA under Section 105 of the Contaminated Land Management Act 1997 and this should be represented in the code.	Section 2.3 of the IPG Code states that development must not occur on significantly contaminated land. Complying development at the site will also be controlled by Section 129 of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021</i> which specifically relates to complying development on contaminated land.	Appendix H –Complying Development Code

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>contamination and remediation to be considered in determining a Development Application. The Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 defines a 'Development Application' as 'an application for consent under Part 4 to carry out development but does not include an application for a complying development certificate'. Consequently, the need to consider site contamination and remediation does not need to be addressed in accordance with Clause 4.6 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021 prior to the issue of a complying development certificate.</p> <p>Records held by the NSW EPA under Section 60 of the Contaminated Land Management Act 1997 only include sites reported to the NSW EPA. As a result, these records will not assist with identifying other unreported potentially contaminating activities on the land.</p>			
	LCC	<p>Asbestos contaminated soils present an important human health risk and management issue due to the widespread use of asbestos materials in New South Wales. Current assessment requirements for VENM and ENM are only likely to detect visible fragments of Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM). In the case of visible ACM, the asbestos is bound in a matrix and usually presents a low human health risk when compared with fibrous asbestos (FA) and asbestos fines (AF). The</p>	<p>The CDC approach is to provide additional measures to demonstrate that asbestos contamination is not present in soils, or if present, will be disposed of in accordance with EPA requirements. It is further recommended that EPA comment is provided in this regard prior to the determination of this Master Plan.</p>	<p>All earthworks are to be carried out in accordance with the Geotechnical Report, AS3798, as well as the relevant TfNSW and Council specifications. This includes testing, compaction and contamination / environmental controls.</p> <p>There is also an Unexpected Finds Protocol and Asbestos Management Plan, which is referenced in the report.</p>	Appendix JJ - Geotechnical Report

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>classification requirements for VENM and ENM do not currently require chemical analysis for ACM, FA and AF. This is concerning as VENM and ENM can be reused on land without adequately evaluating the potential human health risks associated with these contaminants.</p> <p>VENM may also be obtained from land containing naturally elevated concentrations of substances such as heavy metals. As these soils would fall within the definition of VENM, they would not be subject to chemical analysis and the human health risk would therefore not be fully quantified. To adequately protect human health and the environment, it is believed that VENM and all recovered and reused materials must be subject to chemical analysis for a broad range of analytes with consideration for the site's history.</p> <p>In accordance with Schedule 1 of the Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2014, VENM, ENM and other resource recovery materials do not require waste tracking. As waste tracking information and chain of custody documentation is not required, it would be difficult to verify that excavated material generated at sites approved as complying is being classified and disposed of at a licensed facility as per the above requirements. Given the limitations of this legislation, it would also be challenging to determine that the excavated material generated at the source site is the same substance classified and disposed of in accordance with the Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2014.</p>			

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
6	LCC	<p>The Retail Use Code refers to shop or food and drink premises and does not specify requirements for the construction and fit-out of hairdressers, beauty salons and skin penetration premises. Complying Development Codes introduced by the State Government permit the fast-track approval of these businesses as the Proponent may apply for a Complying Development Certificate (CDC) through an accredited certifier.</p> <p>Requirements for the fit-out and construction of a skin penetration premises other than a beauty salon are not prescribed within the Local Government (General) Regulation 2021. Therefore, standards are not specified for floor coverings, shelves, fittings and furniture to ensure that they are suitable for skin penetration activities such as tattooing.</p> <p>Although the Public Health Regulation 2022 prescribes requirements for premises where skin penetration procedures are carried out, these provisions do not relate to internal finishes. Clause 34 of the Public Health Regulation 2022 requires premises to be properly equipped. Furthermore, any premises where skin penetration procedures are carried out must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) be clean and hygienic, and (b) have a waste disposal bin, and (c) have a hand basin that has a supply of clean, warm, potable water, and (d) have a separate sink that has a supply of clean, warm water for cleaning equipment (if equipment used in skin penetration procedures at the premises is cleaned at the premises), and 	It is recommended that “Skin Penetration premises” are not permitted as complying development.	Skin penetration premises has been excluded from complying development within the IPG Code (Section 3.2).	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>(e) have available for use by persons carrying out skin penetration procedures at the premises:</p> <p>(i) liquid soap (or an alcohol-based hand cleaner), and</p> <p>(ii) single-use towels or an automatic hand dryer, and</p> <p>(iii) disposable gloves, clean linen and gowns or aprons that are appropriate for the skin procedures carried out at the premises.</p> <p>(2) Any equipment at premises where skin penetration procedures are carried out must be in good working order, be cleaned and dried after use and be kept in a clean and dry condition’.</p> <p>The lack of legislative provisions for the construction and fit-out of skin penetration premises other than beauty salons is particularly disturbing as lower risk premises including hairdressing salons are subject to more stringent construction and fit-out requirements under the Local Government (General) Regulation 2021. The Local Government (General) Regulation 2021 imposes minimum standards for hygiene, fit-out and construction of hairdresser shops and beauty salons. In accordance with these requirements, the premises must be clean and in good repair and contain adequate facilities for keeping hairdressing appliances and utensils clean.</p> <p>Skin penetration premises require stringent assessment which can be only achieved through a development consent issued by Council. Furthermore, the increased flexibility and lack of legislative requirements for the construction and fit-out of these premises highlights the current shortfalls of the Liverpool LEP 2008, Food Act 2003, Local Government Act 1993,</p>			

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		Public Health Act 2010 and Regulations and their need for improvement.			
7	LCC	<p>Exempt Development - Table 2 of the Exempt Development Explanation of Intended Effects indicates that a change of use from a current use specified in a category in Column 1 of the Table to the corresponding category in Column 2 of the Table would be exempt development. In these circumstances, a change of use to certain potentially contaminating industries such as depots, vehicle body repair workshops and vehicle repair stations would be permitted as exempt development without the need for development consent.</p> <p>Depots, vehicle body repair workshops and vehicle repair stations are complex types of development that have the potential to impact upon the environment and human health if not designed, constructed and operated in accordance with applicable requirements. To ensure that these uses can operate in an environmentally satisfactory manner, adherence is required to relevant guidelines such as the 'Environmental Action for Automotive Servicing and Repairs' published by the Department of Environment and Climate Change NSW (DECC 2008/77) dated May 2008 and 'Environmental Action for Smash Repairers' (DECC 2008/76) prepared by the Department of Environment and Climate Change NSW dated April 2008. Furthermore, if vehicle body repairs and spray painting are undertaken on-site, spray booths, spray painting areas and paint mixing rooms shall be designed, constructed and installed to comply with AS/NZS</p>	State Environmental Planning Policy (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 explains that exempt development comprises minimal environmental impact and may be carried out without the need for development consent. Depots, vehicle body repair workshops, vehicle repair stations and similar industrial uses are complex development and require stringent environmental regulation to mitigate potential environmental and human health impacts and must therefore not be included as exempt development.	These uses have been excluded from the IPG Code (Section 3.2).	Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>4114:2020 Spray painting booths, designated spray-painting areas and paint mixing rooms.</p> <p>If fuel dispensing is proposed at a depot, the development is required to comply with the 'Practice Note Managing Run-Off from Service Station Forecourts' published by the NSW Environment</p> <p>Protection Authority dated June 2019, Protection of the Environment Operations (Underground Petroleum Storage Systems) Regulation 2019, Protection of the Environment Operations (Clean Air) Regulation 2021 and industry best practice and standards including but not limited to Australian Standard AS 4897–2008: Design, installation and operation of underground petroleum storage systems (AS 2008a) and The Standards and Best Practice Guidelines for Vapour Recovery at Petrol Service Stations published by the NSW EPA dated 2017. Additional standards relevant to these uses include Australian Standard (AS) 1940–2017: The storage and handling of flammable and combustible liquids; AS/NZS 3833:2007 The storage and handling of mixed classes of dangerous goods, in packages and intermediate bulk containers; AS/NZS 1596:2014- The storage and handling of LP Gas; and if applicable, Australian Standard (AS) 1692-2006 Steel tanks for flammable and combustible liquids.</p>			
3.12 Noise					
1	LCC	Apart from the Noise Policy for Industry (2017), other relevant noise assessment criteria that should be included in the complying development code includes the 'NSW Road Noise	It is recommended that the Masterplan and CDC include these relevant noise assessment criteria.	<p>The Noise Planning Assessment (NPA) incorporates and makes reference to the following assessment criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Australian Standard AS 2021 – 2015 Acoustics – Aircraft noise intrusion - Building siting and construction - Noise Policy for Industry (NPfI) (EPA 2017) 	<p>Appendix NN – Noise Planning Assessment</p> <p>These confirmed aspects are addressed in the following section of the NPA:</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		Policy' prepared by the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water NSW (DECCW NSW) dated March 2011, 'Interim Construction Noise Guideline' published by the Department of Environment and Climate Change NSW dated July 2009, Australian Standard AS 2021:2015 Acoustics - Aircraft Noise Intrusion - Building Siting and Construction and Australian / New Zealand Standard AS/NZS 2107:2016 Acoustics - Recommended design sound levels and reverberation times for building interiors.		<p>- <i>NSW Road Noise Policy (RNP) (EPA 2011)</i></p> <p>- <i>Interim Construction Noise Guideline (ICNG) (DECC 2009)</i></p> <p>- <i>Environmental Noise Management – Assessing Vibration: a technical guideline (AV:ATG) (DEC 2006)</i></p> <p>Australian / New Zealand Standard AS/NZS 2107:2016 Acoustics - Recommended design sound levels and reverberation times for building interiors. This is not relevant under the NPA or imposed by Council or any other regulatory authority as a condition – it is not a compliance standard. It is a performance criteria standard to be considered by the end user of a building/s.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aircraft Noise – Section 4 - Industrial Noise – Section 5 - Construction Noise – Section 7 – which will also be called up as part of the CEMP for the site and referenced under the Code - Road Traffic Noise – Section 8 <p>Internal design noise levels under AS/NZS 2107 not required under the NPA and not incorporated.</p>
1	LCC	<p>State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts – Western Parkland City) 2021 identifies requirements for design excellence and notes “This Part does not apply to development on land to which a master plan applies if the consent authority is satisfied that the master plan adequately provides for assessment of the design quality of the development.</p> <p>Section 4.2.1 (6) of the proposed Complying Development Code requires;</p> <p><i>Where a new building is proposed to be developed under this Code, evidence of compliance with the Design Quality Strategy (prepared by Urbis February 2024) must be provided to the registered certifier, either through the design verification process by a registered architect, or the endorsement of the design by a</i></p>	The “Architectural Design Statement” is requested to be amended to provide the capacity for a rigorous and independent assessment of the design quality of the development. Additionally, it is recommended that the format of the “Architectural Design Statement” is amended so as to provide certainty in relation to what assessment controls are being prescribed in what circumstances. As an example, it is recommended that the format used in the Apartment Design Guide (under SEPP 65) is used as an example of a	<p>The Architecture Design Statement (ADS) is not comparable to the Apartment Design Guide for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Architecture Design Statement was intentionally structured to illustrate how the masterplan arrived at a superior planning outcome for future built forms and architecture, above that of the WSA Precinct Plan and the DCP, instead of merely prescribing controls. - The Apartment Design Guide is designed specifically for residential typologies. - The Apartment Design Guide is a set of mandatory controls that can used to inform building proposal seeking approval. However, the Architecture Design Guide is not seeking an approval for buildings for DA application. <p>The ADS report is divided into 3 main segments;</p> <p>1. Site Analysis based on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site constraints and opportunities. - Urban Design Principles. - Landscape-led Approach + civil design - Engagement of Local First Nations Community <p>2. Assessment</p>	<p>Appendix T – Architectural Design Statement;</p> <p>1. Planning + Design Framework, Site Analysis (page 8-21)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Overview ▪ Context + Site ▪ Urban Design Principles, Civil Design, landscape-led Approach + Engagement with the Local First Nations Community <p>2. Assessment (page 23-92)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Testing of building envelopes for as per DCP including building and landscape setback, shadow impact analysis and perviousness compliance.

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p><i>relevant Design Review Panel in accordance with the provisions of the Design Quality Strategy.</i></p> <p>The “Architectural Design Statement” (ADS) provided in support of the masterplan indicates in the Executive summary that: <i>It must be clarified that that this report is not a recipe for producing the final architecture outcome. Rather, the report aims at responding to Clients’ brief and framing the test regime for the masterplan using built forms and design concepts to determine the viability and robustness of the masterplan.</i></p> <p>Council is concerned that the “Architectural Design Statement” (ADS) is not rigorous enough to ensure that it “provides for assessment of the design quality of the development” in accordance with the SEPP. Additionally, concern is raised that the ADS is relatively complex to navigate from an assessment perspective.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To assess the viability of the masterplan through built form testing based on Urban Design principles, landscape-led approach and Connection with Country Framework. - Testing apparatus utilised WSA DCP, design concepts of various typologies and site analysis. - Endorsement of our engagement with the Local Aboriginal Communities - Arrived at the outcome and contributed to the Design Quality Strategy based on the shortfall of the current DCP responding to place-making. <p>3. Design Quality Strategy developed to ensure future design can achieve the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location - Whether the form and external appearance of the development will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain - The relationship of the development with other buildings on the same site or neighbouring site in terms of separation, setbacks, amenity and urban form. - The bulk, massing and modulation of buildings - Street frontage heights - Environmental performance and amenity standards, such as sustainable design, overshadowing and solar access, visual and acoustic privacy, noise, wind and reflectivity - Pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access and circulation requirements, including the permeability of pedestrian networks - The impact of the special character areas. - Achieving appropriate interfaces at ground level between the building and the public domain - Architectural diversity where the development is to consist of more than 2 buildings. <p>As such, unlike the Apartment Design Guide, the Architecture Design Statement narration is based on the rigorous analysis, testing of the masterplan and development of the Design Quality Strategy to complement the existing DCP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use various industrial and commercial typologies to assess the subdivisions. ▪ Develop design concepts for each typology to engage with the Local First Nations Community ▪ Develop self-imposed guidelines based on limitations of the DCP and Design with Country. ▪ Gauge building GFA for the overall masterplan. ▪ View analysis in relation to building heights. <p>3. Design Quality Strategy (page 95-Appendices)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incorporate self-imposed guidelines as the outcome of the built form testing. ▪ Integration of sustainable initiatives deeply rooted in the Design for Country and landscape-led approach. ▪ Design elements include building orientation, building alignment, Local Park, site access, street activation, awnings, building compositions and siting, massing + proportions, materials + colours, building frontage, building articulations, street frontage heights, parking, energy, electrical charging capabilities, integration of soft landscaping, heat resilient and deep soil. ▪ Recommendation of the Masterplan.

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
					Please refer to the Planning report pertaining DCP compliance and deviation for further details.
2	LCC	<p>The Design Quality Statement identifies a tiered approach to design excellence, summarised as follows:</p> <p><i>Tier 1 (enterprise and industry): GFA up to 50,000m2 and up to 18 metres in height.</i></p> <p><i>Tier 1 (Local Centre): Up to 3 stories and “Usually have footprints around 2,000sqm or more” (ADS p92).</i></p> <p><i>Tier 1 will be subject to a verification checklist being undertaken by a qualified designer/registered architect.</i></p> <p><i>Tier 2 (enterprise and industry): GFA over 50,000m2 and / or height above 18m and will be subject to Design Review Panel</i></p> <p><i>Tier 2 (Local Centre): “Buildings over the height stipulated in the masterplan or 26-48m subject to Design Review Panel” (ADS p 92).</i></p> <p><i>Tier 3 (Local Centre): “Buildings above or 48m (excluding rooftop garden or rooftop plant) will require an Architectural Design Competition, which can be undertaken in similar fashion to the design excellence competitions stipulated within the provisions of Section 4.32 of the WPC SEPP” (ADS p92).</i></p> <p>Council raises concerns that the ADS does not refer to the existing cost of works trigger point for referral to a design review panel of development</p>	<p>The master Plan Report, CDC controls, ADS and Design Quality Strategy must provide suitable justification for the proposed variations to State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts – Western Parkland City) in relation to design excellence. This should specifically include comment as to why the \$30 million cost of development trigger for Design Review Panels is being removed and why the “height above ground level (existing) greater than 40m or 12 storeys” trigger for an Architectural Design Competition is being removed for enterprise and industry and being altered for the local centre.</p>	<p>The Master Plan and Design Quality Statement provides a comprehensive framework for the assessment of Design Outcomes.</p> <p>The Design Quality Review Process has been updated in accordance with recent comments from Peter Mould and David Burge. IPG has collaborated closely with David Burge to refine the DQS and Design Quality Review Process to ensure the development tiers/categories are appropriate and the scale of development is appropriate for each review process.</p> <p>The tiers have now been updated to consist of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small Scale • Medium Scale • Large Scale • Key Sites • Landmark Buildings <p>The Design Verification Checklist has also been refined in accordance with recent comments from DPHI. The tiered approach ensures assessment by a Registered Architect or a Design Review Panel which is equal to if not greater than the requirements of the Precinct – Western Parkland City SEPP.</p> <p>Architectural Design Competitions have been maintained for certain developments in the Local Centre.</p>	Section 13 of Master Plan Report Appendix C (Design Quality Strategy)

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>with a “cost of more than \$30 million under the SEPP.”</p> <p>Council is also concerned that there does not appear to be a justification for the omission of an Architectural Design Competition in the enterprise and industry area. Additionally, there does not appear to be any justification for the exceedance of the current Architectural Design Competition requirement of the SEPP, namely for proposals with “a height above ground level (existing) greater than 40m or 12 storeys.”</p>			
3	LCC	<p>The ADS indicates that “Design Review Panel are to be nominated by proponent and have previous experience in the industrial and commercial sector (which can be agreed by GANSW)” (p93). Council is concerned that a Design Review Panel nominated by the proponent may not have sufficient independence to be perceived by the public to be expressing an unbiased opinion.</p>	<p>Design Review Panels shall be nominated independently. It is recommended that DPHI and the Government Architect convene a Design Review Panel and Council requests that a Council representative is elected to any such panel.</p>	<p>The Design Review Panels will include highly experienced architects with previous experience in the industrial sector. The independence of the panels will be ensured by the professional standards associated with Architectural Registration. The independence will be assured as the members will all be Government Architect Panel members.</p>	<p>Section 13 of Master Plan Report Appendix C (Design Quality Strategy)</p>
4	LCC	<p>The ADS requires that for a Tier 1 design assessment a qualified designer/registered architect has completed the Verification Checklist. The ADS indicates that this “document is to be prepared and verified by a qualified designer/registered architect (as defined in the EP&A Regulation 2021).” The ADS is silent as to whether this may be a self-assessment by the qualified designer/registered architect who has designed the building or if it is to be a separate qualified designer/registered architect. The ADS is also silent as to</p>	<p>Council recommends that in combination with the amendments to the ADS listed in point (1) above, that self-assessment of design quality is not permitted and that the design verification checklist approach is limited to development assessment that has a simple yes/no answer.</p> <p>Additionally there must be an independent test of design quality in this regard. It must be clearly seen by the public that there is no conflict of interest in this process and the Masterplan is to be amended to demonstrate how this will be achieved.</p>	<p>The Registered Architect will be employed by the proponent to undertake the assessment using the Verification Checklist. The independence of the process will be assured by the professional standards of the Architects Professional Registration.</p>	<p>Section 13 of Master Plan Report Appendix C (Design Quality Strategy)</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>who is to employ the qualified designer/registered architect undertaking the assessment.</p> <p>Council has a concern in relation to perceived conflict of interest in this regard, noting that the Verification Checklist, while a yes/no type of document, requires subjective judgements in multiple circumstances where disagreement between qualified designer/registered architect is not uncommon. The verification process must be both free from a conflict of interest and free from the perception of a conflict of interest for the approach to provide any certainty to the satisfaction of Council and in the final instance, to the public.</p>			
5	LCC	The Urban Design Report references a “Design Quality Strategy” under “Section 7.3.6.” This is also referenced under the ADS. It is noted that the Urban Design Report does not include a section 7.3.6.	The location of the “Urban Design Strategy” is to be clearly identified in all reports.	The reference in the Urban Design Report has been updated.	Section 13 – Urban Design Report Appendix D
Comments on the SEPP WPC 2021					
LRA Map	LCC	Land Reservation Acquisition Map - The Planning Report has not included this updated version of this map and has provided no information or clarity in relation to what authorities are proposed to acquire the significantly increased land take included on the LRA map provided with supporting documents submitted under Appendix 36 of Tranche 5. The Civil Infrastructure Report still identifies Council as the		<p>The Land Reservation Acquisition Plan has been updated in response to meetings held in May 2024 with Sydney Water and Liverpool City Council.</p> <p>The LRA Map has been updated to provide clear labelling, consistent with the LRA Map under the WPC SEPP. The labels only show stormwater infrastructure and no longer reference open space.</p>	<p>Appendix J – EIE - SEPP Amendments</p> <p>Updated Land Reservation Acquisition Map.</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		acquisition authority for the increased land take. It is stressed that Council will not agree to acquire any additional land area. It is requested that the SEPP LRA mapping layer be amended to provide map labels in accordance with the LRA SEPP layer and further that these layers clearly show that Council is not required to acquire land under this mapping in accordance with the current status of the SEPP LRA map. All mapping and supporting documentation are to be updated in this regard and both the Planning Report and the Civil Infrastructure Report are to be amended in this regard.			
Zoning Map	LCC	Zoning Map - Change to identify electricity substation as "local infrastructure." Council does not object to this change.		<p>Noted. No change required in this comment.</p> <p>The proposed zone change to accommodate the electricity substation delivered by Endeavour Energy is labelled as 'SP2 Infrastructure' under the zoning map legend.</p>	Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps
Transport Corridors Map	LCC	Transport Corridors Map - Details changes to identify realignment of the Eastern Ring Road and resultant changes to Fifteenth Avenue and an arterial road. Council does not object to this change.		Noted. No change required in this comment.	Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps
Comments on the Precinct Plan					
WSAP Figures 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13	LCC	Justification for the proposed amendments to the WSAP 2023 are provided within Section 11 of the Planning Report. The justification provided is unclear as to whether the proposed change for Figures 3, 5, 6, 8 - 13 will adopt all of the WSAPP (May 2023) written controls associated with the Figures, or if further amendments		<p>The Precinct Plan maps have been updated in the planning report, with additional justification provided to clearly outline the amendments and the rationale.</p> <p>The Master Plan proposed map amendments only and do not challenge or vary the written controls for Figures 3, 5, 6, 8-13 under the Precinct Plan. The Master Plan is compliant with these written controls which still apply to the site.</p>	Section 10 of the Planning Report.

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		are required. It is also requested that the justification provide a detailed consideration of the written controls within the WSAPP (May 2023) that support the Figures that are the subject of amendment. The justification should clearly indicate how a better outcome is achieved as part of the amendments.			
	LCC	Appendix 36 identifies that WSAPP (May 2023) Figures 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 are to be amended. However, the Planning Report has not updated the proposed figures to allow for a side-by-side comparison of the proposed changes with the existing figures. To provide additional clarity, it is requested that the proposed Amendments to the WSA SEPP mapping and the abovementioned Figures of the WSAPP (May 2023) are included within the Planning report indicating both existing and proposed mapping/figures and a justification for the proposed amendments.		<p>Section 11 of the Planning Report details the proposed changes and justification for each Precinct Plan and SEPP map amendment. It is then supported by a side by side comparison of the before and after version of the figure.</p> <p>The Precinct Plan amendments are also shown in the same format in the Discussion Paper.</p>	<p>Section 10 of the Planning Report.</p> <p>Appendix G – Discussion Paper</p>
Master Plan Report Figure 71	LCC	Figure 71 of the Master Plan Report identifies the provision of education, industry training, multipurpose community centre, long day care, private medical centre, local park and outdoor multipurpose sports courts. The Master Plan, Planning Report and Complying Development Controls should all provide clarity as to when development for these uses is triggered and how these services will be provided.		<p>The provision of uses in the Local Centre and the local park and outdoor multipurpose courts will be provided in stages, as indicated in the staging plan. The Local Centre uses will be partly driven by market demand with commercial floorspace becoming available with the delivery of individual buildings.</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. 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>	<p>Figure 71 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C</p> <p>Appendix TT – Social Impact Assessment</p>
Figure 3	LCC	Figure 3 - Land Use Structure Plan - The justification for the amendments for this figure does not discuss the removal of the education land and does not discuss the removal of		The Local Centre has been designed to allow for a future education facility within the multipurpose community centre. Section 6.3.3.1 of the Social Impact Assessment proposes that an education or industry training space is to be provided as part of the future multipurpose community centre within the Local Centre. A	<p>Appendix TT – Social Impact Assessment</p> <p>Appendix EE – Economic Impact Assessment</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		local/neighbourhood centres. It appears from other reports that the Masterplan assumes that the market will cater to these uses as required, on the basis that they are permissible will result in the provision of both the formerly required educational land and local centres. Council notes that such an outcome is not guaranteed and that is not the role of the future proposed planning framework to assume that the market will achieve required future planning outcomes. Council recommends that indicative local/neighbourhood centres are shown on the Land use structure plan with a requirement for a minimum GFA suitable for servicing the local workforce. In relation to the educational component, it is recommended that a minimum GFA provision for the commercial centre - small scale is required to be utilised for educational facilities.		minimum floorspace requirement is not needed for this use as the exact nature of the type of use is not known at this stage. The justification for the consolidation of the two local / neighbourhood centres into one Local Centre has been justified in the Economic Impact Assessment.	
Figure 5	LCC	Figure 5 – Blue-Green Infrastructure - Significant changes to this Figure are proposed under Appendix 36, however these changes are not identified by either a before and after comparison of figures and no justification is provided for the changes in the Planning Report. The Planning Report must be amended to detail these changes and provide suitable justification for the amendments.		<p>The Blue Green Infrastructure Figure represents an improvement to the Precinct Plan, the central riparian corridor is now continuous and not disjointed.</p> <p>The proposed amendments are detailed in Section 11 of the Planning Report. The overarching amendment includes the reconfiguration of the stormwater infrastructure to reflect the riparian corridors and open space network of the Master Plan.</p>	Section 10 of the Planning Report
Figure 6	LCC	Figure 6 – Total Water Cycle Management - Appendix 36 identifies that this Figure is to be amended to		Sydney Water was consulted on the Land Reservation Acquisition Map in May 2024.	Letter from Sydney Water forthcoming, once a position has been formed.

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		show that all land mapped under the proposed amendments to the SEPP LRA will be identified as "stormwater infrastructure" which suggests that all land acquisition on the site will be assigned to Sydney Water. If this is the case, Sydney Water must be provided with the opportunity to comment.		Sydney Water has now confirmed that it will need additional time to consider the acquisition for regional stormwater infrastructure.	
	LCC	<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 Avenue and the nearest local road intersection (as per the Road Network Complying Development Map),"</i></p>		This has been added as a new point 10.1.3 in the Code	Appendix H – Complying Development Code
Figure 8	LCC	<p>Figure 8 – Transport Network - This Figure has been updated to detail the proposed amendments to the alignment of the Eastern Ring Road and the changes to the local road network within which the indicative local bus routes are located. It is requested that this Figure is amended to detail the WSAPP (May 2023) figure</p> <p>mapping on adjoining sites to demonstrate that roads on the subject site will appropriately link with roads on adjoining sites.</p>		<p>The proposed Precinct Plan map amendment for Figure 8 – Transport Network has been amended to show a continuous connection to the north and south.</p> <p>All Precinct Plan amendments which show the north-south road connections through the panhandle have been amended to reflect these indicative alignments (i.e. Active Transport Map, Street Hierarchy Map).</p> <p>The Master Plan has been designed in consultation with adjoining landowners including CSR to the north and GDC to the south. The realignment of the collector road within the IPG site is informed by the Co-Design process with the TAP and responds to site-specific conditions and lot configurations. Consultation with adjoining landowners confirms the connections to the north and south will be continuous.</p>	<p>Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps</p> <p>Section 10 of Planning Report</p>
Figure 9	LCC	<p>Figure 9 – Active Transport Network - This image does not indicate all adjoining active transport links. For</p>		As above, Figure 9 – Active Transport Network has been updated to include adjoining active transport links into adjoining sites.	Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		example, the "Principal Regional Cycle Path Network (Off - Road)" to the north of the site, adjoining Badgerys Creek is not shown. This map must be amended to detail all elements of the Active Transport Network within the Masterplan site and how this proposed amendment of the active transport network connects to all elements of the Active Transport Network on adjoining sites. This must also be detailed within the Planning Report.		<p>It is acknowledged that the ultimate alignment in the adjoining sites, whilst they provide continuity from the IPG site, will be subject to a separate Master Plan application.</p> <p>This has been discussed through the consultation sessions with adjoining landowners.</p>	Section 10 of Planning Report
Figure 10	LCC	Figure 10 – Street Hierarchy - This Figure does not indicate all Local Roads proposed. The Figure must represent what is proposed under the Masterplan. It is noted that if a local road is not indicated under this figure, then any future proposal to introduce a new local road will not be in accordance with the Masterplan and will require a Development Application with sufficient supporting information justifying a variation to the Masterplan. The Planning Report mapping and justification provided will also require updating to include this image.		<p>All local roads proposed within the Master Plan are already shown in Figure 10 Street Hierarchy.</p> <p>It is noted that any additional local roads proposed which are inconsistent with Figure 10 Street Hierarchy will be subject to a separate Development Application.</p>	Figure 10 Street Hierarchy in Master Plan Report Appendix C
Figure 11	LCC	Figure 11 – Centres Hierarchy - This Figure is not identified and no comparison with the Existing WSAPP (May 2023) Figure is provided within the Planning Report. It is requested that the Planning Report is updated to include this information and to provide detailed justification as to why a new proposed neighbourhood centre should be permitted to overlap a future proposed Local		<p>Figure 11 – Centres Hierarchy has been amended in consultation with DPHI.</p> <p>The proposed consolidation of the local centre within the south eastern corner of the IPG site reinforces the focal point within the site, being at a location where two major roads converge. The re-alignment of the three major arterial roads creates an important major focal point which is a logical location for a potential small scale local centre to complement the Aerotropolis Core. The local centre will be consolidated and situated adjacent to the ERR and BMLR intersection. This focal point is reinforced by a consolidated</p>	<p>Section 10 of Planning Report.</p> <p>Appendix EE – Economic Assessment</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		Centre on the neighbouring site, noting that no centres overlap was proposed in the original WSAPP (May 2023) Figure 11. Alternatively, the Planning Report should explore options as to how the Local Centre will link with any future development on the south-eastern neighbouring site and the Local Centre within this area.		<p>employment zone centre that is well served by public transport and open space corridors.</p> <p>The consolidated centre is classified as a 'local centre' as per the Centres Hierarchy under the Precinct Plan. The 'critical locational criteria' for a local centre, as defined in the Precinct Plan, identifies the need for local centres to be 'located approximately 1.5km apart and adjacent to areas of open space'.</p> <p>The size and location of the Local Centre was carefully considered at a number of stages. The catchment of the centre was assessed in an Economic Study, which found that the two centres served different functions and could acceptably co-exist.</p>	
Figure 12	LCC	Figure 12 – Height of Building - The height of buildings Figure identifies a western parcel and an eastern parcel where high bay warehousing is permitted. Justification provided within the Planning Report must consider how the added height will intensify the use, especially within the eastern parcel, and how such intensification will impact on adjoining sensitive rural/residential receivers in relation to noise. It is fundamental that the future planning for the panhandle portion of the site is able to demonstrate that adjacent residential receivers will not be impacted by unreasonable noise impacts.		<p>Section 11 of the Planning Report which provides the justification to Figure 12 Height of Building has been updated to incorporate a justification from a noise perspective, and potential impacts to adjoining sensitive receivers.</p> <p>The Noise Assessment Report has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of the noise generating potential of the Precinct, including the Panhandle. The noise assessment incorporates an amenity criteria assessment which was the result of many months of discussion between the EPA and the DPHI Industry Assessments Team.</p>	Section 10 of Planning Report Appendix NN – Noise Assessment Report
Figure 13	LCC	Figure 13 – Floor Space Ratio - This Figure has been amended to incorporate the Local Centre. The Planning Report must provide additional justification in relation the removal of identified FSR within the panhandle for the previous neighbourhood centre. Insufficient		<p>Section 11 of the Planning Report which provides the justification to Figure 13 – Floor Space Ratio has been updated to incorporate a justification.</p> <p>The Floor Space Ratio control for the now deleted Neighbourhood centre in the panhandle has been justified on the basis that the FSR was very specific to that centre which is no longer identified as a specified use.</p>	Section 10 of Planning Report

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		justification is provided in this regard.		The consolidation of the local centre and the allocation of the 2:1 FSR control in this location justifies the removal of the removal of the 1:1 FSR control currently under the Precinct Plan for the local centre within the north eastern panhandle. The consolidation local centre provides more site-specific merit in delivering a holistic amenity response to the estate. The proposal of amenity nodes within the Master Plan, which do not require an FSR provision, caters for the intended role of the local centre within the panhandle.	
Comments on the DCP					
Section/Clause					
02b Appendix JJ – Aerotropolis DCP Compliance Table					
2.4.1	LCC	2.4.1 identifies requirements for canopy cover as being 10% on lot and 20% for the local centre. These tree coverage rates are insufficient and do not result in a landscape led response. The justification that "the tree canopy target contradicts the Wildlife Risk performance measures" is not considered to be accurate and is not supported. Additionally, the Complying Development Code Report permits Tree Removal without the need to provide for a replacement tree on site. This outcome is highly unsatisfactory as it will result in an initial canopy coverage on lot that significantly less than the current DCP requirement that will be permitted to be reduced over time under the nominated CDC tree removal control. This does not result in a better outcome for canopy coverage and as such it is recommended that the targets included in the DCP are retained.		<p>It should be noted that these comments from LCC on the proposed variations to the DCP were made prior to the updated Variation to DCP document in accordance with comments provided by DPHI and the TAP Secretariat. These variations now form Tab B of the Final TAP Decision Letter.</p> <p>Condition 6 of the Master Plan conditions states - <i>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.</i></p> <p>These variations to DCP controls for the Master Plan were presented at TAP Meeting 8 and has since been endorsed by the TAP.</p> <p>All additional controls and alternative benchmarks solutions proposed which are actually in accordance with the DCP have since been removed as a proposed variation. This response applies to LCC comments below on the variations to the DCP.</p> <p>However, in response to this RFI from LCC on the proposed tree canopy cover control, the below justification is provided.</p> <p>The landscape design of the Master Plan identifies that the tree canopy coverage for Riparian Corridors will have a minimum coverage of 50% in accordance with the Phase 2 DCP targets for park and open space. However, the tree canopy target contradicts the Wildlife Risk performance measures, looking to minimise wildlife attracting habitat. On lot landscaping will aim for a tree canopy cover of approximately 15%, streetscape and road corridors will target 50% and the local centre lots will target 30% canopy</p>	<p>Section 10 of Planning Report</p> <p>Appendix G – Discussion Paper</p> <p>Appendix YY – Wildlife Hazard Assessment</p> <p>Appendix QQ – Landscape Report</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
				<p>coverage. Within on-lot setback landscape areas, the proposed strategy is for groups of screening trees, which do not exceed more than 5 trees. These groups are spread apart with only understory planting beneath the canopy areas. This is to ensure screening and a soft interface can be achieved, whilst ensuring wildlife hazard considerations are be met. It is also to deliver on a staggered approach to landscape screening whilst not creating dense vegetated on-lot setbacks that will attract nesting birds and wildlife.</p> <p>The landscape strategy within the Master Plan allocates greater tree planting within the carpark areas and driveways, compared to the setback areas, to also address urban heat island effect considerations.</p> <p>The canopy targets across these areas seek to provide a balanced approach between Aviation safeguarding measures and Phase 2 DCP Canopy Coverage targets. Otherwise, the Landscape Plan prepared by Site Image notes that the landscape design looks to consolidate areas of deep soil and provide minimum dimensions which allow for sufficient tree planting.</p> <p>The proposed planting within the Master Plan is consistent with the Wildlife Hazard Assessment which recommends street trees to be spaced at 10m-12m apart is achieved in the Master Plan.</p> <p>Tree canopy cover target of 25% on lot would require landscape areas to be densely canopy with touching canopy cover.</p> <p>DCP Section 2.10.3 (PO2) has the benchmark solution of trees in groups of no more than 5 and spacing of at least 100m between groups. Such densities result in canopy cover that is significantly lower than 25%.</p> <p>The tree canopy has been revisited since the conclusion of the TAP using additional species from the approved tree species list. There has been an updated Wildlife hazards report to assess this new outcome. The resultant tree canopy is an improvement which is closer to the DCP control, whilst still maintaining an acceptable wildlife hazards outcome.</p>	
2.4.1	LCC	The provision of an alternative benchmark solution under 2.4.1 replaces a detailed benchmark solution with a vaguer control. This alternative solution is unnecessary, and it is requested that it be deleted.		<p>As above.</p> <p>In addition, the justification below has been provided in the Discussion Paper in response to this proposed variation to the DCP.</p> <p>The proposed control is provided below:</p>	<p>Section 10 of Planning Report</p> <p>Appendix G – Discussion Paper</p> <p>Appendix YY – Wildlife Hazard Assessment</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
				<p><u>Alternative benchmark solution</u></p> <p>Amend Section 2.4.1 PO1 (1) to read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On-lot development within the Master Plan to achieve canopy cover target of at least 15%. 2. Streetscape and road corridors to achieve a canopy cover target of at least 50%. 3. On-lot development within the local centre to achieve a canopy cover target of at least 30%. <p>The landscape design of the Master Plan identifies that the tree canopy coverage for Riparian Corridors will have a minimum coverage of 50% in accordance with the Phase 2 DCP targets for park and open space. However, the tree canopy target contradicts the Wildlife Risk performance measures, looking to minimise wildlife attracting habitat. On lot landscaping will aim for a tree canopy cover of approximately 15%, streetscape and road corridors will target 50% and the local centre lots will target 30% canopy coverage. Within on-lot setback landscape areas, the proposed strategy is for groups of screening trees, which do not exceed more than 5 trees. These groups are spread apart with only understory planting beneath the canopy areas. This is to ensure screening and a soft interface can be achieved, whilst ensuring wildlife hazard considerations are be met. It is also to deliver on a staggered approach to landscape screening whilst not creating dense vegetated on-lot setbacks that will attract nesting birds and wildlife.</p> <p>The landscape strategy within the Master Plan allocates greater tree planting within the carpark areas and driveways, compared to the setback areas, to also address urban heat island effect considerations.</p> <p>The canopy targets across these areas seek to provide a balanced approach between Aviation safeguarding measures and Phase 2 DCP Canopy Coverage targets. Otherwise, the Landscape Plan prepared by Site Image notes that the landscape design looks to consolidate areas of deep soil and provide minimum dimensions which allow for sufficient tree planting.</p> <p>The proposed planting within the Master Plan is consistent with the Wildlife Hazard Assessment which recommends street trees to be spaced at 10m-12m apart is achieved in the Master Plan.</p> <p>Tree canopy cover target of 25% on lot would require landscape areas to be densely populated with canopy trees, creating a dense</p>	Appendix QQ – Landscape Report

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
				<p>forest like setback. This would be going against the wildlife mitigation measures in place.</p> <p>DCP Section 2.10.3 (PO2) has the benchmark solution of trees in groups of no more than 5 and spacing of at least 100m between group. Such densities result in canopy cover that is significantly lower than 25%.</p>	
2.4.5 PO1 BS2	LCC	2.4.5 PO1 BS 2 - Alternative benchmark solution supported as street tree canopy coverage will still be in accordance with the DCP.		Noted. This proposed alternative benchmark has since been removed as a DCP variation. The Master Plan no longer seeks to amend or vary this control.	Appendix G – Discussion Paper Section 10 of Planning Report.
2.4.5 PO3 BS 1 and 2.4.5 PO1 BS 3	LCC	2.4.5 PO3 BS 1 and 2.4.5 PO1 BS 3 - Provision of an alternative solution here is unnecessary as there are no existing conflicts within the DCP controls. Additionally, the shade controls are dependent on orientation, tree selection and canopy size and associated shade provision should be demonstrated. Recommend deletion.		<p>It is understood this comment from LCC was made prior to the final Master Plan Report issued for TAP Meeting 8.</p> <p>These provisions have already been removed following a previous comment from the TAP Secretariat.</p>	Appendix G – Variations to DCP
2.3.1 PO1	LCC	2.3.1 PO1 - new benchmark solution is unnecessary as road crossings of riparian corridors and riparian streets are permitted in accordance with the Precinct Plan. Additionally, the notion that "corridors can be interrupted to support the delivery of land uses" is not supported as this is not in accordance with the strategic framework, vision, and objectives of the Western Sydney Aerotropolis. Recommend that this benchmark solution is deleted.		<p>It is understood this comment from LCC was made prior to the final Master Plan Report issued for TAP Meeting 8.</p> <p>This alternative benchmark solution is critical to delivering the anticipated land use, street typologies and amenities envisaged under the Precinct Plan.</p> <p>The justification for this alternative benchmark solution includes:</p> <p><i>Strahler stream order 2 and above will be maintained in a natural state other than two breaches in Riparian Corridor 3. In this corridor, the implementation of land use change, provision for active transport corridors and recreational amenities, the delivery of a riparian street as per the Precinct Plan and stormwater infrastructure upstream is required for land development in accordance with the Master Plan and would result in reduced flows within Riparian Corridor 3. This riparian corridor is proposed for re-alignment alongside the riparian street and to suit road geometry requirements.</i></p>	Appendix G – Variations to DCP

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
2.3.1 PO1 BS 6	LCC	2.3.1 PO1 BS 6 - The removal of this benchmark solution and inclusion of the new benchmark solution is not supported as it will impact on Council managed land. The existing benchmark solution requires that "Stormwater infrastructure is not to be located within land identified as avoided or land managed as a reserve." This requirement must be maintained for both avoided land and land managed as a reserve. In relation to the latter, this land can be shown on amendments to the WSAPP, where land to be managed as a reserve is shown in areas where stormwater infrastructure including pipelines and detention basins are not located. Council will not agree to the acquisition of any land for the purpose of public open space if the land is impacted by stormwater infrastructure. This will require consideration and amendment of the Master Plan, Planning Report and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.		<p>It is understood this comment from LCC was made prior to the final Master Plan Report issued for TAP Meeting 8.</p> <p>The alternative benchmark solution for the Master Plan reads:</p> <p>Stormwater infrastructure can be located within land identified as non-certified land within the Master Plan if it can be demonstrated no adverse impacts to biodiversity can be achieved.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Stormwater infrastructure is largely located on certified land (not certified urban-capable, as this is a term under the Cumberland Plan Conservation Plan that does not apply to the subject land). The avoided land category does not apply, and no land identified as a reserve is located within the subject land. Some stormwater infrastructure for the purposes of water sensitive urban design (WSUD) may be located within the non-certified portion of the subject land.</p> <p>Whilst the stormwater infrastructure proposed within the Master Plan has a minor encroachment into non-certified land, this encroachment relates to Basin 13 only, due to the site constraints of the eastern pandhandle. It is also confirmed that there are no trees or vegetation on the location where Basin 13 is being proposed. It is being proposed on top of the previous chicken sheds which have since been demolished.</p> <p>In addition, it should also be noted that the Precinct Plan (and therefore the Master Plan) needs to be consistent with the Growth Centres Biodiversity Certification Order, which required protection of 2000 ha of Existing Native Vegetation (ENV) in the Growth Centres. Whilst the basins are located on non-certified land, they are not located on ENV (which is known as High Biodiversity Value – ENV in the Western Parkland City SEPP).</p> <p>The basin in this location does not impact on ENV and is not located within 40m of the top of bank and is therefore not within a riparian corridor. The basin does not compromise the Growth Centres achievement of the biodiversity target.</p>	<p>Section 10 of Planning Report.</p> <p>The variation to DCP table is also within Appendix A of the Master Plan Report (Appendix C).</p>
2.3.1 PO4 BS2	LCC	2.3.1 PO4 BS2 - Replacement of this benchmark solution is not supported. If the Masterplan proposes non- riparian infrastructure within the inner 50% of the riparian corridor, this must be identified as a variation to the DCP that the		<p>This alternative benchmark solution is a variation to the DCP for the relevant authority to consider. The proposed encroachments into the inner 50% are very minor and relate mainly to active transport paths.</p> <p>The alternative benchmark solution for the Master Plan reads:</p>	Appendix G – Variations to DCP

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		relevant consent authority can consider as part of the relevant application.		<p>2. Active transport paths and supporting public domain amenities within the Eastern and Central Riparian Corridors of the IPG Master Plan can encroach the inner 50% provided consistency with the riparian corridors objectives in Table 16 of the VMP (Appendix D of the Master Plan) are maintained and achieved, in relation to ecological restoration and vegetation delivery.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Active transport paths, as well as seats and lighting, are accommodated in the outer 50% of the riparian corridors. Occasional encroachments into the inner 50% occur in the eastern and central corridors.</p> <p>These encroachments relate to the delivery of seating, amenities, landscaping and pathways.</p> <p>These encroachments are consistent with the 'landscape-led' approach of the Master Plan and enables the delivery of a superior landscape and ecological outcome for the riparian corridors where the existing condition and quality is diminished.</p> <p>These elements are consistent with the VMP at Appendix D of the Master Plan in that it may be used to compensate for the encroachments by revegetating further than what is required in other locations of the riparian corridors, as per the VMP.</p> <p>The only locations within the Master Plan where active transport connections encroach in the inner 50% is in the south portion of the central riparian corridor, where crossing over the inner 50% are required to connect people into the local centre from the corridor.</p> <p>The Master Plan open space layout provides improved connectivity through the central riparian corridor compared to the Precinct Plan, particularly to facilitate connectivity, permeability and the activation of the riparian corridor.</p>	
2.3.1 PO4 BS3	LCC	2.3.1 PO4 BS3 - The inclusion of this alternative benchmark solution is not required as the retention of 2.3.1 PO4 BS2 as recommended above already provides a relevant control. Recommend deletion.		<p>The proposed alternative benchmark solution for PO4 BS3 of the DCP is captured in in the benchmark solution proposed above for PO4 BS2.</p> <p>The reference for a new benchmark solution for PO4 BS3 has been removed in accordance with this condition.</p>	Appendix G – Variations to DCP

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
2.3.1 PO4 BS 6	LCC	2.3.3 PO2 - There is no current need to provide an alternative benchmark solution in relation to access and easement requirements to the riparian zone for the stormwater drainage manager (in the case of the subject site the stormwater drainage manager is Sydney Water). Further discussion with Council will be required in relation to any mapping proposed to be amended under the WSAPP in relation to Council indicative local open space. It is noted that Council will not agree to the acquisition of land for local open space purposes under the WSAP if such land includes any regional stormwater infrastructure.		<p>This provision and DCP variation is no longer being sought, as it is already permissible under the DCP (as pointed out in the RFI). The DCP Variation table has been updated accordingly.</p> <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. 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.</p>	Section 10 of Planning Report.
2.5.3 PO4	LCC	2.5.3 PO4 - The replacement of this benchmark solution for the central riparian stream is unnecessary. Any works proposed within the riparian corridor (either by DA or under Part 5) can consider variations to the DCP where sufficient justification is provided. The DCP will relate to the ongoing protection of all riparian corridors once on-site works are complete and as such this performance objective must not be changed. Additionally, this objective relates to salinity and Council has repeatedly raised issues with the assessment of salinity on the site.		<p>The proposed DCP variation this RFI refers to is provided below. We feel this variation is important to note within the Master Plan, and to specifically call out for the IPG site, as we wish to call out the need to retain undisturbed soil networks as it relates to the eastern and western riparian corridors (Badgerys Creek and South Creek respectively). We also call out the Vegetation Management Plan prepared as part of the TAP process, which sits within Appendix D of the Master Plan.</p> <p><u>Alternative benchmark solution</u></p> <p>Amend Section 2.6 PO1 (1) to read:</p> <p>1. Retain undisturbed soil networks within the eastern and western riparian corridors of the IPG Master Plan, wherever vegetation is being retained.</p> <p>Ensure instream works are delivered in accordance with the Vegetation Management Plan prepared for the Master Plan to achieve healthy soils that stabilise stream banks and mitigate soil erosion.</p> <p>Soil preparation works is to improve the quality of substrate from its current condition, in order to support the revegetation, which will ultimately reduce run off and improve the soil's water infiltration.</p>	Section 10 of Planning Report Section 8.4.4 of Appendix C – Master Plan

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference			
				<p>Justification:</p> <p>Soils will be undisturbed and retained wherever vegetation is being retained. In other words, reference the soils within west (Badgerys) and east (South Creek) riparian corridors, and patches of HBV. Other areas (e.g. central riparian corridor) will require some instream works. This riparian zone contains eroded watercourse bed and bank which often expose B horizon soils which are typically sodic and prone to further erosion. Excavation, reshaping and application of topsoil is required to provide a cultivated and lightly friable consistency to facilitate revegetation. The Vegetation Management Plan (Appendix C of the BMP) provides measures for establishing a healthy soil base for revegetation of the corridor (p.56 – 57 of the VMP). These measures will improve the quality of substrate from its current condition, in order to support the revegetation, which will ultimately reduce run off and improve the soil's water infiltration.</p>				
2.6 PO1 BS 1	LCC	2.6 PO1 BS 1 - TfNSW to provide comment in relation to the proposal to alter this benchmark solution to allow direct vehicular access of proposed Lot 23 onto an arterial road.		<p>The TAP has approved the following control in relation to Lot 23. This is an extract from the TAP endorsement letter of 3rd May, 2024.</p> <table><tr><td>PO2 Where temporary access is required but not currently available, this shall be provided in a way that regards the safety and efficiency of the transport network.</td><td><p>1. To enable the development of land where access across adjoining properties is required but not yet provided, the consent authority may consider temporary access to arterial or sub-arterial roads where:</p><p>a. The development complies with all other development standards;</p><p>b. Subdivisional roads generally conform with the road pattern shown on the Indicative Layout Plan; and</p><p>c. The consent authority is satisfied the carrying out of the development will not compromise road safety.</p><p>2. Where the consent authority grants such consent, the temporary access must be constructed to the Council's standards except in the case of a State classified road, which must be designed and constructed to TfNSW's standards. Conditions will also be imposed to limit access to the designated road when alternative access becomes available.</p><p><i>Note: Approval from TfNSW will be required for any temporary access to a classified road.</i></p></td><td><p><u>Additional control</u></p><p>Additional control to Section 10 of the Planning Report</p><p>3. Temporary access to Lot 23 shall be provided off BMLR through the following arrangement, Access to Lot 23 when access becomes available via adjoining allotment instance.</p><p>Justification:</p><p>Lot 23 has frontages (with BMLR and an eastern boundary) (Perich land). As the lower was made to provide access to the left-in, left-out access is provided within BMLR and which are not conducive to signalised intersections. The development of the access</p></td></tr></table>	PO2 Where temporary access is required but not currently available, this shall be provided in a way that regards the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	<p>1. To enable the development of land where access across adjoining properties is required but not yet provided, the consent authority may consider temporary access to arterial or sub-arterial roads where:</p> <p>a. The development complies with all other development standards;</p> <p>b. Subdivisional roads generally conform with the road pattern shown on the Indicative Layout Plan; and</p> <p>c. The consent authority is satisfied the carrying out of the development will not compromise road safety.</p> <p>2. Where the consent authority grants such consent, the temporary access must be constructed to the Council's standards except in the case of a State classified road, which must be designed and constructed to TfNSW's standards. Conditions will also be imposed to limit access to the designated road when alternative access becomes available.</p> <p><i>Note: Approval from TfNSW will be required for any temporary access to a classified road.</i></p>	<p><u>Additional control</u></p> <p>Additional control to Section 10 of the Planning Report</p> <p>3. Temporary access to Lot 23 shall be provided off BMLR through the following arrangement, Access to Lot 23 when access becomes available via adjoining allotment instance.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Lot 23 has frontages (with BMLR and an eastern boundary) (Perich land). As the lower was made to provide access to the left-in, left-out access is provided within BMLR and which are not conducive to signalised intersections. The development of the access</p>	Section 10 of Planning Report Appendix A of Master Plan Report Appendix C (Variation to DCP)
PO2 Where temporary access is required but not currently available, this shall be provided in a way that regards the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	<p>1. To enable the development of land where access across adjoining properties is required but not yet provided, the consent authority may consider temporary access to arterial or sub-arterial roads where:</p> <p>a. The development complies with all other development standards;</p> <p>b. Subdivisional roads generally conform with the road pattern shown on the Indicative Layout Plan; and</p> <p>c. The consent authority is satisfied the carrying out of the development will not compromise road safety.</p> <p>2. Where the consent authority grants such consent, the temporary access must be constructed to the Council's standards except in the case of a State classified road, which must be designed and constructed to TfNSW's standards. Conditions will also be imposed to limit access to the designated road when alternative access becomes available.</p> <p><i>Note: Approval from TfNSW will be required for any temporary access to a classified road.</i></p>	<p><u>Additional control</u></p> <p>Additional control to Section 10 of the Planning Report</p> <p>3. Temporary access to Lot 23 shall be provided off BMLR through the following arrangement, Access to Lot 23 when access becomes available via adjoining allotment instance.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Lot 23 has frontages (with BMLR and an eastern boundary) (Perich land). As the lower was made to provide access to the left-in, left-out access is provided within BMLR and which are not conducive to signalised intersections. The development of the access</p>						
2.6 PO1 BS 2	LCC	2.6 PO1 BS 2 - TfNSW to provide comment in relation to the proposal to adopt alternative designs for Road design for Primary Arterial Roads, Primary Arterial Roads (Rapid Bus) and Sub arterial roads.		<p>Through the TAP process, TfNSW has provided in-principle support for the higher order roads in the Master Plan.</p>	Section 10 of Planning Report Appendix A of Master Plan Report Appendix C (Variation to DCP)			

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference			
2.6 PO2 - Proposed BS 4	LCC	2.6 PO2 - Proposed BS 4 - TfNSW to comment in relation to additional control that will permit temporary access to Lot 23 within the IPG Master Plan can be provided off BMLR through a left-in, left-out access arrangement.		<p>The TAP has approved the following control in relation to Lot 23. This is an extract from the TAP endorsement letter of 3rd May, 2024.</p> <p>Section 2.6 PO2 of the DCP is not being challenged. The control relating to Lot 23 is provided below.</p> <p><u>Additional control</u></p> <p>Additional control to Section 2.8 PO2:</p> <p>3. Temporary access to Lot 23 within the IPG Master Plan can be provided off BMLR through a left-in, left-out access arrangement. 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.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Lot 23 has frontages (within the IPG site) only to either ERR or BMLR and an eastern boundary to the adjoining property (Perich land). As the lower speed / order road, the decision was made to provide access to BMLR as opposed to ERR. A left-in, left-out access is proposed in recognition of future traffic volumes within BMLR and centre-running Rapid Bus lanes which are not conducive to turning movements other than at signalised intersections. TfNSW has been consulted in the development of the access strategy for Lot 23.</p> <table><tr><td>PO2 Where temporary access is required but not currently available, this shall be provided in a way that regards the safety and efficiency of the transport network.</td><td><p>1. To enable the development of land where access across adjoining properties is required but not yet provided, the consent authority may consider temporary access to arterial or sub-arterial roads where:</p><p>a. The development complies with all other development standards;</p><p>b. Subdivisional roads generally conform with the road pattern shown on the Indicative Layout Plan; and</p><p>c. The consent authority is satisfied the carrying out of the development will not compromise road safety.</p><p>2. Where the consent authority grants such consent, the temporary access must be constructed to the Council's standards except in the case of a State classified road, which must be designed and constructed to TfNSW's standards. Conditions will also be imposed to limit access to the designated road when alternative access becomes available.</p><p><i>Note: Approval from TfNSW will be required for any temporary access to a classified road.</i></p></td><td><p><u>Additional control</u></p><p>Additional control to Section 2.8 PO2:</p><p>3. Temporary access to Lot 23 within the IPG Master Plan can be provided off BMLR through a left-in, left-out access arrangement. 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.</p><p>Justification:</p><p>Lot 23 has frontages (within the IPG site) only to either ERR or BMLR and an eastern boundary to the adjoining property (Perich land). As the lower speed / order road, the decision was made to provide access to BMLR as opposed to ERR. A left-in, left-out access is proposed in recognition of future traffic volumes within BMLR and centre-running Rapid Bus lanes which are not conducive to turning movements other than at signalised intersections. TfNSW has been consulted in the development of the access strategy for Lot 23.</p></td></tr></table>	PO2 Where temporary access is required but not currently available, this shall be provided in a way that regards the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	<p>1. To enable the development of land where access across adjoining properties is required but not yet provided, the consent authority may consider temporary access to arterial or sub-arterial roads where:</p> <p>a. The development complies with all other development standards;</p> <p>b. Subdivisional roads generally conform with the road pattern shown on the Indicative Layout Plan; and</p> <p>c. The consent authority is satisfied the carrying out of the development will not compromise road safety.</p> <p>2. Where the consent authority grants such consent, the temporary access must be constructed to the Council's standards except in the case of a State classified road, which must be designed and constructed to TfNSW's standards. Conditions will also be imposed to limit access to the designated road when alternative access becomes available.</p> <p><i>Note: Approval from TfNSW will be required for any temporary access to a classified road.</i></p>	<p><u>Additional control</u></p> <p>Additional control to Section 2.8 PO2:</p> <p>3. Temporary access to Lot 23 within the IPG Master Plan can be provided off BMLR through a left-in, left-out access arrangement. 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.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Lot 23 has frontages (within the IPG site) only to either ERR or BMLR and an eastern boundary to the adjoining property (Perich land). As the lower speed / order road, the decision was made to provide access to BMLR as opposed to ERR. A left-in, left-out access is proposed in recognition of future traffic volumes within BMLR and centre-running Rapid Bus lanes which are not conducive to turning movements other than at signalised intersections. TfNSW has been consulted in the development of the access strategy for Lot 23.</p>	Section 10 of Planning Report Appendix A of Master Plan Report Appendix C (Variation to DCP)
PO2 Where temporary access is required but not currently available, this shall be provided in a way that regards the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	<p>1. To enable the development of land where access across adjoining properties is required but not yet provided, the consent authority may consider temporary access to arterial or sub-arterial roads where:</p> <p>a. The development complies with all other development standards;</p> <p>b. Subdivisional roads generally conform with the road pattern shown on the Indicative Layout Plan; and</p> <p>c. The consent authority is satisfied the carrying out of the development will not compromise road safety.</p> <p>2. Where the consent authority grants such consent, the temporary access must be constructed to the Council's standards except in the case of a State classified road, which must be designed and constructed to TfNSW's standards. Conditions will also be imposed to limit access to the designated road when alternative access becomes available.</p> <p><i>Note: Approval from TfNSW will be required for any temporary access to a classified road.</i></p>	<p><u>Additional control</u></p> <p>Additional control to Section 2.8 PO2:</p> <p>3. Temporary access to Lot 23 within the IPG Master Plan can be provided off BMLR through a left-in, left-out access arrangement. 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.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Lot 23 has frontages (within the IPG site) only to either ERR or BMLR and an eastern boundary to the adjoining property (Perich land). As the lower speed / order road, the decision was made to provide access to BMLR as opposed to ERR. A left-in, left-out access is proposed in recognition of future traffic volumes within BMLR and centre-running Rapid Bus lanes which are not conducive to turning movements other than at signalised intersections. TfNSW has been consulted in the development of the access strategy for Lot 23.</p>						
2.7 PO9 - Proposed alternative	LCC	2.7 PO9 - Proposed alternative benchmark solution (note this is not numbered correctly on page 84 of		The proposed deep soil solution is maintained, it should be noted that on page 22 of the DCP, it states that areas of deep soil,	Section 10 of Planning Report			

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
benchmark solution (note this is not numbered correctly on page 84 of the Master Plan report).		the Master Plan report). Council does not support this control as it reinforces non-compliances with the 15% deep soil coverage requirement. There should be no instance where the on lot deep soil area does not meet the minimum requirements of the DCP. The justification provided under the Master Plan report identifies that there may be instances where deep soil is unachievable due to "site constraints." In these instances, the built form and associated hard stand areas should be reduced to allow for the minimum deep soil landscaping provision.		<p>shallow soil and permeable pavers can be used in combination to achieve the equivalent required pervious area.</p> <p>The proposed additional control for deep soil in the Master Plan is provided below:</p> <p><u>Additional control</u></p> <p>Additional control to Section 2.6 PO9:</p> <p>3.Where the development has less than 15% deep soil zone for the site, permeable pavers can be used to make up for the shortfall to achieve the minimum required pervious area . It must be clearly demonstrated that 15% deep soil targets cannot be achieved through options testing and that any relevant Australian Standards are met to the satisfaction of an appropriately qualified engineer. The use of permeable pavers is considered acceptable, provided the water is treated to prevent contaminants from entering the stormwater system.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Section 7.3.7 of the Master Plan has indicated that where individual allotment is unable to achieved 15% deep soil zone due to site constraints, pervious surfaces such as permeable pavers will be utilised and applied to surfaces such as parking bays or fire trails.</p> <p>The use of permeable pavers in tandem with deep soil will further the mitigate heat island effect through the use of materials that provide greater reflectivity. This provision also supports and contributes to the level of perviousness, offsetting the handstand areas as much as possible. The proposal for permeable pavers as a substitute for meeting the pervious surface target does not impede on the development and Master Plan's ability to response to WSUD initiatives and the prevention of contaminations from entering the stormwater system.</p>	Appendix A of Master Plan Report Appendix C (Variation to DCP)
2.8 PO2 - Additional control	LCC	2.8 PO2 - Additional control to be reviewed by TfNSW.		Noted, to be reviewed by TfNSW.	Section 7.3.8 of Master Plan Report Appendix C Appendix G – Variations to DCP
2.10.3 PO2 BS1	LCC	2.10.3 PO2 BS1 - Additional proposed solution - Council does not agree that there is a conflict		The tree canopy for the Master Plan area has been increased since the conclusion of the TAP. The proposed benchmark solution is proposed to be maintained. We have provided the updated	Section 10 of Planning Report

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		between canopy coverage and deep soil targets under the DCP and the wildlife hazard controls under this section of the DCP. If this additional control is to be supported Council requires the minimum targets under the existing DCP for deep soil provision and canopy coverage to be achieved under the Landscape Plan supporting the Masterplan.		<p>benchmark solution for tree canopy below which is broken down by area/land use within the Master Plan.</p> <p><u>Alternative benchmark solution</u></p> <p>Amend Section 2.4.1 PO1 (1) to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-lot development within the Master Plan to achieve canopy cover target of at least 15%. Streetscape and road corridors to achieve a canopy cover target of at least 50%. On-lot development within the local centre to achieve a canopy cover target of at least 30%. <p>Justification:</p> <p>The landscape design of the Master Plan identifies that the tree canopy coverage for Riparian Corridors will have a minimum coverage of 50% in accordance with the Phase 2 DCP targets for park and open space. However, the tree canopy target contradicts the Wildlife Risk performance measures, looking to minimise wildlife attracting habitat. On lot landscaping will aim for a tree canopy cover of approximately 10%, streetscape and road corridors will target 50% and the local centre lots will target 20-30% canopy coverage. Within on-lot setback landscape areas, the proposed strategy is for groups of screening trees, which do not exceed more than 5 trees. These groups are spread apart with only understory planting beneath the canopy areas. This is to ensure screening and a soft interface can be achieved, whilst ensuring wildlife hazard considerations are be met. It is also to deliver on a staggered approach to landscape screening whilst not creating dense vegetated on-lot setbacks that will attract nesting birds and wildlife.</p> <p>The landscape strategy within the Master Plan allocates greater tree planting within the carpark areas and driveways, compared to the setback areas, to also address urban heat island effect considerations.</p> <p>The canopy targets across these areas seek to provide a balanced approach between Aviation safeguarding measures and Phase 2 DCP Canopy Coverage targets. Otherwise, the Landscape Plan prepared by Site Image notes that the landscape design looks to consolidate areas of deep soil and provide minimum dimensions which allow for sufficient tree planting.</p>	Section 8.5.2 of Master Plan Report Appendix C

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
				<p>The proposed planting within the Master Plan is consistent with the Wildlife Hazard Assessment which recommends street trees to be spaced at 10m-12m apart is achieved in the Master Plan.</p> <p>Tree canopy cover target of 25% on lot would require landscape areas to be densely canopy with touching canopy cover.</p> <p>DCP Section 2.10.3 (PO2) has the benchmark solution of trees in groups of no more than 5 and spacing of at least 100m between group. Such densities result in canopy cover that is significantly lower than 25%.</p>	
2.18 PO2 - Alternative proposed benchmark solution.	LCC	2.18 PO2 - Alternative proposed benchmark solution. Council would only support this alternative benchmark solution if the 6m maximum cumulative height of retaining walls adjoining the public domain is retained.		<p>The proposed alternative benchmark solution retains the maximum height provision of 6m for retaining walls.</p> <p>The alternative benchmark solution for 2.18 (PO2) reads:</p> <p><i>3. For tiered retaining walls within the Master Plan, where each retaining wall tier element shall be no more than 2.0m, a 2.0m wide deep soil zone between retaining wall tiers, with suitable landscaping, is to be provided between each tier. The maximum cumulative height for tiered retaining walls must not exceed the maximum height of 6.0m, as per the Aerotropolis Phase 2 DCP.</i></p>	Appendix G – Variations to DCP
2.19	LCC	2.19 - Council would only provide support with the use of the IPG Public Art Strategy if this report satisfied Council's comments in relation to this report included elsewhere in this response. Additionally, the controls for both the DCP and CDC are to identify specific triggers that will require the inclusion of public art at appropriate points throughout the development.		<p>IPG proposes a precinct wide approach to public art, as outlined in the Public Art Strategy prepared by Site Image. This approach was supported by DPHI and the majority of the TAP and was considered to have merit, as opposed to the current provisions for public art in the Aerotropolis DCP.</p> <p>Section 10.2 outlines the additional controls for public art within the Master Plan and mandates public art locations and typologies as per the Public Art Strategy from Site Image.</p> <p>IPG is not proposing specific triggers for public art as per the DCP, as a result of this alternative approach.</p>	<p>Section 10 of Master Plan</p> <p>Appendix PP – Public Art Strategy</p>
3.2 PO2 - Additional proposed control	LCC	3.2 PO2 - Additional proposed control is not supported in the current form. It is requested that this control be amended to require loading areas to be behind the rear building alignment, when viewed from both the primary road frontage and the riparian corridor.		<p>The landscaped setback used of 6m (for roads) and 5m (for riparian areas) are permitted in accordance with the DCP. On page 65 of the DCP, it states 'setbacks to public roads may also incorporate loading dock manoeuvring areas and associated hardstand provided the minimum setbacks in Table 5 are achieved'. All setbacks are in accordance with Table 5 of the DCP.</p>	Appendix T – Architectural Design Statement

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		The identified 6m (for roads) and 5m (for riparian areas) landscaped setback for loading is insufficient. Loading areas must be separated from primary road frontages and riparian corridors by building envelopes/built form. This additional control is not supported.			
3.2 PO3 - Additional control	LCC	3.2 PO3 - Additional control - it is not necessary to specify an additional control in this instance to account for 2 lots within the proposal. If these lots are unable to be developed in accordance with the DCP, these lot specific matters can be addressed as part of the application for individual development on those lots.		<p>For context, the provision referred to by LCC in this RFI relates to:</p> <p><i>“2. Loading and unloading areas within the 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.”</i></p> <p>It is important to clarify the controls for the two lots due to the unique configuration of the lots and the limited arrangements for loading and unloading. This provisions ensures efficient and safe access arrangements for these lots can be delivered successfully and to guide future development, as informed by the Master Planning process.</p>	Section 7.3.9 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
3.3.5 PO1 - Alternative benchmark solution	LCC	3.3.5 PO1 - Alternative benchmark solution - the proposed alternative solar access solution is not supported. All sites are of sufficient area and have available orientations to ensure future designs can achieve the existing solar access control that "Communal areas must receive a minimum of 2 hours direct sunlight between 11am and 3pm on 21 June." Council does not support the removal of this existing control for an alternative control that would permit a reduction in solar access provision.		This benchmark solution is not an alternative, but an addition to the DCP to ensure the communal areas meet the solar access for communal areas. The base requirements of the DCP in terms of solar are already complied with.	Appendix T – Architectural Design Statement
4.1.1	LCC	4.1.1 - The proposed amendments to collector roads under Figure 50 are required to be amended to provide legible dimensions and are to show all dimensions including road reserve, road carriageway, road		<p>All typical road sections have been amended in accordance with Condition 3 of the TAP conditions to improve legibility and to achieve consistency with the Aerotropolis DCP graphic style and labelling approach.</p> <p>Refer Section 7.3 of Master Plan.</p>	Section 7.3 of Master Plan Report Appendix C

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		lanes, road verge, landscape dimensions and footpath dimensions.			
4.2.2 - Alternative benchmark solution	LCC	4.2.2 - Alternative benchmark solution for the local centre is not supported as the identified relevant Figure 42 does not provide detailed setback requirements for the Local Centre. Additional information is required in relation to this new benchmark solution.		<p>It is understood this comment from LCC was made prior to the final Master Plan Report issued for TAP Meeting 8.</p> <p>Section 9.1 of the Master Plan provides the detailed provisions and additional controls for the Local Centre</p>	Section 9.1 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
5.2 – Height – Additional control 2	LCC	<p>5.2 Additional control point 2 states – “Within the areas of the IPG site mapped in Figure 40 as ‘Potential for High Bay Warehousing’, only development for the purpose of high bay warehousing can achieve the maximum building height of 52.5m in those locations.”</p> <p>It is recommended that a maximum height for buildings that are not high bay warehouses is nominated.</p>		<p>It is understood this comment from LCC was made prior to the final Master Plan Report issued for TAP Meeting 8.</p> <p>Section 6.4 of the Master Plan outlines the height provisions for the Master Plan. Areas within the site not nominated for potential high-bay warehousing has a maximum height provision of 24m.</p>	Section 6.4 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
5.3 – Additional control 2	LCC	5.2 Additional control 2 nominates a maximum GFA for Retail Floorspace in the Local of 7500m ² . Clarification should be provided that when the Local centre reaches 4900m ² the CDC pathway can no longer be used.		<p>It is understood this comment from LCC was made prior to the final Master Plan Report issued for TAP Meeting 8.</p> <p>Section 6.5.2 of the Master Plan has been updated with new additional controls to restrict the maximum permissible retail floorspace from exceeding 4,900m² within the Local Centre.</p> <p>The Complying Development Code also includes this specification.</p>	<p>Section 6.5.2 of Master Plan Report Appendix C</p> <p>Appendix H – Complying Development Code.</p>
5.4.8 – Table 20	LCC	5.4.8 – Table 20 notes under “cut and fill” that “Must be generally accord with proposed AT&L Civil Report Bulk Earthworks plan – March 2023 and tolerances approved as part of the Masterplan.”		<p>The following amendments have been made to the Design Verification Checklist in response to LCC’s comments:</p> <p><u>Cut and Fill Levels</u></p> <p>IPG Comment – In the event the AT&L report referenced is not part of the Master Plan determination, this control will be amended. However, it is intended that this AT&L report will form part of the</p>	Section 13 of Master Plan Report Appendix C (Design Verification Checklist)

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>In the event that this report is not part of the Master Plan determination, the Master Plan is to be amended to remove reference to this report.</p> <p>Table 20 – Building Orientation – Blank Facades should also not address street frontages.</p> <p>Table 20 – Building Alignment Local Centre – Building heights on The Promenade must respond to solar access with buildings on the northern side to allow for solar access to The Promenade.</p> <p>Table 20 – Awnings Local Centre requires awning projections to be in accordance with Figure 9. Figure 9 provides no guidance in relation to awning projection.</p> <p>Table 20 – Deep Soil Local Centre – if the 25% deep soil target cannot be met, the 35% canopy coverage target should be. It is recommended that this canopy coverage target is included.</p> <p>Table 20 – Building Orientation Enterprise and Industry – Offices, where included should activate riparian corridors and street frontages. Additionally, and ideally, public art should be included within the building design for frontages that adjoin the riparian corridor.</p> <p>Table 20 – Building Setback Enterprise and Industry – It is recommended that any fire (RFS/NSW Fire and Rescue) circulation access is not included within the landscape setback.</p>		<p>Master Plan determination and approval, and hence support this Design Verification Checklist.</p> <p><u>Building Orientation – Local Centre</u></p> <p><i>Additional Provision: Blank walls must not be accommodated where building facades address street frontages.</i></p> <p><u>Building Alignment – Local Centre (The Promenade)</u></p> <p><i>Additional Provision: Buildings heights along the north interface of the Promenade must allow for solar access to the Promenade for a minimum of 3 hours of solar access between the hours of 9am and 3pm on 21 June to 70% of the Promenade.</i></p> <p>IPG Comment – When designing the indicative built forms, we have applied the WSA DCP control (page 74) that states – “A minimum of 3 hours solar access between the hours of 9am and 3pm on 21 June is to be provided to a minimum of 70% of those public areas impacted by a commercial development.” Local Park and Promenade were assessed separately.</p> <p>Please note that additionally, as the minimum, the proposed design will be required to comply with the minimum setback of 5m from the property boundary from Level 4 onwards along the Promenade as per the DQS. If this setback fails to comply with the solar access, greater setback or lower raise of buildings must be achieved.</p> <p><u>Awnings – Local Centre</u></p> <p>This provision has been updated to read:</p> <p><i>Updated Provision: Projection of any proposed awning must be in accordance with Figure 93 in Section 13.4.4 of this Master Plan.</i></p> <p><u>Deep Soil – Local Centre</u></p> <p><i>Previous Provision: If the area of natural ground dedicated for deep soil is less than 25% of the total site area, the development must:</i></p>	

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>Table 20 – Massing Enterprise and Industry – Building offsets and varied setbacks should also be included as measures to modulate building massing.</p> <p>High Bay Warehouse controls must be clarified for elements less than 52.5m in height. Is 35m the maximum permitted height for the 40% of the building not permitted to be 52.5m in height? If so, it is recommended that this is stated.</p> <p>Table 20 – Communal Areas Landscaping & Industry – Communal areas should be provided with seating and weather protection.</p>		<p><i>Provide alternative form of planting on upper floor external areas such terrace and rooftop garden/green roof.</i></p> <p>Updated Provision: If the area of natural ground dedicated for deep soil is less than 25% of the total site area, the development must:</p> <p>Include larger tree species within carparks and setbacks to ensure canopy coverage targets are increased. 30% of the tree species must have a mature canopy of 10-12m and be located strategically to shade carpark and hardstand areas in order to mitigate urban heat buildup.</p> <p>IPG Comment – The assessment of the deep soil based on the indicative built forms shows that the Local Centre (area of 67,191sqm) is capable of achieving 19,900sqm (29%) of deep soil zone, which is more than the 25% stipulated in the WSA DCP.</p> <p>Furthermore, 2.3.2 Stormwater Management and WSUD of the WSA DCP, page 22, states that (P08) areas of deep soil, shallow soil and permeable pavement can be used in combination to achieve the equivalent required pervious area. Accordingly, the site area pervious requirement is to be calculated in accordance with the following index;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deep soil (one metre or more in depth, connected subsoil) – 100% - Shallow soil (less than one metre in depth, not connected to subsoil) – 75% - Permeable pavement – 50% - Hardstand – 0% <p>Therefore, shallow soil, by definition, can be in the form of planting on structure if the shallow soil meets the minimum 600mm depth.</p> <p><u>Building Orientation – Enterprise and Industry</u></p> <p>Additional Provision: Where ancillary offices are proposed, the orientation of the office should address the street frontage, or a riparian corridor (if the building adjoins a riparian corridor).</p> <p>IPG Comment – This provision works on all lots, however please note the orientation of the potential ancillary offices should be based on the order of importance below;</p>	

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gateway sites as per the Trigger list ○ Riparian Corridors ○ Creek to Creek Connection Roads ○ Internal Roads <p><u>Building Setback – Enterprise and Industry</u></p> <p>Additional Provision: Access for fire rescue and fire trail circulation must not be included within the landscape setback area.</p> <p>Indicative firetrails have been shown in the Reference Masterplans, however none of these trails are located in the landscape setback. The firetrails are subject to future detail and design.</p> <p><u>Massing – Enterprise and Industry</u></p> <p>Updated Provision: Where a high bay warehouse development is proposed, the footprint associated with the high bay part of the warehouse component which is more than 35m in height but less than 52.5m in height, must not exceed more than 60% of building gross footprint.</p> <p><u>Communal Areas & Landscaping – Enterprise and Industry</u></p> <p>Additional Provision: Communal areas should be supported with seating and weather protection.</p> <p>IPG Comment – We confirm all future communal areas will have seating and weather protection. In addition, Section 3.3.5 Communal Outdoor Areas of the WSA DCP (page 68) already covers all of this provision mentioned, i.e. P01 3. Communal areas shall be embellished with appropriate soft landscaping, shade, paving, tables, chairs, bins, and access to drinking water commensurate with the scale of the development, activities, and anticipated number of workers.</p>	
6.1 PO1	LCC	6.1 PO1 notes that “The delivery of social and community infrastructure as informed by the Social Infrastructure Needs Assessment is to be delivered in accordance with Figure 69 below.” Figure 69 identifies education, industry training spaces, multipurpose		<p>Noted – The preference is to not to provide a trigger point for these items as they will be delivered in line with the staging plan for the precinct.</p> <p>Section 10 of the Master Plan outlines the social and community infrastructure requirements for the Master Plan.</p>	Section 10 of Master Plan Report Appendix C

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		community centre, long day care centre, private medical centre, local park and outdoor multipurpose sports courts. Council recommends that the controls must identify a trigger point at which each of these social needs are to be provided as part of the development.			
7.4	LCC	7.4 – Building Setbacks – please refer to issues and recommendations under Section 3.2 Built Form, above.		<p>It is understood this comment from LCC was made prior to the final Master Plan Report issued for TAP Meeting 8.</p> <p>All Land Use and Built Form provisions, additional controls and alternative benchmark solutions are outlined within Section 6.6 of the Master Plan.</p>	Section 6.6 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
7.5	LCC	7.5 Building Separation – No additional controls are identified under this section of the Master Plan report. If the “principles” stated are intended as controls, these should be set out as either objectives, performance outcomes or benchmark solutions. If new objectives are proposed it should be illustrated how these objectives are to be achieved by supporting performance outcomes or benchmark solutions.		<p>It is understood this comment from LCC was made prior to the final Master Plan Report issued for TAP Meeting 8.</p> <p>All Land Use and Built Form provisions, additional controls and alternative benchmark solutions are outlined within Section 6.6 of the Master Plan.</p>	Section 6.6 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
7.6	LCC	7.6 Street Frontage - No additional controls are identified under this section of the Master Plan report. If the “principles” stated are intended as controls, these should be set out as either objectives, performance outcomes or benchmark solutions. If new objectives are proposed it should be illustrated how these objectives are to be achieved by supporting performance outcomes or benchmark solutions.		<p>It is understood this comment from LCC was made prior to the final Master Plan Report issued for TAP Meeting 8.</p> <p>All Land Use and Built Form provisions, additional controls and alternative benchmark solutions are outlined within Section 6.6 of the Master Plan.</p>	Section 6.6 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
7.7	LCC	7.7 – Building Typology - No additional controls are identified under this section of the Master Plan report. If the “building typologies” identified are intended as controls, these should be set out as either objectives,		<p>It is understood this comment from LCC was made prior to the final Master Plan Report issued for TAP Meeting 8.</p>	Section 6.6 of Master Plan Report Appendix C

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		performance outcomes or benchmark solutions. If new objectives are proposed it should be illustrated how these objectives are to be achieved by supporting performance outcomes or benchmark solutions.		All Land Use and Built Form provisions, additional controls and alternative benchmark solutions are outlined within Section 6.6 of the Master Plan.	
10.9	LCC	<p>This section of the DCP indicates that “15% Canopy coverage target for On-Lot landscaping will most likely not be achieved in this strategy, but the aim is to find “middle-ground” between Aviation safeguarding measures and DCP Canopy Coverage targets” (page 125).</p> <p>The DCP requires ecological advice in relation to Wildlife Hazards only in instances where the landscaping plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Incorporates alternative landscape species not listed within Appendix B; b. Incorporates landscape species denoted within the landscape species list; c. Will result in more than 5 trees being planted in 1 group (group refers to touching mature canopies); and/or d. Provides a spacing between a group of 5 or more trees that is less than 100m. <p>Council considers that it is possible to provide a landscape plan that does not trigger Wildlife Hazards under 2.10.3 of the DCP while still satisfying the relevant canopy coverage targets of the DCP. Council again requests that the Masterplan demonstrate compliance with the Minimum canopy coverage</p>		<p>Since the conclusion of the TAP, the tree species has been re-visited which has allowed a larger tree canopy coverage which is closer to the DCP controls. The revised Wildlife hazards assessment report still requires a variation to the DCP standard.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The landscape design of the Master Plan identifies that the tree canopy coverage for Riparian Corridors will have a minimum coverage of 50% in accordance with the Phase 2 DCP targets for park and open space. However, the tree canopy target contradicts the Wildlife Risk performance measures, looking to minimise wildlife attracting habitat. On lot landscaping will aim for a tree canopy cover of approximately 10%, streetscape and road corridors will target 50% and the local centre lots will target 20-30% canopy coverage. Within on-lot setback landscape areas, the proposed strategy is for groups of screening trees, which do not exceed more than 5 trees. These groups are spread apart with only understory planting beneath the canopy areas. This is to ensure screening and a soft interface can be achieved, whilst ensuring wildlife hazard considerations are be met. It is also to deliver.</p> <p>on a staggered approach to landscape screening whilst not creating dense vegetated on-lot setbacks that will attract nesting birds and wildlife.</p>	<p>Appendix QQ – Public Domain and Landscape Strategy</p> <p>Appendix YY – Wildlife Hazard Assessment</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		and deep soil planting requirements of the DCP.		<p>The landscape strategy within the Master Plan allocates greater tree planting within the carpark areas and driveways, compared to the setback areas, to also address urban heat island effect considerations.</p> <p>The canopy targets across these areas seek to provide a balanced approach between Aviation safeguarding measures and Phase 2 DCP Canopy Coverage targets. Otherwise, the Landscape Plan prepared by Site Image notes that the landscape design looks to consolidate areas of deep soil and provide minimum dimensions which allow for sufficient tree planting.</p> <p>The proposed planting within the Master Plan is consistent with the Wildlife Hazard Assessment which recommends street trees to be spaced at 10m-12m apart is achieved in the Master Plan.</p> <p>Tree canopy cover target of 25% on lot would require landscape areas to be densely canopy with touching canopy cover.</p> <p>DCP Section 2.10.3 (PO2) has the benchmark solution of trees in groups of no more than 5 and spacing of at least 100m between group. Such densities result in canopy cover that is significantly lower than 25%.</p>	
TRANSPORT FOR NSW					
3.1 Draft Master Plan					
	TfNSW	<p>TfNSW received the Master Plan Report (MPR) for the first time on 6 March 2024. Subsequently, and noting the significance of this document, several changes are required to ensure the MPR adequately and accurately addresses TfNSW requirements for the Master Plan.</p> <p>Recommendations proposed by TfNSW broadly fit into two categories, the first being errors in the MPR which is to be corrected and the second being changes TfNSW requires in order to support the draft Master Plan proceeding to public exhibition.</p> <p>Key changes required in the MPR include:</p>	<p>TfNSW requires the following updates to the MPR:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The block sizes are bigger than the Precinct Plan, they must therefore include ‘pedestrian through site links’ to improve active transport connectivity. The MPR must include a Principle that ‘pedestrian through site links’ for each allotment are considered and provided where blocks have dual street frontages and therefore allow pedestrians to access between both streets. 	<p>Master Plan Report to include the wording suggested by TfNSW in relation to future opportunities for through site links.</p> <p>No through site links have been provided. However, potential opportunities for future Connections have been indicated in the active transport plan. Through site links were originally contemplated in the draft Aerotropolis Development Control Plan but where subsequently removed in the final DCP.</p>	Section 7.1 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response		Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principles to encourage through site links More detail required relevant to provisions on Road 09 and Lot 23. Improvements to pedestrian prioritisation in the local centre. Securing the inclusion of amenity nodes Clarity is required about the referral requirements relevant to a Travel Plan and evidence of available road infrastructure, all of which are to be demonstrated prior to issue of an Aerotropolis Certificate. Resolution for some DCP amendments which are not supported by TfNSW Edits to the cross sections for road types ensuring clarity and consistency. 				
	TfNSW		The MPR to detail the following in the Active Transport section: <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 permeability through the site.</i>	Relevant wording changes have been made to the active transport network.		
	TfNSW		In Table 19 of the MPR, pedestrian prioritisation is to be more directive through Principles which require urban design, materiality and operational actions to be implemented throughout the Master Plan. The Proponent is to implement strategies using the above new Principles to better prioritise pedestrians on Road 5.	We can't locate this table that is referenced to. However, we have incorporated the principles relation to pedestrian connectivity and permeability as part of the Section 7.1 of the Master Plan.		Section 7.1 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C
	TfNSW		The temporary left-in-left out arrangement of Road 09 is shown in Figure 47 of the MPR. The following to also be written into the MPR: <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>	Relevant wording changes have been made to the additional controls of the road network.		Section 7.3 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
	TfNSW		In Table 10 of the MPR it is stated that amenity nodes 'should be encouraged'. The argument for allowing two local centres to be combined hinges on having amenity nodes in walkable distances to each lot. Accordingly, this is to be complemented by the MPR. For example, wording is to be added such as: <i>An amenity node will be provided in at least Stages 1, 3, 4 and 6 in approximately the locations shown in Figure xx</i> [where 'Figure x' is the Structure Plan, which is currently shown as Figure 7].	Relevant wording changes have been made to the additional controls of the amenity node.	Section 9.3 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C
	TfNSW		<p>Section 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 of the MPR needs to directly reference the Codes to be appended to the MPR (noting currently only the Complying Development Code is being appended). The referral requirements to be demonstrated prior to receiving the Aerotropolis Certificate are not captured. The following wording is to be included in the MPR:</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>Referrals to be met include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <p><i>As per State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>section 2.118 Development on proposed classified road</i> <i>section 2.119 Development with frontage to classified road</i> <i>section 2.120 Impact of road noise or vibration on non-road development</i> <i>section 2.121 Excavation in or immediately adjacent to corridors</i> <i>section 2.122 Traffic-generating development</i> <i>section 4.7 Development in future infrastructure corridor for previously permitted uses of land</i> <i>section 4.9 Excavation in, above, below or adjacent to future infrastructure corridors</i> 	<p>Suggested wording by TfNSW in relation to referrals for complying development has been incorporated into the Complying Development Code.</p> <p>Section 12 of the Master Plan has also been amended to include this text – this is consistent with Condition 38 in the Conditions Response Table.</p>	<p>Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework</p> <p>Appendix N – TAP Condition Response Table</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
			<p><i>Under State Environmental Planning Policy (Industry and Employment) 2021:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>section 2.34 Development of land within or adjacent to transport investigation area</i> <i>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</i> <i>section 4.27 Transport corridors 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.</i> <p><i>Concurrence or consent to be met include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Roads Act 1993</i> <i>section 61 Road works on certain classified roads</i> <i>section 87 Traffic control facilities</i> <i>section 125 Approval to use road for food or drink premises</i> <i>section 138 Works and structures</i> 		
	TfNSW		<p>Table 23 of the MPR now shows a total retail floor area of 7,500m2. However, TfNSW notes the previous, tranche 4 review, included a total retail floor area of 4,900m2. It is understood this is an error and should be reinstated as 4,900m2.</p>	<p>The total retail GFA has been indicated as 4,900sqm in the indicative GFA summary. The previous reference to 7,500sqm included non-retail uses which is not the intent of the control and hence has been updated.</p>	<p>Section 6.5 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C</p> <p>Appendix EE – Economics Assessment Report</p>
	TfNSW		<p>The following wording which is also within the Complying Development Code is to be included in the MPR as it relates to requirements for the Aerotropolis Certificate. This matter also relates to Section 3.3, Recommendation 7 in the Complying Development section of this report. Wording is to be:</p> <p><i>In accordance with the 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, as follows:</i></p>	<p>Updated SIDRA modelling was assessed by TfNSW in May 2024, the updated gross floor area of 507,000m² was agreed on June 14th, 2024 and will be included in the complying development code.</p>	<p>Appendix WW - TMAP</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
			<p>a. For development applications an comprehensive addendum Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (TMAP) is to be prepared and include transport 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.</p> <p>B 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.</p> <p>TfNSW notes the ongoing discussion regarding the amount of GFA which can be accommodated under the existing road network. TfNSW requires that the 245,000m2 of GFA (identified in red above) is be used as the threshold amount until updated SIDRA analysis demonstrates the existing road network can accommodate any additional GFA. Should SIDRA analysis support additional GFA TfNSW will advise in writing and this control may be updated.</p>		
	TfNSW		The MPR is to include: <i>A Travel Plan must be prepared prior to an Aerotropolis Certificate being issued and be issued to TfNSW for review and comment, and endorsement will be provided by TfNSW in writing.</i>	This wording has been included in the Complying Development Code and also Section 12 of the Master Plan.	<p>Appendix H – Complying Development Code and Framework</p> <p>Section 12 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C</p>
	TfNSW		Figure 5 of the MPR to include the connections to the major roads as part of item 2 of the figure, as discussed in Section 3.3, Recommendations 2 and 3 of this report. In addition, item 2 does not comprise Classified Roads at this stage, TfNSW requests changing the legend label to either main roads or Arterial and Sub-Arterial	<p>Connections to major roads are now shown in the key transport figures. Refer Figure 92 of Section 12 of the Master Plan.</p> <p>Item 2 within Table 13 has been updated to reflect this RFI.</p>	Section 12 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C
	TfNSW		In Section 3.3, under the dot point <i>Employment Growth</i> , the November Master Plan had 619,000m2 of GFA, this version now states 625,467m2 of GFA. This increase is to be justified if not corrected.	<p>All reports are now consistent with a GFA of 625,467m2 of GFA. This corrected an error in the previous report.</p> <p>Therefore, there has been no increase in GFA.</p>	Section 4.3 of Master Plan Report (Appendix C)

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response		Reference
	TfNSW		In Table 14, in the row <i>Building Compositions and Siting</i> , please remove the word <i>indicative</i> and replace with <i>minimum</i> in the following text "See Figure 11 below for <u>indicative</u> building setbacks."	This controls has since been updated to read - <i>Minimum setbacks within the local centre are to comply with the minimum provisions in accordance with Figure 68.</i>		Section 9.1 of Master Plan Report (Appendix C)
	TfNSW		In Table 17, row Car Parking, update wording to: <i>Provide 1 medium tree (capable of a mature height of 10-15m) for every 5 at grade car spaces.</i> This is consistent with the DCP.	This wording from TfNSW has been included in Section 13 of the DQS. The table is now Table 25 of Section 13. The following provision has been added – <i>Provide 1 medium tree (capable of a mature height of 10-15m) for every 5 at grade car spaces. This provision is to ensure wildlife hazard considerations can also be met.</i>		Section 13 of Master Plan Report (Table 25)
	TfNSW		TfNSW does not support the proposed change to the DCP identified in Table 25, Section 2.4.5, PO1.2, page 79 and requires that Street trees are to be planted at a maximum of 10m intervals (trunk to trunk) on all local streets.	This DCP provision is no longer being challenged and varied. The Master Plan will comply with this DCP provision. The DCP Variation Table in Section 11 of the Planning Report and within the Discussion Paper has been updated accordingly.		Section 10 of Planning Report Appendix G – Discussion Paper – Precinct Plan and DCP Amendments
	TfNSW		TfNSW does not support the proposed change to the DCP identified in Table 25, Section 2.4.5, PO3.1 on page 79 and requires that a numerical goal is required should the 50% proposed in the DCP not be achievable.	This DCP provision is no longer being challenged and varied. The Master Plan will comply with this DCP provision. The DCP Variation Table in Section 11 of the Planning Report and within the Discussion Paper has been updated accordingly.		Section 10 of Planning Report Appendix G – Discussion Paper – Precinct Plan and DCP Amendments
	TfNSW		TfNSW does not support the proposed change to the DCP identified in Table 25, Section 2.4.5, PO3.2 on page 80 and requires that a numerical goal is required should the 80% proposed in the DCP not be achievable.	This DCP provision is no longer being challenged and varied. The Master Plan will comply with this DCP provision. The DCP Variation Table in Section 11 of the Planning Report and within the Discussion Paper has been updated accordingly.		Section 10 of Planning Report Appendix G – Discussion Paper – Precinct Plan and DCP Amendments
	TfNSW		In Table 28, Section 2.6, PO1.1 on Page 83, the control is to state: <i>Direct vehicle access to properties from Sub-Arterial roads will only be considered for Lot 23 within the IPG Master Plan. Approval must be obtained from the relevant roads authority. Access to Lot 23 will be further investigated when access becomes available through adjoining lands. Access via adjoining allotments should be considered in the first instance. When other access is available, access to BMLR is to be removed and all access is to be from adjoining lands.</i>	Relevant text has been updated as part of typical street section, alternate benchmark solution.	Section 7.3 of the Master Plan Report	
	TfNSW		In Table 28, Section 2.6, PO2.1 on Page 84, this change is to be removed as the existing DCP control allows access in this instance.	Noted. The control referenced in this RFI has been removed as a DCP Variation.		Section 10 of the Planning Report. Appendix A of the Master Plan Report at Appendix C.
	TfNSW		In Table 28, Section 2.6, PO2.4 on Page 84 and in Table 33, Section 3.2, PO2 on Page 88, the control refers lot 14, however the justification	Relevant text has been updated as part of typical street section, alternate benchmark solution.		Section 7.3 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
			<p>refers to lot 24. TfNSW can support lot 24 on the basis of the explanation provided. However, if it is intended to refer to lot 14, please note further justification is required as this site has a dual frontage and could provide for separate light and heavy vehicular access.</p> <p>In Table 29, Section 2.8 PO2, page 85, relevant to the control, include: <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>		
	TfNSW		In Table 31, Section 2.18 PO2, page 87, to the control add: <i>The maximum cumulative height of any retaining walls adjoining the public domain is 6.0m.</i>	The text has been updated as part of the earthworks and retaining wall benchmark solutions.	Section 8.4 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C
	TfNSW		For Figure 45 of the MPR, Road 03 and 11 are Collector Roads and therefore have shared paths on one side of the street. This is to be reflected in this plan.	The active transport plan has been updated to reflect the shared paths.	Section 7.1 of Master Plan Report Appendix C
	TfNSW		<p>For the Cross Sections in Section 9.3.1 to 9.3.4 of the MPR, the following updates are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These plans are to be landscape pages to ensure detail can be shown. The plans should be high quality images to ensure detail is legible. • Dimensions are required for each of the uses within the sections (i.e. footpaths, landscaping etc). • Lightpoles are not to be included in the footpath dimensions. In the current sections it appears that they are within the footpath dimensions for the local industrial roads, local centre roads and the collector streets. • The sections are to include consistent labelling (i.e. have the dimensions of paths, roads, planting areas). 	<p>This RFI from TfNSW is consistent with Condition 3 of the TAP Conditions.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Refer Section 7.3 of the Master Plan Report.</p> <p>Light poles are proposed along all public roads and are located within the landscaped verge as shown in the typical road sections contained in the Public Domain and Landscape Strategy, the Civil Engineering Drawings and the Civil Infrastructure Report.</p>	<p>Section 7.3 of Master Plan Report Appendix C</p> <p>Appendix QQ – Public Domain and Landscape Strategy</p>
	TfNSW		The Proponent is to note within the MPR that the roads will be designed and developed to the level of service required by TfNSW, ensuring public benefit.	<p>Section 7.3 of the Master Plan (Road Network section) has been updated to include the following control:</p> <p><i>The roads within the Master Plan will be designed and developed to a level of service required by Liverpool Council and TfNSW (subject to the relevant authority) that ensures safety requirements and delivers a public benefit.</i></p>	Section 7.3 of Master Plan Report Appendix C (Road Network)
3.2 Traffic and Transport					

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
	TfNSW	<p>TfNSW has reviewed the updated Tranche 5 documentation and has compared to the comments provided for the Tranche 4 documentation. The Recommendations detailed in this subsection relate to outstanding or unresolved issues from Tranche 4 comments.</p> <p>In particular, TfNSW is seeking updates to provide further clarity and accuracy to the key transport related reports and have sought direct responses to outstanding issues to be clearly documented.</p> <p>Key changes required in the various transport reports include:</p>	TfNSW provides the following updates are to be included:	Noted	N/A
	TfNSW	Clarity regarding construction responsibility for the roundabout on Badgerys Creek Road (BCR) and Road 03 and the half width of the Eastern Ring Road (ERR).	The IDS is to 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, 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>The IDS has been updated to reflect IPG’s commitments. 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.</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>Section 8 and 12.1 of the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy Appendix LL (BCR Roundabout)</p> <p>Section 12.3 of the IDS (half eastern ring road)</p>
	TfNSW	Details of the acquisition changes for Fifteenth Avenue.	Section 11.3 of the IDS is not clear on who will be responsible for construction of the half width of ERR in Stage 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. Accordingly, please update.	<p>See comments above for ERR Construction.</p> <p>Details of the changes in land acquisition for Fifteenth Avenue (and other arterial and sub-arterial roads) have been included in Section 7 in the IDS and summarized in Table 9.</p>	Section 7 of IDS Appendix LL
	TfNSW	Additional details and explanation within the Infrastructure Delivery Report (IDS).	Relating to Figure 17 of the IDS, the report is to address if a works agreement cannot be reached with the adjoining landowner, what implication does this have for the delivery of access.	The IDS has been amended to include the following statement. “A works agreement will be obtained to allow for the partial construction of this road within the neighbouring site. If access can’t be provided through the neighbouring site, a temporary road will be provided to access the town centre, potentially from the Eastern Ring Road to the Bradfield Metro Link Road (BMLR).”	Section 12.7 of the IDS Appendix LL

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
	TfNSW	Further details on available bus movements for each stage of development.	The IDS is to 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 however, the changes proposed in the Master Plan will result in additional land acquisition for Fifteenth Avenue.	Changes to road lengths, including Eastern Ring Road, Bradfield Metro Link Road, Badgerys Creek Road and Fifteenth Avenue have been discussed in Section 7 of the IDS and specifically summarized in Table 8.	Section 7 (including table 8) IDS Appendix LL
	TfNSW	Remove a mitigation which seeks to close a bus lane during peak periods.	The IDS is to 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.	Statement has been added to Section 1.3 of the IDS.	Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Strategy. Refer Section 1.3 of the IDS
	TfNSW	Provide queue length details and levels of self-containment in the Options Assessment Report (OAR).	The TMAP is to 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) is to be considered, including in the scenario that roads planned within adjacent development sites are yet to be constructed, preventing buses from traversing 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.	The proposed bus access routes for the key infrastructure delivery stages are provided in Figures 48-50 of the updated TMAP (r06v5), with reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy report (prepared by IDC). 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.	Appendix WW – TMAP TMAP 1492r06v5 Section 9.5 Figures 48 - 50
	TfNSW	Include how Level of Service (LoS) advice provided by TfNSW has been addressed.	Within Appendix A of the IDS In the various tables for proposed mitigations, short- and long- term categories are not explained. Please include detail about what the proposed mitigations are.	Explanatory note added prior to Table 27 in Appendix A for timeframes of delivery. The coordinated outcomes, including levels of service between the TMP and IDS are discussed in Section 8 and summarised in Table 10.	Section 8 and Appendix A of the IDS Report IDS Appendix LL
	TfNSW	Provide clarification for the horizon years being used for modelling assumptions.	In Section 5.4 of the OAR, on page 63, 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 lane while retaining the bus lane.	The updated report (Rev04) has been updated throughout to propose an additional traffic lane to mitigate issues identified, while maintaining the existing bus lane. Given the low bus volumes in the Aimsun model, model geometry has not been updated such that this is more of a presentation change than a physical update to the modelling.	Appendix VV – Transport Options Assessment Report (OAR)
	TfNSW	Remove the requirement for a 21-day response by TfNSW to Travel Plan review.	The OAR is to include the average queue lengths and maximum queue length for key intersections for the particular scenarios in the report.	Section 8 has been added to the update 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. 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,	Appendix VV – Transport Options Assessment Report (OAR) 1492r07v04 - Options Assessment Report Version 4

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
				and typically heavily underrepresent queueing. Average queue has not been reported, and all assessment is undertaken based on the max queue.	
	TfNSW		The OAR is to 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.	Ason Group maintains that the adopted level of linked trips is appropriate and supported by various preceding studies. Notwithstanding, the Master Plan OAR has been updated to include additional discussion in Section 2.1.2 of the Master Plan OAR to discuss the significance. In summary, the variation between linked trip assumptions equates to less than 2% of development trips and therefore considered to be immaterial to the overall assessment. Furthermore, it is expected that built-form within the Local Centre shall be subject to future Development Application at which time further refinement of assumptions shall be made once more detail regarding land-use mix for the Local Centre is known. If necessary, that may also include updates to the relevant traffic modelling. As such, additional modelled scenarios at this time are deemed premature.	Noted
	TfNSW	Request for the Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (TMAP) to be updated to respond to errors.	The TMAP is to address the TfNSW LoS advice for the Master Plan.	<p>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 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</p>	Appendix WW – TMAP

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
				<p>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 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>	
	TfNSW		Figure 41 of the TMAP indicates that all development will be complete by 2031 however, it is understood 2026 and 2041 horizon years are the years being used. Update the report/figure to provide an explanation or amended the error.	<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>Therefore, the 2036 and 2041 assessment years represent more critical horizons than that of 2031.</p>	<p>Appendix VV – Transport Options Assessment Report (OAR)</p> <p>The Modelling Methodology Report is attached to the appendix of the OAR.</p>
			TfNSW does not accept with the wording proposed in Section 12.1 of the TMAP, which requires TfNSW to respond within 21 days. While TfNSW would endeavour to respond as soon as possible to the review of the Travel Plan, a timeframe cannot be provided at this stage. The Proponent is required to update the Report to: <i>TfNSW will be issued the draft Travel Plan for review and comment, and endorsement will be provided by TfNSW in writing.</i>	TMAP Section 12.1 has been updated to reflect the wording requested.	<p>Appendix WW - TMAP</p> <p>TMAP Section 12.1</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
	TfNSW		<p>TfNSW enquired about the construction cost changes for ERR between the Precinct Plan and the Master Plan detailed in the CAJR. We are not satisfied that the response provided the level of detail for TfNSW to close our original comment. Please remove the cost noting lack of detail.</p> <p>A general statement of reduced costs based on the vertical alignment and bridge vs culvert crossing can be provided however, please remove any specific costs in the CAJR.</p>	The Corridor Justification Report has been updated to remove costs.	Appendix E – Corridor Alignment Justification Report
	TfNSW		<p>The following matters are to be resolved for staging and servicing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The TMAP identifies thresholds for access based on stages/phases of development. This detail is to be included in the IDS with a statement regarding the delivery of development post phase 1. The Phasing is to be included in the IDS. 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. The IDS GFA in Table 10 is incorrect and is to be updated to 625,467m² (consistent with the TMAP and Urban Design Report). The IDS does not include forecasts of when stages will be complete however, TfNSW notes the Civil Report includes these forecasts. 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The TMAP has been updated to include thresholds for access per the findings of the latest Interim Site Access and Network Capacity Analysis. <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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revised TMAP (r06v5) has been updated which identifies the modelling assessments conducted as "Phases" (Phase 1 - SIDRA model, Phase 2 - Aimsun model). <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> <p>The coordinated outcomes, including the development staging plan and phased infrastructure delivery from the TMAP are discussed in</p>	<p>Appendix WW - TMAP</p> <p>TMAP response reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TMAP Section 2.2 TMAP Section 9.2 TMAP Section 9 <p>Appendix LL Infrastructure Delivery Strategy (Section 8 of the IDS)</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
				Section 8 and summarised in Table 10 of the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy.	
3.3 Complying Development					
	TfNSW	<p>TfNSW has reviewed the updated Tranche 5 documentation in comparison with comments provided on the Tranche 4 documentation. The Recommendations detailed in this subsection relate to outstanding and unresolved issues from Tranche 4 comments.</p> <p>TfNSW has concerns that the Complying Development Report (CDR) has not been updated in response to Tranche 4 comments, with most matters only being addressed in the Justification Report. The changes to also be reflected in the CDR as this document will be appended to the MPR. It is therefore essential that all requirements for Complying Development be included to ensure future compliance with the conditions.</p> <p>The Complying Development framework is dependent on several matters being demonstrated as achieved in the Aerotropolis Certificate. TfNSW notes the Aerotropolis Certificate is required prior to the application for a Complying Development Certificate. Accordingly, these provisions are to be detailed in the MPR in addition to the CDR. The matters which are to be demonstrated as achieved in the Aerotropolis</p>		The Complying Development Report has been updated to address these matters	Appendix H –Complying Development Code and Framework

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response		Reference
		<p>Certificate relate to referrals and concurrences and demonstration of the presence of essential road infrastructure.</p> <p>Key changes required in the CDR include:</p>				
		Noting the difference between concurrences and referrals.	The CDR is to be updated to note that concurrences and referrals are different processes.	The Complying Development Report has been updated to address this matter	<p>Appendix H –Complying Development Code and Framework</p> <p>Complying Development Report Section 2.2</p>	
	TfNSW	Excluding the connection to major roads from the Complying Development framework.	<p>Section 11.1 (iv) of the CDR has not been updated to reflect the latest advice provided by TfNSW, requesting the exclusion of the connections of local roads to main roads in the precinct. The following wording is provided to replace Section 11.1 (iv):</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 Avenue and the nearest local road intersection (as per the Road Network Complying Development Map).</i></p>	The Complying Development Report has been updated to reflect this requirement.	<p>Appendix H –Complying Development Code and Framework</p> <p>Complying Development Report Section 10.1.3</p>	
	TfNSW	Including explicit details for referral and concurrence requirements to be demonstrated in the Aerotropolis Certificate.	The ‘Road Network Complying Development Map’ on Page 51 of the CDR is to be updated to reflect the updated wording in Point 2 above which excludes the connecting road that connects between the access point, of the Eastern Ring Road, BCR, Bradfield Metro Link Road or Fifteenth Avenue and the nearest local road intersection.	The Complying Development Road Network Map has been updated to reflect this requirement.		<p>Appendix H –Complying Development Code and Framework</p> <p>Complying Development Report Appendix A</p>
	TfNSW	Include details for demonstration of the provision of essential road infrastructure in the Aerotropolis Certificate.	<p>Section 2.2 of the CDR is to include the referral requirements which are to be demonstrated prior to receiving the Aerotropolis Certificate. The following wording is to be included in the CDR:</p> <p><i>Development which ordinarily requires authority referrals pursuant to other environmental planning instruments, is to 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 is to be demonstrated in the Aerotropolis Certificate. Referrals to include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <p><i>Under State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>section 2.118 Development on proposed classified road</i> 	The Complying Development Report has been updated to reflect this requirement.		<p>Appendix H –Complying Development Code and Framework</p> <p>Complying Development Report Section 2.2</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>section 2.119 Development with frontage to classified road</i> • <i>section 2.120 Impact of road noise or vibration on non-road development</i> • <i>section 2.121 Excavation in or immediately adjacent to corridors</i> • <i>section 2.122 Traffic-generating development</i> • <i>section 4.7 Development in future infrastructure corridor for previously permitted uses of land</i> • <i>section 4.9 Excavation in, above, below or adjacent to future infrastructure corridors</i> <p><i>Under State Environmental Planning Policy (Industry and Employment) 2021:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>section 2.34 Development of land within or adjacent to transport investigation area</i> <p>Thank you for reaching out. <i>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</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>section 4.27 Transport corridors</i> <p><i>Development which ordinarily requires authority concurrence or consent pursuant to other legislation is to obtain the relevant concurrence or consent prior to lodging an application for an Aerotropolis Certificate.</i></p> <p><i>Concurrence or consent is to include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Roads Act 1993</i> • <i>section 61 Road works on certain classified roads</i> • <i>section 87 Traffic control facilities</i> • <i>section 125 Approval to use road for food or drink premises</i> • <i>section 138 Works and structures</i> 		
	TfNSW	TfNSW notes the Position Paper on Exempt and Complying Development for Master Plans currently being prepared by DPHI. TfNSW requests an opportunity to review the draft Paper given its	In Section 4.2.1 of the CDR the following wording is to be included: <i>Where development comprises 'Traffic Generating Development' as per Section 2.122, State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021, a referral in accordance with Section xx of this Code is to be demonstrated in the Aerotropolis Certificate.</i>	The Complying Development Report has been updated to reflect this requirement.	Appendix H –Complying Development Code and Framework Complying Development Report Section 4.2.1

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		importance to finalising the Exempt and Complying Code.			
	TfNSW		In Section 11.2, Point 3 of the CDR, Riparian Streets are to be included in this list. The Master Plan includes Riparian Streets as a typology and is to be reflected in the policy.	The Complying Development Report has been updated to reflect this requirement.	Appendix H –Complying Development Code and Framework Complying Development Report Section 10.1 (2)
			<p>The wording In Section 4.2.1, Point 5 of the CDR is to be replaced with the following text:</p> <p><i>In accordance with the 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 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 to the TMAP is to be prepared, which includes transport modelling as agreed with TfNSW in terms of model methodology. Endorsement of the updated TMAP by TfNSW is to be demonstrated prior to the application for an Aerotropolis Certificate. The updated TMAP is to demonstrate that essential road infrastructure and network capacity is operational to support traffic generated by the proposed development.</i></p> <p>It is noted in the TMAP that the existing road network (primarily Badgerys Creek Road) can support at least 245,000m2 of GFA in 2026 based on existing SIDRA modelling. The proponent has been requested to provide further SIDRA analysis to support their proposal for a maximum of 362,000m2 of GFA. TfNSW is endeavouring to finalise this matter by the 19 April 2024. If this not possible, it is recommended that this matter be resolved with TfNSW during the adequacy review by DPHI.</p>	The Complying Development Report has been updated to reflect this requirement; however, the maximum gross floor area is stated as 507,050sqm as per discussions with TfNSW.	Appendix H –Complying Development Code and Framework Complying Development Report Section 4.2.1 (5)
Comments on the SEPP WPC 2021					
	TfNSW	FIGURE 9: Active Transport Network: Key Intersections	A new 'key intersection' is now shown along ERR between Road 6/7 and Road 10/BMLR. This needs to be removed.	The Active Transport Network Map has been updated to show the key intersection in the right location. The Active Transport Network	Appendix C – Section 7.1 of Master Plan report

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
			The BCR and ERR intersection dot is not over the actual intersection. This should be located over the intersection.	Map is shown in Section 7.1 of the Master Plan (Appendix C) and the Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps (Appendix J). The legend for Active Transport map in Section 7.1 has been updated to reflect consistent colouring and the information shown on the map.	Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps
	TfNSW	Figure 9: Active Transport Network: Planned Signalised Intersections	The northern intersection is to be a 'planned signalised intersection' and shown in orange as per other planned signalised intersections within the Precinct.	The legend for Active Transport map in Section 7.1 has been updated to reflect consistent colouring and the information shown on the map. 'Planned signalised intersections' shown in orange relate to the Street Network Hierarchy and Transport Network maps in the Precinct Plan as it relates to vehicular movement. We've kept the Active Transport Map consistent with the Precinct Plan to show 'Key Signalised Intersections' only in red.	Appendix C – Section 7.1 of Master Plan Report Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps
	TfNSW	Figure 9: Active Transport Network: Cycle Paths	The legend for Cycle Paths through open space and collector roads are incorrectly labelled and is to be amended accordingly. TfNSW notes an extension of the green dotted line out of the south eastern boundary which does not connect to anything (now BMLR has been realigned), and is to be removed.	The legend for Active Transport map in Section 7.1 has been updated to reflect consistent colouring and the information shown on the map. The green dotted extension referenced in this RFI has been removed.	Appendix C – Section 7.1 of Master Plan Report Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps
	TfNSW	Figure 9: Active Transport Network: Collector Road Cycle Paths	Cycle paths along the collector roads must also be shown.	The Active Transport Network Map has been updated to show the cycle paths along collector roads.	Appendix C – Section 7.1 of Master Plan Report Appendix J – Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps
Independent Urban Designer – Peter Mould					
3.1 Draft Master Plan					
	PM	Inconsistencies or inaccuracies in the document. For example, Fig 18 Wind Diagram is actually a solar diagram, Fig 23 shows views from top of 12 storey buildings where they should be from the public domain. Issues with Design Quality Strategy including parameters for hierarchy of tiers and confusion in verification	Review and edit document to check for inconsistencies in this document and references to/from other documents. General review of design quality strategy following workshop 27.3.24	Added 'consideration of micro-climate' in the figure title. Refer Section 13 of the Master Plan (Design Quality Strategy).	Section 13 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C (Design Quality Strategy).

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		check list between controls and quality measures.			
3.2 Built Form					
	PM	ADS will need to be aligned with any changes to the DQS of Master Plan. References to the DQS document should be changed to the master plan.	Align this document with updated Master Plan report and review of DQS.	The Architectural Design Statement and the Design Quality Strategy align and are consistent. The ADS references the DQS and provides a lot of architectural and built form provisions which are within the DQS.	Appendix T – Architectural Design Statement Section 13 of the Master Plan Report Appendix C (Design Quality Strategy).
3.3 Stormwater					
	PM	The redesign of the road levels and water treatment detention ponds to lessen their impact on the riparian corridors is an improvement. However, the civil and landscape packages only show the changes in three of the 13 pond systems and continued refinement of all areas is need.	Update all documents to show resolution across the entire site.	All civil drawings have now been updated in accordance with the principles agreed with the TAP	Appendix AA - Civil Engineering drawings Appendix QQ – Landscaping Plans.
3.9 Open Space					
	PM	Riparian Corridors are the important moderators on the impact of large-scale industrial development. Every effort should be made to continue to improve their accessibility, and visual and physical amenity. Overly engineered solutions need to be reviewed and modified. For example, the civil drawings show 19 scours into the central riparian corridor to lessen the impact of piped stormwater flows. These have significant visual and amenity impacts.	Stronger collaboration between landscape and engineering consultants to improve open space quality.	There has been considerable work undertaken to take a softer engineering response, which has been supported by Water Sensitive Urban Design and Landscape design. Please see detailed response to this issue in the Liverpool City Council RFIs. Section 8 of the Master Plan provides an overview of the how an integrated, landscape led response has guided the design of the three riparian corridors. The comments provided by the Independent Architect here are based on Tranche 5 and not the updated response, which was presented at TAP meeting 8, which were well received by the Technical Assurance Panel. There was general agreement from the Panel that there were considerable improvements to the design of the riparian corridors.	Appendix AA - Civil engineering drawings Appendix QQ – Landscaping Plans.
3.13 Design Quality					

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
	PM	A workshop was convened on 27 th March to address issues around the approach to design quality but response to this were not received by the date of this submission and so remain outstanding.	None.	The workshop discussed a range of issues which were incorporated in the update to the Design Quality Strategy and the Master Plan Controls.	Updated Design Quality Strategy Section 13 of Appendix C – Master Plan
Comments on the SEPP WPC 2021					
	PM	In the Precinct Plan Road 10 and Road 6 would have required a 12 metre setback and 6 metre landscape edge and BMLR would have required a 20 metre setback and 10 metre landscape edge.	The development now proposes a 7.5 metre setback and 4 metre landscape edge for Road 10 and Road 6 and a now 6 metre setback for BMLR. This change is not justified in the DCP Amendments Report and is to be updated in the DCP Amendment Report.	<p>We had maintained 12m building setback and 6m landscape setback along Road 10 and Road 6 as per the WSA DCP in the current Masterplan. These setbacks had not changed since the major ERR realignment. Setbacks of 7.5m and 4m for building and landscape respectively, are applied when there are no parking or hardstands along the local streets as per the DCP. Please refer to page 66, Table 6 setbacks of Development for Enterprise and Industry, WSA DCP.</p> <p>For the lots along the BLMR (Lot 23 and 24), we have established 6m building setback and 3m landscape setback due to the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preserve existing trees for the Local Park and maintain efficient building envelopes that adjoin the park as the result of the BMLR re-alignment - Denote a sense of arrival at the heart of the estate by presenting the building closer to the street for the Local Centre - Contrast the street presentation to the remaining buildings in the Enterprise + Industry, creating a recognisable Local Centre and facilitate navigation. - Addressing the corner and adhere to the WSA DCP, Table 6 setbacks of Development for Enterprise and Industry (page 66) for secondary road frontages, whereby 3m is applied for the landscape setback. However, 6m setback is applied for the building setback, which is a greater setback than the DCP. 	Appendix C -Master Plan Report Section 6.6 of Master Plan (Building Setbacks)
WPCA					
	WCPA	The Western Parkland City Authority (WPCA) has reviewed the Tranche 5 studies submitted as part of the IPG Bradfield Master Plan WSA_MP01 at 475 Badgerys Creek Road, Bradfield. The review has identified the majority of previous concerns have been addressed, noting the following key issues to be addressed:		These items have been noted and updated accordingly.	All appendices to the Planning Report

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of adequate access to Lot 5 and adjoining riparian corridor from the public domain. • Consistent reporting of staging and infrastructure delivery, especially the staging and delivery of the surrounding road network and related upgrades. • The adequate consideration of public access especially regarding public art on the western side of Lot 5. • Ensuring adequate planning controls are implemented regarding building massing, solar access and height of buildings. 			
3.1 Draft Master Plan					
	WCPA	<p><u>Staging and Infrastructure Delivery</u></p> <p>The proponent should ensure that staging, including delivery of enabling works such as stormwater and open space, including riparian corridors, are consistent in all submitted documentation. For example, some infrastructure requirements identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy, such as the zone substation, are not identified in the staging plan included within the draft Master Plan.</p> <p>The Master Plan Report should clearly identify the stages and provide a summary of infrastructure required to be</p>	Section 12 be updated to reflect consistent staging and to include a list of infrastructure required to be delivered for each stage, as identified in the submitted Infrastructure Delivery Strategy.	The Infrastructure Delivery Strategy has been updated to clearly show the staging strategy. The zone substation is in the first stages of the development.	Appendix A of Appendix LL – IDS.

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		delivered for each stage, to enable efficient assessment at future stages of development.			
3.2 Built Form					
	WCPA	<p><u>Passive surveillance of riparian and open space areas</u></p> <p>Previous comments by the WCPA identified that the Phase 2 DCP requires an edge street adjoining open space/parks. The Tranche 5 documentation does not include a park edge street adjoining Lot 5. Whilst an edge street is a preferred outcome, consideration should be given to alternate design solutions to achieve passive surveillance and maintenance access to stormwater basins adjoining Lot 5. Furthermore, it is noted that the Master Plan includes passive surveillance as a design quality principle stating “Ensure the layout arrangements and the relationships between uses and functions maximise activation, visibility, clarity, and opportunities for passive surveillance.” It is recommended that the riparian interface with Lot 5 be included in more detail regarding this design principle.</p> <p>It is noted that public art is proposed along the western wall of the building on Lot 5, however this is not accessible from the public domain in the current configuration. See Section 3.9 for more comments in relation to public art.</p>	Table 6 of the Master Plan Report is updated to include design quality principle specific to passive surveillance of riparian and public and private open space, which is applicable to all development within the Enterprise and Industry areas and the Local Centre.	The CPTED report has addressed the issue of passive surveillance and this embedded in the design of the Master Plan.	Appendix CC – CPTED Report

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		In response to this concern, consideration should be given to the Master Plan Report and Exempt and Complying Development Framework being amended to ensure all building designs provide passive surveillance to riparian areas and public and private open space.			
	WCPA	<p><u>Building massing and height of Buildings</u></p> <p>The proposal seeks to increase building height across some sites, however plans provided identify building massing variations to enable solar access requirements to be met. However, the development controls established within the Urban Form section of the Master Plan Report should be stronger to ensure solar access standards are met.</p> <p>DPHI to confirm if proposed mechanism for height of building control provides sufficient statutory weight, given amendments proposed to the SEPP (Precincts - Western Parkland City) 2021 and draft Master Plan identifying locations of High-Bay warehouse buildings.</p>	<p>Table 12 of the Master Plan Report is updated to include specific solar access design quality outcomes for a minimum period of time on the winter solstice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DPHI to confirm suitability of statutory controls for height of building given proposed height of buildings sought in amended SEPP exceed the identified locations in the draft Master Plan Report (page 76). 	Acceptable solar access has been demonstrated in the shadow analysis/diagrams.	<p>Section 6.11 of the Urban Design Report Appendix D</p> <p>Appendix T – Architectural Design Statement</p>
3.4 Traffic and Transport					
	WCPA	It is noted that the proponent has submitted an amended Transport Management Access Plan (TMAP) to address concerns	Staging and provision to be consistent throughout all master plan documentation. This should include detail of which stage of development will require upgrade of Badgerys Creek Road and Eastern Ring Road.	Staging is now consistent across the Infrastructure Delivery Report, TMAP and Master Plan	Appendix WW –TMAP

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		raised by TfNSW. WPCA notes that staging identified in the TMAP is not consistent with the staging identified in the Master Plan Report or Infrastructure Delivery Strategy.			Appendix LL – Infrastructure Delivery Plan
Sustainability					
	WCPA	The WPCA notes the proponents comments on the previous Wildlife Hazard Assessment. Comments provided on the previous Sustainability Strategy and ESD report have been adequately addressed. The WPCA notes the proponent's justification relating to previous comments, including those regarding hard renewable energy targets and the adoption of the WSROC Cool Suburbs Tool.		Noted. No action required.	N/A
3.8 Open Space					
	TfNSW	See comment in Section 3.2 above on passive surveillance of open space. The WPCA notes that comments previously given on the previous Riparian Assessment Report have been resolved, noting separate assessment of realignment of watercourses is required in accordance with the <i>Water Management Act 2000</i> .		Noted	N/A
3.9 Public Art					
		The WPCA notes that previous comments regarding the reinstating of the Public		Noted	N/A

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>Art Panel have been addressed in Tranche 5 studies.</p> <p>While previous comments regarding the provision of specific timeframes for the consultation and delivery of public art have not been specified, the WPCA notes that the provision of such is not integral to the delivery of the project.</p>			
		<p>The Public Art Strategy has detailed that public art will be included within the riparian corridor on the western side of Lot 5. However, it is not clear how this artwork will be accessible from the public domain, as no public access has been provided. It is noted that the Summary of Artwork Briefing Requirements table makes mention of the need to consider the public domain when implementing the riparian corridor artwork, as well as the impacts on the riparian zone.</p>	Public access is provided within the riparian area adjoining Lot 5 to ensure adequate public access to the artwork is enabled.	Public access will be available to this area of the Riparian Corridor. This has been shown in the Public Domain Landscaping Strategy.	N/A
3.10 Complying Development					
		<p>The WPCA notes the proponents comments regarding the addition of amendments in relation to local and state infrastructure contributions prior to the issue of an Occupation Certificate.</p> <p>Further comments are provided in Section 3.2 above which could be addressed through specific inclusions in the Complying Development Framework.</p>		Noted	N/A
3.12 Design Quality					
		The WPCA notes that previous comments regarding the reinstatement of the active		Noted	N/A

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		transport underpass Eastern Ring Road and the planned signalised intersection have been addressed.			
3.13 Economic Assessment					
		The WPCA notes that previous comments given regarding the Economic Assessment Report have been addressed within the current technical studies. The WPCA acknowledges that justification the proponent at the TAP meeting provided on 15 March 2024 and seeks for the justification to be included within the economic assessment report.	The Economic Assessment include an addendum outlining the justification provided by the consultant at TAP meeting on 15 March 2024.	The additional economic analysis requested at the TAP meeting on the 15 th March, has been included in an Addendum to the Economic Assessment. This includes case studies from other parts of Western Sydney A cumulative impact assessment and an analysis of the planned centres retail floorspace.	Appendix EE – Economics Assessment New Section 6.0 Addendum, page 38 of Economic Assessment
3.14 Waste Management					
		WPCA comments regarding food waste separation, storage and removal from site have been adequately addressed within the report noting that while specific tenancies are not fully defined yet, the number of food waste bins/removal processes required cannot be fully known		Noted	N/A
Comments on SEPP WPC 2021		Building Height	DPHI should ensure building height controls are satisfactory, noting the height amendments proposed and the analysis provided by the proponent limiting to only certain portions of the site.	Noted, a full analysis of the proposed new height controls is included in the Urban Design Report.	Appendix D – Urban Design Report Section 7, page 130 of Urban Design Report
Biodiversity, Conservation and Science		BCS does not support the Master Plan creating a complying development pathway for the nominated development within flood prone land, i.e. on land within the extent of the PMF identified		The controls around flood prone land are nominated in Section 2.3.1 of the IPG Code. This provides a very limited range of works that can be undertaken on this land, none of which would be habitable buildings.	Appendix H – Complying Development Code

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
Group (BCS) within the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEE W)		in the Wianamatta South Creek Catchment Flood Study – Existing Conditions, 2022.		The way the Code is written seeks to facilitate infrastructure works such as water and stormwater management, local roads and infrastructure and environmental protection works. This would avoid a situation where these works could be undertaken as CDC, with only a small part requiring a DA, which would work counter to this process of facilitating streamlined development through the CDC framework under a Master Plan.	
		A review of the flood modelling and update to the flood assessment to address the Aerotropolis DCP requirements/provisions for the whole Master Plan area.		The Aerotropolis DCP requirements have been addressed in the revised IWCMP report for the whole Master Plan footprint. This includes areas beyond the developable footprint, including riparian corridors, open space, basins, etc.	Appendix LL – IDS Appendix MM - IWCMS Refer to Section 2, Section 4 and Section 5 of the IDC IWCMP report which identifies the objective and performance outcomes relevant to the site and of which the flood modelling and flood assessment has been based upon.
		All development (including complying) must meet the construction and operational phase waterway health and stormwater management targets in Sections 2.3 and 2.5.5 of the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Development Control Plan Phase 2 (Aerotropolis DCP), in accordance with the Technical guidance for achieving Wianamatta-South Creek stormwater management targets (DPIE, 2022), available at: https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/research-and-publications/publications-search/technical-guidance-for-achieving-wianamatta-south-creek-stormwater-management-targets .		The Masterplan has demonstrated compliance with the operational phase waterway health and stormwater management targets setout in the Aerotropolis DCP in accordance with the technical guidance parameters. Refer to Section 2 of the IDC IWCMP which documents how the operational phase targets have been achieved. Compliance with the construction phase targets cannot be demonstrated at this phase of the masterplan timeline as more detail is required around the proposed construction methodology (i.e. location of site shed, stockpile locations, etc.) to calculate performance against the construction targets. Detailed erosion and sediment control plans are required to demonstrate achievement of these targets and will be provided in the later detailed design phases of the project.	Appendix LL – IDS Appendix MM – IWCMS Refer Section 2 of the IDC IWCMP report which identifies the objective and performance outcomes relevant to the operational phase waterway health.

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		BCS does not support the location of infrastructure and other development on non- certified land unless it is in accordance with Relevant Biodiversity Measure 11 of the Order to confer biodiversity certification on the State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006 (Growth Centres Order).		There is no infrastructure or other development on the High Biodiversity Value (ENV) Areas. These areas contribute to the 2000ha target for the Growth Centres. The non-certified land which does not contain native vegetation does not contribute to the target.	Appendix V – Biodiversity Assessment Report
		<p>The Ingham Planning Report – IPG Bradfield Master Plan prepared by Urbis and dated 4 March 2024 (Planning Report) and package of 44 supporting documents are lengthy, difficult to navigate and there are errors as well as repetition of content across the documents. This makes understanding the proposed outcomes of the Master Plan unnecessarily complex. Examples include (but are not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ the description and map of the existing land zoning in Figure 9 in the Planning Report (p.43) is incorrect, and inconsistent with other maps in the same report which show the existing and proposed land zoning (e.g., Figure 24, p.72) □ the Exempt and Complying development provisions are covered in at least 5 different documents – the Planning Report, Complying Development Report, Exempt and Complying Development Framework Justification Report, Exempt Development Explanation of Intended Effect (EIE) and Complying Development Code □ Documents 8 and 30 are the same 		<p>The package of supporting documents have been updated to ensure consistency across all documents.</p> <p>The exempt and complying development controls were required to be documented in a number of locations. This has been reduced in the final set of documents.</p>	<p>Planning Report and supporting documents.</p> <p>Appendix C –Master Plan Report</p> <p>Appendix H – Complying Development Code.</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>Appendices O and P are not separate documents and are both contained in the Integrated Water Cycle Management Plan (IWCMP) prepared by infrastructure & development consulting (March 2024).</p>			
3.3 Stormwater		<p>The Planning Report incorrectly states that: “due to the absence of final development controls relating to stormwater drainage design and stormwater management, stormwater drainage across the site has been designed to adhere with the Liverpool City Council, Development Design Specification D5 Stormwater Drainage Design – January 2003”. This is incorrect – the development controls for stormwater management in the Aerotropolis have been established via Section 4.5.1, BG4 of the Aerotropolis Precinct Plan which states that development must demonstrate “Compliance with the ambient water quality and flow objectives must be consistent with the NSW Government Technical guidance for achieving Wianamatta-South Creek stormwater management targets (DPIE, 2022)”. The Aerotropolis DCP contains the waterway health and stormwater management targets which must be complied with at construction and operational phases of development for all land within the Aerotropolis.</p>	<p>This statement has been removed from Section 12.7 of the Planning Report.</p> <p>The construction and operational phase waterway health and stormwater management targets in Sections 2.3 and 2.5.5 of the Aerotropolis DCP must be met for all development (including complying) in the Master Plan area in accordance with the NSW Government Technical guidance for achieving Wianamatta-South Creek stormwater management targets (DPIE, 2022).</p>	<p>The Masterplan has demonstrated compliance with the operational phase waterway health and stormwater management targets set out in the Aerotropolis DCP in accordance with the technical guidance parameters. Refer to Section 2 of the IDC IWCMP which documents how the operational phase targets have been achieved.</p>	<p>Appendix MM – IWCMP</p> <p>Refer Section 2 of the IDC IWCMP report which identifies the objective and performance outcomes relevant to the operational phase waterway health.</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		The IWCMP states that for both the Regional Scenario (p.19) and IPG Site Only (p.22), compliance with the waterway health and stormwater management targets have been demonstrated. However, the Master Plan does not require compliance with the waterway health and stormwater management targets. Therefore, the Master Plan will not comply with the waterway health and stormwater management targets.	The Complying Development Code is updated to require compliance with the waterway health and stormwater management targets for complying development in accordance with the NSW Government Technical guidance for achieving Wianamatta-South Creek stormwater management targets (DPIE, 2022).	Compliance with the waterway health and stormwater management targets has been achieved and demonstrated in the IWCMP. The Complying Development Code includes a development standard in Section 12.2 the required compliance with the 'Technical Guidance for Achieving Wianamatta-South Creek Stormwater Management Targets'.	Refer to Section 2 in the IWCMP Appendix MM
		The Discussion Paper – IPG Master Plan Application prepared by Urbis (March 2024, p. 12) proposes that Section 2.3 PO1 – 6 of the Aerotropolis DCP be varied to enable stormwater infrastructure to be located on non-certified land “if it can be demonstrated that no adverse impacts to biodiversity can be achieved”. BCS does not support the provision of stormwater infrastructure (or any other development) within non-certified land.	All stormwater infrastructure must be located on certified land. All infrastructure must be located on certified land unless it is in accordance with Relevant Biodiversity Measure 11 of the Growth Centres Order.	The High Biodiversity Value land does not contain any infrastructure. The proposed DCP Variation regarding stormwater infrastructure in non-certified land is no longer being proposed. There is no stormwater infrastructure proposed within non-certified land.	Section 10 of Planning Report. Appendix MM – IWCMS
		The Aerotropolis DCP objectives and performance outcomes stated in Section 3.1 of the IWCMP for stormwater quantity management are confused with the Aerotropolis DCP flood management provisions.	Section 3.1 of the IWCMP should refer to the flooding provisions in Section 2.3 of the Aerotropolis DCP instead of the provisions in Section 2.5.1 of the DCP	The IWCMP has been amended to include the objectives and performance outcomes for stormwater management and water sensitive urban design (Section 2.3.2 of the DCP), and now also includes the references to the flooding provisions in Section 2.5.1 of the DCP.	Appendix MM 0- IWCMP Refer to Section 2, Section 4 and Section 5 of the IWCMP
3.7 Biodiversity, Hazards and Conservation		The Biodiversity Assessment Report prepared by Eco Logical Australia dated 4 March 2024 (BAR) includes a consistency report with an ‘assessment of consistency between the Relevant Biodiversity Measures of the Biodiversity Certification Order, and the Western Sydney Aerotropolis (Aerotropolis Core, Badgerys Creek, Wianamatta-South Creek) Precinct Plan and the proposed 475 Badgerys Creek Road, Bradfield NSW Master Plan’. BCS notes that the area of Existing Native Vegetation (ENV) to be protected has increased from 3.27 ha in	Clarify the increase in ENV to be protected in the Master Plan from Tranche 4 to Tranche 5.	The previous ENV calculation was based on a previous GIS file which had the incorrect boundary.	

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		the Tranche 4 report to 4.59 ha in the BAR (Tranche 5). There is no explanation provided for this increase in ENV.			
		The BAR refers to HBV and not ENV. The Growth Centres Order does not contain a definition for HBV.	The BAR be updated to only refer to ENV (where it meets the definition of ENV in the Growth Centres Order, whether located in the certified or non-certified land) or AHCVV (where it meets the definition of ENV except for not originally being mapped in the Conservation Plan).	The WPC SEPP refers to the mapped areas as HBV. Report has been updated to reflect ENV terminology.	
		Exempt and complying development which involves the removal of vegetation must not be permitted on non-certified land.	All ENV to be protected is to be mapped on the High Biodiversity Value Map in the Western Parkland City SEPP.	All ENV within the site and master plan will be protected.	Appendix B –Master Plan key diagram Figure 1 IPG Structure Plan
		Exempt and complying development must not be permitted in areas of natural waterways and buffers defined under section 2.3.1 of the Aerotropolis DCP.	Exempt Development provision 4.5(1)(e) should be updated to include another dot point: “the tree or vegetation is not identified on the High Biodiversity Value Map in the Western Parkland City SEPP”.	This has been updated in Section 4.5 of the Explanation of Intended Effects	Appendix F –Explanation of Intended Effects
		The location of infrastructure and other development on non-certified land is not appropriate unless it is in accordance with Relevant Biodiversity Measure 11 of the Growth Centres Order.	Update Section 5.5.1 of the Planning Report to accurately describe the role of the Growth Centres biodiversity certification under the BC Act and the Commonwealth Strategic Assessment under the EPBC Act.	Section 5.5.1 of the Planning Report has been amended with the following wording: <i>The Sydney Region Growth Centres Biodiversity Certification was approved on 11 December 2007. The biodiversity certification of the Growth Centres was given effect via transitional arrangements under the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. Development on biodiversity certified land does not require further biodiversity assessment. This applies to the majority of the IPG site. On non-certified land, Relevant Biodiversity Measure 11 from the Order to Confer Certification states that where essential infrastructure that involves clearing of existing native vegetation on non-certified land and that do not require consent, such clearing must be offset by applying the requirements from condition 8. Within the IPG Master Plan, no clearing of existing native vegetation on non-certified land is proposed and therefore no offsets are required.</i>	Section 5.5.1 of Planning Report
		Inconsistencies in mapping of the Blue-Green Infrastructure Framework make the intended outcomes for conservation of biodiversity unclear. For example, there are at least 3 versions of the map, some of which do not identify	Clause 4.25A Clearing of native vegetation of the Western Parkland City SEPP must apply to all ENV to be protected via mapping of the ENV on the High Biodiversity Value Areas map.	All relevant maps showing the ENV, have been updated to be consistent. Refer to the updated SEPP and Precinct Plan Map Amendments.	Appendix D – Urban Design Report Section 03 Urban Design of Report Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps Appendix J

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>ENV to be protected in the north-western corner of the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Figure 8 of Document 3. Urban Design Report <input type="checkbox"/> Figure 5 in Document 36. Amended SEPP and Precinct Plan Maps <input type="checkbox"/> Page 7 of Document 23. Discussion Paper PP and DCP Amendments. 			
		<p>Section 5.5.1 of the Planning Report does not refer to the Growth Centres biodiversity certification which applies to the land. This section also incorrectly states that the approval of the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) Strategic Assessment for the Growth Centres means that the subject land is exempt from the biodiversity assessment requirements of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (BC Act).</p>		<p>Section 5.5.1 of the Planning Report has been amended with the following wording:</p> <p><i>The Sydney Region Growth Centres Biodiversity Certification was approved on 11 December 2007. The biodiversity certification of the Growth Centres was given effect via transitional arrangements under the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. Development on biodiversity certified land does not require further biodiversity assessment. This applies to the majority of the IPG site. On non-certified land, Relevant Biodiversity Measure 11 from the Order to Confer Certification states that where essential infrastructure that involves clearing of existing native vegetation on non-certified land and that do not require consent, such clearing must be offset by applying the requirements from condition 8. Within the IPG Master Plan, no clearing of existing native vegetation on non-certified land is proposed and therefore no offsets are required.</i></p>	Section 5.5.1 of Planning Report
3.9 Open Space		<p>ENV land should not be used for passive or active recreation purposes.</p>	<p>Open space uses must be clearly delineated from protected ENV in the Master Plan.</p>	<p>The ENV land will not be used for active or passive recreation purposes. This has been clearly shown in the Master Plan, Structure Plan and Land Use Plan within the Urban Design Report.</p>	Appendix D – Urban Design Report
3.11 Complying Development		<p>Complying development must meet the waterway health and stormwater management targets</p> <p>The Complying Development Justification Report (Urbis, 2024) proposes that development does not need to meet the waterway health and stormwater management targets in Sections 2.3 and 2.5.5 of the Aerotropolis DCP, in accordance with the Technical guidance for achieving Wianamatta-South Creek stormwater management targets (DPIE, 2022). This is not supported by BCS.</p>	<p>The construction and operational phase waterway health and stormwater management targets in Sections 2.3 and 2.5.5 of the Aerotropolis DCP must be met for all development (including complying) in the Master Plan area in accordance with the NSW Government Technical guidance for achieving Wianamatta-South Creek stormwater management targets (DPIE, 2022).</p>	<p>Section 12.2 of the IPG Code requires that any local stormwater works undertaken under complying development must comply with both the requirements of the DCP and the ‘Technical Guidance for Achieving Wianamatta-South Creek Stormwater Management Targets’.</p>	Appendix H –Complying Development Code 12.2

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>Proposed complying development within flood prone land is not supported by BCS</p> <p>BCS reviewed the Complying Development Code Report (Urbis, February 2024). Section 2.3.1 of the report proposes carrying out complying development within the flood extent including below the flood planning level for specific development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> water and stormwater management such as flooding and stormwater works, including on- site detention structures, swales, water sensitive urban design structures, gross pollutant traps and trunk drainage pipes <input type="checkbox"/> environmental facilities <input type="checkbox"/> public park or reserve <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental protection works <input type="checkbox"/> Local roads and road infrastructure. 			
		<p>The Complying Development Code Report incorrectly classifies them as ‘low risk development’.</p> <p>BCS does not support the Master Plan creating a complying development pathway for the nominated development within flood prone land i.e., on land within the extent of the PMF identified in the Wianamatta South Creek Catchment Flood Study – Existing Conditions, 2022.</p> <p>BCS highlights that, given the sensitivity of the Wianamatta-South Creek catchment due to flooding, as identified in the Wianamatta South Creek Catchment Flood Study – Cumulative Impact Assessment, there is significant potential for altered flood behaviour and associated impacts due to development including modification</p>	<p>The Complying Development Code is updated to require compliance with the waterway health and stormwater management targets for complying development in accordance with the NSW Government Technical guidance for achieving Wianamatta-South Creek stormwater management targets (DPIE, 2022).</p>	<p>Section 12.2 of the IPG Code requires that any local stormwater works undertaken under complying development must comply with the ‘Technical Guidance for Achieving Wianamatta-South Creek Stormwater Management Targets’.</p> <p>The IWCMP demonstrates generally no increase in flood level across the site and its surrounds, including impact in downstream flood behaviour in South Creek.</p>	<p>Appendix H –Complying Development Code (Section 12.2)</p> <p>Appendix MM – IWCMP</p> <p>Section 5.3.7 of the Integrated Water Cycle Management Plan</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		of the landform and other associated development within flood prone land.			
		<p>Given this potential for impacts due to flooding, BCS recommends the objectives and provisions contained within the Aerotropolis DCP should continue to apply. These provisions were developed to enable the NSW Government to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consider the potential impacts due to flooding in land use planning for the Aerotropolis - ensure consideration of resilience to the existing and future community - be adaptable to enable the Aerotropolis to resist, absorb, accommodate, and recover from the effects of a flood. <p>Proposed complying development on flood prone land is inconsistent with the Master Plan Guidelines</p>	<p>The Master Plan must not create a complying development pathway for the nominated development within flood prone land, i.e., on land within the extent of the PMF identified in the Wianamatta South Creek Catchment Flood Study – Existing Conditions, 2022.</p>	<p>IWCMP and Masterplan shows the development has considered flooding up to the PMF event and all targets and objectives of the Aerotropolis DCP are achieved.</p>	<p>Appendix MM – IWCMP</p> <p>Section 5 of the Integrated Water Cycle Management Plan</p>
		<p>The Western Sydney Aerotropolis Master Plan Guidelines (December 2021) identifies the primary purpose of a master plan development approval pathway, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Create a complying development pathway for nominated development in large-scale precincts, where upfront strategic assessment can suitably manage identified risks [emphasis added]. <p>State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts—Western Parkland City) (Western Parkland City SEPP) requires consistency with the Master Plan Guidelines.</p> <p>According to the Master Plan Guidelines an upfront strategic assessment must be undertaken to suitably manage the identified flood risks prior to creating any complying development within the area affected by flood risk.</p> <p>BCS highlights that from a floodplain risk management perspective, an upfront strategic assessment to address and manage flood risks requires an understanding of the interaction of the full range of flooding with the community where it can cause</p>	<p>The objectives and provisions contained within the Aerotropolis DCP should continue to apply to flood prone land.</p>	<p>Non-habitable structures are the only development considered suitable on land that is flood prone including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Water and stormwater management such as flooding and stormwater works, including on-site detention structures, swales, water sensitive urban design structures, gross pollutant traps and trunk drainage pipes. (2) Environmental facilities. (3) Public park or reserve. (4) Environmental protection works. (5) Local roads and road infrastructure. (6) Vegetation management and landscaping. <p>This approach is considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>In addition, IDC has prepared a FIRA which has been included within the Integrated Water Cycle Management Plan.</p>	<p>Appendix H –Complying Development Code Section 2.3.1</p> <p>Appendix MM – IWCMP</p> <p>FIRA located in Section 5 of the IWCMP.</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>damages, detrimental impacts and risk to life.</p> <p>A strategic assessment can only be prepared if a flood impact and risk assessment (FIRA) is undertaken with the fully established details of the development proposed by the master plan, including all development and works that are intended to be provided through complying development pathway. This has not occurred for the Master Plan because fully established details of the development within the master plan have not been made available.</p>			
		<p>Accordingly, creating a complying development pathway for development within areas identified with flood risk i.e., the flood prone land (on land within the extent of the PMF) as part of the master planning process is inconsistent with the Master Plan Guidelines.</p>	<p>The flood related provisions of the Aerotropolis DCP should remain as a key outcome of the Master Plan to ensure development demonstrates consistency with the flood planning clause 4.24 of Part 4.4 Chapter 4 of the Western Parkland City SEPP, the NSW Flood Prone Land Policy, the Flood Risk Management Manual, and current Wianamatta South Creek flood studies.</p>	<p>The flood assessment undertaken in IWCMP is compliant with the provisions and requirements of the Aerotropolis DCP.</p>	<p>Appendix MM – IWCMP Section 4 & 5 of the IWCMP</p>
3.14 Flooding		<p>Previous flood comments dated 16 January 2024 have not been addressed</p> <p>BCS has reviewed the flood assessment presented in Sections 3 and 4 of the IWCMP and associated flood maps. BCS highlights that the proponents have not addressed BCS' flood risk management comments provided to the TAP on 16 January 2024. BCS reiterates its previous comments and provides the following response which is</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> A review of the modelling to include changes to land outside the urban development footprint including within the floodways and flood storage areas is required. The post- development modelling for hydrology and hydraulics should include any proposed use of the land, including but not limited to, urban development, earthworks, drainage infrastructure, proposed detention basin network and any propose vegetation and use of land within the green/blue corridor and open space areas (as described in the Riparian Assessment Report).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Based on this revised modelling, update the flood assessment and address the Aerotropolis DCP requirements/provisions for the whole</p>	<p>An amendment to land outside of the urban development footprint, which includes paths, maintenance tracks, basins, change in vegetation and passive recreation has been included in the updated modelling and reporting of the IWCMP.</p> <p>This has included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amending the hydrologic model to increase the imperviousness of the catchments within the non-urban land use. Refer Figure 13 and Tables 15, 16 & 17). - amending the materials file within the hydraulic model which increased imperviousness within riparian corridors, flood way and flood storage areas to better reflect the basins, 	<p>Refer to Section 3.6.1, Figure 13: Proposed Land Uses & Table 15, 16 & 17 of the IWCMP report for the amended land use calculations materials/imperviousness for areas outside of the urban development footprint. Also refer to Figure 27 for materials file regions for proposed conditions.</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>generally confined to the information provided in the report and associated maps.</p> <p>Post-development condition is limited to the urban footprints</p> <p>Section 4.2.3.1 of the IWCMP indicates that the post development condition has been represented in the models by including the urban built development i.e., the four key land uses including enterprise and light industry, business and enterprise, employment zone centres and mixed use. The three proposed regional detention basins have been represented using outflow weirs.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the lands outside the urban built development which are mainly floodway and flood storage areas (refer to Figure 7.2 below) and would include paths, maintenance tracks, basins, change in vegetation and passive recreation (the green area in Figure 25 below) have not been considered by the post development modelling.</p> <p>Aerotropolis DCP provisions for various areas of the floodplain have not been adequately considered</p> <p>BCS highlights that the Master Plan area includes all three categories of the floodplain identified by the DCP i.e., the ‘1% AEP Floodway and Critical flood Storage Areas’, ‘Area Between</p>	<p>Master Plan area which includes the three categories of the floodplains identified by the DCP, as shown below:</p>	<p>footpaths, vehicle maintenance tracks/paths within the drainage corridor (Figure 27).</p> <p>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% AEP Floodway / Critical Flood Storage and Flood Planning Area; and; Outside Flood Planning Area to Probable Maximum Flood). These have been tabulated and responses provided within the IWCMP (Section 5.6, Figure 35).</p> <p>For reporting on the hydrology in Section 3, an additional paragraph and figures were added to the IWCMP report to address the shape of the flood hydrographs at critical nodes. Refer Section 3.6.2 and Figure 15 & 16 identifying key nodes 5.01 & 5.02 and the correlation of peak flows and hydrograph shapes downstream of the site for the 1% AEP event.</p> <p>Additional maps have been provided to show the extent of the hydraulic model. Refer to Appendix A of the IWCMP.</p> <p>The maps for existing and post-development conditions have included flood extent, depth, level, velocity, flood function and hazard for the full range of events, including 5% AEP, 1% AEP, PMF and 0.5% AEP or 0.2% AEP.</p> <p>A review of the hydrological model was undertaken, and parameters were adjusted to find a better correlation with the Advisian study. Refer to Section 3.5 and Tables 13, 14 & 15 for amended results which provide a much closer representation of existing flows to the Advisian study.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 4 of the IWCMP Appendix MM for the included Aerotropolis DCP flood category provisions. Discussion in Section 5.6, 5.6.1, Figure 35).</p> <p>Refer Section 3.6.2 and Figures 15 & 16 for comparison of Hydrographs at critical downstream nodes.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix A of the IWCMP for map updates.</p> <p>Refer to Section 3.5 and Tables 12, 13 & 14 for amended validation results</p>

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p>1% AEP Floodway / Critical Flood Storage and Flood Planning Area’ and ‘outside Flood Planning Area to Probable Maximum Flood’.</p> <p>Section 4.1 of the IWCMP has only addressed the development within the urban footprint and limited consideration of the Aerotropolis DCP requirements to the category titled ‘outside Flood Planning Area to Probable Maximum Flood’.</p> <p>Different parts of the floodplain have various sensitivity to changes in the catchment due to development based on the flood constraints on the land. The Aerotropolis DCP provisions consider the floodplain sensitivity variation and were determined in accordance with the NSW Flood Prone Land Policy and the principles of the Manual. Therefore, it is critical that the flood assessment addresses the provisions of the Aerotropolis DCP within the whole Master Plan area.</p> <p>The post-development modelling for hydrology and hydraulics should include any proposed use of the land, including but not limited to, urban development, earthworks, drainage infrastructure, proposed detention basin network and any proposed revegetation and use of land within the green/blue corridor and open space areas (as described in the Riparian Assessment Report).</p> <p>The meaning of development is provided by the EP&A Act in section 1.5. Comments on Reporting within the flood assessment</p>			

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
		<p><input type="checkbox"/> The reporting for the hydrology in Section 3 was limited to the results of the peak flow at the critical nodes. It is prudent to report on the shape of the flood hydrograph at critical downstream nodes including but not limited to, nodes 5.01, 5.02 and 1.13 to ensure it is generally maintained in the post development condition for events up to and including the 1% AEP flood event.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The maps must be provided for the extent of the hydraulic model, not trimmed to the site as currently presented.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The maps for existing and post development conditions should include flood extent, depth, level, velocity, flood function and hazard for the full range of events, including 5% AEP, 1% AEP, PMF and 0.5% AEP or 0.2% AEP.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Impact maps should include changes to flood extent, depth, level, velocity, flood function and hazard.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The results of the hydrological model for the existing condition peak flow at the critical nodes are generally within the acceptable discrepancies to the Advisian results. However, at node 1.13 of Wianamatta-South Creek upstream of Elizabeth Drive the discrepancy for the 1% AEP 2-hour storm duration is significant as the peak flow is 65% less than Advisian which is concerning.</p>			

RFI No.	Agency	Issue	Recommendation	Response	Reference
Comments on DCP		Section 2.3 PO1 - 6	BCS do not support the amendments to Section 2.3 PO1 to allow the location of stormwater infrastructure on non-certified land.	<p>The provision proposed relating to the potential for stormwater infrastructure on non-certified land is provided below:</p> <p><u>Alternative benchmark solution</u></p> <p>Amend Section 2.3.1 PO1 (6) to read:</p> <p>Stormwater infrastructure can be located within land identified as non-certified land within the Master Plan if it can be demonstrated no adverse impacts to biodiversity can be achieved.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Stormwater infrastructure is largely located on certified land (not certified urban-capable, as this is a term under the Cumberland Plan Conservation Plan that does not apply to the subject land). The avoided land category does not apply, and no land identified as a reserve is located within the subject land. Some stormwater infrastructure for the purposes of water sensitive urban design (WSUD) may be located within the non-certified portion of the subject land.</p> <p>Whilst the stormwater infrastructure proposed within the Master Plan has a minor encroachment into non-certified land, this encroachment relates to Basin 13 only, due to the site constraints of the eastern pandhandle. It is also confirmed that there are no trees or vegetation on the location where Basin 13 is being proposed. It is being proposed on top of the previous chicken sheds which have since been demolished.</p> <p>In addition, it should also be noted that the Precinct Plan (and therefore the Master Plan) needs to be consistent with the Growth Centres Biodiversity Certification Order, which required protection of 2000 ha of Existing Native Vegetation (ENV) in the Growth Centres. Whilst the basins are located on non-certified land, they are not located on ENV (which is known as High Biodiversity Value – ENV in the Western Parkland City SEPP).</p> <p>The basin in this location does not impact on ENV and is not located within 40m of the top of bank and is therefore not within a riparian corridor. The basin does not compromise the Growth Centres achievement of the biodiversity target.</p>	Section 10 of Planning Report
		DCP Changes	Once the proponent addresses the above issues, BCS may provide additional advice on the proposed DCP changes.	Noted	N/A

