

Table 1 – Consistency of planning proposal with Ministerial Directions

Direction	Consistency	Comment
1. Employment and Resources	N/A	
2. Environmental Heritage		
2.1 Environmental Conservation	Yes	The site does not contain any threatened/endangered species, populations or ecological community or their habitats, as detailed in the planning proposal.
3. Housing, Infrastructure & Urban Development		
3.1 Residential Zones	Yes	The consistency of the planning proposal with this direction is considered in the planning proposal.
3.3 Home Occupations	Yes	The planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of existing or future home occupation provisions.
3.4 Integrating Land Use & Transport	Yes	The consistency of the planning proposal with this direction is considered in the planning proposal.
3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes	Able to comply	If appropriate, Air Services Australia and Civil Aviation Authority should be consulted (consultation is unlikely to be required given that a height of six storeys is proposed).
4. Hazard and Risk		
4.3 Flood Prone Land	Yes	The consistency of the planning proposal with this direction is considered in the planning proposal.
5. Regional Planning		
5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy	Yes	The consistency of the planning proposal with this direction is considered in the planning proposal.
6. Local Plan Making		
6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements	Yes	The planning proposal does not include any concurrence, consultation or referral provisions nor does it identify any development as designated development.
6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes	Yes	The planning proposal will not affect any land reserved for public purposes.
6.3 Site Specific Provisions	Yes	The consistency of the planning proposal with this direction is considered in the planning proposal.
7. Metropolitan Planning		
7.1 Implementation of <i>A Plan for Growing Sydney</i>	Yes	The consistency of the planning proposal with this direction is considered in the planning proposal

Table 2 – Consistency of planning proposal with SEPPs

State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP)	Comment
SEPP No 1—Development Standards	Not relevant
SEPP No 14—Coastal Wetlands	Not relevant
SEPP No 19—Bushland in Urban Areas	Not relevant
SEPP No 21—Caravan Park	Not relevant
SEPP No 26—Littoral Rainforests	Not relevant
SEPP No 30—Intensive Agriculture	Not relevant
SEPP No 33—Hazardous and Offensive Development	Not relevant
SEPP No 36—Manufactured Home Estates	Not relevant
SEPP No 39—Spit Island Bird Habitat	Not relevant
SEPP No 44—Koala Habitat Protection	Not relevant
SEPP No 47—Moore Park Showground	Not relevant
SEPP No 50—Canal Estate Development	Not relevant
SEPP No 52—Farm Dams and Other Works in Land	Not relevant
SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land	✓ Residential development is already permitted on the site. The Preliminary Site Investigation concludes that the site is suitable for residential development.
SEPP No 62—Sustainable Aquaculture	Not relevant
SEPP No 64—Advertising and Signage	Not relevant
SEPP No 65—Design Quality of Residential Flat Development	The preferred development concept has been designed to comply with the Apartment Design Guide, as detailed in the Urban Design Report by AE Design (Appendix A).
SEPP No 70—Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)	Not relevant
SEPP No 71—Coastal Protection	Not relevant
SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009	Not relevant
SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004	Able to comply (DA consideration)
SEPP (Educational Establishments and Child Care Facilities) 2017	Not relevant
SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008	Not relevant
SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004	Not relevant
SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007	Future development of the site will be required to consider the provisions of the Infrastructure SEPP (in particular traffic generation). As part of the planning proposal, it is envisaged that consultation will be required with Transport for NSW and Roads and Maritime Services.
SEPP (Integration and Repeals) 2016	
SEPP (Kosciuszko National Park— Alpine Resorts) 2007	Not relevant
SEPP (Kurnell Peninsula) 1989	Not relevant

State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP)	Comment
SEPP (Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) 2007	Not relevant
SEPP (Miscellaneous Consent Provisions) 2007	Not relevant
SEPP (Penrith Lakes Scheme) 1989	Not relevant
SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008	Not relevant
SEPP (State and Regional Development) 2011	Future DAs for the site are likely to be deemed as 'regional development', with a regional panel acting as the consent authority.
SEPP (State Significant Precincts) 2005	Not relevant
SEPP (Sydney Drinking Water Catchment) 2011	Not relevant
SEPP (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006	Not relevant
SEPP (Three Ports) 2013	Not relevant
SEPP (Urban Renewal) 2010	Not relevant
SEPP (Vegetation in Non-Rural Areas) 2017	Not relevant
SEPP (Western Sydney Employment Area) 2009	Not relevant
SEPP (Western Sydney Parklands) 2009	Not relevant
Relevant deemed SEPPs	
SREP No.9 – Extractive Industry (No 2 – 1995)	Not relevant
SREP No.18 – Public Transport Corridor	Not relevant
SREP No.19 – Rouse Hill Development Area	Not relevant
SREP No. 20 – Hawkesbury – Nepean River (No 2 – 1997)	A range of urban land uses are already permitted on the site. Appropriate controls are in place to ensure that future development does not adversely impact the riverine environment (as DA considerations). Accordingly, it is considered that the planning proposal achieves satisfactory compliance with the provisions of SREP No. 20.