

Attachment 4

ORD01

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|---|-----|-------------------|---|--|
| General ESL | | | | |
| Concerned over the impact the proposal will have on value of land and any ongoing impact from the exhibition of the draft controls. | 195 | | <p>The ESL maps and proposed clauses do not rezone land or change the type of development that is currently permissible on land.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses.</p> <p>The ESL maps will be reviewed, validated and updated with further ground truthing to reflect recent developments and approvals, along with any changes that may arise following the finalisation of the Blue and Green Grid Analysis and a review of Council's Biodiversity Strategy.</p> <p>For land outside the SWGA, the need to include ESL provisions into a future Planning Proposal will be considered at the completion of this work. For land within the SWGA that has not yet undergone precinct planning, detailed studies will be prepared to inform the zoning and indicative layout plans (ILPs) that will be incorporated into a future amendment to the Growth Centres SEPP.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerned about the impact the ESL controls will have over the ability to develop their land. | 107 | | <p>The ESL clauses and maps do not rezone land or change the type of development that is currently permissible on land. The clauses provide criteria for Council to consider when assessing DAs and require development to try and avoid, minimise, mitigate and offset impacts to terrestrial biodiversity, watercourses and riparian lands.</p> <p>As detailed in the Council report, it is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerned over the lack of research, detail in mapping and consistency of the proposed ESL mapping. | 182 | | The data used in preparing these maps was derived from existing publicly available data from various government sources and | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local |

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|--|-------------------|---|--|
| Concerns were also raised that surveying and analysis was not undertaken to inform the proposed ESL mapping. | | strategies. It is acknowledged however that in some areas, the maps do not accurately reflect all recent developments and approvals. As detailed in the Council report, it is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses. | clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Invite Council to undertake a site visit to the property to confirm affected land. | 65 | As detailed in the Council report, it is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses. | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerned that ESL is not applicable for land zoned under the Sydney Region Growth Centres SEPP 2006 SWGA. Suggests that the LEP Review should be pre-emptive of the Growth Area Precincts and recently gazetted rail corridor. | 101 | The Planning Proposal does not apply to land currently zoned under the Sydney Region Growth Centres SEPP. Significant objection was received from landowners within the SWGA to the inclusion of the proposed ESL clauses and maps. When land within the SWGA is rezoned in the future under the Growth Centres SEPP, the provisions within the Camden LEP will no longer apply. For land within the SWGA that has not undergone precinct planning, detailed studies will be prepared to inform the zoning and indicative layout plans (LPS) that will be incorporated into a future amendment to the Growth Centres SEPP. It can be expected that this will include controls for riparian and native vegetation, similar to those already provided where precinct planning has been undertaken. | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerns as to why the changes are required. There is also concern that the implications of the proposal were not detailed in the Planning Proposal. | 72 | The objective of the Stage 1 Planning Proposal was to align the Camden LEP 2010 with the planning priorities within the Western City District Plan and Camden Local Strategic Planning Statement. | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the |

Page 2 of 20

Attachment 4

ORD01

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|---|-------------------|---|--|
| Concerns that the proposal has not taken in a consideration of existing controls. | | <p>Specifically Planning Priority W12 and W14 of the District Plan along with Local Priority S2 and Local Priority S4 of the Camden LSPS, all encourage the protection of environmentally sensitive land and protecting biodiversity.</p> <p>Currently, when assessing DAs, the environmental impacts of the development are considered through the provisions of various legislation and policies, including the Integrated Development provisions of the EP&A Act, the provisions of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016, the controls within the Camden DCP 2019 and Council's Biodiversity Strategy.</p> <p>As detailed in the Council report, it is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses.</p> | Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerns that Development Application approvals and rezoning of land have not been considered in the preparation of the draft ESL mapping. Further, general concerns have been raised that the mapping does not take into consideration of the current environment. | 40 | <p>In relation to the ESL maps, the data used in preparing these maps was derived from existing publicly available data from various government sources and strategies. It is acknowledged however that in some areas, the maps do not accurately reflect all recent developments and approvals.</p> <p>As detailed in the Council report, it is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerns regarding how the environmentally sensitive land provisions were determined. | 19 | In relation to the ESL maps, the data used in preparing these maps was derived from existing publicly available data from various government sources and strategies. It is acknowledged however that in some areas, the maps do not accurately reflect all recent developments and approvals. | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|---|-------------------|--|--|
| | | As detailed in the Council report, it is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses. | |
| Concerns that flooding has not been identified on the property but has still been determined as environmentally sensitive land. | 22 | <p>In relation to the ESL maps, the data used in preparing these maps was derived from existing publicly available data from various government sources and strategies. It is acknowledged however that in some areas, the maps do not accurately reflect all recent developments and approvals.</p> <p>The proposed clauses provided criteria for consideration when assessing DAs and require development to try and avoid, minimise, mitigate and offset impacts to terrestrial biodiversity, watercourses and riparian lands.</p> <p>As detailed in the Council report, it is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL maps and two associated clauses.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concern that landowners affected by ESL should be compensated or Council should pay market value for land as rated residential if acquiring is necessary. | 15 | <p>The ESL maps and proposed clauses do not rezone land or change the type of development that is currently permissible on land. The proposed clauses provide criteria for consideration when assessing DAs and require development to try and avoid, minimise, mitigate and offset impacts to terrestrial biodiversity, watercourses and riparian lands.</p> <p>As detailed in the Council report, it is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concern over the application of the ESL mapping in regard to the recently | 16 | The Planning Proposal only applies to land zoned under Camden LEP 2010. It does not apply to land zoned under the State Environmental Planning Policy (Major Infrastructure Corridors) 2020. | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local |

Attachment 4

ORD01

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|--|-------------------|--|--|
| gazetted South West Rail link extension. | | The land identified as part of the South West Rail Link Extension is now zoned under State Environmental Planning Policy (Major Infrastructure Corridors) 2020, therefore the Planning Proposal no longer applies to that land. | clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerned that the application of the ESL clauses and mapping will prevent certain complying development codes from being carried out. | 19 | Clause 1.19 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2006 identifies that Complying Development may not be undertaken on land containing environmentally sensitive land. Further to this, Clause 1.19 (6) states that the clause does not prevent complying development from being carried out on part of a lot that is not land affected by ESL. As detailed in the Council report, it is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses. | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerned that certain land zoned under the Growth Centres SEPP has been excluded from the proposal. | 13 | The Planning Proposal applies to land zoned under Camden LEP 2010. It does not apply to land already zoned under the State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006 (Growth Centres SEPP). A number of precincts within the SWGA have already been zoned under the Growth Centres SEPP, such as Oran Park, Leppington, Turner Road and East Leppington. The environmental protection within these precincts is included in the provisions of the Growth Centres SEPP. | No action. |
| Specific concern was raised by some submitters around the exclusion of the large area bounded by Anthony and Alma Road that was shown white on the proposed ESL maps. Concerns were also raised over the | 3 | The Planning Proposal applies to land zoned under Camden LEP 2010. It does not apply to land already zoned under the State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006 (Growth Centres SEPP). A number of precincts within the SWGA have already been zoned under the Growth Centres SEPP, such as Oran Park, Leppington, | No action. |

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|---|-------------------|---|--|
| delay in acquisition of this land by the State Government. | | <p>Turner Road and East Leppington. The environmental protection within these precincts is included in the provisions of the Growth Centres SEPP.</p> <p>The land located along the corner of Anthony and Alma Road is already zoned Public Recreation – Regional under the Growth Centres SEPP. The acquisition of this land is determined by the State Government.</p> | |
| Concerned that previous development has not been accounted for in regard to protecting environmentally sensitive land. | 18 | <p>The LSPS has identified that clearing for agriculture and urban development has reduced the extent of tree cover across the Camden LGA. In addition to cooling of urban areas, remnant vegetation plays an important role in the biodiversity of the area, provides habitat for fauna, and contributes to local character.</p> <p>As detailed in the Council report, it is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| <p>Concerned with the accuracy of the mapping in regard to the ongoing Northern Road and Bringelly Road upgrades. Further concern has been raised regarding the flooding issues associated with the road upgrades.</p> <p>Concern is also raised that the removal of earthworks from the ongoing road upgrades at the submitter's property was at their cost and they have never been compensated for it.</p> | 13 | <p>In relation to the ESL maps, the data used in preparing these maps was derived from existing publicly available data from various government sources and strategies. It is acknowledged that in some areas (including the recently developed areas), the maps do not accurately reflect all current developments and approvals.</p> <p>As detailed in the Council report, it is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL maps and two associated clauses.</p> <p>The submissions which expressed concern regarding flooding issues and removal of earthworks in Bringelly will be forwarded to the relevant Council branch for investigation.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |

Attachment 4

ORD01

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|--|-------------------|---|--|
| Concerned that the proposal is inconsistent with the Greater Sydney Region Plan, Western City District Plan and Camden Local Strategic Planning Statement. | 5 | <p>The inclusion of the local clauses and ESL mapping is consistent with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Greater Sydney Region Plan. The proposal is consistent with objective 25 and objective 27 which aim to ensure waterways are protected and healthier and biodiversity is protected, urban bushland and remnant vegetation is enhanced; The District Plan, Planning Priority W12 – Protecting and improving the health of the District's waterways and W14 – Protecting and enhancing bushland and biodiversity; and The Camden LSPS Local Priority S2: Protecting and enhancing the health of Camden's waterways, and strengthening the role and prominence of the Nepean River and Local Priority S4: Protecting and restoring environmentally sensitive land and enhancing biodiversity. <p>It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL maps and two associated clauses.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerns that the proposed provisions duplicate existing controls and safeguards such as those in the <i>Water Management Act 2002</i> and <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> . | 25 | <p>The Camden LSPS identified that Council needs to further protect and enhance environmentally sensitive land.</p> <p>Currently, when assessing DAs, the environmental impacts of the development are considered through the provisions of various legislation and policies, including the Integrated Development provisions of the EP&A Act, the provisions of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016, the controls within the Camden DCP 2019 and Council's Biodiversity Strategy.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL maps and two associated clauses.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerns that they were not notified of the proposed provisions. The submitter asserts that although not directly affected by the provisions, the | 16 | Council sent approximately 2,800 letters to landowners affected by the proposed environmentally sensitive land provisions. | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the |

Page 7 of 20

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|--|-------------------|--|--|
| proposal provides impacts among the wider community. | | <p>A number of submissions have been received from residents who are not affected but live within the general area of the proposed ESL mapping.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses.</p> | Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerns that the proposed provisions will add additional costs and approval delays associated with Development Applications. | 17 | <p>Currently, when assessing DAs, the environmental impacts of the development are considered through the provisions of various legislation and policies, including the Integrated Development provisions of the EP&A Act, the provisions of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016, the controls within the Camden DCP 2019 and Council's Biodiversity Strategy.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerns raised that the Leppington Precinct has already been gone through detailed investigations as to the suitability of land uses across the Precinct. The proposed provisions should not be considered in regards of the Leppington Precinct. | 10 | <p>The Leppington Precinct was exhibited in 2013 and included draft zones which were informed by detailed studies for the precinct. Stage 1 of Leppington Precinct was rezoned in 2015. However, stages 2 – 5 of the Leppington Precinct were not progressed and are currently zoned under the Camden LEP 2010.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerns that the property is already restricted by flooding controls. Why are additional restrictions being implemented which will further | 3 | The Camden LSPS identifies that Council needs to further protect and enhance environmentally sensitive land. | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the |

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|--|-------------------|--|--|
| complicate the Development Application process. | | It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses. | Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerns that the proposed provisions will be reflected on a Section 10.7 planning certificate. | 4 | <p>Clause 1.19 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2006 identifies that Complying Development may not be undertaken on the part of the land containing environmentally sensitive land, land outside of the identified ESL mapping is able to undertake Complying Development.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses. As such, no changes to the Section 10.7 Planning Certificates will be made relating to ESL.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerns that the proposed ESL provisions will impact on existing and future operations which are currently permissible (such as forestry and grazing) in the rural zones. | 6 | <p>Council officer's note that there are concerns regarding the application of the ESL provisions in the context of rural land uses.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerns that the proposed ESL provisions will raise insurance premiums and impact upon clearing of hazardous land in light of the recent bushfire events. | 5 | <p>The ESL clauses maps do not rezone land or change the type of development that is currently permissible on land. The clauses provide criteria for Council to consider when assessing DAs and require development to try and avoid, minimise, mitigate and offset impacts to terrestrial biodiversity, watercourses and riparian lands.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerned that the proposed provisions will further fragment land | 5 | Significant objection was received from landowners within the SWGA to the inclusion of the proposed ESL clauses and maps. | Removal of the proposed ESL |

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|--|-------------------|--|--|
| which is already significantly fragmented. | | <p>When land within the SWGA is rezoned in the future under the Growth Centres SEPP, the provisions within the Camden LEP will no longer apply.</p> <p>For land within the SWGA that has not undergone precinct planning, detailed studies will be prepared to inform the zoning and indicative layout plans (ILPs) that will be incorporated into a future amendment to the Growth Centres SEPP. It can be expected that this will include controls for riparian and native vegetation, similar to those already provided where precinct planning has been undertaken.</p> | mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Noted that the Camden Local Planning Panel considered the Stage 1 LEP Review Planning Proposal which has regard to certainty regarding future opportunities and constraints for development. | 2 | <p>The Stage 1 LEP Review Planning Proposal was considered for advice by the Camden Local Planning Panel (The Panel) on 17 September 2019. And provided the following recommendation:</p> <p><i>“The Panel was satisfied that the Stage 1 Planning Proposal is generally in the nature of a housekeeping amendment and probably not inconsistent with the pending studies and LSPS. The Panel considered it appropriate to progress the Planning Proposal which included terrestrial biodiversity and riparian lands and watercourse mapping in the LEP in order to be consistent with the District Plan and to provide landowners certainty about constraints and opportunities for future development.”</i></p> <p>It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Community Consultation | | | |
| Concerns regarding Council's approach to community consultation during the current COVID 19 Pandemic. | 214 | The planned community engagement strategy was altered due to Covid-19 restrictions. However, the exhibition was undertaken in accordance with the EP&A Amendment (Public Exhibition) Regulation 2020 and the Gateway Determination issued by DPIE. | No action. |

Page 10 of 20

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|---|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>The Gateway Determination required Council to publicly exhibit the Planning Proposal for a minimum 28 days. The Planning Proposal was on public exhibition for 42 days. During that time, Council officers were available over the phone, via email and also in person at Council offices during the public exhibition.</p> <p>In accordance with the LEP review program determined by the DPIE, the Planning Proposal is required to be submitted to DPIE by 31 August 2020.</p> | |
| Concerns that the proposal should be in multiple languages and correspondence from Council should include access to translation services. | 23 | <p>Noted.</p> <p>A Translation and Interpreting Service is currently available for landowners to help understand Council correspondence.</p> | No action. |
| Concerns that the exhibition material should be more accessible and considerate of affected land owners that are not computer literate. | 9 | <p>In relation to the public exhibition process, the planned community engagement strategy was altered due to Covid-19 restrictions. However, the exhibition was undertaken in accordance with the EP&A Amendment (Public Exhibition) Regulation 2020 and the Gateway Determination issued by DPIE.</p> <p>The Gateway Determination required Council to publicly exhibit the Planning Proposal for a minimum 28 days. The Planning Proposal was on public exhibition for 42 days. During that time, Council officers were available over the phone, via email and also in person at Council offices during the public exhibition.</p> | No action. |
| Requests a public hearing under Section 3.34 (2) of the EP&A Act be undertaken by Council. | 76 | <p>In relation to the public exhibition process, the planned community engagement strategy was altered due to Covid-19 restrictions. However, the exhibition was undertaken in accordance with the EP&A Amendment (Public Exhibition) Regulation 2020 and the Gateway Determination issued by DPIE.</p> | No action. |

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|---|-------------------|--|--|
| Concerned that no definitions were provided in the exhibition material regarding ESL. | 14 | The definition of environmentally sensitive land was provided in a fact sheet attached to the notification letter, as follows: <i>Land may be considered environmentally sensitive for a variety of reasons, including the presence of endemic and protected ecological communities or populations, its location as a link between larger bushland and remnants, or its location adjacent to watercourses or other significant natural features.</i> | No action. |
| Concerns with the contents of the Planning Proposal notification letter. Generally, concerns were raised that the letter was not explained well enough, there was a lack of detail/mapping to understand the extent of land affected on a site-specific basis, and that the letter did not discuss the implications of the proposal. Concerned that the timing of the letter left them with minimal time to understand and form a position on the exhibition material. | 23 | The concerns are noted with the contents of the Planning Proposal notification letter. Council will consider the contents of these submissions and feedback in future planning proposal communication. To assist the community Council provided an interactive map to allow affected landowners to determine the exact extent of ESL that would be applied to the property. In accordance with the LEP program set by the DPIE, the Planning Proposal is required to be submitted to the DPIE by 31 August 2020. | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| ESL – Riparian land and Watercourse | | | |
| Concerned regarding the accuracy of the Riparian lands mapping. | 162 | The data used in preparing the ESL maps was derived from existing publicly available data from various government sources and strategies. It is acknowledged however that in some areas, the maps do not accurately reflect all recent developments and approvals. It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses. | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |

Attachment 4

ORD01

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|--|-------------------|--|--|
| Concerned regarding the identification of a Watercourse on the property. | 135 | <p>The ESL maps will be reviewed, validated and updated with further ground truthing to reflect recent developments and approvals, along with any changes that may arise following the finalisation of the Blue and Green Grid Analysis and a review of Council's Biodiversity Strategy.</p> <p>The data used in preparing the ESL maps was derived from existing publicly available data from various government sources and strategies. It is acknowledged however that in some areas, the maps do not accurately reflect all recent developments and approvals.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses.</p> <p>The ESL maps will be reviewed, validated and updated with further ground truthing to reflect recent developments and approvals, along with any changes that may arise following the finalisation of the Blue and Green Grid Analysis and a review of Council's Biodiversity Strategy.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concern that stream order guidelines as set out in the Guidelines for riparian corridors on waterfront land should have been considered in preparation of the proposed ESL provisions. | 20 | <p>The data used in preparing the ESL maps was derived from existing publicly available data from various government sources and strategies. It is acknowledged however that in some areas, the maps do not accurately reflect all recent developments and approvals.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses.</p> | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerns also raised that draft ESL mapping is inconsistent with Growth Centres SEPP Flood prone and | 2 | When land within the SWGA is rezoned in the future under the Growth Centres SEPP, the provisions within the Camden LEP will no longer apply. | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local |

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|---|-------------------|---|--|
| major creeks mapping as 1st and 2nd order streams are not shown. | | For land within the SWGA that has not undergone precinct planning, detailed studies will be prepared to inform the zoning and indicative layout plans (ILPs) that will be incorporated into a future amendment to the Growth Centres SEPP. It can be expected that this will include controls for riparian and native vegetation, similar to those already provided where precinct planning has been undertaken. | clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Concerns that the proposal is contrary to the Upper South Creek Flood Risk Management Plan. Further, general concerns are raised that a more updated study should be completed to reflect the ongoing development within the South Creek catchment area before an amendment to the LEP is considered. | 7 | In 2019, Council adopted the Upper South Creek Flood Risk Management Plan which informs floodplain management options for future development within the catchment. Council officers have commenced a review of the Upper South Creek Flood Study in the context of the ongoing development. This study will seek to confirm flood behaviour within the Upper South Creek Catchment, given the current and ongoing development. It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses. | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| ESL – Terrestrial Biodiversity | | | |
| Concern regarding the accuracy of the Terrestrial Biodiversity mapping. | 36 | In relation to the ESL maps, the data used in preparing these maps was derived from existing publicly available data from various government sources and strategies. It is acknowledged however that in some areas, the maps do not accurately reflect all recent developments and approvals. It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses. The ESL maps will be reviewed, validated and updated with further ground truthing to reflect recent developments and approvals, along | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |

Page 14 of 20

Attachment 4

ORD01

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|--|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| A greater understanding of what Biodiversity certification is and how it was applied is sought. | 14 | <p>with any changes that may arise following the finalisation of the Blue and Green Grid Analysis and a review of Council's Biodiversity Strategy.</p> <p>In 2007, the SWGA underwent a Biodiversity Certification process, which means a Biodiversity Certification Order was issued under the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995.</p> <p>Biodiversity certification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> removes the need for further threatened species assessments before developing land in 'Certified' lands; and identifies areas of native vegetation in the Growth Centres to be retained and areas where losses could be offset by protecting land inside or outside the Growth Centres with similar ecological characteristics. <p>More information regarding biodiversity certification can be found on the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment's website: https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/Plans-for-your-area/Priority-Growth-Areas-and-Precincts/South-West-Growth-Area/Historical-documents</p> | No action. |
| Rural Lands | | | |
| General support has been received in relation to the amendments to rural zone (RU1 and RU2) objectives to broaden permissible non-agricultural land uses such as eco-tourist facilities. Submitter's have noted that providing more flexibility will assist the rural economy especially in light of increased tourism which will be | 3 | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Camden LSPS identifies that Council will work to increase tourism and grow the local visitor economy. The introduction of 'eco-tourism facilities' in the RU1 zone is considered to be consistent with the priorities and intent of the Camden LSPS.</p> <p>Further to this, the Camden Rural Lands Strategy (RLS) identifies Camden's rural land as important, due to its role in providing Sydney</p> | No action. |

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|---|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| <p>facilitated from the development of the Western Sydney Airport.</p> <p>Submitter has suggested the addition of 'eco-tourist' facilities should accompany land use compatibility controls.</p> | | <p>with fresh food but also other benefits such as tourism and cultural landscape values, further noting strong growth potential.</p> <p>General support was received regarding the change in the zoning objectives for the RU1 and RU2 zones. The proposed changes seek to allow more flexibility for tourism uses (limited to eco-tourist facilities) to influence the rural economy and leverage off opportunities such as that presented by the Western Sydney Airport.</p> <p>It is further noted that there is general support for the addition of 'eco-tourist' facilities to the rural zones (RU1 and RU2). The objectives of the proposed 'eco-tourist facilities' clause is to minimise the potential for land use conflict and will support agricultural production remaining viable and sustainable. Specific controls are proposed to ensure 'eco-tourist facilities' minimise the potential for land use conflict and hence consistency with the LSPS.</p> | |
| Concerned that landholdings in Bringelly are to be considered in the context of the Camden Rural Land Strategy. | 1 | <p>The Planning Proposal does not include any provisions relating to the application of the Camden Rural Lands Strategy on specific sites.</p> <p>It is recommended that the submitter make further contact with Council officers to confirm the application of the Rural Lands Strategy.</p> | No action. |
| Suggest that Council consider permitting a broader range of tourism related uses by permitting 'tourist and visitor accommodation' in the RU1 Primary Production zone. The submitter states that this is entirely consistent with the amendment to the RU1 objective. This will enable landowners in the RU1 zone to establish tourism related uses and facilities that can attract and cater to what will be a growing visitor | 1 | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Council understands the importance of the rural economy for the LGA. Council officers will look to consider providing more flexibility for rural businesses to help support the rural economy. This will be considered as part of Stage 2 of the LEP Review.</p> | No action. |

Page 16 of 20

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|--|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| economy brought on by the delivery of the airport. | | | |
| There is general support for enabling tourism related uses to the RU1 and RU2 zones. Suggests that the scope of changes to the objective in the RU1 and RU2 zones include the RU4 zone. | 1 | <p>The general support for the changes to the RU1 and RU2 zones is noted. However, the Planning Proposal does not include any proposed changes to the RU4 zone, and the scope of the proposal is not able to be changed to include it.</p> <p>It should be noted that the RU4 zoned area of the LGA is located within the SWGA and is subject to future urban development. Future land uses within this area will be determined as part of the SWGA Precinct Planning process.</p> | No action. |
| Industrial Lands | | | |
| Concerns regarding the strengthening of the IN2 Light Industrial zone objectives to resolve existing land use conflicts. The proposal does not clearly spell out what incidents have informed this change, nor does it provide significant additional clarity to the industry going forward. The submitter proposes this matter be deferred to the Stage 2 for further explanation and inclusion in Council's Employment and Centres Strategy. | 1 | <p>Council has been investigating various options to manage land use conflict issues between industrial land uses and surrounding sensitive uses, including residential uses.</p> <p>At it's meeting of 12 September 2017 and 26 September 2017 Council resolved the following:</p> <p><i>"investigate a new LEP clause for industrial development adjacent to residential uses as part of Phase 2 of the comprehensive review of Camden LEP 2010".</i></p> <p>As part of this comprehensive LEP Review, Council officers are preparing a Centres and Employment Lands Strategy. This work will consider longer term options for Camden's employment lands which includes industrial lands. The outcomes of the Strategy will inform Stage 2 of the Camden LEP Review.</p> | No action. |
| Other issues | | | |

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|--|-------------------|---|--|
| General concerns were raised regarding the change of the natural environment as a result of development of new urban areas. This includes changes to the natural flow of water and stormwater runoff. The submitter has stated that Council should look at conducting better practices in regard to ensuring run off of urban areas does not negatively impact the overall quality of water in Camden's waterways. | 6 | Local Priority S2 of the Camden Local Strategic Planning Statement looks to protect and enhance the health of Camden's waterways. Several LSPS Actions have been identified to protect and enhance water quality. These include, developing a program for ongoing water quality monitoring and investigating opportunities to reinstate natural conditions in highly modified urban waterways. | No action. |
| Concerns that Council should investigate unauthorised works which are degrading environment. | 1 | Action 100 and 108 of the Camden LSPS includes developing a community education program to build awareness and understanding of the importance of water quality and biodiversity issues. Council officers recommend the submitter contact the relevant branch of Council to further discuss specific sites where unauthorised works have been undertaken. | No action. |
| The submitter does not support the amendment to the initial DPIE Gateway Determination. | 1 | The intent of the Planning Proposal as submitted to the DPIE was to apply to all land subject to the Camden LEP 2010. A Gateway Alteration was issued by DPIE to reflect the intention of the original proposal. It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to delete the ESL clauses and maps for terrestrial biodiversity and riparian land and watercourses. | Removal of the proposed ESL mapping and local clauses from the Planning Proposal is recommended. |
| Submitter suggests that the state significant development and rezoning proposal for their land should form part of LEP Review. | 1 | It is noted the future demand the Western Sydney Airport will bring to the Camden LGA. However, Council officers consider that any proposal to develop the submitter's land falls outside the scope of the Stage 1 LEP Review Planning Proposal. | No action. |

Page 18 of 20

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|--|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| Suggests that Council should investigate rezoning of open space to RE1 – Public Recreation to ensure certainty that existing land open space and recreation land remains as intended. | 1 | Council officers note that land across the LGA being used as open space and public recreation is not necessarily zoned as RE1 – Public Recreation. Council is currently in the process of reviewing its open space and recreation land and Council officers will consider this request as part of Stage 2 of the Camden LEP Review. | No action. |
| Concerns that the Stage 1 LEP Review Planning Proposal does not consider the need to deliver housing for the Camden LGA. Council should set out its planned timeframe for completion of the next phase of the LEP update, being the completion of its LHS. | 1 | Noted. The Local Housing Strategy is currently being prepared. The Local Housing Strategy (LHS) will be exhibited later in 2020. Outcomes of the exhibition period and the finalisation of the LHS will inform Stage 2 of the Camden LEP Review. | No action. |
| Generally supportive of embedding health outcomes in the LEP. However, such an approach will provide more clarity to industry if it is translated into specific built form outcomes through Council's Development Control Plan. | 1 | Noted. The inclusion of the health objectives is consistent with Planning Priority W4 – Fostering healthy, creative, culturally rich and socially connected communities of the District Plan, and Local Priority L3 – Providing services and facilities to foster a healthy and socially connected community of the LSPS. Whilst built form outcomes can be most effectively implemented at the design stage of development, there is an opportunity to reflect the focus on health placemaking within the broader aims of the Camden LEP. The submitters comments will be considered in a future amendment to the Camden DCP as part of the Stage 2 LEP Review process. | No action. |

Stage 1 LEP review Planning Proposal – Summary of General Submission Issues

| Matter raised in submission | No of Submissions | Officer response | Proposed Action |
|--|-------------------|---|---|
| Concerns with the recently built car park at the rear of Rossmore Public School. The submitter is concerned that the car park was constructed without notifying the adjoining residents. There is also concern that the car park has restricted and impacted the privacy of the submitter and that the car park has altered the natural flow of water in the area. | 2 | Noted. The submitter's concerns will be forwarded to the relevant Council branch for investigation. | Forward to the relevant Council branch for investigation. |
| Concerns as to why the Catherine Fields North Precinct has not been included in current planning and development of Precincts? | 3 | The Catherine Fields North Precinct is located within the South West Growth Area and is not yet released for precinct planning by the State Government. There is currently no timeframe on when the Precinct will be released. Council will continue to work with the State Government agencies to identify timeframes for the release of further SWGA Precincts. Landowners will be further informed and consulted when timeframes have been identified. | No action. |