LEP Review Exhibition Submission Summary & Evaluation

Note: A copy of each submission has been provided to Council in a confidential book.

Table 1 - Public Authority Submissions

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----------|---------------------|------------------------------|---|---|--|
| NSW RFS | 102822.2020- 002 | Phase 1 Planning Proposal | No objection to the proposal. Future stages of the LEP Review and any future development applications shall be required to address the NSW RFS document Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2019. | Noted | No change. |
| TransGrid | 191167.2020 | Request for rezoning | Request to rezone a site at Illaroo Road and Yarrawa Street, Prestons (Lot 22 DP 2359 and Lot 3 DP 1045029) TransGrid requests that the portion of the site currently zoned IN3 Heavy Industrial be rezoned to SP2 Infrastructure. | Agree. This is considered a minor amendment. | Amend the Phase 1 Planning Proposal to include the rezoning to SP2 Infrastructure. |
| WaterNSW | 193117.2020 | Upper Canal zoning controls | WaterNSW supports the 'SP2 (Water Supply System)' zoning of the Upper Canal where the LEP provisions apply. | Noted. The Upper Canal does not fall under the Liverpool LEP 2008. Its zoned under the Growth Centres SEPP and the Western Sydney | No change. |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|--------|------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | Parklands SEPP. No changes to the zoning of the Upper Canal System under the Growth Centres SEPP are proposed. | |
| | | Aim of Plans | Add an Aim of Plan to support the sustainability and water-related provisions of the LSPS, by promoting 'energy conservation, water cycle management (incorporating water conservation, water reuse, catchment management, stormwater pollution control and flood risk management) and water sensitive urban design'. | This would be better supported through objectives and controls within a DCP and not within the aims of the LEP. | No change. Investigate as part of DCP Review. |
| | | Schedule 5: Environmental Heritage | Upper Canal: Request to rename heritage item from: 'Sydney Water Supply Upper Canal' to 'Upper Nepean Scheme – Upper Canal'. Amend Lot and DP info to accurately identify the Item. | Heritage Officer advice: This Item should not be located under the LLEP 2008. It is currently listed in SEPP (Sydney Region Growth Centres) and SEPP (Western Sydney Parklands). Recommend removal from LEP and follow up with DPIE to correctly identify Item under State legislation. | Amend the Phase 1 Planning Proposal to remove item from LLEP 2008. Follow up anomaly with DPIE to correct State Government legislation. |
| | | | Brown Memorial & Water Trough: The memorial was moved | Heritage Officer advice: The proposed | No change. |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|--------|------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | to the new stated address, however WaterNSW believe that the water trough was left in place. | amendment is correct as the trough was relocated with the memorial to WV Scott Memorial Park. | |
| | | | Row of Bunya Pines: Note the lots listed are incorrect, and listing is not required as the trees lie within the curtilage of the Upper Canal listing on the State heritage register. | Heritage Officer advice: This Item should not be located under the LLEP 2008. It is currently listed in SEPP (Sydney Region Growth Centres). Recommend removal from LEP and follow up with DPIE to correctly identify Item under State legislation. | Remove item from LLEP 2008 as part of Phase 1 Planning Proposal. Follow up anomaly with DPIE to correct State Government legislation. |
| | | Stormwater Management | Recommends adding a stormwater management clause to the LEP to support LSPS Planning Priority 15 'A green, sustainable, resilient and water-sensitive city'. | Noted, however out of scope for the Phase 1 LEP Review. This recommendation will be considered as part of the Phase 2 LEP review. | No change. To be considered as part of the Phase 2 LEP review. |
| | | Phase 1 Planning Proposal | Request that the Planning Proposal shows the relationship with the proposed Aerotropolis SEPP, and where this SEPP applies. | The Aerotropolis SEPP is currently being drafted by the Western Sydney Planning Partnership (WSPP). The WSPP released draft plans in December 2019 showing how it applies to the | No change. |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|--------|------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | LGA. It is not applicable to this planning proposal. | |
| | | Phase 1 Planning Proposal | Numbering error between Table 5: Summary of Proposed Amendments and Appendix A: Proposed LEP Amendments | Noted. | Correct numbering error. |
| | | Phase 1 Planning Proposal | Request that planning proposal notes when LSPS Action 14.2 will occur: 'Review LEP and DCP to ensure protection of biodiversity and waterway quality, and implement the Green Grid'. | LSPS contains timeframes for implementation. This action is a short – medium term action (2019 - 2025) | No change. |
| | | Phase 1 Planning Proposal | WaterNSW would like to be consulted regarding any changes to the Upper Canal corridor. | Noted. Council will continue to engage with WaterNSW as necessary. | No change. |
| | | Draft Local Housing Strategy | The coverage of sustainability in the Executive Summary could be expanded to include the 'environment' and issues such as environmental values and constraints, green and blue grid, green infrastructure and open space. | The Executive Summary discussion of Sustainability refers to key actions from the Strategy and thus could not be updated without a restructure of the Strategy. Environmental issues mentioned in this comment are referred to in the Vision and Part 1.3.6. | No change. |
| | | | The Strategy may benefit by referring to the Premier's Priorities for Greener Public Spaces and Greening Our City along with those summarised in Table 2 (p.5). | Agree. Table to be updated to refer to specific Premier's Priorities. | Update Table 2 in line with suggestion. |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|--------|------------|-------|--|---|---|
| | | | Supports the Draft Strategy's | Noted. | No change. |
| | | | consideration and emphasis on incorporating WSUD. | | |
| | | | To align with other Statements in the Strategy and Action 15.3 of the LSPS, Action 20 should be extended to review the LEP as well as the DCP in responding to urban heat, sustainable waste and WSUD. | Perhaps referring to Action 21. Controls considered more appropriate for DCP than LEP. | No change. |
| | | | The Strategy could elaborate on key principles of WSUD such as fostering water re-use including retention in the landscape, thereby improving water conservation, water quality, and reducing the impacts of stormwater on downstream properties and environments. | Details on specific WSUD principles is not considered necessary for the Strategy. | No change. |
| | | | The rationale for Action 20 could be expanded to better outline the problems that Action 20 is addressing (i.e. it is needed to reduce urban impacts on water quantity and quality, reduce pollution risks, and better respond to the urban heat island effect). | Considered to be referring to Action 21. There is detail in section 1.3.6 however, Part 3.4 could be updated to outline some of the issues faced in relation to urban heat and water quality. | Update Section 3.4 to provide more information on rationale for improving environmental outcomes. |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|--------|------------|--|---|--|---|
| | | Draft Industrial & Employment Lands Strategy | Currently, the Strategy gives little attention to stormwater management and opportunities for incorporating WSUD principles into new industrial and employment land development. That said, based on current zoning and the map on page 7, it appears that industrial-related development is focused away from the open waters of the Upper Canal. | Currently no industrial zoned land has proximity to the Upper Canal. Furthermore, no areas are anticipated to transition to an employment use within proximity to the Upper Canal. | No change. |
| | | | The Map on page 7 of the Strategy depicts various industry urban and urban services areas. Greater clarity is required regarding whether this map is depicting the current industry and business areas and where pressures and opportunities are arising, or whether this is the long-term vision for the Strategy. | The map identifies existing industrial zoned lands only. However, it does provide a vision for this existing land in terms of the strategic vision for each precinct. | Insert a title for the map to improve clarity: "Strategic Vision for Liverpool's Employment Lands" |
| | | | The Strategy includes Guiding Criteria for Planning Proposals (page 33). This includes that Proposals must be designed to avoid land use conflict. The rationale here discusses industrial, commercial, retail, recreational and residential uses. WaterNSW asks that consideration be given to expanding the rationale to include reference to special uses such as critical infrastructure. This would help reduce any potential land-use | The rationale for guiding Principle 3 can be amended to include critical infrastructure. | Alter the rationale of Principle 3 as follows: "This applies to industrial, commercial, retail, recreational, critical infrastructure, and residential uses. Measures must be employed to avoid detrimentally impacting these existing uses by creating amenity impacts. Similarly, development with |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|--------|------------|-------|---|---|---|
| | | | conflict with the Upper Canal should industrial and business development be proposed near the Canal. | | proximity to existing employment areas must not create land use conflicts to the detriment of existing lawfully established uses." |
| | | | The implementation of Action 1 is associated with Phase 2 of the LEP and DCP Review. WaterNSW is supportive of this action, noting that the review involves both objectives and standards. In undertaking this review, WaterNSW asks that particular consideration be given to stormwater management, the potential incorporation of WSUD principles, and adopting the principle that post-development off-site flows should equate with pre-development flows. | Noted. | To be considered as part of the DCP Review & Phase 2 of the LEP Review. |
| | | | WaterNSW notes and is supportive of Action 6 'Prioritise public domain improvements and vegetation within industrial precincts'. However, to ensure that stormwater management is addressed, we request that the Implementation section be expanded to state: 'Update DCP controls to deliver improved public domain, landscaping and stormwater | The need to address stormwater management in Action 6 is noted. | Update the implementation section of Action 6 as follows: "Update DCP controls to deliver improved public domain, and landscaping and stormwater management outcomes." |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|--|-------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | management outcomes' (or 'water management outcomes'). | | |
| | | | In the DCP review consideration could be given to incorporating WSUD principles including water re-use and water retention | Noted. | Consider incorporating WSUD principles as part of the DCP Review. |
| DPIE – Environment, Energy and Science Group (EES) | 192843.2020 | LEP Review – Environmentally Significant Land | EES would like to assist Council in identifying areas of high conservation value as part of Council's review of Environmentally Significant Land (LSPS Action 14.2) | Noted. | No change. To be considered as part of Phase 2 of the LEP Review. |
| | | LEP Review – E2 land | EES preference is that remnant vegetation, bushland and riparian land in the LGA be zoned E2 - Environmental Conservation to ensure it is protected, managed and maintained. | Noted. This is not within scope of this planning proposal. | No change. To be considered as part of Phase 2 LEP Review. |
| | | LEP Review – Aims | The planning proposal is amending Aim (h), and EES recommended further amendments to read: (h) to protect, <i>enhance, connect</i> and enhance <i>and maintain</i> the natural environment in Liverpool and promote ecologically sustainable development. | Agree with submission. | Change Aim (h) to read: (h) to protect, connect, maintain and enhance the natural environment in Liverpool and promote ecologically sustainable development. |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|--------|------------|-------|---|---|---|
| | | | EES recommends amendments to the Aims of the Plan to promote building design elements which reduce the urban heat island effect (green roofs/walls, cool roofs). | Not supported. This recommendation is not appropriate for the Aims of the Plan, however these ideas are suited to controls within a Development Control Plan. | No change. Consider the recommended controls to address urban heat island effect as part of the DCP Review. |
| | | | The planning proposal is adding an aim to improve public access along waterways. EES recommends additional wording to ensure public access to waterways and green corridors doesn't impact environmental values. (k) to improve public access along waterways and green corridors while protecting and ensuring the natural environmental values of riparian and bushland corridors and the habitat they provide are protected and enhanced. | Supported. | Amend the Planning Proposal with the following revised wording for this Aim: (k) to improve public access along waterways and green corridors while protecting and ensuring the natural environmental values of riparian and bushland corridors and the habitat they provide are protected and enhanced. |
| | | | The LSPS states Council will work to increase green space, canopy cover and connectivity as part of implementing the State Government's Green Grid. EES recommends a specific Aim is included in the LEP as follows: (p) to increase green space, | To be considered as part of Phase 2 of the LEP Review and DCP Review. | No change. Consider as part of Phase 2 of the LEP Review and DCP Review. |
| | | | canopy cover, and vegetated connectivity across the LGA. | | |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|--------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | EES recommends the Aims of the Plan are amended to: Protect and improve biodiversity/remnant native vegetation in the LGA Protect and conserve waterways, riparian land and groundwater dependent ecosystems Maintain and improve water quality Facilitate adaptation to climate change. | In addition to Aim amendments above, add consideration of regard to environmental constraints. | Amend the Phase 1 Planning Proposal (aims of the Plan) as follows: (h) promote ecologically sustainable development, which considers environmental constraints. |
| | | Phase 1 Planning Proposal | The planning proposal seeks to include a Standard Instrument LEP clause which ensures land use conflict is considered when subdividing land and/or building dwellings. EES seeks clarification on why this clause is proposed to apply to E2 – Environmental Conservation zoned land. | This is a standardised clause under the Standard Instrument LEP, which may be adopted by NSW Councils. The wording of the clause (including its applicability to E2 land) can't be changed by Council. The clause seeks to minimise potential conflict between land uses, and does not promote development of E2 land. | No change. |
| | | Phase 1 Planning Proposal – Sydney Water sites | Sydney Water Rezoning Site A: Lot 6 DP 17316 155 Epsom Rd Chipping Norton The planning proposal intends to rezone the site from R3 Medium | The vegetation to the west primarily falls within the W1 Natural Waterways zone. The vegetation is also within | No change. |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|--------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | Density Residential to SP2 Infrastructure. Aerial photography shows the western end of Site A located within the Georges River riparian corridor. Ideally riparian land along the Georges River should be zoned E2 Environmental Conservation, however it is recommended the existing vegetation remains as R3 Medium Density Residential. | the Foreshore Building Line. It is unlikely that the proposed SP2 Infrastructure zone will have an impact on vegetation. Development under the Infrastructure SEPP does not allow for exempt or complying development where it involves removal and pruning of trees/vegetation in areas where consent is required (ie Foreshore Building Line). | |
| | | Phase 1 Planning Proposal – Sydney Water sites | Sydney Water Rezoning Site D: Lot 201 DP 1117280 Newbridge Road Moorebank Planning proposal intends to rezone Site D to SP2 Infrastructure. The site is currently zoned E2 Environmental Conservation and R3 Medium Density Residential. EES does not agree the rezoning from E2 is of minor significance as the SP2 zone would provide for infrastructure and not protect the existing vegetation. | Given the timeframes of the planning proposal, it is recommended that this site be removed from the planning proposal and incorporated into Phase 2 of the LEP Review. This will allow time to liaise with Sydney Water and also investigate the rezoning of Council land directly above the site to E2 Environmental Conservation. | Remove this site from planning proposal and investigate as part of the Phase 2 LEP Review. |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|--------|------------|--|---|---|--------------------|
| | | | Additionally, recommend that a strip of land directly north (Council owned) be rezoned from R3 Medium Density Residential to E2 Environmental Conservation. | | |
| | | Phase 1 Planning Proposal – Sydney Water sites | Sydney Water Rezoning Site L: Lot 10 DP 1171820 Kurrajong Road Prestons Planning proposal intends to rezone Site L to SP2 Infrastructure. The site is currently zoned IN1 General Industrial. EES noted concerns with rezoning of this site, however no additional information was provided. | Development under the Infrastructure SEPP does not allow for exempt or complying development where it involves removal and pruning of trees/vegetation in areas where consent is required. Development for Water Supply Systems under the ISEPP also lists IN1 General Industrial as a prescribed zone, so the ISEPP is already applicable to this site. | No change. |
| | | Phase 1 Planning Proposal | Rezoning of Dalmeny Reserve The planning proposal intends to rezone the Council owned reserve from R2 Low Density Residential to RE1 Public Recreation. EES supports rezoning, however recommends the use of E2 Environmental Conservation, as there is a patch of bushland on | The site is in Council's ownership, and RE1 Public Recreation already covers a portion of the site. Note that EES supports the rezoning to RE1 Public Recreation, which is the intent of the land. | No change. |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|----------------------------|-------------|---|--|---|--------------------|
| | | | Dalmeny Reserve and the adjoining site is mapped as the critically endangered ecological community Shale Plains Woodland, and there are a number of threatened fauna records from the site. | | |
| | | Phase 1 Planning Proposal – Flooding | EES recommends Council considers flood management through its LEP and DCP to ensure new development is located in consideration of the: • flood function and hazard of the land • flood planning constraints categories of the land including emergency response limitations potential impact of new development on existing flood behaviour and community flood emergency response to the detriment of the existing community. | The initial planning proposal sent to Gateway included the addition of "Residential accommodation" to the list of land uses requiring consideration of flood evacuation under Clause 7.8A Floodplain risk management. This amendment was removed as a condition of the Gateway determination. | No change. |
| Transport for NSW / RMS | 194350.2020 | Property and Transport Reservations | All existing TfNSW corridors and reservations need to be maintained and appropriately reflected in the Land Zoning and Land Reservation Acquisition maps as SP2 Infrastructure. No new reservations or SP2 zones relating to TfNSW are to be added without prior written approval. | Noted. | No change |

| Agency | Record No. Theme | | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action | |
|--------|------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | Underutilised and Surplus TfNSW Land | As part of any future master planning and LEP amendment, TfNSW would like to work in collaboration with Council to identify potential uses for underutilised and surplus land to assist Council in achieving the Housing and Employment Strategies. | Noted. | No change | |
| | | Public and Active Transport and Travel Demand Management | Council to consider expanding the existing objective for the R4 zone to be replaced with the following wording: 'to permit increased residential density in accessible locations so as to maximise public transport patronage and to encourage walking and cycling'. | Consider objective as part of Phase 2 of the LEP Review. | No change. To be considered as part of Phase 2 of the LEP Review. | |
| | | Draft Local Housing Strategy – Transport Studies | Comprehensive transport studies for the precincts targeted for significant population uplift would be required in order to investigate the multi-modal impacts of the additional person trips and vehicle trips on transport networks resulting from the planned growth. An infrastructure schedule and implementation plan that identifies | Council is currently engaged in transport modelling for the entire Liverpool Collaboration Area, which will inform necessary infrastructure needed to support increased populations. For other areas it is understood that transport studies would need to be | No change | |
| | | | transport interventions, costings, timing, land components and proposed funding mechanism(s) should be developed in consultation with TfNSW. | conducted. | | |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|--------|------------|---|---|-----------------|--------------------|
| | | Draft Local Housing Strategy – Potential Investigation Areas | TfNSW supports Council's proposed approach of completing studies and strategies for these opportunity areas prior to rezoning. TfNSW would appreciate the opportunity to continue to work collaboratively with Council on this master planning process and associated transport studies to deliver place based outcomes and identification of practicable transport infrastructure. | Noted | No change |
| | | Draft Local Housing Strategy – Liverpool Collaboration Area | TfNSW will continue to work collaboratively with Council in the master planning for the Liverpool Collaboration Area via the existing Steering Group to deliver the land use and transport infrastructure schedule including high level costings and agreed funding mechanisms. | Noted | No change. |
| | | Draft Local Housing Strategy - Airport, Aerotropolis and South-West Growth Area | TfNSW will continue to work collaboratively with Council and Western Sydney Planning Partnership on the planned precincts within Liverpool LGA, such as Badgery's Creek Airport, Aerotropolis and any future reviews of the South-West Growth Area to identify the transport task and deliver place-based outcomes to enable and support transit- | Noted | No change. |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|--------|------------|---|--|--|--------------------|
| | | | oriented developments that can leverage off State Government's investment in transport infrastructure. | | |
| | | Draft Local Housing Strategy – Public and Active Transport and Travel Demand Management | Council may wish to give consideration to investigating a range of travel demand management measures, including appropriate maximum parking rates for new developments in accessible locations, as part of any future master plan and future LEP amendments, particularly for precincts that can leverage from public transport infrastructure investment. | Parking rates in accessible locations are set out in the Guide to Traffic Generating Developments. Any changes to current Council parking policy would require significant upgrades and commitments to public transport provision before maximum parking rates could be entertained. | No change. |
| | | Draft Liverpool Industrial and Employment Strategy | Multi Modal Travel TfNSW would like to work collaboratively with Council and developers to identify practicable measures for employees of new employment areas to have multi modal travel choices. | Noted | No change |
| | | | Road Freight Council should consider how to protect freight corridors and industrial land from encroachment by sensitive land uses and managing the interfaces of industrial areas, trade gateways and intermodal facilities (such as | Noted, Consider as part of Phase 2 of the LEP Review. | No change |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|---|--------------|-------|--|---|--------------------|
| | | | Moorebank intermodal) in this and/or future LEP updates. The aims of the LEP should include protecting people from unreasonable noise impacts and protecting major freight corridors and facilities from urban encroachment. The LEP should also balance the need to minimise negative impacts of freight movements on urban amenity with the need to support efficient freight movements and deliveries (e.g. 24/7 operations). | Noted. Consider as part of Phase 2 of the LEP | No change. |
| | | | Freight rail forms an essential and invaluable component of NSW's freight and logistics network. The Southern Sydney Freight Line and Main South rail line are important rail freight corridors in the Liverpool LGA. Council's land use plans and development controls will need to support freight rail | Review and DCP review (including controls for noise and vibration). | |
| Sydney Water | Not received | | | | |
| Heritage, Department of Premier and Cabinet | Not received | | | | |

| Agency | Record No. | Theme | Submission Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Greater Sydney Commission | No received | | | | |

Table 2 – Community and Stakeholder Submissions

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|-------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| 1 | 187488.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | The submitter's street is not proposed to be downzoned. Requests that all R4 land in Moorebank be rezoned to R3. | A portion of the R4 zone is proposed to remain for a range of reasons including its location to the Moorebank shopping centre and where residential flat buildings have already been built or approved. | No change |
| 2 | 185130.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | There should be no rezoning for any high-density housing. | The Planning Proposal seeks to downzone land from R4 High Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential. It is not proposed to rezone any land to R4. A portion of the R4 zone is proposed to remain. | No change. |
| 3 | 183324.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Objects to the proposed downzoning. Concern about the impact on property values. | Concerns are noted, however, properties south of the Moorebank Town Centre along Nuwarra Road have interface issues with surrounding dwellings. | No change |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|-------------------------|---|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | Compensation should be provided if the proposal proceeds. The proposal is against the Section 9.1 Directions. | The Liverpool Housing Study and SGS Moorebank Rezoning Advice commissioned by Council supports the proposed amendments. The Housing Study & SGS Moorebank Advice provides the necessary justification for the inconsistency with the Section 9.1 Direction. | |
| 4 | 182589.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Objects to the proposed downzoning. Concern about the impact on property values. Compensation should be provided if the proposal proceeds. The proposal is against the Section 9.1 Directions. | Concerns are noted, however, properties south of the Moorebank Town Centre along Nuwarra Road have interface issues with surrounding dwellings. The Liverpool Housing Study and SGS Moorebank Rezoning Advice commissioned by Council supports the proposed amendments. The Housing Study & SGS Moorebank Advice provides the necessary justification for the inconsistency with the Section 9.1 Direction. | No change |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|-------------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| 5 | 181496.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Asks if Council will reverse the R4 zoning in Moorebank. Concerned about the lack of community consultation when land was upzoned in 2008. | The Planning Proposal seeks to downzone land from R4 High Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential. It is not proposed to rezone any land to R4. A portion of the R4 zone around the Moorebank Town Centre is proposed to remain. | No change |
| 6 | 181470.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | The introduction of high density and medium density living to Moorebank has had a significant impact on the infrastructure of the area. It has also had impacts on amenity, the environment and surrounding property values. | Noted. The Planning Proposal seeks to downzone land from R4 High Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential. It is not proposed to rezone any land to R4. | No change |
| 7 | 179402.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Supports the proposal. | Noted. | No change |
| 8 | 176194.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Supports the proposal. | Noted. | No change |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|--------------------|------|---------|-------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| 9 | <u>173822.2020</u> | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Concerned about what has happened to Moorebank since the land was rezoned to R4. | Noted. This proposal seeks to downzone land from R4 High Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential. It is not proposed to rezone any land to R4. | No change |
| 10. | <u>173769.2020</u> | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Against high rise apartments in Moorebank. Concerns about lack of supporting infrastructure. | Notes the concerns about the lack of supporting infrastructure. This proposal seeks to downzone land from R4 High Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential. It is not proposed to rezone any land to R4. | No change |
| 11 | 173527.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Concern about traffic and parking in the area. Council should consider rezoning the greater Moorebank area to R2 Low Density. | Notes the concerns about traffic and parking. Rezoning Moorebank from R4 High Density Residential to R2 Low Density Residential is not appropriate as the majority of the land | No change |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|-------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | | around the town centre is R3 Medium Density Residential. | |
| 12 | 173189.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Supports the proposal. | Noted. | No change. |
| 13 | 172397.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Concern about the impact on future property prices and restrictions. | The property is located in the Georges Fair estate containing newly constructed detached dwellings. The rezoning of this area from R4 to R3 better reflects the existing character of this area. It should be noted that given the above, development for residential flat buildings is unlikely. | No change. |
| 14 | 172050.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | The submitter's property is currently zoned R3. It is a corner block adjacent to recently built RFBs. Concern about existing land use conflict and amenity issues. Concern that the adjacent RFB developments have devalued surrounding R3 zoned properties. | The Planning Proposal seeks to ensure that (where possible) there is an appropriate transition between high and medium density housing. It is noted that there has been limited uptake of medium density housing in much of the R3-zoned land in the Liverpool LGA. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|-------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Requests that Council consider rezoning land to R4 to address land use conflict issues. | The draft Local Housing includes a short-term action to review controls for the R3 zone to improve feasibility, having consideration to appropriate built form outcomes. | |
| 15 | 171995.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Concerned about high density housing in Moorebank. | This Proposal seeks to downzone land from R4 High Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Resident. It is not proposed to rezone any land to R4. | No change. |
| 16 | 189755.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Objects to the proposal. Concern that the proposal is not based on planning outcomes. Concern the proposal will set a precedent and remove certainty. Concern about impact to property values and would like a compensation scheme set up. Concern that the proposed development standards for the R3 | The exhibited Planning Proposal supports a proposed change in zoning from R4 to R3 on the basis that the R3 zone is more aligned with the local character and will likely generate additional housing capacity around the town centre due to its feasibility. However, there is some merit to retaining the current R4 zone around Harvey Avenue and Dredge Avenue as the zoning and | It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to retain the R4 land and development standards around Harvey Avenue, Dredge Avenue and Astor Street. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|-------------------------|---|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | zone will not be feasible as detailed in the SGS report. Concern there will be no transition between R4 (18m height) and R3 (8.5m height). Concerns about loss of privacy and amenity. | development standards do provide for a transition from high density to medium density housing. There is also less interface issues as the block is surrounded by a road. | |
| 17 | 171700.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | There should be no increase for apartment buildings, there is already too many high density housing. | The Planning Proposal seeks to downzone land from R4 High Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential. It is not proposed to rezone any land to R4. | No change. |
| 18 | 171572.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Concern about impact on property values. Concern that the Planning Proposal does not have Strategic merit and has not considered the environmental, social, economic and other site-specific considerations. The area has all the transport, shopping centre, infrastructure, industries and schools to | Concerns are noted, however, this property and other properties south of the Moorebank Town Centre along Nuwarra Road have interface issues. The Liverpool Housing Study and SGS Moorebank Rezoning Advice commissioned by Council supports the proposed amendments. Please refer to Part 2 and Part 3 of the | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|-------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | support the current zoning. | Planning Proposal regarding strategic merit. The proposal has received a gateway determination from DPIE. | |
| 19 | 190056.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | The current R4 zoning has had a significant impact on the infrastructure of the Moorebank area. | The Planning Proposal seeks to downzone land from R4 High Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential. It is not proposed to rezone any land to R4. | No change |
| 20 | 190915.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Supports the rezoning. Concern that R4 will take away for the village character. Concerns about traffic, safety and lack of infrastructure. | Noted. | No change. |
| 21 | 190880.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Council should reverse the current R4 zone. | Noted. The Planning Proposal seeks to downzone land from R4 High Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential. It is not proposed to rezone any land to R4. | No change |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|-------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| 22 | 190867.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Objects to the downzoning. There is a lack of strategic or planning merit. Concerns about financial impacts. Council should leave the land R4 or increase the HOB and FSR of the proposed R3 zoned land to controls more applicable to medium density residential. | Concerns are noted, however, this property and other properties south of the Moorebank Town Centre along Nuwarra Road have interface issues. The Liverpool Housing Study and SGS Moorebank Rezoning Advice commissioned by Council supports the proposed amendments. Please refer to Part 2 and Part 3 of the Planning Proposal regarding strategic merit. The proposal has received a gateway determination from DPIE. | No change. |
| 23 | 190056.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Concern about the existing R4 zone and the impact on local infrastructure. | The Planning Proposal seeks to downzone land from R4 High Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential. It is not proposed to rezone any land to R4. | No change |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| 24 | 192159.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Objects to the proposed rezoning. Concern about impact on property values. If Council further reduces the development standards, land values will drop further as developers of town houses become less interested. | The exhibited Planning Proposal supports a proposed change in zoning from R4 to R3 on the basis that the R3 zone is more aligned with the local character and will likely generate additional housing capacity around the town centre due to its feasibility. However, there is some merit to retaining the current R4 zone around Harvey Avenue and Dredge Avenue as the zoning and development standards do provide for a transition from high density to medium density housing. There is also less interface issues as the block is surrounded by a road. | It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to retain the R4 land around Harvey Avenue, Dredge Avenue. And Astor Street. |
| 25 | 192277.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Objects to the proposed rezoning. Concern about impact on property values and lack of compensation scheme. | The exhibited Planning Proposal supports a proposed change in zoning from R4 to R3 on the basis that the R3 zone is more aligned with the local character and will likely generate additional housing | It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to retain the R4 land around Harvey Avenue, Dredge Avenue. And Astor Street. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | Concern about single storey homes opposite 6 storey apartments. | capacity around the town centre due to its feasibility. | |
| | | | | | Questions why downzoning is only occurring in Moorebank and not the rest of Liverpool. | However, there is some merit to retaining the current R4 zone around Harvey Avenue and Dredge Avenue as the zoning and development standards do provide for a transition from high density to medium density housing. There is also less interface issues as the block is surrounded by a road. It should be noted that a review of R4 zoned land around local centres to address interface issues has been identified in Council's Local Strategic Planning Statement (Action 8.2) | |
| 26 | 192314.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Objects to the proposed rezoning. Concerns about financial hardship. Residents have come to terms with R4 and have planned accordingly. | The exhibited Planning Proposal supports a proposed change in zoning from R4 to R3 on the basis that the R3 zone is more aligned with the local character and will likely generate additional housing | It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to retain the R4 land around Harvey Avenue, Dredge Avenue. And Astor Street. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|---|--|-------------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| | | | | | Numerous sites have already been sold with the intention to develop them. | capacity around the town centre due to its feasibility. However, there is some merit to retaining the current R4 zone around Harvey Avenue and Dredge Avenue as the zoning and development standards do provide for a transition from high density to medium density housing. There is also less interface issues as the block is surrounded by a road. | |
| 27 | 193122.2020 | Melanie Gibbons MP (Member for Holsworthy) | 60 Walder Road, Hammondville NSW 2170 | Moorebank Downzoning | Proposes that the zoning changes need to go further, rezoning more R4 zones to R3, as well as investigating rezoning land to R2. | A portion of the R4 zone is proposed to remain for a range of reasons including its location to the Moorebank shopping centre and areas where residential flat buildings have already been built or approved. The majority of the land around the town centre is zoned R3. It is not proposed to rezone this land to R2. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Not all residents in the Moorebank area have been notified of the proposed changes. Suggests another opportunity be provided for locals to have their say. | Letters were sent to all landowners currently zoned R4 in Moorebank. An email was sent to participants of the 2019 Moorebank survey to notify them of the public exhibition. A notice was placed in the local newspaper, on Council's website and on Council's Facebook page. Over the last two years, there has been significant consultation on this matter including through the LSPS. Council is aware of the diverse community views on this matter. | Further consultation is not recommended. |
| | | | | Draft Centres and Corridors Strategy | The Draft Liverpool Centres and Corridors Strategy identifies the Moorebank Shopping Village as a Town Centre. One of the criteria for Town Centres includes "Good public transport and pedestrian accessibility". | Moorebank is identified as a Town Centre in the existing retail hierarchy for the Liverpool LGA. The Liverpool Centres and Corridors Study (SGS Economics and Planning, 2020) notes that Moorebank is the town centre with the | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|--------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | This is contradictory to the LEP Planning Proposal when discussing the Moorebank Town Centre's connection to public transport. Council should investigate this discrepancy further, as clarity around the provision of infrastructure and services is essential to managing future zoning. | fewest retail anchors and the worst colocation with social infrastructure, but its status as the only town centre in the Eastern District means that its position in the hierarchy should be retained (p.71). | |
| | | | | Crossroads Submission | Supports the Crossroads submission for greater flexibility in the B5 zone, allowing a greater range of businesses to operate from the centre. | Support Noted. | N/A |
| 28 | 193881.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | There is an existing development application for the site at 113-115 Nuwarra Road, Moorebank which seeks the demolition of existing structures, removal of trees and the construction of a residential flat building with basement car parking and associated landscaping. | Council is required to include a savings and transitional clause in its Local Environmental Plan to ensure that proposed amendments do not affect any current development applications under assessment by Council or appeal processes. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | Being a corner site, in a gateway location, it is appropriate for the subject site to have the benefits of the R4 zoning, particularly with regard to the floorspace ratio and height attributable to such zoning. Leaving the zoning of | | |
| | | | | | the subject site will not affect the strategic planning sought by the planning proposal. | | |
| | | | | | The subject site can be developed in a sensitive and environmentally sustainable manner while maintaining its R4 Zoning. | | |
| | | | | | Request that the council leave the zoning of the subject site and support the applicant's development application. | | |
| 29 | 193406.2020 | | | Moorebank downzoning | Objects to the proposal to downzone land. Concern about property values. | The exhibited Planning Proposal supports a proposed change in zoning from R4 to R3 on the basis that the R3 zone is more aligned | It is recommended that the Planning Proposal be amended to retain the R4 land around Harvey Avenue, Dredge |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|-------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| | | | | | Concern that the lowering of development standards will impact on the feasibility to develop the land for medium density housing. | with the local character and will likely generate additional housing capacity around the town centre due to its feasibility. However, there is some merit to retaining the current R4 zone around Harvey Avenue and Dredge Avenue as the zoning and development standards do provide for a transition from high density to medium density housing. There is also less interface issues as the block is surrounded by a road. | Avenue and Astor Street. |
| 30 | 194065.2020 | | | Moorebank downzoning | Objects to the proposed zoning changes. Owners have discussed developing the site with a neighbouring site and concerned about the implications on property values. The site has access to Newbridge Road, easy access to Liverpool by car or bus and is close | Concerns are noted, however, the R4 zoning on this property (and others on Stockton Avenue) will likely result in interface issues with surrounding properties. The Liverpool Housing Study and SGS Moorebank Rezoning Advice commissioned by Council supports the proposed amendments. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|---------|---|-----------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | to Moorebank shopping centre. | | |
| | | | | | Stockton Avenue is the main access road to the Moorebank Shopping village. | | |
| | | | | | Retaining the R4 zoning would be most appropriate and would aesthetically fit in with an Avenue leading to a shopping village. | | |
| | | | | | Stockton Avenue does not have any traffic congestion problems and would be most appropriate to remain R4 zoned and developed. | | |
| | | | | | Concern about the lack of a compensation scheme. | | |

| 31 | 193187.2020 | | Moorebank Downzoning | Concern about the lack of early action, with the review subject to preliminary consultation as part of wider LEP Review. Moorebank zoning change should be its own Planning Proposal. All R4 zoned lands in East Liverpool should be downzoned, and there should be a blanket high-density zoning ban for East | The proposed changes were incorporated into the LEP Review process as it was the fastest option to address the issue. The LEP Review project provided the opportunity to undertake the required technical reports (e.g. local housing study) needed to justify the proposal. It also provided an opportunity to carefully consult with the | |
|----|-------------|--|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | local road system and there will be traffic conflict to come with the Moorebank Intermodal. In any of the transitional developments, no development should occur where the highrise residential building blocks winter sun light from the north. | Liverpool is zoned R3 Medium Density Residential. Solar access is a consideration during the DA assessment process. | |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|--|--|---|--------------------|
| | | | | Draft Liverpool Industrial and Employment Lands Strategy | Concerned about the zoning of lands on the eastern side of the Georges River in Moorebank for industrial operations (Moorebank Intermodal). | This land is already zoned for industrial use (IN1). Land is already subject for state significant development | No change. |
| 32 | 194459.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Objects to the removal of 4 storey R4 zoning in Moorebank. Council should remove 6 storey apartments, instead of low impact 4 storey apartments. The proposal does nothing for the area expect devalue homes. Concern about financial impacts. | Concerns are noted, however, properties along Maddecks Avenue have interface issues. The Liverpool Housing Study and SGS Moorebank Rezoning Advice commissioned by Council supports the proposed amendments. | No change |
| 33 | 194459.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Supports the downzoning. There is not enough public transportation available, shopping, car spaces, playgrounds and schools. Our sewerage systems will not cope with the high demand if all of the R4 zone goes ahead. | Noted. | No change |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|---|------|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| 34 | 194459.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | The suburbs of Moorebank, Hammondville, Holsworthy and Wattle Grove are quiet suburbs that do not deserve medium or high density housing. Concerns about the impacts on roads, parking, health services, schools, and increased crime rates. | Concerns are noted. The Planning Proposal seeks to downzone land from R4 High Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential. It is not proposed to rezone any land to R4. | No change. |
| 35 | 194459.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | There is a need for more parking spots at railway stations and shopping centres before anymore high or medium buildings. Streets are narrow and there is a need for improved infrastructure in Moorebank. | Noted. | No change. |
| 36 | 194459.2020 196589.2020 196213.2020 | | 17 Sabre Cr Holsworthy 19 Sabre Crescent, Holsworthy 21 Sabre Crescent Holsworthy. | Request for upzoning (Holsworthy) | Requests that several properties in Holsworthy are rezoned from R3 to R4. | Outside of scope of the Phase 1 LEP Review. This site is located to the north of the existing residential community zoned R4. The request to rezone these 3 sites should not be considered in isolation. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|-------------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| | | | | | | The request is not supported by any documentation needed for a rezoning proposal. | |
| 37 | 194459.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Opposed to the high and medium density housing in Moorebank. In particular, within the Georges Fair Estate area. These existing houses are less than 10 years old. Currently, it allows for the neighbourhood to be quiet and safe for its residents and children who play in the streets and surrounding parks. A possible solution for the Moorebank area would be to develop the Industrial areas, located in Chipping Norton and Moorebank, for these medium to high density housing plans. Then relocate the Industrial buildings further west, outside of the Liverpool City Council boundaries. | Noted. The R4 zoning anomaly in Georges Fair is being rectified as part of this proposal. | No change. |
| 38 | 194459.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Congratulates Council for listening to the people of Moorebank | Noted. | No change |

| with regard to the rezoning form R4 to R3 in areas of Moorebank. The proposal is much more in line with the area and will help to maintain some of the areas appeal to new residents. It will assist with the already heavy traffic currently being experienced on the major roads in the area. Supports the amendment from R4 to R3. Moorebank Downzoning Moorebank Town Centre to R3 medium density or to R2 low density residential. Has concerns with medium to high density residential at Moorebank Town Centre and Noorebank Town Centre And | | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|---|----|------------|------|---------|-----------|---|---|--------------------|
| surrounds including lack of street parking provisions in developments. | 39 | | | | Moorebank | with regard to the rezoning form R4 to R3 in areas of Moorebank. The proposal is much more in line with the area and will help to maintain some of the areas appeal to new residents. It will assist with the already heavy traffic currently being experienced on the major roads in the area. Supports the amendment from R4 to R3. Requests that Council considers changing all the current zoning in Moorebank Town Centre to R3 medium density or to R2 low density residential. Has concerns with medium to high density residential at Moorebank Town Centre and surrounds including lack of street parking provisions in | Concerns about parking, character and lack of infrastructure are noted. The majority of the land around the town centre is zoned R3. It is not proposed to rezone this | |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------|---------|-------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| 40 | 192881.2020 | | | Moorebank | Residents are currently using parking spaces at the library and neighbourhood shops on Nuwarra Rd. Concerned about the lack of infrastructure and the need to protect local character. | The Planning Proposal | No change. |
| | | | | downzoning | High Density land in the village of Moorebank. | seeks to downzone land from R4 High Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential. It is not proposed to rezone any land to R4. A portion of the R4 zone is proposed to remain. | |
| 41 | 192901.2020 | | | Moorebank downzoning | Supports proposed downzoning, including the land around Dredge Ave and Harvey Avenue. Concern about privacy and amenity impacts from existing apartment buildings. Requests Council pay for a large | Support noted. This request is not a town planning consideration. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | canopy to protect privacy. | | |
| 42 | 193106.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Against any R4 development in the Moorebank area. Concern about traffic congestion, impact on local character and that infrastructure cannot cater for more people. | Concerns are noted. | No change. |
| 43 | 192805.2020 | | | Moorebank Downzoning | Supportive of proposed changes, but they could have gone further. Concerned about infrastructure and community safety. | Noted. | No change. |
| 44 | 183207.2020 | Emily Elliott (Premise) | 62 – 66 Flowerdale Road, Liverpool | Request for Rezoning | Request to rezone 62-66 Flowerdale Road, Liverpool (Lot 7 in DP22473) from R2 Low Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential. | Outside the scope of this planning proposal The proponent is able to lodge a separate application. | No change. |
| 45 | 179398.2020 | Josh Owen (APP) | 368-370 Cowpasture Road, Middleton Grange | Request for Rezoning | Request to rezone 368- 370 Cowpasture Road, Middleton Grange (Lot 4 in DP 1052704) from R1 General | Outside the scope of this planning proposal The proponent is able to lodge a separate application. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | | residential to B6 Enterprise Corridor | | |
| 46 | 170936.2020 | Christopher Weston (Consultant Planner) | No.168 Green Valley Road, Green Valley | Request for Rezoning | Request to rezone 168 Green Valley Road, Green Valley from R3 Medium Density Residential to B1 Neighbourhood Centre. | Outside the scope of this planning proposal The proponent is able to lodge a separate application. | No change. |
| 47 | 190900.2020 | Ethos Urban | Crossroads | Request to amend the draft Centres and Corridors Strategy Request for additional permitted uses. | Council should amend the Draft Centres and Corridors Strategy so that it recommends an expansion of permissible uses on the site to include business premises and shops (with certain exceptions relating to supermarkets and neighbourhood shops), subject to a cap on floorspace of 10% of the Gross Floor Area (GFA). Request to amend the draft LEP to permit these uses under Schedule 1 (Additional Permitted Uses). The provision of a floorspace cap in the suggested threshold would support the centre's viability and | Refer to SGS Response to submission contained in Attachment 2 . | The proposed amendment to the Phase 1 Planning Proposal is out of scope. The amendment would require more detailed assessment and DPIE have advised that a gateway review and additional public exhibition would be required. It is recommended that the matter be considered as part of Phase 2 of the LEP Review. Alternatively, the proponent can lodge a separate planning proposal with Council. It is proposed to amend the draft LCCS to include the following |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|---------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | allow for flexibility in uses delivered onsite, while providing ongoing support for jobs and increased employment intensity. | | guiding criteria for Planning Proposals: "Allow additional retail uses in the B5 zone if it can be demonstrated they could not reasonably locate in another centre and they constitute a small proportion of the total retail floorspace". |
| 48 | 193126.2020 | Gazcorp | The Grove Centre, Warwick Farm | Phase 1 LEP Review | The submission proposes an increased range of uses and amount of permissible retail floorspace at The Grove | Refer to Attachment 2 for SGS Summary and Review The proposed amendment to the Phase 1 Planning Proposal is out of scope. | The proponent has agreed to lodge a separate Planning Proposal with Council. |
| | | | | Draft Liverpool Centres and Corridors Strategy | Requests amendments to the 'Large Format and Business Premises' section on pages 13-15 of the Draft Strategy in order to accurately recognise The Grove Liverpool as a standalone centre which has approval for a broad and diverse range of retail | Council has continued to classify The Grove as a stand-alone centre and this is reflected in the draft retail hierarchy. SGS advise that while the site is intended to house a range of retail premises in the future, its location is consistent | No change |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|-----------|--|---|---|--|--------------------|
| | | | | | uses which is within a walkable catchment and is an appropriate site for business premises uses. | with an 'out-of-centre designation'. Bulky goods retailing is one of its primary retail functions. | |
| | | | | Draft Liverpool Centres and Corridors Strategy | It is requested that instead of permitting neighbourhood shops in the B6 Zone as proposed by SGS and the LCCS, shops are permitted up to a maximum of 500sqm in tenancy size. This request has been justified by stating that neighbourhood shop premises would not be easily leased and so restricting the B6 Zone to neighbourhood shops would result in a corridor of vacant premises. | SGS Response: Permitting shops up to a maximum tenant size of 500sqm as proposed would be similar to the current provisions in the B6 Zone, which permit shops up to a maximum floor area per property of 1,600 sqm per development. It would have similar risks in that it could allow the creation of multiple small stand-alone retail centres with low amenity along the Hume Highway and Camden Valley Way. This is the problem which led SGS to recommend restricting the permissibility of shops in the B6 Zone. | No change |
| 49 | 167116.2020 | City Plan | 78-82 Riverside Road, Chipping Norton | Phase 1 LEP Review - | Supportive of the planning proposal and its proposed land use table | Noted | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | amendments, permitting vehicle sales or hire premises' in the IN3 zone. | | |
| 50 | 193870.2020 | Evolve Housing | 9-13 Argyle Street, Parramatta | Draft Liverpool Local Housing Strategy | Council should include key and essential workers housing targets for low to moderate-income groups into its Housing vision so they can directly contribute to the local community and economy. The strategy should consider the most appropriate mechanisms for delivering on their needs to ensure that affordable housing remain financially viable, appropriately targeted and retained in perpetuity. | Noted. Setting targets for key and essential worker housing is not supported, as key and essential workers have a variety of housing needs. Council is reviewing its development standards to ensure there is a variety of housing available for different needs, in the right areas. | No change. |
| | | | | | Encourages Council to find appropriate forms of medium density infill housing to provide diversity of housing choice while maintaining local character. | Noted. Council is reviewing its development standards to encourage a greater variety of housing typologies. | No change. |
| | | | | | Evolve Housing is already working in the Liverpool Area in | Noted. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|---------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | managing social and affordable housing and would be happy to work with Council in achieving their Housing Priorities. | | |
| | | | | | Welcomes Council's support of secondary dwellings to improve housing diversity. | Noted. | No change. |
| | | | | | Affordable Housing rent is calculated as a discount applied to Market Rent - not median rent as suggested in the 2nd paragraph on page 37 – Affordable Housing description includes the following text. Market rents are referred to elsewhere in the document. Suggests amending the text to replace median rent/s with market rent/s. | Noted. | Update the draft Local Housing Strategy to refer to market rent. |
| | | | | | Encourages Council to collaborate with one or more community housing providers to ensure appropriate management (according to regulatory guidelines) of dwellings and ensuring eligible | Noted. This feedback has been provided to Council's Community Planning team. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|---------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | tenants/residents are accommodated at affordable rent. Encourages Council to identify sites near Liverpool or other centres to collaborate with state or federal government to deliver Affordable New Age Boarding Houses in order to provide suitable and principal place of residence to people living in-group household. Happy to work with Council to explore options such as requiring boarding houses to be developed in partnership with a CHP and for the CHP to manage boarding houses to ensure they are targeted to low income earners as a means of providing low cost accommodation in the community. | As part of the Housing Strategy, Council has indicated it will advocate for changes to the SEPP to ensure it is targeted towards those with genuine affordable housing needs. | No change. This feedback has been forwarded to Council's Community Planning teams for review & action. |
| | | | | | Support Council's intention of encouraging a greater range of apartments in the Liverpool CBD through reconfiguration of minimum and maximum | Noted. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|----------|---|---|--------------------|
| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | I neme/s | apartment mix controls, and extending to other areas. Support Council's vision on Housing diversity (3.2) and commend Council on expanding housing diversity to include Manor homes, Group home, Secondary dwellings and Senior housing in the conventional mix of housing typology. Should include new generation boarding | The Housing Strategy refers to boarding houses generally, and notes that these can include shared facilities or private facilities (new generation boarding houses). Providing further distinction is not considered necessary. | No change. |
| | | | | | homes in this definition, as it is suitable for a number of client cohorts, such as women escaping domestic violence and young people studying and working. | | |
| | | | | | Encourages Council to allow for dual occupancies within R2 Low Density Residential zone and R3 Medium Density Residential zones of Liverpool LEP. Similarly, it would be good to allow Manor Homes in R3 Medium Density Residential zone of Liverpool LEP to | Council is reviewing development standards in its R2 and R3 zones as part of its Phase 2 LEP Review program. The suitability of including dual occupancies in the R2 and R3 zones, and interactions with the Low-Medium Rise | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|---------|---|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | further improve Housing diversity. | Housing Code, will be considered. | |
| | | | | | Commend short-term investigation areas, particularly those regarding precinct plans for State social housing assets. Evolve works on programs to provide employment and training support for youth living in social and affordable housing and would be happy to work together with Council on similar projects to help support residents find employment in the LGA, which may reduce displacement of very low and low-income workers. | Noted. | No change. |
| | | | | | Commends Councils intention to Partner with State Government to investigate the potential for master planned precincts to renew and increase social and affordable housing. | Noted. | No change. |
| | | | | | Encourages Council to clearly identify sites or precincts that are well | Council resolved to remove an Affordable Housing Contribution | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|---------|---|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | serviced by public transport and services, where it may be appropriate to deliver affordable housing through an Affordable Housing Contributions Plan on Council or other government owned sites. | Scheme from the draft Housing Strategy, and, as such, will not at present be pursued. | |
| | | | | | Encourage Council to advocate to State and Federal governments for more investment in social and affordable housing, and partner with other Councils and relevant not-for-profit organisations to develop a strategy for improving and increasing social and affordable housing. | An action in the Strategy is to advocate to State and Federal governments for increased provision of social and affordable housing. | No change. |
| | | | | | Supports Council's intention to advocate for changes to the ARHSEPP to improve its effectiveness. One measure to do this would be to require developers to not be able to receive an occupancy agreement until there is written confirmation from a community housing provider (CHP) that a | Noted. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|---------|--|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | contract or management agreement is in place (not just an intention to enter into one) for the affordable housing to be managed by a CHP. This would ensure the housing provided is appropriate to income eligible households at an affordable rent. | | |
| | | | | | Encourages Council, following development of affordable housing strategy, to establish an affordable housing target to help benchmark and drive Council's commitment to the provision of future affordable housing. | Council resolved to remove an Affordable Housing Contribution Scheme from the draft Housing Strategy, and, as such, will not at present be pursued. | No change. |
| | | | | | Notes Council's identification of ageing community infrastructure in residential zones that may need to be redeveloped to meet contemporary needs, including an increased demand for seniors' housing. Evolve would be happy to explore options to redevelop sites with incorporation of neighbourhood facilities. | Noted These comments have been provided to Council's Community Planning team for review and action. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|---------|--|--|--------------------|
| | | | | | Given the aging population as predicted, recommends Council develop more Senior Living and Specialist Disability Accommodation (SDA) properties under the NDIS program. Evolve Housing would be happy to assist identifying opportunities. | Noted. There appears to be adequate existing and few new suppliers in the private developments of Senior Living and SDA space already. Significant development proposals are currently at assessment phase in suburbs like Austral and Casula. Council staff welcomes the opportunity to work with experienced CHPs to advise on basic metrics and zonings of lots that could render a site feasible/ suitable. Subject to Council's Procurement processes, this may assist Council to identify opportunities should underutilised surplus land become available for review on a case by case basis. | No change. |
| | | | | | Encourages the use of SEPP 70 to provide for affordable housing. | Council resolved to remove an Affordable Housing Contribution Scheme from the draft Housing Strategy, and, as such, will not at present be pursued. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------|--------------------|
| 51 | 195267.2020 | Property Council of Australia | Level 1, 11 Barrack Street Sydney NSW 2000 | LEP Review – Phase 1 Planning Proposal - Moorebank Downzoning | Generally support the proposed changes. The change to R3 Medium Density Residential (supported by appropriate development standards) is more likely to bring about greater development activity and urban renewal that is consistent with the predominant built form within surrounding areas. | Support noted. | No change. |
| | | | | Fully support the inclusion of a savings clause in the Planning Proposal to avoid affecting current development applications and appeal processes. | Noted. | No change. | |
| | | | | LEP Review Phase 1 Planning Proposal – Casula Industrial Precinct | Generally support this rezoning from IN3 to IN1 and maintaining the site's development standards. | Noted. | No change |
| | | | | LEP Review Phase 1 Planning | Supports the change. | Noted. | No change |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|--|---|---|--------------------|
| | | | | Proposal – Sydney Water sites | | | |
| | | | | Draft Liverpool Local Housing Strategy | Concerning that Council claims to have more than sufficient supply of zoned land when this supply is in many cases theoretical and not economically viable. | While Council understands this concern, the draft Local Housing Strategy does apply a feasibility lens to its zoned land and still finds there is currently enough zoned land to provide for future growth. Notwithstanding this, and understanding that feasibility can change due to market conditions, Council has also identified a number of short-term investigation areas that could support additional growth, and is currently progressing a number of proposals to rezone land and add additional housing capacity. | No change. |
| | | | | | Supportive of actions to increase housing diversity. | Noted. | No change. |
| | | | | | Support housing growth being focused on town centres and strategic centres close to services | Noted. Council's housing demand is broken down into detached, medium | No change |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|---------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | and public transport. The draft Strategy must identify the quantity and type of housing growth needed, and embed this into statutory planning controls. | density and high density. Council has committed to reviewing planning controls to further encourage housing diversity. | |
| | | | | | Acknowledge Council's position regarding low-scale character of suburban areas and note that in many cases these locations will only be suitable for low-rise detached housing. | Noted. | No change. Consider advice as part of DCP Review. |
| | | | | | Note that BASIX is a good tool for energy and water efficiency, and understand this will be updated in 2021 to be included in the new Design and Place SEPP. Planning for resilience from flooding and bushfire is also important and support Council working with RFS and SES to develop appropriate policy responses. | Noted. | No change. |
| | | | | | Council needs to ensure it can meet local infrastructure needs without heavy reliance on development | Council is cognisant of the interaction of local development contributions and feasibility. Council will apply appropriate | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|---------|---|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | | | contributions and planning agreements. | charges and enter into planning agreements in order to meet the needs of the local community while also encouraging development. | |
| | | | | | Supportive of draft Strategy recommendations around housing location and growth. | Noted. | No change. |
| | | | | | Supportive of strategies to achieve housing diversity. Council's LEP and DCP planning controls should be designed to encourage development of well-designed and located medium density housing. Council should look at providing examples of good design in its DCP using case studies or a pattern book that can be replicated to improve design outcomes. | Noted. This will be considered as part of Council's DCP Review. | Consider as part of DCP review. |
| | | | | | Support actions to address housing affordability. | Noted. | No change |
| | | | | | Support actions to address built form and sustainability in principle and look forward to | Noted | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|---|---|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | working with Council and industry partners to develop specific details. | | |
| | | | | Draft Liverpool Centres and Corridors Strategy | Draft Guiding Criteria No.1 (p.3) "Proposals must not have a significant negative impact on the retail operation of the Liverpool City Centre, town centres and local centres (including planned future centres)". This is supported. Proponents should be made aware of the requirements Council expects when they are intending to submit a planning proposal that involves commercial and retail development. | Noted. In the rationale, it is noted that an Economic Impact Assessment will be required to accompany a planning proposal. | No change. |
| | | | | | Draft guiding criteria for planning proposals No.4 (P.24) "Proposals for redevelopment or expansion of town centres and local centres must demonstrate improved integration with the public domain and with nearby open space, social infrastructure and other services". | Noted, however in most instances this forms part or negotiated through a Planning Proposal and/or VPA. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|---------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | It is appropriate that Council detail what requirements apply in the DCP and associated guidelines so that proponents can determine their obligations well in advance of developing a proposal. Draft Guiding Criteria for planning proposals No.2 (p.24): "The creation of new out of centre retail developments are not encouraged". There are several retail formats that are appropriate and permissible in out of centre locations including hardware and bulky goods retail. Other formats may have merit and should be considered on a case by case basis. | Noted. | Amend the wording in the rationale in guiding criteria 2 (p.24) as follows: "While there are several retail formats that are appropriate and permissible in out of centre locations (including bulky goods retail), out of centre developments can generally not take a broader place-based role in addition to their retail functions". |
| | | | | | Responses were provided for each of the nine actions within the draft Strategy. Actions 1, 2, 4, 6 & 7 are generally supported. | Noted. Action 5 was recommended by the SGS Centres and Corridors Study. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|---------|---|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | Action 5 'Amend LEP to replace permissibility of 'shops' in the B6 Enterprise Corridor zone with 'neighbourhood shops' is not supported. Although retail floor space in centres should be prioritised, there are many instances in which out of centre supermarkets is necessary and appropriate. Population growth is driving scarcity of land in centres, excess or unanticipated out of centre demand, the emergence of new, out of centre hubs and a need to disperse traffic movements. | Whilst there is a current cap of 1,600sqm of retail premises in the B6 zone, there is a need for additional measures to prevent out of centre developments. Allowing 'neighbourhood shops' instead of 'shops' in the B6 zone is the most straightforward way to prevent out of centre development while continuing to allow highway corridors to house some convenience-based retail premises. | |
| | | | | | Council's controls should provide guidance to landowners and proponents regarding the Council's design requirements. This should include examples of good design features that can be replicated by similar development projects. | Noted. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|--|---|---|--------------------|
| | | | | Draft Industrial and Employment Lands Strategy | Responses were provided for each of the nine actions within the draft Strategy. Action 1: Support | Noted. | No change. |
| | | | | | Action 2: Supports. Encourages Council to retain an open mind to future review of employment land in the eastern portion of the LGA. They note the important role these lands play in providing urban services, logistics, manufacturing and future employment. | Noted. | No change. |
| | | | | | Action 3: Support. | Noted. | No change. |
| | | | | | Action 4: Support. Would like future engagement in this area. | Noted. | No change. |
| | | | | | Action 5: Support. Encourages Council to consider the option of removing maximum heights on areas where this may be warranted and present minimal conflict. They also encourage wide-ranging industry engagement. | Noted. Will be considered as part of Phase 2 of the LEP review process | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|---------|---|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | Action 6: Support. Encourages a targeted approach in selecting precincts, being mindful of the need for functionality and affordability in other areas. | Noted. | No change |
| | | | | | Action 7: Support, as long as this consideration doesn't inhibit the creation of local jobs. | Noted. | No Change |
| | | | | | Action 8: Support and would like future engagement | Noted. | No change |
| | | | | | Action 9: Reservations are had regarding the potential for a loss of flexibility which runs counter to recent planning directions such as the creation of broader zoning terminology in the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan. A more detailed submission will be made as part of Phase 2 of the LEP review. | Noted, no change required at this point. This will be considered as part of LEP Phase 2 review. | No change |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|--------------------|---------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | Action 10: Support. However the action being achieved through the "Moorebank Intermodal Committee" is questioned as the functions of this committee do not relate to economic development and employment outcomes. It is recommended that instead implementation be amended to be through industry peak bodies in addition to resident committees. | Noted. However, the Moorebank Intermodal Committee also look at achieving positive community outcomes. The strategy can be amended to include recognising industry peak bodies as contributing to advocacy in relation to the Moorebank Intermodal. | Amend implementation under Action 10 as follows: "Advocate for local jobs and positive community outcomes through Council's Intermodal Precinct Committee, and the Community Consultation Committee and through input from industry peak bodies." |
| 52 | 193026.2020 | Ingham Property | PO Box 35 Casula | Draft Liverpool Centres and Corridors Strategy | Excited to see Casula retain its classification as a Town Centre and looks forward to using its landholdings within the Town Centre to ensure Casula becomes a better integrated community gathering space. Currently considering the future development | Support for draft Centres & Corridors Strategy noted. | No change. |
| | | | | | options for its 4ha landholding. As an R4-zoned site within Casula Town Centre, the | It should be noted that the draft Centres and | |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|--------------------|
| | | | | | subject site presents a key opportunity to evolve the Town Centre and deliver the various objectives for Town Centres set out in the Draft Strategy It is important that the Draft Strategy supports the evolution of Liverpool's centres, especially acknowledging the unrealised potential within and around the Casula Town Centre | Corridors Strategy does not provide any specific strategic direction for the site. | |
| 53 | 192878.2020 | Peter Naidovski On behalf of Charter Hall | PO Box 1778 SYDNEY NSW 2001 | Draft Liverpool Centres and Corridors Strategy | Supportive of the classification of the Carnes Hill Centre as a 'Town Centre'. The continued endorsement of Carnes Hill as a Town Centre recognises its role in providing retail convenience for the community. Together with the recent delivery of the Carnes Hill Community and Recreation Precinct, the Carnes Hill Town Centre is a retail, community | Noted. | No change |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|---------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | and recreational hub for the community. | | |
| | | | | | Extremely concerned with the re-classification of the Middleton Grange Village Centre as a 'Town Centre'. The Middleton Grange Village Centre is subject to an active Planning Proposal, which is seeking to, significantly and unjustifiably, increase its retail, commercial and residential capacity, above the vision for the centre. More concerning is that the draft Strategy applies a centre classification that is inconsistent with the recommendation of the SGS Study which recommends that Middleton Grange be reclassified to a 'Local Centre'. | The draft LCCS as exhibited identifies Middleton Grange as a Town Centre as per Council's resolution on 29 April 2020 SGS Advice: SGS continues to recommend that Middleton Grange should be considered as a Local Centre instead of Town Centre. Such a classification would still provide sufficient scope for the provision of a moderately sized retail centre providing a range of retail premises to serve the needs of the local population. | SGS recommends that Council amend the exhibited draft LCCS to identify Middleton Grange as a local centre in the retail hierarchy. |
| | | | | | No rationale or justification is provided by the LCCS for applying a higher order | | |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| | | | | | classification in the centre's hierarchy for Middleton Grange, which differs to the economic analysis undertaken in the SGS Study. The market demand is insufficient to support a centre of the scale proposed for Middleton Grange. The draft Strategy must be amended to be consistent with the recommendation of the SGS Study to categorise Middleton Grange as a 'Local Centre' in the | | |
| | | | | | Liverpool Centres Hierarchy. | | |
| | | | | | The Planning Proposal for Middleton Grange must be refused in its current form, in light of the SGS Study's recommendation to categorise as it as a Local Centre in the Liverpool Centres Hierarchy. | | |
| 54 | 326057.2019 | Chris Western | 66,68 & 70 Orange Grove | Rezoning of the subject | Request (as part of phase 2) to amend the | Out of scope for the Phase 1 LEP Review. | No change. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | Rd, Warwick Farm | property from IN1 to B6 Enterprise Corridor. | LLEP 2008 by extending the B6 Enterprise Corridor zone from Viscount Place to the Hume Highway. The extension of the B6 Enterprise Corridor zone will provide for a variety of permissible land uses including business premises, commercial premises and light industries to service the local residents, business and passing traffic. The rezoning of these properties would stimulate and encourage land owners to amalgamate properties to achieve increased floor area, improved vehicle access and provide a buffer to the industrial land at the rear. | The proponent is able to lodge a separate planning proposal with Council if preferred. | |
| 55 | 199454.2020 | PPM Consulting (Middleton Grange) | PO Box 1398, North Sydney NSW 2059 | Draft Centres and Corridors Study | The Liverpool Centres and Corridors Study is extremely flawed and should not be placed on exhibition with the downgrading of the Middleton Grange Town Centre to that of a "Local Centre". | This submission was received prior to exhibition. The revised draft LCCS (provided as Attachment 5) identifies Middleton Grange as a Town Centre as per Council's | SGS recommend that Middleton Grange should be considered as a Local Centre. |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--|--|---|--------------------|
| 56 | 203596.2020 | Western | PO Box 397, | Fifteenth | WSA acknowledges the | resolution on 29 April 2020. SGS Advice SGS continues to recommend that Middleton Grange should be considered as a Local Centre instead of Town Centre. Such a classification would still provide sufficient scope for the provision of a moderately sized retail centre providing a range of retail premises to serve the needs of the local population. | No change. |
| 30 | 203596.2020 | Sydney Airport | Liverpool NSW 1871 | Avenue Smart Transit (FAST) corridor | proposed Fifteenth Avenue Smart Transit (FAST) corridor and is supportive of any opportunity to improve transit orientated development connections from Liverpool to the airport and Aerotropolis. | Noted | No change. |
| | | | | Improved road connections | WSA is supportive of improved road connections, notably the development of an Eastern Ring Road to | Noted | No change |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|--|---|-------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | replace the southern section of Badgerys Creek Road (as detailed in the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan). | | |
| | | | | Draft Local Housing Strategy | WSA supports the Local Housing Strategy direction for diversity and affordability in housing as the Liverpool LGA continues to grow and in anticipation that a significant proportion of workers at WSI are expected to be Liverpool LGA residents. | Support is noted. | No change |
| | | | | Draft Industrial and Employment Lands Strategy | Industries and employment generating land uses complementary to the airport should be located in areas closer to the airport, enabling industries to develop around an expanding 24-hour airport, i.e. the Aerotropolis, and thereby fostering regional growth. | Noted. | No change |
| | | | | Minimising Land Use Conflicts | Consistent with the Local Strategic Planning Statement and planning Priority 13 – 'A viable | Noted. | No change |

| No. | Record No. | Name | Address | Theme/s | Comment Summary | Officer Comment | Recommended Action |
|-----|------------|------|---------|--|--|-----------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | 24-hour Western Sydney International Airport growing to reach its potential' - WSA supports a precautionary approach to the location of future residential and other noise-sensitive development to minimise the potential for land use conflicts, while maximising opportunities for new jobs and industry. | | |
| | | | | Draft Industrial & Employment lands Strategy | WSA supports the Strategy's proposed Action 4, to 'Facilitate industrial development to support the operation of the Western Sydney International (Nancy- Bird Walton) Airport and Western Sydney Aerotropolis' and will work with collaboratively with Council and the Western Sydney Planning Partnership to achieve this. | Noted. | No change |