

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

Agency	Key advice	Department response
Campbelltown City Council	<p>Infrastructure Council raised the importance of ensuring Infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner and is adequate for the incoming community and Council.</p> <p>The submission raised concerns in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wastewater servicing - Transport/Traffic - Stormwater Management/Flooding - Social Infrastructure (including Open Space Provision) - Regional Facilities 	<p>Agree. Significant consultation has been undertaken with relevant State Government Agencies to ensure adequate infrastructure is planned for. Infrastructure will be provided through local and state planning agreements, Council's Contributions Plan and state funding.</p> <p>The Department will exhibit the draft DCP together with the draft State Planning Agreement and ensure infrastructure provision aligns to the Precinct Structure Plan for the site.</p> <p>The PSP and DCP will only be adopted to cater for the number of homes covered by confirmed or committed infrastructure. Other areas of the site zoned UDZ may be unlocked in the future as additional infrastructure funding for further homes is confirmed.</p>
	<p>Natural Areas Canopy Cover and Connectivity The proposed natural areas framework is to be commended. Opportunities to optimise street focused canopy cover should be promoted in the Proposal so as to redress the past extensive landscape clearing to accommodate grazing/pasture focused activities</p>	<p>Noted and supported.</p>
	<p>Dwelling Yield Controls Council is of the view that there is no practical strategy or planning mechanism in place to ensure that the dwelling target of 3,300 dwellings is not exceeded and ensuring that higher density forms are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Concerns with practical management of dwelling caps is noted. However this has been included in response to issues raised by Sydney Water and Transport. The SEPP controls for open space provision have been specifically based on the anticipated population arising from 3,300 homes.</p>

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

	<p>Acquisition Authority Council is of the view that the most appropriate classification of the SP2 identified land on the Land Use Zoning Map is Zone SP2 Infrastructure and marked 'Classified Road 'with Transport for NSW being the nominated acquisition authority.</p>	<p>Noted. The SP2 zoning has been removed from the proposal. The regional road network is identified on the Transport Corridors Map. Currently this only includes the Greater Macarthur Transit Corridor however more roads are anticipated to be included following the completion of the Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (TMAP).</p>
	<p>Council raised several other matters which do not relate to the rezoning but are relevant to and will be taken into consideration during the finalisation of the Precinct Structure Plan, DCP and State Planning Agreement.</p>	
Agency	Key advice	Department response
<p>Western Parkland City Authority</p>	<p>Strengths of the proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • responds to the Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan which identifies areas to be conserved for biodiversity and augments fauna corridors through the site, linking it to the Nepean River. • proposes to supply homes in tandem with local infrastructure, funded by the proponent. • Identifies a corridor for a public transport. • Conserves the Gilead homestead and curtilage and other built heritage • is accompanied by a voluntary planning agreement offer to fund \$224m worth of regional scale public infrastructure. This includes Appin Road upgrades north of and adjoining the Figtree Hill site, Menangle Road and Medhurst Road upgrades and an east west sub arterial road through the site. 	<p>Noted</p>

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

	<p>Flooding WPCA states the proposal doesn't reflect the recommendations of the NSW Flood Inquiry 2022, and that sensitivity testing of flood planning levels may be required before the rezoning is finalised.</p>	<p>The flood assessment did not identify any significant constraints on land proposed to be zoned for urban development and advised the majority of the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability event and Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) levels would be contained within environmental conservation lands.</p> <p>As part of the preparation of the Precinct Structure Plan, the Department will ensure the NSW Flood Inquiry recommendations are addressed. In particular, this includes understanding where the PMF level is and flooding behaviour (such as duration, velocity, depth) and ensuring any landuses proposed in the PMF have adequate evacuation and other mitigation measures in place, if required.</p>
	<p>Infrastructure The infrastructure assessment notes "more significant" infrastructure is required. The Authority notes Sydney Water has advised a new wastewater treatment plant is required within 10 years when Glenfield waste water treatment plant reaches capacity. However, a site for the plant has not been identified or acquired within Greater Macarthur Growth area. The Department should confirm the rezoning does not preclude sites for a wastewater treatment facility in Sydney Water's intended site selection process in line with the technical studies underpinning the Department's Greater Macarthur 2040 strategy.</p>	<p>The Department has undertaken significant engagement with Sydney Water to ensure adequate planning for waste water management. Special consideration to potential treatment plant sites will be given during the structure plan phase.</p>

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

	<p>Transport The proposal notes limitations on access to TfNSW models constraining the preparation of a Traffic and Transport assessment. This should be completed before rezoning including a delivery strategy for the precinct.</p>	<p>The proponent and Transport for NSW have been engaging to prepare a TMAP, which will be used to inform the structure plan. This is not required to finalise the rezoning of the site.</p>
Agency	Key advice	Department response
Transport for NSW	<p>Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (TMAP) Transport has requested a TMAP should be prepared, to their satisfaction of prior to the finalisation of the planning proposal and structure plan is prepared.</p>	<p>A TMAP is not required to inform the finalisation of the rezoning but is needed at the subsequent Precinct Structure Planning (PSP) phase. The determination letters clearly articulate the need and role for the TMAP to be resolved prior to progressing the draft DCP, SPA and PSP for the site</p>
	<p>Alignment of Transit Corridor The indicative alignment of proposed secondary collector road (north of Menangle Creek) shown on the draft structure plan of Gilead Stage 2 does not align with current plans for the Rosalind Park site to the north, or the proposed transit corridor as indicated on the GMAC 2040 plan.</p>	<p>The alignment of the Transit Corridor has since been updated based on information provided by Transport. The corridor is shown on the Transit Corridor Map. This map will be updated in the future to reflect any subsequent decisions in relation to the regional road network.</p>
	<p>Transit Corridor and Koala Corridors TfNSW notes that the proposed sub-arterial road (secondary collector road) bisects the koala habitat corridor along Woodhouse Creek and Menangle Creek and raises that satisfactory koala connectivity would be required at these locations to ensure functionality of the koala habitat corridor is maintained</p>	<p>Noted. The detailed design of the Transit Corridor (and any other road that crosses a koala corridor) will need to comply with the recommendation of the OCSE to ensure compatibility with the Koala Corridors.</p>

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

	<p>Timing and delivery of road network It is unclear how the proposed road network will be funded and when it will be delivered.</p>	<p>The TMAP is the evidence base for investment decisions for the road network.</p> <p>The PSP and DCP will only be adopted for the portion of the site that is accommodated by committed and funded infrastructure delivery mechanisms (such as planning agreements, contributions plans, state funding, etc).</p>
	<p>Dwelling Yield TfNSW raises concern with the flexibility offered in Section 4.6 – Exceptions to development standards which could be potentially used in the future to justify increase in the development yield without corresponding provision of road infrastructure. TfNSW recommends DPE to consider including Section 4.3A – Residential density under Section 4.6(8) to cap the maximum yield of the Site at 3,300 dwellings.</p>	<p>Noted. This has been included in the draft instrument.</p>

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

Agency	Key advice	Department response
Mining, Exploration & Geoscience	<p>Coal Resource MEG advised the site is subject to a Coal Authorisation held by Illawarra Coal Holdings Pty Ltd (a subsidiary of South32) covers the entire site which is also overlapped by a Consolidated Coal Lease held by Endeavour Coal (also a subsidiary of South32).</p> <p>The subject site is underlain by high quality metallurgical coal resources from within the Illawarra Coal Measures. The targeted Bulli Coal Seam is positioned around 500-600m below ground surface, with a thickness of around 2.5 - 3.5m. Parts of the land within the subject site is heavily faulted and extraction of coal is not considered economically viable.</p> <p>The Mine Subsidence Impact Assessment includes subsidence measures for existing nearby and potential future mining impacts including setbacks from the existing South32 Illawarra Coal holdings.</p> <p>MEG-GSNSW has no concerns to raise providing development is compliant with the Campbelltown Mine Subsidence Guidelines and that consultation with South32 is ongoing.</p>	<p>Noted. Future development will be subject to the integrated development provisions, or any future complying development will need to provide relevant approvals from Subsidence Advisory NSW prior to a CDC being issued (See below).</p>
Agency	Key advice	Department response
Subsidence NSW	<p>Mine Subsidence District The site of the proposal is located within a declared Mine Subsidence District and future development will require approval from Subsidence Advisory.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

Agency	Key advice	Department response
EPA	<p>Possible land use conflicts The EPA has identified several matters to consider in the development of the precinct plan to deliver improved environmental outcomes and reduce possible land use conflicts.</p> <p>These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - potential noise and dust impacts from adjacent Rosalind Park Quarry to the north of the Precinct - potential odour impacts from adjacent Menangle Sand and Soil to the west of the Precinct. - noise mitigation measures for future residents located in the north-western section of the Precinct. 	<p>Land use conflicts and potential mitigation measures will be considered as part of the PSP and DCP work.</p>
Agency	Key advice	Department response
TRANSGRID	<p>Encroachment of transmission line easement Transgrid have requested that the organisation is consulted early during the Gilead Stage 2 Masterplanning stage to ensure that no prohibitive development or encroachment of transmission line easement arises.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Agency	Key advice	Department response
Sydney Water	<p>Recycled Water Servicing The Glenfield facility currently has recycled water provisions. The proposed Upper Nepean facility will be designed with recycled water provisions for non-potable use as a result of it being an inland plant. Therefore, Sydney Water requests that planning provisions incorporate recycled water provisions to assist in futureproofing the precinct.</p>	<p>Noted. This will be investigated during the preparation and assessment of the DCP and PSP</p>

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

	<p>Stormwater Stormwater initiatives for the precinct focus on maintaining water in the landscape. Stormwater opportunities identified include water sensitive urban design or stormwater treatment at the potential future Upper Nepean facility. The Applicant should consider Integrated Water Cycle Management initiatives for their development.</p>	<p>Noted. This will be investigated during the preparation and assessment of the DCP and PSP.</p>
Agency	Key advice	Department response
WaterNSW	<p>Intensification of development adjacent to the canal WaterNSW raised concern over the potential for development to impacts either the Canal structure or the Corridor, to ensure the supply of bulk water for Greater Sydney can continue.</p> <p>They highlighted the importance of preventing the water from becoming polluted during construction by careful management of run off.</p>	<p>Noted. Development adjacent to the Upper Canal corridor in 'affected land' under clause 2.163 of the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP must be consistent with WaterNSW Guidelines for 'Development Adjacent to the Upper Canal and Warragamba Pipelines'.</p> <p>Safeguarding of the Upper Canal will be further investigated during the preparation and assessment of the DCP and PSP</p>
	<p>Stormwater management WaterNSW highlighted the need for strict stormwater control measures to ensure the water quality of the canal is not impacted by post development flows.</p>	<p>Stormwater management matters This will be investigated during the preparation and assessment of the DCP and PSP. Adequate stormwater measures will be considered prior to being adopted.</p>

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

	<p>Structure Plan Amendments The precinct plan provisions do not outline the process of how the structure plan can be amended.</p>	<p>The written instrument allows for some flexibility to allow for minor inconsistencies, so the structure plan does not need to be amended for minor variations at the DA stage.</p> <p>The SEPP controls provide that the Secretary may amend an adopted Precinct Structure Plan. In practice, anyone can request the Secretary amend an adopted PSP, however it is anticipated that Council will play a central role in assessing proposed amendments and seeking amendments on behalf of proponents and potentially agencies.</p>
	<p>Development Control Plan WaterNSW notes that clause 6.3 of the Precinct Plan requires the preparation of a DCP. The DCP is required to provide for stormwater and water quality management controls. This alone is not sufficient to ensure that stormwater control measures will be provide in appropriate locations across the development site and that the Upper Canal will be protected. WaterNSW request that subclause 6.3(3) is modified to include an additional requirement for the DCP to include safeguards to protect the water quality and infrastructure of the adjoining Upper Canal Corridor.</p>	<p>The Department notes the current draft instrument contains provisions for the DCP to provide stormwater management and controls. The Transport and Infrastructure SEPP also provides for protection to the Upper Canal via s2.163. As Parliamentary Counsel's Office will not duplicate provisions that exist in another EPI, the Department has requested a note be inserted in to the written instrument highlighting this subclause.</p>
	<p>Open space WaterNSW would prefer to see a separate zone allocated for open space rather than it being flexibly incorporated under the UDZ arrangement.</p>	<p>The zoning for this planning proposal follows the same approach used for Wilton Precincts, and the Appin (part) Precinct, which utilises the UDZ. Open space will be shown on the structure plan for the site and supported by a DCP.</p>

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

	<p>Crossings of the upper canal WaterNSW raised concern over the number of potential bridge crossing points of the Upper Canal shown in the Urban Design Report and noted they do not support this number of crossings. They noted it is imperative that vehicular and pedestrian crossings of the Canal Corridor are kept to an absolute minimum to ensure the Corridor remains unencumbered for operational and strategic augmentation purposes. Any crossing will need to comply the clearance and other structural requirements of the WaterNSW Guideline.</p>	<p>Noted. WaterNSW will be consulted further before a final PSP is submitted to the Secretary for adoption.</p>
	<p>Consultation with WaterNSW WaterNSW request that the WaterNSW Guideline is applied, and that WaterNSW is consulted, in the preparation of the detailed masterplan, DCP and Planning Agreement processes so that the Upper Canal is afforded appropriate protection.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed. The Greater Macarthur PCG will be an important interagency forum to ensure collaboration on these matters.</p>
	<p>Additional Permitted uses in C2 Zone Water NSW raised concern over the additional permitted uses for C2 zones that do not form part of the Koala Corridors, specifically the land east of the upper canal, as development in this area may contribute to stormwater management issues.</p>	<p>The list of APUs have been substantially reduced. The final list of APUs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - roads, and - water supply systems. <p>Further APUs are available for land east of Appin Road but this is not in the vicinity of the Upper Canal.</p>

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

Agency	Key advice	Department response
Fire and Rescue NSW	<p>New fire station for Gilead FRNSW believes at least two new stations will be required to provide service coverage of the new population and infrastructure that is proposed – one each in the Gilead Stage 2 precinct, and one in the Appin Part precinct.</p>	Consideration of the location of the station will be part of the structure plan work.
	<p>Dedication of land FRNSW Seek the dedication of land for new fire stations via a State Planning Agreement to ensure that land can be secured in an appropriate location and in a timely manner</p>	Consideration of the dedication of land for a new fire station will be negotiated in the proposed Voluntary Planning Agreement.
Agency	Key advice	Department response
Rural Fire Service	<p>New RFS station for Gilead NSW RFS believes a new NSW RFS Station within the Gilead Stage 2 precinct approximately one hectare in size is required to provide improved operational effectiveness and functionality during emergencies.</p> <p>This is in addition to the two new Fire and Rescue stations at Mt Gilead and Appin that have already been identified as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the GMGA.</p>	Consideration of a new fire station may be negotiated in a proposed Voluntary Planning Agreement. If agreed, the site for a relocated fire station will be further explored in the precinct structure plan stage.

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

	<p>Staging of development and roads The proposed staging of the urban development on both sites, should align with the components of the proposed road infrastructure network in so far as to facilitate access and egress for emergency services and associated fleet during all stages.</p>	Noted.
Agency	Key advice	Department response
Museums of History NSW	<p>Impacts to Beulah homestead MHNSW raised concern over the scale and proximity of the proposed development to Beulah homestead and the impacts that development may have on the site's heritage significance and biodiversity values.</p>	<p>The Department notes that Beulah homestead is outside of the footprint of the Gilead Stage 2 rezoning, however, acknowledges that as the site is immediately adjacent to the proposed development, careful consideration will need to be given to the protection of the site's unique heritage and biodiversity values as part of the PSP and DCP work.</p> <p>Beulah reserve forms an integral section of Koala Corridor B (Woodhouse Creek) which is an important connection between the Nepean River Corridor and the Georges River Corridor. The rezoning provides protection for a significant portion of corridor B through the proposed C2 zone and Koala Corridor Map. Fencing will ensure that wildlife within the corridors is protected from domestic and feral animals.</p>

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

Agency	Key advice	Department response
NSW Health	<p>Need for public transport provision. Gilead Stage 2 will have a significant contribution to the cumulative impact of housing developments and growing populations and subsequent needs for health infrastructure across the Macarthur region. Public transport provision may impact access to health services which will largely be located in district and regional centres.</p>	<p>The proposal includes provision for a transit corridor which will help facilitate a strong public transport connection to Campbelltown in the north and the new Appin (part) precinct in the south.</p>
	<p>Inadequate employment opportunities within the precinct NSW Health states the planning proposal does not provide adequate employment opportunities for residents within the precinct, forcing residents into long commutes for employment. This urban sprawl continues to drive down liveability and health outcomes for people in South Western Sydney.</p>	<p>The rezoning is consistent with the strategic framework for the Growth Area, which provides a balanced outcome for biodiversity protections, housing, local centres and future employment land.</p>
	<p>Recommended aims for Gilead Precinct Plan NSW Health recommends that the appendix for Gilead within the WPC SEPP uses the templates used for Appendix 5 Camden Growth Centres Precinct Plan and Appendix 6 Campbelltown Growth Centres Precinct Plan as the aims in appendices 5 and 6 more comprehensively reflect the desired liveability and sustainability outcomes needed for Greater Macarthur and in particular Gilead.</p>	<p>Following careful considering of the additional recommended aims, the Department has amended the precinct's aims to incorporate some of the suggested aims, noting there were significant similarities to the existing aims in many cases.</p>

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

Agency	Key advice	Department response
Heritage NSW	<p>Aboriginal cultural heritage considerations under the <i>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</i></p> <p>General advice regarding the management and conservation of items of Aboriginal cultural heritage significance was provided.</p>	<p>Matters raised in relation to Aboriginal Cultural Heritage do not relate to the rezoning stage of the precinct planning.</p> <p>The comments provided have been issued to the proponent to address during subsequent planning phases as relevant.</p>
	<p>State heritage and historic archaeology considerations under the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i></p> <p>Heritage NSW request that a statement of heritage impact be prepared prior to any development application be approved for the site.</p> <p>An interpretation strategy is recommended to be prepared that will provide an explanation of the history of the site and the significance of the retained historic elements, and significant views and vistas.</p> <p>Heritage NSW supports the recommendations set out within the Historical Archaeology Assessment.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

ATTACHMENT E – Summary of key issues raised in Council, Agency and Utility Submissions – Gilead Stage 2 State Assessed Planning Proposal

	<p>Local heritage considerations under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i></p> <p>Humewood Forest is locally significant as a rare surviving stand of Eucalyptus maculata (spotted gum) and is included in the Beulah Biobank site. It is recommended that any future subdivision and development of the subject site endeavour to provide a suitable vegetation buffer to protect the local item's natural heritage values and minimise the potential for damaging edge effects.</p>	Noted.
Agency	Key advice	Department response
SINSW	School infrastructure NSW's submission was marked confidential; therefore, it is not discussed here.	
Agency	Key advice	Department response
Greater Cities Commission	The Greater Cities Commission submission was marked confidential; therefore, it is not discussed here.	
Agency	Key advice	Department response
Environment and Heritage Group	Environment and Heritage Group's submission is discussed comprehensively in section 3.2 of the finalisation report.	Interested parties are encouraged to review the detail provided in the Department's finalisation report.