



IRF26/4637

Plan finalisation report – PP-2024-321

1364-1396 Pacific Highway and 1,1A and 3A Kissing Point Road, Turramurra

July 2026



Published by NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure

dpie.nsw.gov.au

Title: Plan finalisation report – PP-2024-321

Subtitle: 1364-1396 Pacific Highway and 1,1A and 3A Kissing Point Road, Turramurra

© State of New South Wales through Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure 2026 You may copy, distribute, display, download and otherwise freely deal with this publication for any purpose, provided that you attribute the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure as the owner. However, you must obtain permission if you wish to charge others for access to the publication (other than at cost); include the publication in advertising or a product for sale; modify the publication; or republish the publication on a website. You may freely link to the publication on a departmental website.

Disclaimer: The information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing [July 26] and may not be accurate, current or complete. The State of New South Wales (including the NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure), the author and the publisher take no responsibility, and will accept no liability, for the accuracy, currency, reliability or correctness of any information included in the document (including material provided by third parties). Readers should make their own inquiries and rely on their own advice when making decisions related to material contained in this publication.

Acknowledgment of Country

The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure acknowledges the Traditional Owners and Custodians of the land on which we live and work and pays respect to Elders past, present and future.

Contents

- Introduction 9**
 - 1.1 Overview 9
 - 1.1.1 Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan 2015 (Amendment No. 45)..... 9
 - 1.1.2 Site description..... 9
 - 1.1.3 Purpose of plan 9
 - 1.1.4 Parliamentary Representation..... 10
- 2 Gateway determination and key events 10**
- 3 Public exhibition and public hearing 11**
 - 3.1 Summary of Submissions..... 12
 - 3.1.1 Community submissions 12
 - 3.1.2 Agency submissions..... 20
 - 3.2 Public hearing..... 22
 - 3.3 Post-exhibition changes 22
 - 3.3.1 Council resolution..... 22
 - 3.3.2 Department recommended changes 22
- 4 Department Assessment..... 22**
 - 4.1 Additional Assessment..... 23
 - 4.1.1 Draft Sydney Plan 24
- 5 Post-assessment consultation 24**
- 6 Recommendation..... 24**

Table 1 Summary of attachments

Attachment	Title
A	Gateway determination
B	Gateway determination report
C	Amended planning proposal for exhibition
D	Alteration of gateway determination
E	Council post-exhibition report
F	Council minutes
G	Council summary of submissions
H	Agency submissions
I	Public Hearing Report

Introduction

1.1 Overview

1.1.1 Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan 2015 (Amendment No. 45)

The draft Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan (KLEP) 2015 (Amendment No.45) seeks to amend the built form controls to facilitate a mixed use commercial and residential development to deliver approximately 180 dwellings (including 5% affordable housing) at 1364-1369 Pacific Highway and 1, 1a, 3 and 3a Kissing Point Road, Turramurra.

1.1.2 Site description

The site is known as Turramurra Village and contains a mix of low-rise commercial and retail buildings and a council-owned car park. All lot details are shown in **Figure 1**.



Figure 1 Subject site (source: Planning proposal)

1.1.3 Purpose of plan

The draft LEP seeks to amend KLEP 2015 to provide for a mixed use development. The amendment proposes height and floor space ratio (FSR) increases, a 5% affordable housing contribution in perpetuity and the reclassification of council owned land (no interests being extinguished). The details are found in **Table 2**.

Table 2 Current and proposed controls and provisions

Control	Current	Proposed
Zone	E1 Local Centre	No change
Maximum height of building (HOB)	17.5m	28.5m and 34.5m
Maximum floor space ratio (FSR)	1.2:1	3.0:1 plus a minimum non-residential FSR of 0.85:1
Affordable housing rate	Nil	5%
Reclassify land at 1A, 3 and 3A Kissing Point Road, Turramurra No interests being extinguished	“Community” land This classification means council cannot develop, sell, exchange or dispose of land under the provisions of the <i>Local Government Act 1993</i> .	“Operational” land This classification means these lots can form part of the development site and council can divest the land in future, if needed.

1.1.4 Parliamentary Representation

There are no donations or gifts to disclose, and a political donation disclosure is not required.

2 Gateway determination and key events

The Gateway determination issued on 9 May 2025 (**Attachment A**) and Gateway determination report (**Attachment B**) determined that the proposal should proceed, subject to conditions. **Table 3** below provides commentary on the gateway conditions and confirms whether they have been satisfied.

Table 3 Gateway conditions commentary

Gateway Condition	Commentary
(a) Clarify if the amendment seeks to include: a minimum commercial FSR OR non-residential FSR provision	The amended planning proposal (Attachment C) clarified that the proposal seeks to apply a minimum non-residential FSR provision.
(b) Clarify if the proposed FSR map amendment only relates to the subject site, i.e does not seek to amend the maximum FSR for all sites identified in ‘Area 4’	The amended planning proposal confirmed that the proposed FSR map amendment to remove the maximum FSR identified as ‘Area 4’ is only for the site and does not amend the FSR for any other site.
(c) Clarify that draft wording for new subclause within Clause 4.4 is one example of how the proposed amendment could be worded, with final working subject to drafting and agreement by Parliamentary Counsel’s Office (PCO)	The amended planning proposal incorporated this condition.

Gateway Condition	Commentary
(d) Update land zoning maps within the planning proposal and associated documents to reflect new zoning labels within the Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015	The references to the superseded business zones were corrected.
(e) Provide assessment against consistency with Direction 3.1 Conservation zones	The amended planning proposal included this detail. See <i>Section 4.1 Additional Assessment</i> below.
(f) Remove assessment against Chapter 6 Bushland in urban areas of the Biodiversity and Conservation SEPP 2021	The amended planning proposal removed this assessment.
(g) Provide assessment against Division 17 Road and Traffic, Subdivision 2 of the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP 2021	The amended planning proposal included this detail. See <i>Section 4.1 Additional Assessment</i> below.
(h) Remove assessment against SEPP No 65 – Design Quality and Residential Flat Development and replace with assessment against Chapter 4 of the SEPP (Housing) 2021	The amended planning proposal removed this assessment.

The Department is satisfied that all the Gateway conditions have been met.

Table 4 below provides an overview of the key events throughout the planning proposal process.

Table 4 Summary of key events

Date	Event	Commentary
9 May 2025	Gateway determination issued	A Gateway determination is issued, subject to conditions (Attachment A).
4 July 2025	Exhibition	The proposal is exhibited from 4 July- 1 August 2025. Additional detail is contained in <i>Section 3 Public exhibition and public hearing</i> below.
28 August 2025	Public hearing	The public hearing takes place on 28 August 2025. Additional detail is contained in <i>Section 3 Public exhibition and public hearing</i> below.
2 February 2026	Gateway alteration	LEP completion timeframe is altered from 28 January 2026 to 24 July 2026 (Attachment D).
17 March 2026	Finalisation	Council resolves to submit proposal to the Department for finalisation. The package is submitted on 25 March 2026.

3 Public exhibition and public hearing

In accordance with the Gateway determination, the planning proposal and supporting material was publicly exhibited on the NSW Planning Portal for 20 working days from 4 July to 1 August 2025.

A total of 44 submissions were received during the exhibition period - 41 community and 3 agency submissions.

Council's post-exhibition report and minutes (**Attachments E & F**) provides responses to the submissions, and the Department is satisfied that Council has adequately addressed all concerns raised.

3.1 Summary of Submissions

3.1.1 Community submissions

Table 5 below summarises key concerns raised in community submissions. Council's full summary is found at **Attachment G**.

Table 5 Community submissions summary

Concern	Submission	Response
Support for redevelopment	Some submissions supported the planning proposal.	Council Response: Support for the development is generally consistent with the Turrumurra Public Domain Plan, the DCP, the Contributions Plan and the proposed site-specific DCP. Department Response: Noted.
Integration into Turrumurra/Ku-ring-gai	Submissions questioned how the various parts of Turrumurra Centre will be integrated.	Council Response: The site-specific DCP embeds the site within the planned local-centre structure. It requires the new street, public park, active frontages, and through-site link to be integrated with centre movement and existing public-domain networks. The proposed street, footpath, and open-space works are consistent with the Turrumurra Public Domain Plan. Department Response: Noted, no additional comment.
Pedestrian Accessibility	Submissions were concerned about the steepness of the site and the ability to cross the Pacific Highway.	Council Response: The site-specific DCP requires direct and safe movement via an at-grade pedestrian only street, stairs, and a lift to avoid the slope of the street between Pacific Highway and the new park. These new connections will improve the Pedestrian Accessibility in the southern part of Turrumurra and connect it to an upgraded intersection at Pacific Highway and Kissing Point Road which the

Concern	Submission	Response
		proponent proposes to dedicate land towards for TfNSW to complete in the future. Department Response: The Department is satisfied that the concerns about pedestrian accessibility have been adequately responded to.
Carparking	Submissions raised concerns about the adequacy of parking, loss of community parking, spillover to local streets.	Council Response: Parking provision will be determined at the Development Application (DA) stage and will be determined by the DCP to ensure adequacy of parking within the development. Additionally, any loss of Council parking and off-street parking will be absorbed by capacity within the proposed development and the new Stonnex Street to be delivered as part of the Planning Agreement associated with the proposal. Department Response: A planning agreement has not yet been executed by Council. Notwithstanding, the Department is satisfied that the concerns about carparking have been adequately responded to.
Traffic	Submissions raised concerns about congestion, intersection performance, construction, and pedestrian and cyclist safety.	Council Response: The proponent will be constructing Stonnex Street and dedicating land to support a new intersection at Kissing Point Road and the Pacific Highway as part of the Planning Agreement associated with the proposal. Detailed traffic modelling and design will be resolved at the DA stage. Department Response: As noted above, a planning agreement has not yet been executed by Council. TfNSW has been consulted and have raised no objections to the proposal subject to recommendations for detailed planning and design considerations at the DA stage.

Concern	Submission	Response
		The Department is satisfied that concerns regarding this matter have been adequately responded to.
Cycling	Submissions about connectivity for cycling including links along Kissing Point Road, and to Browns Creek.	Council Response: The land to be dedicated by the developer for the new intersection includes the provision for a Council Cycleway along Kissing Point Road. Stonnex Street when delivered, will also include cycling infrastructure in the form of dedicated space for cyclists. Cycling connections and end-of-trip details will be finalised at the DA stage consistent with the Public Domain Plan and DCP. Department Response: The Department is satisfied that the submissions about this matter have been adequately responded to.
Biodiversity, Trees and Landscape	Submissions raised concerns about tree removal, impacts on Blue Gum High Forest (BGHF), and the need for replacement planting and reserve-edge treatments.	Council Response: Ecological impacts and mitigation will be addressed through detailed assessment at the DA stage, with landscaping to align with Council's DCP and Public Domain Plan. Department Response: It is noted that ecological affectations can be appropriately addressed at the DA stage through Council's DCP and Public Domain Plan. The Department is satisfied that concerns raised can be addressed at DA stage.
Granny Springs Reserve	Submissions raised concerns about safety and privacy issues, and requested any new track/access minimise impacts to the BGHF.	Council Response: Any reserve-edge treatments and potential track alignments will be determined at the DA stage to minimise ecological impact. Additionally, any new tracks will be determined by Council if and when Council upgrade Granny Springs Reserve. The upgrade of Granny Springs Reserve has no set date but is outlined in the Contributions Plan, the Development Control Plan and Public Domain Plan.

Concern	Submission	Response
		Department Response: Noted. The Department is satisfied that the concerns raised have been adequately responded to.
Open Space/Public Park	Submissions claimed the new park would be inaccessible, noisy and polluted.	Council Response: The proposed park will form part of the planned public-domain network and will incorporate accessible and safe connections to Turramurra centre and Granny Springs Reserve with the new intersection and Stonnex Street. Additionally, the park acts as a node that can stage future reserve embellishments, consistent with the Contributions Plan and Turramurra Public Domain Plan. Department Response: The Department is satisfied that the concerns about the future public park have been adequately responded to.
Height and FSR	Submissions raised concerns about bulk, visual impact, and transition to surrounding lower-scale areas.	Council Response: Proposed heights align with the Gateway Determination and are supported by independent design review. The site-specific DCP manages transitions, massing and activation at the DA stage. Department Response: The Department is satisfied Council has adequately addressed this matter and notes further assessment of the proposed built form will occur at DA stage.
Overshadowing	Submissions raised concerns about overshadowing of nearby properties, particularly along Kissing Point Road.	Council Response: Solar access and overshadowing impacts have no discernible impacts to properties as outlined in the independent urban design review by Studio Zanardo. Detailed assessments and impacts against properties will be assessed at the DA stage, referencing the Apartment Design Guideline and DCP. Department Response: The Department is satisfied that the concerns about overshadowing have been adequately responded to and notes

Concern	Submission	Response
		further assessment of amenity impacts will occur at DA stage.
Privacy	Submissions raised concerns about overlooking into adjacent properties and private open space.	Council Response: Privacy will be managed via setbacks, orientation, and screening measures at the DA stage, consistent with the DCP and Apartment Design Guideline. Department Response: The Department is satisfied that the concerns about privacy have been adequately responded to and notes further assessment of amenity impacts will occur at DA stage.
Construction and Design	Submissions emphasised high-quality architecture and materials to ensure consistency with local character.	Council Response: Detailed design quality, residential amenity, and acoustic performance will be tested at the DA stage consistent with the DCP and Apartment Design Guideline. Department Response: The Department is satisfied that the concerns about construction and design have been adequately responded to.
Amenity	Submissions raised concerns about noise, air quality, and traffic impacts on neighbouring properties.	Council Response: Construction and operational amenity will be managed through conditions at the DA stage. Detailed acoustic and traffic design and operational plans can also be undertaken at the DA stage. It is also noted that relocating open-air parking into structured parking will ameliorate existing traffic impacts. Department Response: The Department is satisfied that the concerns about amenity have been adequately responded to and notes further assessment of these matters will occur at DA stage.
Reclassification	Submissions opposed reclassification of Council land, citing loss of access, parking, and uncertainty about community benefit.	Council Response: Reclassification enables delivery of key public benefits (new street, park and land for intersection upgrades) associated with the Planning Agreement. If the land is not

Concern	Submission	Response
		reclassified the vision for the town centre consistent with the Public Domain Strategy and DCP cannot be achieved. Department Response: A public hearing was held to allow the community to expand on written submissions and present issues to an independent person in a public forum. Following the hearing, the chairperson of has recommended for the reclassification of the land to proceed. See <i>Section 3.2 Public hearing</i> below for additional detail.
Service Relocation	Submissions noted the need to coordinate service relocations with agencies.	Council Response: Service relocations will be coordinated at the Development Application stage. Department Response: Noted, no additional comment.
Housing	Submissions queried affordable housing delivery.	Council Response: Housing uplift is strategically supported in the proposal. 5% affordable housing will form part of the Planning Agreement associated with this Planning Proposal. Department Response: As noted above, a planning agreement has not been executed. The Department recommends a post exhibition change to identify the site on the Affordable Housing Contribution Map. This will ensure the 5% contribution is secured in perpetuity through the LEP, rather than through a planning agreement. See section 3.3 <i>Post-exhibition changes</i> below for more detail. The Department is satisfied that the concerns about affordable housing have been adequately responded to.
Access to Public Transport	A submission questioned access to rail and bus services given the Pacific Highway barrier.	Council Response: The site is within a short walk of the station and bus services, with safe crossings and planned upgrades to further support access with a new intersection at Kissing Point Road and Pacific Highway.

Concern	Submission	Response
		Department Response: The Department is satisfied that the concerns about public transport access have been adequately responded to.
Retail and Commercial Provisions	A submission queried the need for another supermarket and noted the need for additional medical services.	Council Response: Retail analysis indicates under-provision of modern supermarket floorspace locally. The proposal will strengthen the centre without altering its hierarchy. Department Response: The E1 Local Centre zone lists medical centres as a land use that is permitted with consent. The proposal does not preclude the future provision of additional medical services within the centre. The Department is satisfied that the concerns about retail provision has been adequately responded to.
Bushfire	Submissions raised concerns about evacuation capacity and changes to mapped bushfire-prone land.	Council Response: Bushfire advice confirms that requirements under Planning for Bushfire Protection 2019 and local controls can be satisfied at detailed design; it highlights applicable setbacks and protection measures where warranted. Department Response: The planning proposal is supported by Bushfire Advice (Blackash Bushfire Consulting 2023) that has identified the site and surrounds are not located within bushfire prone land.
Heritage	A submission raised concern about adverse visual impacts on the Hillview Heritage Conservation Area (HCA).	Council Response: The Statement of Heritage Impact identifies visual change to the Hillview HCA context, and sets mitigation via setbacks, landscape and materials to be tested and refined at DA Stage. Department Response: The Department is satisfied that the concerns about Hillview HCA have been adequately responded to noting any potential impacts will be further considered at the DA stage.

Concern	Submission	Response
Stormwater	A submission raised concern about stormwater impacts to Granny Springs Reserve.	Council Response: Stormwater will be directed to the reticulated system with water-sensitive design, protecting adjacent natural areas. Detailed assessment will occur at DA stage and as part of the Planning Agreement (works-in-kind to upgrade the stormwater basin) associated with this proposal. Department Response: The Department is satisfied that the concerns about stormwater have been adequately responded to.
Contamination	A submission cited risks from past land uses.	Council Response: The exhibited Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) adopts the standard NSW pathway of detailed site investigation and, when required, remediation at the DA stage. This is consistent with SEPP (Resilience and Hazards) 2021. Department Response: The remediation of any on site contaminants will be undertaken as part of future development of the site. The planning proposal does not hinder the application of the SEPP for future DAs on the site.
Community Space	A submission questioned the need of the proposed 400sqm community space.	Council Response: The Planning Agreement Letter of Offer includes provision for the community space to be provided on the ground floor with direct access to Stonex Lane. This is intended to compliment (not replace) any other community facilities Council have planned for the area. Department Response: As noted above, a planning agreement has not yet been executed by Council. The details around this potential community space are a matter for Council. The Department is satisfied that the concerns about community space have been adequately responded to.

3.1.2 Agency submissions

Table 6 below summarises agency submissions, providing relevant commentary as required. The submissions are found at **Attachment H**.

Table 6 Agency submissions summary

Agency	Submission	Response
Ausgrid	Requires consideration be given to compatibility of proposal with existing Ausgrid infrastructure including electrocution, fire, electric and magnetic fields, noise, and visual amenity. Consent authority must consider suitability of the proposal including its compatibility with surrounding land uses and existing environment Better to include mitigation measures during design phase such as buffer, screening, building design, orientation, and construction methods. Provided generic conditions of consent that Council could include in approval of any future DAs.	Council Response: These are matters for the Development Application stage and have been noted. Department Response: The Department is satisfied that the comments raised by Ausgrid have been adequately responded to.
Sydney Water	Preliminary assessment indicates that water and wastewater servicing should be available for future demands. Amplification, adjustments, deviations and/or extensions to the 150mm and 225m wastewater main traversing the site may be required. Proponent should provide anticipated ultimate and annual growth data for this development. Council advised to forward Sydney Water Planning Proposal Information Sheet to proponent.	Council Response: Comments regarding water servicing, wastewater servicing and potential adjustments are noted. Council officers have provided the information sheet and the Growth Data form to the proponent to be sent back to Sydney Water. Department Response: The Department is satisfied that the comments raised by Sydney Water have been adequately responded to.
Jemena	Confirmed they have no objection to the proposal.	Council Response: Noted. Department Response: Noted. No additional comments.
Transport for NSW (TfNSW)	Suggested that a meeting be organised between TfNSW, Council, and the proponent to discuss a proposed future upgrade to the section of the Pacific Highway relevant to the site.	Council Response: The proposal identifies land to be dedicated to facilitate the future road

Agency	Submission	Response
	Reiterated previous network and safety comments provided as part of the scoping proposal. Summarily: • Supports vehicle access to/from the site to be via Kissing Point Rd only. • Extending the right turn bay is likely to impact traffic efficiency. • New traffic counts are required. • Considering there is a proposed active transport lane on the eastern side of Kissing Point Rd, the proposed setback is likely to be insufficient • The proposed new road should be a shared zone/low-speed zone. • Bike parking should be at street level. • Future development should consider noise attenuation, particularly along the site's frontage to Pacific Highway. Vehicular access to / from the site from Kissing Point Road should be located as far away from the traffic signals as possible. Consideration should be made to remove the existing zebra crossing to improve traffic flow. Bus stop location on Kissing Point Road should be reviewed. Upgrades to Pacific Highway/Kissing Point Road, Kissing Point Road/Stonex Drive, Duff Street/Stonex Drive and Pacific Highway/Duff Street intersections should be considered to cater for the largest design vehicle entering/exiting the site. SIDRA Network Layout and Phasing summaries should be provided to TfNSW prior to the finalisation of the Planning Proposal to ensure signalised intersections have been modelled correctly.	upgrades. Further refinement is a matter for the Development Application stage. Department Response: Council's response is noted. The proponent has commissioned a formal response to TfNSW via JMT Consulting. The document finds that most of the matters raised by TfNSW relate to detailed planning and design considerations that will be addressed at the DA stage. The Department is satisfied that the comments raised by TfNSW have been adequately responded to.

3.2 Public hearing

In accordance with the Gateway determination, a public hearing was held on 28 August 2025. The independent chair was Catherine Van Laeren from Van Laeren Planning. Following the hearing, a report was prepared and provided to Council on 19 September 2025 (**Attachment I**).

In summary:

- 42 written submissions were made.
- Submissions supporting the proposal noted the renewal of Turramurra Centre.
- Submissions against the proposal raised concerns regarding pedestrian access, car parking, traffic, trees and landscaping, design and construction of the proposal, and the reclassification itself.
- The independent chair considered the submissions and recommended the reclassification of the land.

3.3 Post-exhibition changes

3.3.1 Council resolution

Council resolved to progress the planning proposal with no post-exhibition changes at its 17 March 2026 Ordinary Meeting (**Attachment E**).

3.3.2 Department recommended changes

At the time of exhibition, the planning proposal sought to secure the 5% affordable housing contribution through a planning agreement, as Council did not have an Affordable Housing Contribution Scheme or an LEP mechanism to receive affordable housing contributions. A Gateway condition required an appropriate statutory mechanism to be in place prior to finalisation to secure the 5% contribution.

Council has since introduced an Affordable Housing Contribution Scheme and clause 6.14, *Affordable housing contributions*, into its LEP. As a planning agreement has not been executed, a post exhibition change is recommended to identify the site on the Affordable Housing Contribution Map. This will ensure the 5% contribution is secured in perpetuity through the LEP, rather than through a planning agreement.

4 Department Assessment

Table 7 and **Table 8** below reassesses the strategic and site-specific merits of the proposal.

Table 7 Summary of strategic assessment

Strategy	Consistency with Gateway report	
Regional Plan	☒ Yes	☐ No, refer to section 4.1
District Plan	☒ Yes	☐ No, refer to section 4.1
Local Strategic Planning Statement	☒ Yes	☐ No, refer to section 4.1
Section 9.1 Ministerial Directions	☐ Yes	☒ No, refer to section 4.1

Strategy	Consistency with Gateway report
State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs)	☒ Yes ☐ No, refer to section 4.1

Table 8 Summary of site-specific assessment

Site-specific assessment	Consistent with Gateway determination report Assessment
Social and economic impacts	☒ Yes ☐ No, refer to section 4.1
Environmental impacts	☒ Yes ☐ No, refer to section 4.1
Infrastructure	☒ Yes ☐ No, refer to section 4.1

4.1 Additional Assessment

Table 9 provides commentary on any remaining strategic or site-specific assessment required.

Table 9 Summary of additional assessment

Item	Response
Gateway Condition 1(e) – Ministerial Direction 3.1 Conservation zones	The Department's assessment of the proposal at Gateway determination stage found the proposal to be inconsistent with this Direction as it modified development standards applying to the site. However, it was considered that the inconsistency was justified as it aligned with the District Plan and the provisions with LEP and other legislation sufficiently ensures environmental issues can be considered at the DA stage. The amended planning proposal as exhibited included an assessment against the direction. The addendum outlines that the proposal does not reduce conservation standards and will increase the amount of green space adjacent the C2 zoned area to the south-west. It also notes that any other environmental impacts of future development can be addressed during the Development Application (DA) Stage in combination with the proposed site-specific DCP. The Department is satisfied that the updated planning proposal is justifiably inconsistent with the direction.
Gateway Condition 1(g) – SEPP (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021 (Transport SEPP)	The amended planning proposal as exhibited included an assessment against this SEPP. The addendum outlines that the matters identified in Clauses 2.118 and 2.121 of the Transport SEPP will apply to future development applications lodged on the site, with detailed assessment to be undertaken at that stage. It also notes the proposal does not preclude the application of the SEPP. The Department is satisfied with the updated assessment against this SEPP.

4.1.1 Draft Sydney Plan

The draft region plan (Sydney Plan) sets out how the NSW Government will address growth in Sydney over the next 20 years. Once finalised, the Sydney Plan will replace the Greater Sydney Region Plan (2018) and the associated district plans.

The draft Sydney Plan was not released at the time of gateway determination for this proposal and is therefore addressed below in **Table 10**.

Table 10 Assessment of Draft Sydney Plan

Item	Commentary
Housed	The proposal will provide up to 180 dwellings additional dwellings in a local centre. The site is close to transport and services, will provide 5% affordable housing in perpetuity and is therefore consistent with this priority.
Prosperous	The proposal is consistent with this priority as it will provide a net additional 178 jobs – providing employment opportunities for people close to where they live.
Connected	The proposal is consistent with this priority as it will provide housing and jobs in a location well connected to public transport.
Coordinated	The proposal is consistent with this priority because it is utilises existing social and essential infrastructure.

5 Post-assessment consultation

Table 11 below provides a summary of the stakeholders consulted post-assessment.

Table 11 Consultation following the Department's assessment

Stakeholder	Consultation
Mapping	Digital mapping has been prepared by Council and finalised by the Department's GIS team.
Council	Council was consulted on the terms of the draft instrument and mapping and confirmed on 20 May 2026 that the maps and draft instrument are satisfactory.
Parliamentary Counsel Certificate	On 22/06/2026, Parliamentary Counsel provided the Certificate that the draft LEP could legally be made.

6 Recommendation

It is recommended that the Minister's delegate as the local plan-making authority determine to make the draft LEP under clause 3.36(2)(a) of the Act as:

- The proposal has strategic merit and will facilitate the delivery of new housing and jobs.
- The proposal is consistent with the Gateway Determination.
- The proposal's inconsistency with Ministerial Direction 3.1 (Conservation zones) is considered justified.

- A Public Hearing into the classification of public land has been undertaken and Council has adequately responded to the Report recommendations.
- Issues raised during consultation have been addressed, and there are no outstanding agency objections to the proposal.



Eleanor Robertson

A/Director, Local Planning (North, East and Central Coast)

29 July 2026

Sarah Waterworth

Manager, Local Planning

Assessment Officer

Andy Ng

Senior Planning Officer, Local Planning