The table in this document indexes all submissions received during the public exhibition of the draft rezoning package. Submissions have been categorised by Agency or Public Submission. Submissions are listed alphabetically under each category.

Submissions who requested to be identified as 'Confidential' have not been included within this table. Where a submitter has requested their name not be printed it is listed as 'Name Withheld' and it will not be possible to search for the submission by name. To protect the privacy of individuals, even where submitters have not requested their name to be withheld, any reference to their address has also been removed.

| No. | Name | Key Issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|------|--|-------------------|---|--|
| Agen | cies | | | |
| 88 | Department of Communities and Justice | N/A | No Department of Communities and Justice sites are affected and therefore no submission is provided. | Noted. |
| 76 | Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development | Planning controls | No reference to airport safeguarding measures such as glare, wildlife attraction, aircraft noise and lighting distractions. Suggest these are incorporated to protect 24/7 operation of airport. No new noise sensitive uses, such as residential uses or places of worship, are permissible within the ANEC/ANEF 20 and above contours. | Airport safeguarding measures have been incorporated within the WSEA SEPP, where possible. Further airport safeguarding measures were identified in the Aerotropolis Plan and will be further considered as part of the finalisation of that plan. No new noise sensitive uses are proposed under the Mamre Road rezoning. Measures related to noise will be investigated as part of the DCP. In addition, Australian Standard 2021 will need to be satisfied to ensure appropriate noise attenuation measures are incorporated into development. |
| 75 | Department of Primary Industries | Zoning | Identifies that the prohibition of agriculture will mean that existing agricultural land uses will not be able to significantly expand their operations during the transition of land to an industrial precinct. Requests to retain 'agriculture' as a permissible land use in the IN1 zone or as an additional permitted use. | Existing agricultural uses will be able to remain under 'existing use rights'. The expansion of agricultural uses is not supported as the Western Sydney Employment Area (WSEA) is designated for industrial uses. |

| No. | Name | Key Issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|---|---|--|--|
| 85 | Environment, Energy and Science Group (within DPIE) | Biodiversity and Waterway Health | Supports the approach to zone environmentally sensitive land as E2 Environmental Protection or RE1 Public Recreation. Includes land which has been identified by EES which is recommended to be 'protected or improved'. Understands that the development footprint has been informed by the Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan. These submission supports this approach but has not reviewed this data. Recommends that a Waterway Health Clause be included in the SEPP that references mapping done by EES. | 1. Noted. 2. Noted 3. A stormwater, water quality and waster sensitive design clause has been included in the WSEA SEPP amendments. The clause has been prepared in consultation with EES and NRAR. |
| | | Transport and traffic | The Structure Plan identifies the Transport Infrastructure Investigation Area as well as employment service hubs in areas which are to be zoned E2. These uses are not compatible with the E2 zone. If E2 zoned land is to be development, it will need to be shown as developable and appropriate offsets provided. | Transport investigation area has been refined to exclude E2 land. Employment service hubs are shown indicatively on the structure plan only. Noted. |
| | | South Creek | Supports the zoning of land adjacent to South Creek as RE1. Recommends that land with biodiversity values plus a buffer be mapped so that future development can avoid impacts to these areas. | Noted. Cumberland Plain Vegetation is being mapped E2, but no buffers are being provided. The Structure Plan has been amended to identify that development must provide a transition area to respond to the biodiversity values of adjoining land. |
| | | Wildlife Buffer Zone | Questions whether a Wildlife Buffer Zone will be applied in the precinct. Notes that it is proposed under the draft Aerotropolis SEPP. | No wildlife buffer zone is proposed, however a wildlife zone has been introduced as a matter for consideration as part of airport safeguarding within the WSEA SEPP. |
| | | Flooding | Suggests that the definition of flood prone land in the Discussion Paper clarification to include land within the PMF as outlined in the NSW Flood Prone Development Manual (2005). Suggests the future DCP incorporate controls for recreation areas within the 1:100 AEP to reduce the risk to life. | See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. Controls for recreation areas within the 1:100 AEP will be considered as part of a precinct wide DCP. |

| No. | Name | Key Issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|--|--------------------------|---|--|
| 86 | Environment Protection Agency (EPA) | Licencing and Regulation | The proposed rezoning will permit a range of industrial uses. The assessment and approval process should be clearly understood including the potential need for EPA licencing. | The existing approval process will be retained for WSEA. |
| | | Water Quality | 1. Planning for the precinct should ensure that there is the outcome where: - there is not pollution of waters, except in accordance with an Environmental Protection Licence; - provides development that maintains or restores the environmental uses and values of water; and - promotes integrated water cycle management 2. Consideration of how stormwater would be managed including Integrated Water Cycle Management. 3. Consideration of the role of contributions in delivering key infrastructure. 4. Encourages DPIE to consider consulting with Sydney Water regarding the role of treated wastewater and stormwater. | Noted and agreed. An integrated water management plan is being prepared for the precinct and will form part of the DCP. Noted and agreed. Sydney Water has been consulted as part of precinct planning and recycled water is under consideration. |
| | | Air Quality | 1. Planning should ensure the following: - emissions do no cause adverse impact on human health or the environment; - no offensive odours beyond each site's boundary; - compliance with the POEO Act - maintains or improves air quality to ensure National Environment Protection Measures are retain; and - dust emissions are prevented or minimised. 2. Rural lands require careful planning in relation to new or existing agricultural activity. 3. Best available emission controls should be implemented for new development. | New development applications for the precinct will be required to address relevant legislation and policy. |
| | | Noise and Vibration | Strategies should be implemented that consider the land use compatibility and the impacts of noise on public health and amenity. Proposed industrial development should be assessed in accordance with the NSW Industrial Noise Policy (EPA 200) | New development applications for the precinct will be required to address relevant legislation and policy. |

| No. | Name | Key Issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | Contaminated Land Management | Planning should identify contaminated land is identified and managed. SEPP 55 provides the appropriate guidance for development on contaminated land. Future development on contaminated land should involve an EPA accredited Site-Auditor | A Preliminary Contamination Assessment has been completed. See section 6.6 of the Finalisation Report. Noted. |
| 84 | Heritage Council of NSW | Heritage | There a 3 items of local heritage significance listed under Penrith LEP 2010. Any future development near these items should include a visual impact assessment. | See section 4.1.10 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | Aboriginal Heritage | The precinct also has potential for Aboriginal cultural heritage such as stone artefact scatters. An Aboriginal cultural heritage study should be prepared to identify potential impacts, mitigation measures, and consultation with Aboriginal communities. | An Aboriginal Heritage Study has been completed and the findings will be addressed via the DCP. |
| 16 | Jemena | Infrastructure | The change in land uses proposed does not change the risk matrix impacting the pipelines. No objections to the Precinct as it is not seeking any additional mitigations to protect its pipeline. Ability to augment the network is limited to the capacity of the existing network in the adjoining areas and being a regulated network Suggests gas network will expand into the Precinct upon receipt and processing of customer requests. | Noted. |
| 74 | Ministry of Health | Infrastructure | The NSW Ministry for Health is working with the Greater Sydney Commission (GSC) on the Western Sydney Growth Infrastructure Compact to identify the demand for health services. | Noted. |
| | | Planning controls | The DCP should promote opportunities for walking and cycling and include measures to mitigate the health impacts of heat such as landscaping and increasing tree canopy. | The DCP will include provisions to encourage active transport as well encourage landscaping, tree canopy and other measures to promote urban cooling. |

| No. | Name | Key Issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|---|-----------------------|---|---|
| 87 | Natural Access Resources Regulator | Future Development | Future development within the draft Mamre Road Precinct is to be consistent with the Guideline's for Controlled Activities www.industry.nsw.gov.au/water/licensing- trade/approvals/controlled-activities | Noted. |
| 79 | NSW Ports | IMT | 1. The protection of land for the purposes of an intermodal terminal (IMT) within a planning instrument is consistent with long term planning and is vital to supporting future productivity and liveability of Western Sydney. | See section 4.1.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | 2. Recommends that site is confirmed and zoned for the purpose of an IMT. The Department should be the relevant acquisition authority for the relevant land holdings. Planning should commence for the site's development by the private sector as an IMT with the capacity to handle at least 500,000 TEUs annually. | |
| | | | 3. Development of the site for associated transport and distribution activities be pursued in the shorter term, subject to not compromising its future rail use. The colocation of warehousing and other logistics improves supply chain efficiency and productivity as the packing and unpacking of goods can be undertaken on site. | |

| No. | Name | Key Issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| 9 | Office of Sport | Infrastructure | Community sport and relevant infrastructure is essential for building communities. Office of Sport are currently collaborating with the GSC in the Western Sydney Growth Infrastructure Compact to identify infrastructure. Office of Sport supports the provision of open space indicated in the structure plan. The plan does not show how the RE1 and RE2 land is accessible or connected to the road network. Recommends exploration a suitable additional zoning (other than RE2), modified industrial zoning or split zoning within the SEPP that could permit indoor sport and active recreation facilities in the precinct for the increase in workforce. Recommends working with Council to deliver local sport and active recreation facilities/ infrastructure, including through infrastructure contributions (local, SIC and GIC work). | 1. Noted. 2. Noted. 3. An indicative road network is proposed to be identified within the DCP. 4. A modified RE2 zone is proposed that permits a range of uses. 5. Noted, this is occurring. |
| 54 | Penrith City Council | Planning | The western boundary of the precinct splits property boundaries, resulting in some properties being zoned under two different instruments. Should consider including these properties under one instrument. Council should maintain a role in future development in the precinct under future State Significant Development Applications. Currently a Subdivision Works Certificate for a SSD can be determined via private certifiers and can result in assets being dedicated to Council and results in developments which are not consistent with Council's vision. | Properties will remain under two instruments. The western portion will fall under the Aerotropolis SEPP and falls under the Wianamatta-South Creek Precinct. This is an existing issue related to the operation of the WSEA SEPP. The Department will continue to work with Council to address this issue. Council will still play a role in determining applications and will be consulted with regard to SSDs. |

| No. | Name | Key Issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | Traffic and Transport | Precinct-wide strategy should be developed along with funding commitments for infrastructure. Road classification - the Southern Link Road and Western North South Roads should be classified as State Roads. Future Traffic Generation - planning should consider growth from the Western Sydney Aerotropolis as well as estimate traffic generation from the IMT. Southern Link Road - should consider that this road when developed should be extended to The Northern Road. Mamre Road - width of the road should be 3 lanes in each direction and consider accommodating public transport. Aldington Road - will function as a sub arterial and classified as a State Road. Precinct plan should identify other future roads and connections to major roads. School access - future connections to the schools via Bakers Lane are a local connection and should not be shown on the Structure Plan. Road connections between the IMT and the Southern Link Road are not supported due to safety concerns for the school. IMT access - suggests considering a free flow access arrangement to reduce traffic congestion. Bus network - planning should identify the bus network as it is the only public transport. Shared Pathway - planning should identify shared pathways on existing and future roads. | See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. See section 4.1.3 of the Finalisation Report. Agreed. Strategic traffic planning is being considered as part of the Place Infrastructure Compact for the wider catchment and specific work that will be completed for the Mamre Road Precinct. Noted. Planning is being undertaken by TfNSW. Further extensions of the Southern Link Road may be considered at a later stage. Noted. Planning is being undertaken by TfNSW however this road is proposed to be 2 lanes each way. Noted. Classification is yet to be determined. Future road planning is being undertaken as part of the precinct wide DCP. The Structure Plan identified road connection to the schools as they are existing local infrastructure which require access. Further work on the local road network is to be completed. Noted. Future access to the IMT to be determine through future design. The public transport network has yet to be determined and will require further consultation with TfNSW. Noted and agreed. |

| No. | Name | Key Issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|---------------------|--|---|
| | | Engineering | Planning should consider the topography of the area the required cut and fill. A stormwater drainage strategy is required to identify future water basins. The planning does not recognise the full extent of tributaries from Ropes Creek, South Creek and Kemps Creek. Planning should consider development adjacent to the water pipeline. | 1. Planning has considered the topography for the area as large flat parcels of land are required to deliver the necessary industrial floorplates. A bulk earthworks clause has been included within the WSEA SEPP. Further work will be completed to inform the DCP. 2. An integrated water management plan is being prepared for the precinct and will form part of the DCP. A stormwater clause has also been included within the WSEA SEPP. 3. A riparian corridor study has been completed and reviewed by NRAR, see Section 4.1.2.1 of the Finalisation Report. Additional riparian and ecological controls will also form part of the DCP. 4. Planning adjacent to the pipeline has occurred in consultation with WaterNSW. |
| | | Water management | Limited information is provided regarding future water management in the precinct. A risk-based framework should be applied in accordance with the Western City District Plan. Council should be involved in future water management planning. Any changes to drainage lines and stream should be in accordance with the NSW Natural Resource Access Regulator (NRAR). | An integrated water management plan is being prepared for the precinct and will form part of the DCP. This is occurring. NRAR have been consulted as part of the finalisation of the rezoning package. The Water Management Act 2000 will continue to apply to development within the precinct. |

| No. | Name | Key Issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|----------------|--|---|
| | | Biodiversity | The Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan should be incorporated into the planning of the precinct. The ownership and maintenance of environmental conservation areas should be provided. Suggests a future east-west connection which would extend a proposed northern E2 zone along a riparian watercourse from South Creek to Aldington Road. Zonings should incorporate the outcomes of the Biodiversity Assessment Method which assesses impacts on threatened species and threatened ecological communities (TECs), and their habitats, and the impact on biodiversity values, where required under the BC Act, Local Land Services Act 2013 (LLS Act) or the State Environmental Planning Policy (Vegetation in Non-Rural Areas) 2017). The proposed management with the interface of South Creek should also consider interface issues within the precinct. Mitigation of the impact of artificial light of wildlife needs to be incorporated in management plans. | The Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan has widely informed planning of the precinct. See section 4.1.1.2 of the Finalisation Report. Noted. This zone is not proposed to be extended, however a green arrow to identify a potential ecological corridor has been identified on the Structure Plan. The E2 Environmental Conservation zone has been informed by this method. This will form part of the DCP. This issue could be further considered as part of a precinct wide DCP and via the Aerotropolis work. |
| | | Infrastructure | Timeframe should be provided for the freight line and intermodal. The 'Transport Investigation Area' is large and should not include land not required for the IMT. An assessment of utility servicing should be undertaken. Should be a commitment to deliver infrastructure prior to development. | This timeframe is not yet known. The area must be protected to enable the future development of these uses. This area has been further refined and reduced. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. Planning has occurred in consultation with utility providers. No issues have been raised. Infrastructure will be delivered in conjunction with development. |

| No. | Name | Key Issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | Funding Mechanisms | Council supports innovative infrastructure funding. DCP and infrastructure contributions plan should be in place prior to rezoning. Ownership and delivery should be identified for future water treatment facilities. Details should be provided for ownership and acquisition of riparian corridors, drainage reserves and open space. If Council is the future owner of riparian corridors and open space, a funding source should be identified for maintenance. | Noted. These will not be in place prior to a rezoning but a DCP will be place by the second half of 2020. The precinct will be subject to the draft WSEA SIC, a s7.12 contributions plan to be prepared by Council and a top up for applications when the SIC is released for the Aerotropolis. Land to be acquired by Council is shown on the land reservation acquisition map, including part of one second order tributary as part of an open space corridor. Other riparian corridors and drainage land will likely remain in private ownership. This will be further refined as the DCP is prepared. Noted. |
| | | Interface | More details should be provided with the residential interface at Capitol Hill and Twin Creeks. Savings provisions should be considered for 19-105 Capital Hill Drive. The impacts should be considered with the school / retirement village precinct. | See section 4.1.8 of the Finalisation Report. Dwelling houses are not permissible within the IN1 General Industrial zone. A savings provision has not been proposed due to the noise affectation from the airport. However, the physical commencement of development consents and existing use rights continue to apply under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1989 and the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000. See section 4.1.8 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | Employment | Clarification is should regarding job numbers and details regarding future jobs. | Job numbers were estimated on the average job density per hectare for the proposed land uses. These rates were based on current best practice and have been used for planning of other areas in western Sydney. |

| No. | Name | Key Issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-----------------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | Excluded Lands | 1. Exclusion of the lands in Capitol Hills is supported. DCP controls should be provided for this interface. 2. Lands near the intersection of Mamre and Elizabeth Drive should be retained within the WSEA with the less intensive IN2 zone applied. 3. Lands near Mandalong Close should be included with land above the 1:100 flood zoned for development as per other areas within the Aerotropolis. 4. Exclusions of the lands along South Creek and the Warragamba Pipeline are supported. | Noted. See section 4.1.5.3 of the Finalisation Report. See section 4.1.5.1 of the Finalisation Report. Noted. |
| 67 | Sydney Water | Infrastructure | Sydney Water currently carrying out strategic planning for the Precinct due for completion end Feb 2020. | Noted. The outcomes from this planning will be incorporated within the precinct plan. |
| | | Infrastructure | Significant implications to existing trunk services will be required at both the northern and southern ends of Mamre Road. Also investigating interim and long-term wastewater servicing, with at least one pumping station in the western catchment. Two assets required for the precinct - a water reservoir within the eastern catchment and a wastewater pumping station within the western catchment. Supports water-use activated both within the internal and external environments. | 2. Noted.3. See section 4.1.9 of the Finalisation Report.4. Noted and agreed. |
| | | Planning controls | 5. Provides comments in relation to Discussion Paper which supports the outcomes of the South Creek Minamata corridor, flooding work being undertaken by Sydney Water, supportive of waterway health outcomes and provides recommendations. | 5. Noted. The incorporation of this work is important in delivering the outcomes of the work for the Wianamatta-South Creek Corridor. |

| No. | Name | Key Issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-----------|-------------------|---|---|
| 47 | Water NSW | Flooding | Risk of increased stormwater flows into, and flooding of the Warragamba Pipelines Corridor. A Precinct based flood study should be undertaken. Recommend extending non-industrial zones to the boundary of the PMF to minimise the risk of stormwater runoff from industrial land increasing the stormwater velocities, volumes and flooding risk to the Warragamba Pipelines. Risk of Industrial rezoning and development contributing to increased flows into Kemps Creek Farm Dam and potential risk of farm dam failure. DPIE should liaise with Council regarding consistency with South Creek Floodplain Risk Management Study. | 1. Noted and will be considered as future stormwater planning and water management in the precinct. 2. An integrated water management plan is being prepared for the precinct and will form part of the DCP. The extension of the boundary to the PMF is not supported as it results in the sterilisation of land. 3. Noted. Planning will consider the South Creek Floodplain Risk Management Study and other flood studies in the area. |
| | | Unzoned land | 4. Submissions seeks clarification as to whether or not the pipeline land will remain unzoned within the WSEA SEPP. Supports the intent to revert to SP2 zoning. | 4. No changes to the pipeline zoning. Unzoned land clause is being removed from the SEPP. |
| | | Zoning | 5. Supports exclusion of offensive or hazardous industries. Recommends that industries dealing with flammable materials should be excluded from land immediately abutting the pipelines or freight line. 6. Suggests inclusion of an objective 'to minimise any adverse effect of industry on surrounding land uses and infrastructure'. | 5. Noted and agreed.6. It is considered that existing clauses already seek to minimise the impact of industrial development on surrounding development.7. Noted. |
| | | | 7. Supports the retention of vegetation and the E2 zoning of land to buffer stormwater impacts on the Pipelines. | |
| | | Planning controls | 8. Concern that there is a reliance on development controls and measures to address flooding after rezoning decisions are made. 9. Recommends that stringent stormwater management controls be introduced in a supporting DCP. 10. Supports separate new clauses for stormwater management and waterway health, as well as flooding clause. | 8. Controls under the existing WSEA SEPP will apply to the rezoned precinct and be complemented by DCP controls. New SEPP clauses regarding bulk earthworks, flooding and stormwater have been introduced to ensure the cumulative impact of individual developments is adequately considered. 9. Stormwater controls will be provided as part of the DCP. 10. To be included in the SEPP. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|--------|-------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Public | Submissions | | | | |
| 27 | ALLAN, Raymond | 707-711 Mamre Road, Kemps Creek | Unzoned land | 1. The plan fails to align WSEA SEPP boundaries and land zoning boundaries with defined parcels of land. This creates uncertainties and the potential sterilisation of land. | 1. Precinct planning always aims to align zoning the cadastre boundaries but this is not always possible. Sometimes different zones are needed within the one land parcel. |
| | Ti | Flooding | 2. Overly stringent flood planning controls which contradict NSW Government and Penrith City Council planning policies by using the 1:100 ARI. This results in an unnecessary sterilisation of land. These flood affected areas, when adjusted to the prevailing topography, would not result in any net loss of flood storage, nor any changes to the existing flood hazard/overall flooding characteristics of the locality. 3. Using the PMF as the default building level is not in line with standard NSW planning practice. | 2. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. 3. The PMF has not been used as the default building line. The building line is in between the 1:100 line and the PMF and development proposals will need to address any impacts within the floodplain. | |
| | | and traffic too broad, and no gu how interim land use land, or how TfNSW making powers as a Intermodal 5. There is currently proposed IMT. There land acquisition, eng potential that planning | • | 4. The mapped Transport Investigation Area is too broad, and no guidance is provided as to how interim land uses may be undertaken on this land, or how TfNSW might use their decision making powers as a concurrence authority. | 4. See section 4.1.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | 5. There is currently no business case for the proposed IMT. There are concerns regarding land acquisition, engineering challenges and the potential that planning for the IMT could sterilise development in the short-medium term. | 5. Post exhibition additional work was completed to investigate a reduced footprint for an IMT. TfNSW is developing a business case for the Western Sydney Freight Line and lead ins but TfNSW intends an IMT will be delivered by private enterprise. | |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | Infrastructure & Acquisition | 6. Uncertainty regarding applicable s7.12 contributions and applicable SIC rates. 7. The proposed freight rail corridor width should not exceed 60m as to not unnecessarily sterilise otherwise developable land. 8. Insufficient details on process for, as well as costs and timing of, land reservation acquisition. Acquisition should be at the highest and best industrial land use. | 6. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. 7. The Freight rail corridor is unchanged from the proposed 60m as exhibited by TfNSW. 8. Any future acquisition would be in accordance with the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991. |
| | | | Zoning | 9. There is already adequate open space provided for in the locality. The existing open space should be sufficient without sterilising flood free industrial land. 10. A broad range of land uses should be and RE2 zone should be considered. 11. There are general incompatibilities with SSD 9522. IN1 General Industrial zone should apply to DA in its entirety. | 9. The precinct currently has little public open space. Masterplanning has provided open space for regional use as well as for use by future employees of the precinct. 10. This has occurred. 11. SSD 9522 is currently under assessment by DPIE and has taken into consideration the masterplanning of the precinct. |
| | | | Planning controls | 12. Missed opportunity to identify and encourage opportunities for exempt and complying development to be undertaken within the Precinct. | 12. See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 61 | ALTIS Property Group | 772-782 & 884-928 Mamre Road, Kemps Creek | Infrastructure Contributions | 1. Notes that a draft SIC has not been provided which is essential for developers and landowners to understand the costs for development and the impact on land values. The current WSEA SIC should be used in the short term and a new SIC should only relate to major road infrastructure serving the Mamre Road Precinct. | 1. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|---------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | Planning controls | 2. Supports the use of the WSEA SEPP, but not the additional land uses and controls as they will significantly reduce employment within the Precinct and lead to substantial acquisition costs to government. | 2. Master planning needs to consider the constraints of an area and provide all appropriate zones. |
| | | | Exhibition | 3. Detailed technical investigations have not been completed to inform decisions on land use planning. These studies should be completed and considered to preserve employment land within the Precinct and jobs in Western Sydney. | 3. Planning has been based on previous analysis undertaken for the WSEA and the Aerotropolis. Further studies will be completed for the precinct wide DCP. |
| | | | IMT | 4. IMT was not accompanied with an options investigation report or detailed technical studies confirming the viability of the Precinct. Economic and topographic constraints need to be considered in consultation with Industry. The IMT hatching should be removed. 5. Conflicting information on whether IMT will be wholly privately owned and operated or whether the IMT is subject to a strategic business case. 6. There is significant uncertainty as to whether the IMT will progress and on what land it will be located. Therefore, the imposition of a zoning overlay is premature. 7. Concurrence requirements are too onerous. 8. Zoning overlay should not be imposed if IMT is to be privately operated. 9. Acquisition uncertainty and what land is to be acquired. 10. Feasibility depends on the delivery of the fright line, which has not been confirmed. | 4-10. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response |
|-----|------|---------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
| | | | Flooding | 11. Adoption of the PMF as a flood planning controls is considered inappropriate leading to significant loss of employment land capital investment within the Precinct. | 11. The PMF has not been used as the default building line. The building line is in between the 1:100 line and the PMF and development proposals will need to address any impacts within the floodplain. |
| | | | Zoning | 12. Designation of RE1 and RE2 zonings is not suitable for employment as it is not economical and unwarranted. The Precinct has 488 hectares of land affected by the 1:100 year flood that is suitable for open space and recreation. 13. Designation of open space for drainage should be completed at the Development Application stage, following detailed civil engineering and stormwater studies. | 12-13. See sections 4.1.2.2 and 4.1.2.3 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Infrastructure | 14. RMS should confirm the confirm final Mamre Road design and acquisition authority. A program for the upgrade should also be provided. 15. RMS should expedite the concept design of the Southern Link Road, particularly the proposed grade separation to Mamre Road. | 14. TfNSW (formerly RMS) are currently designing Stage 1 of the upgrade of Mamre Road. The timeframe for Stage 2 has yet to be determined. 15. The concept design for the Southern Link Road was developed by TfNSW (formerly RMS). Further consultation by TfNSW will occur in the second quarter of 2020. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | Planning controls | 16. The infrastructure zoning overlay places the same planning constraints on land needed for infrastructure (IMT, Mamre Road, SLR, WSFL). Not appropriate to treat all proposed infrastructure the same way as the IMT as it is uncertain and therefore should be subject to the same zoning constraints. 17. Draft clauses should be publicly exhibited. It is impossible for landowners to understand what is being proposed, and therefore to make informed submissions in response to exhibition documents. 18. The IMT is inconsistent with the objectives of the WSEA SEPP as it limits development of the area and prevents the creation of jobs. | 16. The IMT is not proposed to be zoned at this stage but any development applications within or adjoining the area will be referred to TfNSW for its concurrence. 17. See section 5.2 of the Finalisation Report. 18. The IMT will help deliver the overall objectives of the WSEA and employment land for western Sydney. The IMT would make the whole of the WSEA more efficient and attractive for tenants. |
| 68 | ALTIS Property Group | Mamre West - Stage 2 | Unzoned land | 1. Questions why WSEA SEPP is being amended to remove Mamre West Stage 2. Altis have prepared all necessary studies require to support the rezoning of Mamre West Stage 2 to contribute to industrial land supply. | 1. See section 4.1.5.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 24 | ALTIS / FRASERS | 657-769 Mamre Road, Kemps | Precinct boundary | Plan fails to align WSEA SEPP boundaries and land zoning boundaries with defined parcels of land, creating planning system uncertainties and sterilising the use of land. | Precinct planning always aims to align zoning the cadastre boundaries but this is not always possible. Sometimes different zones are needed within the one land parcel. |
| | | Creek | Flooding | 2. Overly stringent flood planning controls which contradict NSW Government and Penrith City Council planning policies by using 1:100 ARI. This results in an unnecessary sterilisation of land. These flood affected areas, when adjusted to the prevailing topography, would not result in any net loss of flood storage, nor any changes to the existing flood hazard/overall flooding characteristics of the locality. | 2. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|---------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | Transport and traffic | 3.Mapped Transport Investigation Area are too broad and no guidance is provided as to how interim land uses might be undertaken on this land, or how TfNSW might use its decision making powers as a concurrence authority. | 3. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | IMT | 4. Raises that there is currently no business case for the proposed IMT. | 4. TfNSW is developing a business case for the Western Sydney Freight Line and lead ins but the IMT will be delivered by private enterprise. |
| | | | Infrastructure | 5. Uncertainty regarding applicable s7.12 contributions and applicable SIC rates. 6. Corridor width for Western Sydney Freight Line should not exceed 60m as to not unnecessarily sterilise otherwise developable land. 7. Insufficient details on process for, as well as costs and timing of, land reservation acquisition. | 5. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report.6. The freight rail corridor is unchanged from the proposed 60m as exhibited by TfNSW.7. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Zoning | 8. There is already adequate open space provided for in the locality which should be sufficient without sterilising flood free industrial land. 9. Should the RE1 Zone be applied, the permissible land uses must be broadened. 10. General incompatibilities with SSD 9522. IN1 General Industrial zone should apply to DA in its 8. The precinct curre space. Master plant for regional use as well the Finalisation Report the Finalisation Report SED 9522. IN1 been expanded. RE | 8. The precinct currently has little public open space. Master planning has provided open space for regional use as well as for use by future employees of the precinct. See section 4.1.2.2 of the Finalisation Report 9. Permitted uses under the RE2 zone have been expanded. RE1 uses as per the Standard Instrument. |
| | | | | | 10. The SSD assessment process has occurred in tandem with finalising the structure plan. Land use zones match the urban design advice provided to the proponent. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response |
|-----|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
| | | | Planning controls | 11. Missed opportunity to identify and encourage opportunities for exempt and complying development to be undertaken within the Precinct. | 11 See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 57 | ANGLICAN SCHOOLS CORPORATION | 45-59 Bakers Lane, Kemps Creek | Planning controls | To ensure the site does not need to rely upon existing use rights, educational establishments and centre based childcare facilities should be included as additional permitted uses on the site. | 1. The site will have existing use rights with new uses permissible as per the WSEA SEPP. Childcare facilities are already a permitted use under Clause 15 of the WSEA SEPP, with the exception of areas affected by an ANEF of 20 or above. New uses incompatible with the industrial nature of the precinct and airport noise restrictions (e.g. schools) will not be permitted. |
| | | | IMT | Requests that the Transport Infrastructure overlay be removed from the site and instead a buffer provided adjacent to the school which is similar to the residential development provisions in the draft structure plan. The proposed location of the intermodal terminal is not supported by the school due to the amenity impacts and the potential traffic safety issues. | 2-3. Post exhibition additional work was completed to evaluate a reduced footprint for an IMT. TfNSW intends that an IMT will be delivered by private enterprise. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Transport and traffic | 4. Requests discussions regarding specific location of the Southern Link Road. | 4. TfNSW is separately consulting with the school regarding Southern Link Road. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response | | |
|-----|---------------------|--|------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report | | |
| 32 | ATORRAIE Pty Ltd | 155-167, 169-181, 183-197, | Intermodal | Transport Infrastructure Investigation Area is too large. The submission seek clarification on the | The Transport Investigation Area has been further refined following the exhibition. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. | | |
| | | 199, 201- 217 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek | | process for obtaining TfNSW concurrence on the zoning overlay. 3. Seeks clarification regarding the potential interim land uses that may be undertaken within the Transport Infrastructure Investigation Area. 4. No information has been provided as to who is delivering the Intermodal and the timeframe for | A concurrence clause forms part of the WSEA SEPP amendment which will require all applications to be referred to TfNSW to ensure future development of the IMT won't be compromised. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. | | |
| | | | | delivery. | 4. There is no timeframe for the delivery of the IMT but TfNSW intends that it will be delivered by private enterprise. | | |
| | | | Inf Zo | | Flooding | 5. Using the PMF as the default building level is not in line with other development in the area. This would mean that part of the Precinct may be considered unusable due to flooding matters. | 5. The PMF has not been used as the default building line. The building line is in between the 1:100 line and the PMF and development proposals will need to address any impacts within the floodplain. |
| | | | | Infrastructure | 6. Landholders need more information about the contribution rates that will apply to their land. | 6. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. | |
| | | | | Zoning | 7. There is extensive public recreation spaces in the Precinct, which could conflict with the IN1 zone. There is an abundance of open space in the area. Zoning open space limits flexibility for developers to provide open space where it is most sensible. | 7. The precinct currently has little public open space. Master planning has provided open space for regional use as well as for use by future employees of the precinct. | |
| | | | | Planning controls | 8. Missed opportunity to identify and encourage opportunities for exempt and complying development to be undertaken within the Precinct. | 8. See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report. | |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------|---|--|
| 40 | BBC Consulting Planners | 1297-1305 & 1307- 1337 Elizabeth Drive, Kemps Creek | Unzoned land | 1. The submission is from properties on the northern side of Elizabeth Drive. The submission requests that these properties should remain in broader WSEA as identified in 2015. The submission states that excision from the WSEA and Aerotropolis is unwarranted and appears related to the M12 compulsory acquisition. The subject land has been identified for employment/industrial uses since 2015. | These sites will remain within the WSEA boundary but continue to be zoned under PLEP 2010. See section 4.1.5.3 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 42 | BLASIOLI, Guerino & Rita | 53-63 Mandalong Close, Orchard Hills | Unzoned land | Question why Mamre West Stage 2 has not been included in the rezoning. Does not agree with flooding being reason for exclusion. Planning should follow Penrith Council's approach to managing the floodplain. | 1-2. See section 4.1.5.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Industrial land | 3. Notes that Mamre West Stage 1 was rezoned in 2016 and successful in delivering industrial land. This development has significantly altered the character of the area as it now accommodates industrial uses. | 3. Noted. See section 4.1.5.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 25 | CALLEGARI, Daniella & Galiano | 105-127 Mandalong Close, Orchard Hills | Unzoned land | 1. Request that Mandalong Close remains within the WSEA SEPP area. This area should not be excluded due to flooding, with planning following Penrith Council's approach outlined the Floodplain Risk Management Plan. | 1. See section 4.1.5.1 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|--------------------------------------|---|----------------|---|---|
| 8 | CALLIPARI Family | 1016-1028 Mamre Road, Kemps Creek | Zoning | Supports the release of the precinct but proposed zoning of E2 Environmental Conservation will reduce development potential. Want to understand rationale and methodology for the proposed E2 zoning. Proposes that the consideration to relocate or realign the area which is zoned E2 to be reduced and be similar to recent industrial developments in Erskine Park and Eastern Creek. | 1-3. See section 4.1.2.1 of the Finalisation Report. The E2 and RE1 zones have been removed from this site due to further investigation. A creek is still located in the area and will have to be considered (along with any buffer required) as part of any DA for the site as well as any drainage requirements. |
| 36 | CAPOGRECO, Leonardo and Teresa | 201-217 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek | Intermodal | Transport Infrastructure Investigation Area is too large. The submission seek clarification on the process for obtaining TfNSW concurrence on the zoning overlay. Seeks clarification regarding the potential interim land uses that may be undertaken within the Transport Infrastructure Investigation Area. No information has been provided as to who is delivering the Intermodal and the timeframe for delivery. | The Transport Investigation Area has been further refined following the exhibition. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. A concurrence clause forms part of the WSEA SEPP amendment which will require all applications to be referred to TfNSW to ensure future development of the IMT won't be compromised. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. There is no timeframe for the delivery of the IMT but TfNSW intends it will be delivered by private enterprise. |
| | | Flooding | Flooding | 5. Using the PMF as the default building level is not in line with other development in the area. This would mean that part of the Precinct may be considered unusable due to flooding matters. | 5. The PMF has not been used as the default building line. The building line is in between the 1:100 line and the PMF and development proposals will need to address any impacts within the floodplain. |
| | | | Infrastructure | 6. Landholders need more information about the contribution rates that will apply to their land. | 6. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------------------------------|---|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | Zoning | 7. There is extensive public recreation spaces in the Precinct, which could conflict with the IN1 zone. There is an abundance of open space in the area. Zoning open space limits flexibility for developers to provide open space where it is most sensible. | 7. The precinct provides for public and private recreation areas. The public open space is located to provide an amenity interface between industrial development and Wianamatta-South Creek. The public open space will be used on a regional level and by employees of the precinct. |
| | | | Planning controls | 8. Missed opportunity to identify and encourage opportunities for exempt and complying development to be undertaken within the Precinct. | 8. See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 17 | DAHER, Ray | 919-929 Mamre Road, Kemps Creek | Zoning | The adjoining rural-residential properties in Mount Vernon should be included as part of the rezoning due to the increased traffic volumes which will detrimental impact on their current standard of rural living. | The Mount Vernon area is identified as an Urban Investigation Area under the Western City District Plan. Penrith Council is the relevant planning authority for this area. |
| 34 | DAL SANTO, John and Maria | 183-197 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek | Intermodal | Transport Infrastructure Investigation Area is too large. The submission seek clarification on the process for obtaining TfNSW concurrence on the zoning overlay. Seeks clarification regarding the potential interim land uses that may be undertaken within the Transport Infrastructure Investigation Area. No information has been provided as to who is delivering the Intermodal and the timeframe for delivery. | The Transport Investigation Area has been further refined following the exhibition. See 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. A concurrence clause forms part of the WSEA SEPP amendment which will require all applications to be referred to TfNSW to ensure future development of the IMT won't be compromised. See 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. There is no timeframe for the delivery of the IMT but TfNSW intends it will be delivered by private enterprise. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-----------------------------|---|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | Flooding | 5. Using the PMF as the default building level is not in line with other development in the area. This would mean that part of the Precinct may be considered unusable due to flooding matters. | 5. The PMF has not been used as the default building line. The building line is in between the 1:100 line and the PMF and development proposals will need to address any impacts within the floodplain. |
| | | | Infrastructure | 6. Landholders need more information about the contribution rates that will apply to their land. | 6. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Zoning | 7. There is extensive public recreation spaces in the Precinct, which could conflict with the IN1 zone. There is an abundance of open space in the area. Zoning open space limits flexibility for developers to provide open space where it is most sensible. | 7. The precinct provides for public and private recreation areas. he public open space is located to provide an amenity interface between industrial development and Wianamatta-South Creek. The public open space will be used on a regional level and by employees of the precinct. |
| | | | Planning controls | 8. Missed opportunity to identify and encourage opportunities for exempt and complying development to be undertaken within the Precinct. | 8. See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 12 | D'ANGOLA, Michael & Nina | 1-19 Mandalong Close, Orchard Hills | Unzoned land | Requests that Mandalong Close remains within the WSEA SEPP area. The area should not be excluded due to flooding. Planning should follow Penrith Council's approach under the Floodplain Risk Management Plan. Raises the rezoning of Mamre West - Stage 1 in 2016 and the success of this development in providing industrial land. States that Mamre West Stage 2 could deliver 50-60 hectares of industrial land which could be serviced by utilities and have good road access. | 1-3. See section 4.1.5.1 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-----------------------------------|--|------------|--|---|
| 70 | DAVID, Edmond | 20 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek | Zoning | Concerned about the proposed E2 Environmental Conservation on the value of their property and the potential to generate income from the subject land. Questions the reasoning of providing a small amount of environmental conservation land within an industrial precinct. Raises a number of questions related to the operation of E2 zoned land including taxes, expenses, rates concessions and other potential financial compensation. | 1-3. The proposal to zone the land as 'Environmental Conservation' (land use zone E2) was based on the presence of Cumberland Plain Woodland on the land. Cumberland Plain Woodland is listed as a Critically Endangered Ecological Community under Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. Zoning the land as land use zone E2 has been refined to respond to this submission. The overall approach will protect high quality Cumberland Plain Woodland and provide opportunities for connection. See section 4.1.2.1 of the Finalisation Report for |
| | | | | | more information on E2 zoning. |
| 33 | DE BONO, Michael and Carmen | hael and Aldington | Intermodal | Transport Infrastructure Investigation Area is too large. The submission seek clarification on the process for obtaining TfNSW concurrence on the zoning overlay. Seeks clarification regarding the potential interim land uses that may be undertaken within the Transport Infrastructure Investigation Area. No information has been provided as to who is delivering the Intermodal and the timeframe for delivery. | 1. The Transport Investigation Area has been further refined following the exhibition. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. 2. A concurrence clause forms part of the WSEA SEPP amendment which will require all applications to be referred to TfNSW to ensure future development of the IMT won't be compromised. 3. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. 4. There is no timeframe for the delivery of the IMT but TFNSW intends it will be delivered by private enterprise. |
| | | | Flooding | 5. Using the PMF as the default building level is not in line with other development in the area. This would mean that part of the Precinct may be considered unusable due to flooding matters. | 5. The PMF has not been used as the default building line. The building line is in between the 1:100 line and the PMF and development proposals will need to address any impacts within the floodplain. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|---|-------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | Infrastructure | 6. Landholders need more information about the contribution rates that will apply to their land. | 6. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Zoning | 7. There is extensive public recreation spaces in the Precinct, which could conflict with the IN1 zone. There is an abundance of open space in the area. Zoning open space limits flexibility for developers to provide open space where it is most sensible. | 7. The precinct provides for public and private recreation areas. The public open space is located to provide an amenity interface between industrial development and Wianamatta-South Creek. The public open space will be used on a regional level and by employees of the precinct. |
| | | | Planning controls | 8. Missed opportunity to identify and encourage opportunities for exempt and complying development to be undertaken within the Precinct. | 8. See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 30 | DE 757-769 FRANCESCO, Mamre Road, Josephine Kemps | Mamre Road, Kemps | Precinct boundary | Plan fails to align WSEA SEPP boundaries and land zoning boundaries with defined parcels of land, creating planning system uncertainties and sterilising the use of land. | Precinct planning always aims to align zoning the cadastre boundaries but this is not always possible. Sometimes different zones are needed within the one land parcel. |
| | | Creek | Flooding | 2. Overly stringent flood planning controls which contradict NSW Government and Penrith City Council planning policies by using 1:100 ARI. This results in an unnecessary sterilisation of land. These flood affected areas, when adjusted to the prevailing topography, would not result in any net loss of flood storage, nor any changes to the existing flood hazard/overall flooding characteristics of the locality. 3. Using the PMF as the default building level is not in line with standard NSW planning practice. | 2-3. The PMF has not been used as the default building line. The building line is in between the 1:100 line and the PMF and development proposals will need to address any impacts within the floodplain. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|---------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | Transport and traffic | 4. Mapped Transport Investigation Area are too broad, and no guidance is provided as to how interim land uses might be undertaken on this land, or how TfNSW might use its decision making powers as a concurrence authority. | 4. The Transport Investigation Area has been amended. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. TfNSW has provided additional guidance on how concurrence powers would be exercised. |
| | | | Intermodal | 5. There is currently no sound business case for the proposed IMT. | 5. TfNSW is developing a business case for the Western Sydney Freight Line and lead ins but TfNSW intends an IMT will be delivered by private enterprise. |
| | | | Infrastructure | 6. Uncertainty regarding applicable s7.12 contributions and applicable SIC rates. 7. Corridor width should not exceed 60m as to not unnecessarily sterilise otherwise developable land. 8. Insufficient details on process for, as well as costs and timing of, land reservation acquisition. Acquisition should be at the highest and best industrial land use. | 6. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. 7. The Freight rail corridor is unchanged from the proposed 60m as exhibited by TfNSW. 8. Any future acquisition would be in accordance with the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991. |
| | | | Zoning | 9. There is already adequate open space provided for in the locality. This should be sufficient without sterilising flood free industrial land. A broad range of land uses and RE2 zone should be considered. 10. General incompatibilities with SSD 9522. IN1 General Industrial zone should apply to DA in its entirety. | See section 4.1.2.2 of the Finalisation Report. Noted. The assessment of this SSD is being undertaken in consideration of planning for the Mamre Road Precinct. |
| | | | Planning controls | 11. Missed opportunity to identify and encourage opportunities for exempt and complying development to be undertaken within the Precinct. | 11. See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| 72 | DEXUS 706-752 Mamre Road, Kemps Creek | Mamre | Infrastructure Contributions | 1. The SIC contribution rate should be no more than the current applicable rate for the existing WSEA. | 1. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | • | Transport and traffic | 2. The Structure Plan should align with the strategic transport direction set out in the WSAP. This identifies the need for an IMT but does not specify where it should be located and identifies that a series of investigations are needed before a site can confirmed. | 2. The Transport Investigation Area has been amended. See section 4.1.1 for further commentary. |
| | | | Planning controls | 3. Supports the use of WSEA SEPP as the primary environmental planning instrument for the precinct. 4. States that new land uses and clauses should not be added to the WSEA SEPP, as this duplicate existing polices and local planning controls which still apply to the Precinct. | 3. Noted. 4. There are a number of amendments to the WSEA SEPP. These amendments seek to support the development of the precinct. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|---------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | IMT | 5. Requests NSW Government review the cumulative supply of current and proposed IMTs NSW to respond to the need for this asset and interest from an Intermodal operator. 6. Technical investigations need to confirm Mamre Road Precinct is an appropriate site for an IMT prior to identification on a Structure Plan and land zoning map. | See section 4.1.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | | 7. The intermodal is dependent on the delivery of the Western Sydney Freight Line. 8. Timing of announcement with Structure Plan, as opposed to fright corridor in 2018, appears to be an afterthought. 9. NSW Government needs to consider the probability of this site being developed as an IMT, due to land fragmentation. 10. NSW Government need to confirm the legality of the concurrence required by TfNSW. Size of overlay is oversized. 11. Need to advise if alternate located were considered and provide analysis as to why Mamre Road Precinct is the preferred site. 12. Current market operations in WSEA and prospective tenants of Mamre Road Precinct are not requiring an IMT for their operations in the short, medium and long term. IMT is limiting certainty of investment. | |
| | | | Infrastructure | 13. The concept design for Southern Link Road, including intersection treatment with Mamre Road, should be expedited to establish the land reservation requirements and remove the need for concurrence to TfNSW. | 13. The concept design for Southern Link Road has been designed by TfNSW (formerly RMS). Further consultation on this road will occur in the second half of 2020 by TfNSW. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the |
|-----|-------------------------|---|------------|---|--|
| | | | | | Finalisation Report |
| 77 | ESHO and BNR Trading | 54-72 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek | Exhibition | Inadequate notification period, particularly with site proposed to be zoned E2 Environmental Conservation. Technical studies to support the E2 zoning were not made publicly available. | 1. The public exhibition period was from 18 November to 20 December 2019. E2 zoned land was proposed based on work completed by the DPIE on the Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan. Post exhibition further work has been completed with the E2 zoning refined in some areas. |
| | | | Zoning | 2. The submission is concerned that the proposed E2 zoning is too restrictive. Notes that the Department has advised councils against using this zone and notes that the application of this zone may invoke the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991. | 2. The proposal to zone the land as 'Environmental Conservation' (land use zone E2) was based on the presence of Cumberland Plain Woodland and River-Flat Eucalypt Forest. Cumberland Plain Woodland is listed as a Critically Endangered Ecological Community under Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. River-Flat Eucalypt Forest is listed as an Endangered species under Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. Zoning the land as land use zone E2 will help to protect the Cumberland Plain Woodland and the River-Flat Eucalypt Forest. See section 4.1.2.1 of the Finalisation Report for more information on E2 zoning. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-----------------------|---|-------------------|--|---|
| 64 | ESHO & BNR Trading | 54-72 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek | Zoning | Submission opposes the front western portion of the site being zoned E2 Environmental Conservation. Attached ecological submission identifies that the site comprises highly modified vegetation and disturbed species with presence of exotic species. Want to understand why adjoining sites with similar vegetation have not be similarly protected. Opposes middle portion of the site being zoned SP2 (Drainage). Site's location, serviceability and topography make it suitable for industrial zoning. There was an expectation that the site would be zoned for industrial uses following previous exhibition material for the Aerotropolis LUIIP. A. Zoning the site as a mixture of E2 and SP2 has sterilised the potential for development of the site. | 1-4. The proposal to zone the land as 'Environmental Conservation' (land use zone E2) was based on the presence of Cumberland Plain Woodland and River-Flat Eucalypt Forest on the land. Cumberland Plain Woodland is listed as a Critically Endangered Ecological Community under Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. River-Flat Eucalypt Forest is listed as an Endangered species under Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. Zoning the land as land use zone E2 will help to protect the Cumberland Plain Woodland and the River-Flat Eucalypt Forest. See section 4.1.2.1 of the Finalisation Report for more information on E2 zoning. |
| 44 | ESR | 290-308 Aldington | Planning controls | Supports the release of the draft Structure Plan and retaining the precinct in WSEA. | 1. Noted. |
| | | Road & 61-63 Abbotts Road, Kemps Creek | Zoning | A field assessment of the identified riparian corridor provided. Identifies creek line holds very little ecological conservation value. Requests removal of the E2 zoning as riparian corridor has no significant ecological value. | 2-3. E2 zoned land was proposed based on work completed by the DPIE on the Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan. Post exhibition further work has been completed with the E2 zoning refined in some areas, including the deletion of the E2 zone on this site. See section 4.1.2.1 in the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|---------------------|---|----------------------|--|--|
| | | | Infrastructure | 4. The NSW Government should prioritise the formulation and implementation of infrastructure funding and developer contribution frameworks to ensure future development is not delayed. 5. Local developer contributions be formulated on reasonable nexus and apportionment principles. | 4-5. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Transition areas | 6. Transitional area identified on the draft Structure Plan be planned and managed through the current WSEA SEPP provisions and DCP controls. | 6. See section 4.1.8 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 28 | FIAZUDDIN, Ahmed | · | Precinct boundary | 1. The plan fails to align WSEA SEPP boundaries and land zoning boundaries with defined parcels of land. This will create uncertainties in the planning framework and the potential sterilisation of land. | 1. Precinct planning always aims to align zoning the cadastre boundaries but this is not always possible. Sometimes different zones are needed within the one land parcel. |
| | | 713-755 Mamre Road, Kemps Creek | Flooding | 2. Overly stringent flood planning controls which contradict NSW Government and Penrith City Council planning policies by using 1:100 ARI. This results in an unnecessary sterilisation of land. These flood affected areas, when adjusted to the prevailing topography, would not result in any net loss of flood storage, nor any changes to the existing flood hazard/overall flooding characteristics of the locality. 3. Using the PMF as the default building level is not in line with standard NSW planning practice. | 2-3. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|---------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | Transport and traffic | 4. Mapped Transport Investigation Area are too broad and no guidance is provided as to how interim land uses might be undertaken on this land, or how TfNSW might use its decision making powers as a concurrence authority. | 4. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Intermodal | 5. There is currently no sound business case for the proposed IMT. | 5. TfNSW is developing a business case for the Western Sydney Freight Line and lead ins but TfNSW intends an IMT will be delivered by private enterprise. |
| | | | Infrastructure | 6. Uncertainty regarding applicable s7.12 contributions and applicable SIC rates. 7. Corridor width should not exceed 60m as to not unnecessarily sterilise otherwise developable land. | 6. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. 7. The Freight rail corridor is unchanged from the proposed 60m as exhibited by TfNSW. |
| | | | Infrastructure | 8. Insufficient details on process for, as well as costs and timing of, land reservation acquisition. Acquisition should be at the highest and best industrial land use. | 8. Any future acquisition would be in accordance with the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991. |
| | | | Zoning | 9. There is already adequate open space provided for in the locality. This should be sufficient without sterilising flood free industrial land.10. Open space zonings should be broader and encourage more private investment. | 9. See section 4.1.2.2 of the Finalisation Report. 10. Noted, expanded uses are proposed in RE2 Private Recreation zone. |
| | | | Planning controls | 11. Missed opportunity to identify and encourage opportunities for exempt and complying development to be undertaken within the Precinct. | 11. See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Zoning | 12 General incompatibilities with SSD 9522. IN1 General Industrial zone should apply to DA in its entirety. | 12. The assessment of the SSD is considering the outcomes of planning for the Mamre Road Precinct and Aerotropolis. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| 31 | FRASERS Property Australia | 155-167, 169-181, 199, 201- 217 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek | IMT | 1. The mapped area for the IMT is excessive and could be reduced without imposing on the future operation of the IMT. 2. Seek clarification on the process for obtaining TfNSW concurrence on the zoning overlay. 3. That the process for Government-led land acquisition or developer-led instigation of the IMT be extrapolated. Not doing so leaves portions of the site being identified for acquisition without being formally mapped on the acquisition map and therefore no land reservation acquisition recourse. 4. Potential interim land uses that may be undertaken within the Transport Infrastructure Investigation Area need to be identified. | 1-4. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | PMF level as the standar evacuation requirements allowable building line and the 1 in 100 building line study demonstrating according impacts. 6. Does not support all 1: | 6. Does not support all 1:100 ARI land within the Precinct being sterilised from used for industrial | 5-6. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. | |
| | | | Contributions | 7. Further information requested regarding 7.11 contributions. 8. Any new applicable 7.11 contributions should relate to local infrastructure, roads, drainage and open space only. Developers should have the option to provide infrastructure which can offset against contributions. | 7-8. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|--------|---|-------------------|---|--|
| | | | Zoning | 9. There is already adequate open space provided for in the locality. This should be sufficient without sterilising flood free industrial land. 10. A broad range of land uses be considered including restaurants and cafes, child care centres, recreation facilities, artisan food and drink industries. 11. Extent of the IN1 should be increased to encourage more private provision of active land uses near to the creek line. 12. RE2 should be provided adjoining the creek to encourage private investment in activating this space. | 9. See section 4.1.2.2 of the Finalisation Report. 10. Noted. The RE2 zone provides for additional uses. 11. Planning has sought to provide the optimal amount of developable industrial land in the precinct. The focus adjoining Wianamatta-South Creek is to provide public open space. 12. Planning has focused on providing public open space adjoining the creek with a portion of RE2. |
| | | | Planning controls | 13. Missed opportunity to identify and encourage opportunities for exempt and complying development to be undertaken within the Precinct. | 13. See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 18 | GAONOR | 919-929 Mamre Road, Kemps Creek | Zoning | 1. Supports industrial zoning under WSEA SEPP. 2. Timeline for delivering the rezoning should be expedited. 3. Open space should be provided in a more flexible manner within the Precinct so as to discourage land use conflicts and lessen the burden on the public purse in providing these lands. | 1. Noted. 2. The rezoning of the precinct has been identified to provide additional industrial zoned land. 3. Since exhibition, the extent of public open space has been refined based on design considerations by Council. However, around 25 ha of public open space has been rezoned within the precinct. Local public open space is essential to deliver liveability and public recreation outcomes for future employees of the area. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-------------|---|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | | Planning controls | 4. Notes that the land use controls have not been specified.5. Requests that local heritage listing of dwelling on the site be removed. | 4. The exhibition discussion paper discusses in general terms the proposed SEPP amendments. Detailed controls will be included in the precinct wide DCP. 5. See section 4.1.10 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Transport and traffic | 6. Road network layouts should allow for suitable heavy vehicle circulation. | 6. The design of the road network will seek to accommodate heavy vehicles (including B-doubles) which is suitable for large scale industrial warehouses. |
| | | | Infrastructure | 7. Uncertainty regarding applicable s7.12 contributions and applicable SIC rates. | 7. See section 4.1.7.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Planning controls | 8. Missed opportunity to identify and encourage opportunities for exempt and complying development to be undertaken within the Precinct. 9. Confirmation sought whether based controls under the WSEA SEPP would remain the same i.e. Height of buildings, FSR. Requests current WSEA flexibility is maintained. | 8. See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report. 9. Other controls would be generally consistent with the WSEA SEPP in regard to height, FSR etc. However other controls will be provided via the precinct-wide DCP. |
| 63 | GATT, James | 654-674 Mamre Road, Kemps Creek | Transport and traffic | Negotiations were in place for the sale of the subject land. The identification of the land to service the IMT and Western Sydney Freight Line has stalled the sale of these properties. The identification of land to service the IMT now sterilises the land until TfNSW or developers purchase the land. | 1-2. Noted. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-----------|--|-----------|--|---|
| | | | Zoning | 3. Land is disturbed with fragmented vegetation coverage and not ideal for environmental conservation. 4. The proposed environmental zoning conflicts with industrial land zoning with the risk of having bushland close to industrial uses. | 3-4. The proposal to zone the land as 'Environmental Conservation' (land use zone E2) was based on the presence of Cumberland Plain Woodland on the land. Cumberland Plain Woodland is listed as a Critically Endangered Ecological Community under Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. Zoning the land as land use zone E2 will help to protect the Cumberland Plain Woodland. The refined location of the IMT has been analysed to minimise impacts on Cumberland Plain Woodland and the future design will be required to provide buffers to ensure |
| | | | | | the long term protection of these areas of ecological significance. |
| 53 | GPT Group | 754-770 & 784-786 Mamre Road, Kemps Creek | Zoning | Supports the proposed IN1 zone as it aligns with future intentions for the site. States that a technical review of the Strahler Stream classification of this E2 zone is required including the ground truthing of the ecological value of farm dams. Requests removal of E2 zoning and suggests that the ecological conservation of any actual stream can be managed at the DA stage. | Noted. The proposal to zone the land as 'Environmental Conservation' (land use zone E2) was based on the riparian land definition under the Biodiversity Assessment Method Appendix 3, which is established by the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. See section 4.1.2.1 of the Finalisation Report for more information on the E2 zoning of land. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|---------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | IMT | No supporting documentation has been provided that provides any form of strategic justification for the proposed location of an intermodal terminal despite the potential sterilisation of land and implications to landowners. Questions whether the precinct is a suitable location for an intermodal terminal. Suggest the proposed intermodal detrimentally impacts on the immediate development potential which will limit redevelopment opportunities for warehouse and distribution. Any acquisition should have land acquired at market rate should government continue to set aside this land. The WSAP does not identify an alternate intermodal location. | TfNSW is developing a business case for the Western Sydney Freight Line and lead ins but TfNSW intends an IMT will be delivered by private enterprise. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. Any future acquisition would be in accordance with the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Infrastructure | 8 Seeks clarification and confirmation of the intended infrastructure funding mechanisms for the site. Infrastructure delivery needs to be coordinated and delivered swiftly through VPAs. | 8 See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report | | |
|-----|--------------|---|-------------------|--|---|--|---|
| 35 | GREEN, Peter | 199 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek | Intermodal | Transport Infrastructure Investigation Area is too large. The submission seek clarification on the process for obtaining TfNSW concurrence on the zoning overlay. Seeks clarification regarding the potential interim land uses that may be undertaken within the Transport Infrastructure Investigation Area. No information has been provided as to who is delivering the Intermodal and the timeframe for delivery. | The Transport Investigation Area has been amended following exhibition. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. A concurrence clause forms part of the WSEA SEPP amendment which will require all applications to be referred to TfNSW to ensure future development of the IMT won't be compromised. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. There is no timeframe for the delivery of the IMT but TfNSW intends it will be delivered by private enterprise. | | |
| | | | In | | Flooding | 5. Using the PMF as the default building level is not in line with other development in the area. This would mean that part of the Precinct may be considered unusable due to flooding matters. | 5. The PMF has not been used as the default building line. The building line is in between the 1:100 line and the PMF and development proposals will need to address any impacts within the floodplain. |
| | | | | Infrastructure | 6. Landholders need more information about the contribution rates that will apply to their land. | 6. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. | |
| | | | | Zoning | 7. There is extensive public recreation spaces in the Precinct, which could conflict with the IN1 zone. There is an abundance of open space in the area. Zoning open space limits flexibility for developers to provide open space where it is most sensible. | 7. The precinct provides for public and private recreation areas. The public open space is located to provide an amenity interface between industrial development and Wianamatta-South Creek. The public open space will be used on a regional level and by employees of the precinct. | |
| | | | Planning controls | 8. Missed opportunity to identify and encourage opportunities for exempt and complying development to be undertaken within the Precinct. | 8. See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report. | | |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|--------------|--|---|---|--|
| 59 | HDC Planning | 1030-1048 Mamre Road, Kemps Creek | Zoning | The exhibition identifies part of their site as E2 Environmental Conservation and SP2 Drainage. The inclusion of this restrictive zoning on their land would create an irregular lot, will require regular maintenance and will likely result in a complicated acquisition process. | 1-2. The E2 and SP2 zoning have been removed . A creek is still located in the area and will have to be considered (along with any buffer required) as part of any DA for the site as well as any drainage requirements. |
| | | | | | See section 4.1.2.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | Flooding has not previously been identified of the site. 4. The zoning of the riparian corridor as E2 be not identified for acquisition. Provision of WSI work on the lot applies to a private landowner This includes ongoing maintenance and who control over the waterway. Recommend zonin E2 portion for drainage so it can be similarly acquired. Acquisition 5. The zoning of land as E2 Environmental Conservation will result in this area being excluded from compulsory acquisition. This is unreasonable as it will result in land which is adjoins SP2 Drainage and will create issues related to access for maintenance. | Exhibition | informed the SP2 zoning has not been exhibited. Flooding has not previously been identified on the site. 4. The zoning of the riparian corridor as E2 but not identified for acquisition. Provision of WSUD work on the lot applies to a private landowner. This includes ongoing maintenance and who has control over the waterway. Recommend zoning E2 portion for drainage so it can be similarly | 3-4. See above. |
| | | | Conservation will result in this area being excluded from compulsory acquisition. This is unreasonable as it will result in land which is adjoins SP2 Drainage and will create issues related to access for maintenance. 6. The submission requests that land proposed to be zoned E2 should be considered to be | 5-6. See above. | |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|----------------------|--|-------------------|--|---|
| 52 | HYPED | 1157-1161 & 1163- 1167 Mamre Road, Kemps Creek | Unzoned land | Site should not be excluded from the Broader WSEA Precinct. Site is currently limited to existing use rights with a service station currently operating on the site. Site should be included within Precinct and zoned either IN1 or B6. The land is separated from the Kemps Creek Precinct in the WSAP and potential development should not be limited by flooding. | 1-3. This site is located in the Aerotropolis. Planning for this site will occur in accordance with the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan. See section 4.1.5.2 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 65 | J. WYNDHAM PRINCE | Lot 1672 DP 85501 & Lot 4132 DP 857093 | Zoning | 1. Raises the inconsistency between the mapping shown and the flood hazard that has been identified by Council in their overland flow studies. Substantial portions of the zone in not affected by the 1:100. The shape and configuration of the proposed zoning should be reduced and incorporated in the IN2 zoning. 2. Considers the limited range of uses that are proposed under the RE2 to be inappropriate given likely patronage and risk of the through route for access between the residential and industrial. | The 1:100 yr flood data used was Council's data. Land not flood prone in this area would be isolated in a flood event and is therefore not suitable for industrial uses. The range of uses under RE2 has been expanded. |
| | | | Planning controls | 3. Request that a savings provision be included due to existing subdivisions and limited on subsequent applications for dwellings.4. Request increased residential density provisions in adjacent site. | 3. Savings and transition provisions will only apply to the extent the land can be subdivided. They will not allow the erection of dwellings as they are prohibited under the industrial zoning and subject to airport noise restrictions. 4. This is not supported due to airport noise restrictions. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|---------------|--|-------------------|---|---|
| 51 | JACFIN | Existing zoned WSEA | Planning controls | 1. Supports the Mamre Road Structure Plan which responds to land supply needs. 2. Has identified the increase in campus style development which incorporating complementary uses such as gyms, child care centres and activity centre. This style of development should be encouraged in the WSEA. Supports the identification of employment service hubs within the Structure Plan. 3. States that development should cater for multinational companies, high value companies and allow for office works and technicians to be connected to industrial developments 4. Mamre Road Precinct and infrastructure provides a catalyst to revisit planning controls and transition uses that support higher economic value, more employee focused, support high worker densities and a more diverse and specialist workforce within the existing WSEA area. | 1-4. Noted |
| 22 | JAMES, Trevor | 65-73 Mandalong Close, Orchard Hills | Unzoned land | Requests that Mandalong Close (part of Mamre West Stage 2 area) remains within the WSEA SEPP area. This area should not be excluded due to flooding, with planning following Penrith Council's approach outlined in the Floodplain Risk Management Plan. | See section 4.1.5 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|---|--|-----------------|---|---|
| 62 | KERFOOT, Robert & Kerry Milosevic | 21-43 Bakers Lane, Kemps Creek | Zoning | 1. The land is currently zoned RU2 Rural Landscape and is not currently mapped as 'Natural Resourced Sensitive Land'. 2. The land contains sparse vegetation with scattered stands of trees and shrubs in poor condition which does not meet the definition under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. 3. The proposed environmental zone will be destroyed by the IMT and the WSFL. 4. The extent of vegetation is not accurately shown and does not reflect the existing quality of vegetation. 5. The E2 zone conflicts with the surrounding Industrial zones. 6. The property has been heavily grazed and does not reflect the quality of vegetation as it is today. The IMT in this location means that the vegetation is not highly significant. | 1-6. The proposal to zone the land as 'Environmental Conservation' (land use zone E2) was based on the presence of Cumberland Plain Woodland on the land. Cumberland Plain Woodland is listed as a Critically Endangered Ecological Community under Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. Zoning the land as land use zone E2 will help to protect the Cumberland Plain Woodland. The refined location of the IMT has been analysed to minimise impacts on Cumberland Plain Woodland and the future design will be required to provide buffers to ensure the long term protection of these areas of ecological significance. |
| 26 | LANTOO Pty Ltd | 657-703 Mamre Road, | Unzoned land | Plan fails to align WSEA SEPP boundaries and land zoning boundaries with defined parcels of land, creating planning system uncertainties and sterilising the use of land. | Precinct planning always aims to align zoning the cadastre boundaries but this is not always possible. Sometimes different zones are needed within the one land parcel. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | Kemps Creek | Flooding | 2. Overly stringent flood planning controls which contradict NSW Government and Penrith City Council planning policies by using 1:100 ARI. This results in an unnecessary sterilisation of land. These flood affected areas, when adjusted to the prevailing topography, would not result in any net loss of flood storage, nor any changes to the existing flood hazard/overall flooding characteristics of the locality. 3. Using the PMF as the default building level is not in line with standard NSW planning practice. | 2. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report.3. The PMF has not been used as the default building line. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Transport and traffic | 4. Transport Infrastructure Investigation Area is too large and could be scaled back to align with existing lot boundaries. Uncertainty of what can be done with the land in the meantime. Process is unknown for obtaining concurrence. | 4. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | IMT | 5. There is currently no sound business case for the proposed IMT. | 5. TfNSW is developing a business case for the Western Sydney Freight Line and lead ins but the TfNSW intends an IMT will be delivered by private enterprise. |
| | | | Infrastructure | 6. States that more information is needed on contribution rates for the land. 7. Corridor width should not exceed 60m as to not unnecessarily sterilise otherwise developable land. 8. Insufficient details on process for, as well as costs and timing of, land reservation acquisition. | 6. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. 7. The corridor for the Western Sydney Freight Line is proposed to be 60m. 8. Any future acquisition would be in accordance with the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response |
|-----|--------------------|--|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
| | | | Zoning | 9 There is already adequate open space provided for in the locality. This should be sufficient without sterilising flood free industrial land. 10. A broad range of land uses and RE2 zone should be considered. 11. General incompatibilities with SSD 9522. IN1 General Industrial zone should apply to DA in its entirety. | 9. See section 4.1.2.2 of the Finalisation Report. 10. RE2 uses have been expanded. 11. The assessment of the SSD is considering the outcomes of planning for the Mamre Road Precinct and Aerotropolis. |
| | | | Planning controls | 12. States that there is a missed opportunity to identify and encourage opportunities for exempt and complying development to be undertaken within the Precinct. | 12. Additional provisions have not been included to extend the application of exempt and complying development. See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 60 | LAURETI, Sergio | 771-781 & 783-797 Mamre Road, Kemps Creek | Zoning | 1. Objects to rezoning a quarter of the site for RE1 or E2 as it will leave half of the site outside the WSEA Application Area would result in inefficiencies in the site's developable footprint, irregular shape and small pocked of IN1 making certain land uses within the IN1 zone undevelopable on the land. 2. States that there is already adequate open space providing for in the locality. Should RE1 zone be applied, it should permit a broader range of compatible land uses and suggests the RE2 Private Recreation zone be considered. 3. States the location of the proposed E2 zone to preserve the existing tributary of South Creek is not making best use of the land. Suggests the tributary could be realigned. | The proposal to zone the land as 'Environmental Conservation' (land use zone E2) was based on the riparian land definition under the Biodiversity Assessment Method Appendix 3, which is established by the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. Since exhibition, the extent of RE1 has been refined and the riparian corridor zoned RE1 to enable acquisition given the sites proximity to the Wianamatta-South Creek Precinct. See section 4.1.2.2 of the Finalisation Report. Planning has sought to implement the objectives for Wianamatta-South Creek under the Western District Plan and the South Creek Sector Review. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | | Unzoned land | 4. States that rezoning a quarter of the site for RE1 or E2 and leaving half of the site outside the WSEA Application Area would result in inefficiencies in the site's developable footprint, irregular shape and small pocked of IN1 making certain land uses within the IN1 zone undevelopable on the land. 5. The WSEA SEPP boundaries and land zonings should align and apply to defined parcels of land. | 4 – 5. Precinct planning always aims to align zoning the cadastre boundaries but this is not always possible. Sometimes different zones are needed within the one land parcel. See section 4.1.5 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Flooding | 7. Overly stringent flood planning controls which contradict NSW Government and Penrith City Council planning policies by using 1:100 ARI. This results in the unnecessary sterilisation of land. 8. The flood affected areas, when adjusted to the prevailing topography, would not result in any net loss of flood storage, nor any changes to the existing flood hazard/overall flooding characteristics of the locality. | 7-8. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Infrastructure | 9. Uncertainty regarding applicable s7.11 contributions and applicable SIC rates. 10. Insufficient details on process for land reservation acquisition. | 9. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. 10. Any future acquisition would be in accordance with the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991. |
| | | | Zoning | 11. Suggests there is adequate open space providing for in the locality. Should the RE1 zone be applied, it should permit a broader range of compatible land uses and the RE2 Private Recreation zone should be considered. | 11. See section 4.1.2.2 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | Planning controls | 12. States that there is a missed opportunity to identify and encourage opportunities for exempt and complying development to be undertaken within the Precinct. | 12. See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 82 | LUDDENHAM LANDOWNER CONSORTIUM | Sites on Elizabeth Drive, The Northern Road, Adams Road, Eaton Road and Anton Road | Unzoned land | Submission represents 'Consortium Lands' which are in Luddenham. Under the changes to the WSEA SEPP, the site would no longer form part of the WSEA but would be zoned under a future Aerotropolis SEPP. Site is proposed to be located within the Agribusiness Precinct under the Aerotropolis. The submission states removing the site from the WSEA would result in a loss of potential employment lands. | 1-2. The land will remain under the future Aerotropolis SEPP. |
| 13 | LUPPINO, Salvatore & Carmela | 33-41 Mandalong Close, Orchard Hills | Unzoned land | 1. Is concerned that Mandalong Close (part of Mamre West Stage 2) is to be removed from the WSEA SEPP. 2. Requests that Mandalong Close remains within the WSEA SEPP area. The area should not be excluded due to flooding, with planning should follow Penrith Council's approach in their Floodplain Risk Management Plan. 3. Raises the rezoning of Mamre West - Stage 1 in 2016 and the success of this development in providing industrial land. | 1-3. See section 4.1.5.1 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|---|---|--|---|---|
| 20 | MAMRE ROAD HOLDINGS Pty Ltd and VAPOVI Pty Ltd Mamre Road, Kemps Creek Treek 1. The submission states that rezoning a quarter of the site for RE1 or E2 and leaving half of the site outside the WSEA application area would result in inefficiencies in the site's developable footprint, irregular shape and small pocked of IN1 making certain land uses within the IN1 zone undevelopable on the land. 2. The location of the proposed E2 zone to preserve the existing tributary of South Creek is not making best use of the land. The tributary could be realigned. 3. Already adequate open space provided for in the locality. Should RE1 zone be applies, it should permit a broader range of compatible land uses and the RE2 Private Rec zone considered more broadly. | 1. The proposal to zone the land as 'Environmental Conservation' (land use zone E2) was based on the riparian land definition under the Biodiversity Assessment Method Appendix 3, which is established by the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. 2. The realignment of creek tributary is not supported as planning seeks to maintain the natural features of watercourses. 3. Since exhibition, the extent of RE1 has been refined and the riparian corridor zoned RE1 to enable acquisition given the sites proximity to the Wianamatta-South Creek Precinct. | | | |
| | | Unzoned land 4. Rezoning a quarter of the site for RE1 or E2 and leaving half of the site outside the WSEA Application Area would result in inefficiencies in the site's developable footprint, irregular shape and small pocked of IN1 making certain land uses within the IN1 zone undevelopable on the land. 5. WSEA SEPP boundaries and land zonings should align and apply to defined parcels of land E2 could be absorbed in the adjoining IMT and sterilise land, which will impact on its future operation. | 4-5. Precinct planning always aims to align zoning the cadastre boundaries but this is not always possible. Sometimes different zones are needed within the one land parcel. | | |
| | | | sterilise land, which will impact on its future | 6. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report | |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|---|--|---------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | Flooding | 7. Overly stringent flood planning controls which contradict NSW Government and Penrith City Council planning policies by using 1:100 ARI. This results in an unnecessary sterilisation of land. These flood affected areas, when adjusted to the prevailing topography, would not result in any net loss of flood storage, nor any changes to the existing flood hazard/overall flooding characteristics of the locality. | 7. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Infrastructure | 8. Uncertainty regarding applicable s7.11 contributions and applicable SIC rates. 9. Insufficient details on process for, as well as costs and timing of, land reservation acquisition. | 8-9. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. |
| LANI GRO consi Mirva Propo Capit | MAMRE ROAD LANDOWNERS GROUP consisting of Mirvac, Frasers Property, Fife Capital, Stockland, Altis, | NA | Infrastructure Contributions | Submission requests exhibition of infrastructure contribution mechanisms for Mamre Road Precinct to allow landowners to understand the complete picture of the proposed costs of developing in the Precinct. The SIC contribution rate should be no more than the current applicable rate for the existing WSEA. | 1-2. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | GPT and Dexus | | Transport and traffic | 3. The Structure Plan should align with the strategic transport direction set out in the WSAP. Whilst it identifies the need for an IMT, it does not specify where it should be located and identifies that a series of investigations are needed before a site can confirmed. | 3. The structure plan is consistent with planning for the Aerotropolis. The Stage 1 Aerotropolis Plan identified the Mamre Road Precinct as the location for a potential IMT. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|---------|----------------------|---|--|
| | | | Planning controls | 4. Supports the use of WSEA SEPP as the primary environmental planning instrument. 5. New land uses and clauses should not be added to the WSEA SEPP, as these duplicate existing polices and local planning controls which still apply to the Precinct. 6. Majority of technical inputs can be resolved at the DCP or DA stage through detailed design, and by way of satisfying existing NSW policies and DCP controls. | 4. Noted.5. See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report.6. Noted. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|---------|-----------|---|---|
| | | | IMT | 7. IMT should not be identified in Mamre Road Precinct unless NSW Government can demonstrate to the public it is the most appropriate location for the use. | 7-14. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | | 8. Requests NSW Government review the cumulative supply of current and proposed IMTs. 9. Technical investigations need to confirm Mamre Road Precinct is an appropriate site for an IMT prior to identification on a Structure Plan and land zoning map. Challenges include topography in comparison to Moorebank site. 10. Dependent on the delivery of the Western Sydney Freight Line. Timing of announcement with Structure Plan, as opposed to fright corridor in 2018, appears to be an afterthought. 11. NSW Government need to confirm the legality of the concurrence required by TfNSW is the land for the IMT is not proposed to be compulsorily acquired but is intended to be privately owned and operated. 12. Need to advise if alternate locations were considered and provide analysis as to why Mamre Road Precinct is the preferred site. 13. Current market operations in WSEA and prospective tenants of Mamre Road Precinct do not require an IMT for their operations in the short, medium and long term. IMT has limited certainty of investment. 14. Size of overlay is oversized. | |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|---------|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | | Mamre Road Upgrade | 15. NSW Government needs to confirm that the proposed zoning and land acquisition for Mamre Road is consistent with the final design for the upgrade. 16. The NSW Government needs to confirm the program for delivery of the Mamre Road upgrade. 17. A concept design for Southern Link Road, including intersection treatment with Mamre Road, should be expedited to establish the land reservation requirements and remove the need for concurrence to TfNSW. 18. Whilst infrastructure contribution frameworks are refined, rezoning should not be prevents as satisfactory arrangement mechanisms are in place for DAs. | 15-18. TfNSW (former RMS) are currently undertaking the design of Stage 1 of the upgrade. The timeframe for future stages of the upgrade are yet to be determined. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Flooding | 19. The current flood planning level to 1:100 should be maintained. If the NSW Government seeks to update flood planning policy, the public should be presented with the opportunity to review the technical basis of the South Creek Sector Review to understand the rationale of amending current standards. 20. Should investigate the opportunity to maximise the appropriate use of land within the 1:100 ARI including water quality and quantity control basins. Permissible uses should be amended to allow this. | 19-20. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | Zoning | 21. Needs to be a clear match between environmental conservation areas and statutory controls. Evidence based studies need to demonstrate that appropriate areas are being conserved. 22. RE1 and RE2 zones should be removed as industrial estate will provide appropriate open space for employees. 23. NSW Government needs to confirm Councils stance on RE1 along South Creek and willingness to acquire flood prone land. 24. Clarification should be provided of the purpose of RE2 zone as the submitter considers that it should be removed. | 21-24. The proposal to zone land as 'Environmental Conservation' (land use zone E2) is based on the riparian land definition under the Biodiversity Assessment Method Appendix 3, which is established by the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. See section 4.1.2 of the Finalisation Report for discussion on the various zones. |
| | | | IMT | 25. Concurrence requirements to TfNSW should be removed from the proposed WSEA SEPP amendment for the IMT as it will not be a publicly owned and operated infrastructure asset. | 25. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report |
| 19 | MP PLANNING | 1080-1094 Mamre Road, | Transition areas | The submission raises concern in regard to what development controls will apply to transition areas. | 1. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | _ I | Kemps Creek | Transport and traffic | 2. Clarification sought on potential lot layouts and road structures for the precinct. The submission requests consultation with landowners as part of future masterplanning. | 2. See section 4.1.3 of the Finalisation Report. Future transport planning will include consultation with landowners, developers and other stakeholders as part of the preparation of the precinct wide DCP. |
| | | | Zoning | 3. Requests that their site is zoned IN1 Industrial as identified in the Structure Plan and not be rezoned as an infrastructure zone or buffer area. | 3. The site is to be zoned IN1 as identified in the exhibited zoning map. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|---|
| 37 | OLD MACDONALDS CHILD CARE | 25-31 Mandalong Close, Orchard Hills | Transport and traffic | 1. The submission is concerned that Mandalong Close is proposed to be a left-in, left-out as part of the Mamre Road upgrade works. If the RMS are relying on the proposed internal road linking to signalised lights at James Erskine Drive, RMS should not make decisions until Mamre West Stage 2 is finalised. 2. The intersection of Mamre Road and Erskine Park Road should be altered to a 4 way intersection to ensure safety of the child care centre | 1-2. The upgrade of Mamre Road is currently being designed by TfNSW (former RMS). This submission was provided to TfNSW for consideration. |
| 14 | ORLOVIC, Ana | 113-127 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek | Zoning | Objects to the proposed riparian buffer on their property. Provides a report which assesses the riparian land and waterways on their site. The report identifies that the watercourse does not meet the definition of a river under the WM Act 2000 and that further investigation is required. | The proposal to zone the land as 'Environmental Conservation' (land use zone E2) was based on the riparian land definition under the Biodiversity Assessment Method Appendix 3, which is under the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. The retention of this corridor provides an important link between Wianamatta-South Creek and Ropes Creek. See section 4.1.2.1 of the Finalisation Report for more information regarding E2 zoning. |
| 66 | PAZIT | AZIT Lot 1671 DP 855001 & Lot 4132 DP 857093 | Transition areas | Seek further details regarding the transition zone, area, interface, dimensions and likely uses. | 1. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Zoning | 2. Seeks clarification regarding drainage and open space land identified on the plan and if it is part of the PMF. | 2. See section 4.1.2.4 of the Finalisation Report |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|--------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | Planning controls | 3. States that as the second runway is not yet approved, land is not currently affected by ANEF 20 mapping. 4. States that land within Mount Vernon should allow for smaller minimum lot sizes. | 3. The noise contours are consistent with those identified as part of the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan and were developed in consideration of long-term planning for the airport. 4. Further subdivision for smaller lots is not supported as it would increase residential development which is inconsistent with the airport noise requirements. |
| | | | Infrastructure | 5. Seeks clarification on the following matters likely infrastructure levies for development of industrial land likely timeframe for services, sewer/water likely VPA arrangement to commence a Planning Proposal as soon as possible. | 5. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 50 | PERICA, Jack | 25-51 Aldington Road, | Planning controls | Aerotropolis LUIIP identified their site for flexible employment. | Noted. Planning for the Mamre Road Precinct was based on the Aerotropolis LUIIP but has included more detailed planning. |
| | | Kemps Creek | Zoning | Site is cleared of almost all native vegetation and has been replace with exotic/native garden plans. Flora and fauna assessment undertaken identifies site contains poor condition Cumberland Plain Woodland and is unlikely to meet definitions under the EPBC Act. Mapping inconsistency of site in environmental considerations and zoning. | 2-4. The proposal to zone the land as 'Environmental Conservation' (land use zone E2) was based on the presence of Cumberland Plain Woodland on the land. Cumberland Plain Woodland is listed as a Critically Endangered Ecological Community under Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. Zoning the land as land use zone E2 will help to protect the Cumberland Plain Woodland. The E2 zoning has been refined where possible, however, the site is still partly zoned E2. See section 4.1.2.1 of the Finalisation Report for more information regarding E2 zoning. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|--------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| 69 | PISATURO Family | Mandalong Close | Unzoned land | Questions why WSEA SEPP is being amended to remove Mamre West Stage 2. States that Altis have prepared all necessary studies require to support the rezoning of Mamre West Stage 2. The rezoning of this area could contribute to industrial land supply and should advance as soon as possible. Raises that Mamre West Stage 1 has been successful in delivering industrial land and has created 1000 jobs. | 1-3. See section 4.1.5 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 3 | POCHODYLA, Ted | 53 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek | Zoning | Objects to the proposed zoning of their land for environmental conservation as their site is elevated land and previously used for cattle grazing with few large gum trees. The vegetation is low scrub and lots of dead trees with no Cumberland Plain Woodland on site. Suggests the proposed environmental conservation zoning would create a bushfire hazard for adjoining industrial land. | 1. The proposal to zone the land as 'Environmental Conservation' (land use zone E2) was based on the presence of Cumberland Plain Woodland on the land. Cumberland Plain Woodland is listed as a Critically Endangered Ecological Community under Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. Zoning the land as land use zone E2 will help to protect the Cumberland Plain Woodland. The E2 zoning has been refined where possible, however, the site is still partly zoned E2. See section 4.1.2.1 of the Finalisation Report for more information regarding E2 zoning. 2. Adequate measures to address the risk of bushfire will be identified in the DCP. Industrial development are also required to meet fire safety standards. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-------------------------------|--|-----------|---|---|
| 4 | POCHODYLA, Ted and Charles | 53 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek | Zoning | Proposed E2 Environmental Conservation. Requests a copy of the environmental impact study undertaken on their property. The submission states that there are no threatened species on his property and disagrees with zoning of land for environmental conservation as it is elevated land previously used for cattle grazing with no Cumberland Plain Woodland on site. 2. The proposed environmental conservation zoning would create a bushfire hazard for adjoining industrial land. 3. The submitter does not want to live in the industrial estate affected by aircraft noise and would be willing to consider acquisition by government. | 1. The proposal to zone the land as 'Environmental Conservation' (land use zone E2) was based on the presence of Cumberland Plain Woodland on the land. Cumberland Plain Woodland is listed as a Critically Endangered Ecological Community under Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. Zoning the land as land use zone E2 will help to protect the Cumberland Plain Woodland. The E2 zoning has been refined where possible, however, the site is still partly zoned E2. See section 4.1.2.1 of the Finalisation Report for more information regarding E2 zoning. 2. Adequate measures to address the risk of bushfire will be identified in the DCP. Industrial development are also required to meet fire safety standards. 3. Noted. This site has not been identified for acquisition at this stage. See section 4.1.2.1 of the Finalisation Report for more information. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|-------------------|---|---|
| 21 | PODESTA, Matthew & Ciara | 79-81 Mandalong Close, Orchard Hills | Unzoned land | Request that Mandalong Close (part of Mamre West Stage 2 area) remains within the WSEA SEPP area. The area should not be excluded due to flooding, with planning following Penrith Council's approach outlined the Floodplain Risk Management Plan. Raises that Mamre West Stage 1 was rezoned for industrial uses in 2016. The industrial development has been successful in providing employing users but has changed the character of the area. There was an expectation that Mamre West Stage 2 would be rezoned in the future following the completion of Mamre West Stage1. | 1-3. See section 4.1.5.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 58 | PRC Capital | NA | Planning controls | Requests expediting the rezoning of the precinct to address the existing issues about industrial land in Western Sydney. Suggests the DCP requirement should be completed as currently required in the WSEA SEPP to cover potential lag, whilst Precinct wide DCP is being prepared. | Noted. A precinct wide DCP is being prepared but the DCP requirement within the WSEA SEPP will be retained. |
| | | | Flooding | 3. Allow merit-based assessment for treatment of floodplain management where the cumulative flood impact can be demonstrated to improve by alterations within the 1:100 ARI. | 3. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Zoning | 4. The IN1 should be applied to their site rather than RE2 zone and allow assessment of the floodplain to be done at DA stage. | 4. The RE2 zone covers land affected by the 1:100 year flood or land that will be isolated in such a flood. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-------------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | Transition areas | 5. Transition areas should be limited to 250m of residential land, with RE2 and E2 zones assessed as part of precinct wide DCP. | 5. See section 4.1.8 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Reservoir | 6. The proposed location of the water reservoir is unsuitable as it should be at a peak and is affected by an easement. | 6. The reservoir has been deleted. See section 4.1.9 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | IMT | 7. There is a lack of interest in IMT by property industry. Recommends the IMT is removed and the rezoning process is permitted to proceed to allow the development of other parcels. | 7. See section 4.1.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 48 | PROPERTY COUNCIL OF AUSTRALIA | INCIL OF | Zoning | Supports the release of the precinct and the use of the IN1 General Industrial Zone. | 1. Noted. |
| | | | Traffic and Transport | Supports the upgrade of Mamre Road and future delivery of Southern Link Road. | 2. See sections 4.1.1.2 and 4.1.1.3 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Transpor | Transport | 3. Notes the Western Sydney Freight Line and advises that planning for this corridor should not impede new industrial land. |
| | | | Intermodal | Landowners have concerns that the intermodal will delay the future provision of industrial land. | 4. See section 4.1.1.1 of the Finalisation Report.5. Noted. |
| | | | | 5. Supports the effective movement of freight but has concern regarding the loss of developable industrial land. | |
| | | | Biodiversity | 6. Understands the significance of the Wianamatta-South Creek as part of the bluegreen grid. Setbacks and flood planning levels should align with the Western Sydney Aerotropolis SEPP. | 6. Noted. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|--|--|---------------------|---|---|
| | | | Transition Areas | 7. Minimise the conflict with nearby residential uses. Recognises the proposed distances with the Mount Vernon Residential Area | 7. See section 4.1.8 of the Finalisation Report. 8. Noted |
| | | | | 8. Existing schools and aged care facility within the precinct and the incompatibilities with industrial uses. | |
| | | | Infrastructure | 9. Much of the Precinct can connect to required services which would allow construction to commence in the short term. | 9. Noted |
| | | | Contributions | 10. Does not support the use of a satisfactory arrangement clause (SAC). Would prefer the introduction of a reasonable SIC. | 10. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Flooding | 11. Supports the use of the 1:100 flood level as the base level. Does not support the potential use of the PMF. | 11. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | SAPONI, ELLESMERE and SAINTLY Investments | 83-91 Mandalong Close, Orchard Hills | Unzoned land | Why has Mamre West Stage 2 has not been included in the rezoning. The submitter notes the delivery of Mamre West Stage 1 and the success in delivering industrial land. Also noted that this development included refinement of the 1:100 flood line. | 1-2. See section 4.1.5.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | | Flooding | 3. Planning approach is inconsistent with Penrith Council's approach to flood planning in their recently exhibited South Creek Floodplain Risk Management Plan (September 2019). | 3. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the |
|-----|------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | Finalisation Report |
| | | | Supply of industrial land | 4. The submission raises that there is an urgent need to increase industrial land supply in Western Sydney. The Mamre West Stage 2 could provide 50-60 hectares of developable land which would have access to the M4 and M7. | 4. The shortage of industrial land is acknowledged and forms part of the reason why the release of the Mamre Road Precinct has been expedited. Mamre Rd (Stage 2) will be considered separately along with its flood constraints. |
| 23 | SCHELLNACK, Gregory | 75-77 Mandalong Close, Orchard Hills | Unzoned land | Request that Mandalong Close (part of Mamre West Stage 2 area) remains within the WSEA SEPP area. This area should not be excluded due to flooding, with planning following Penrith Council's approach outlined the Floodplain Risk Management Plan. | 1-2. See section 4.1.5 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 10 | SHARP, Mark | 25-31 Mandalong Close, Orchard Hills | Unzoned land | 1. Wanting to understand why Mamre West Stage 2 has not been included as part of the WSEA and would like it included to allow development. 2. Raises that Mamre West Stage 1 was rezoned and included the use of fill to address flood impacts. Should Mamre West Stage 2 not be permitted due to filling then there should have been consideration of this issue for Mamre West Stage 1. | 1-2. See section 4.1.5 of the Finalisation Report. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|--|---|------------------------|---|---|
| 43 | SJH Planning & Design (on behalf of 19-105 Capital Hill Drive) | 19-105 Capital Hill Drive, Mount Vernon | Transition areas | Requests clarification on the following matters: 1. Further understanding regarding the proposed interface with existing rural residential subdivision. 2. The potential to allow additional rural residential lots on their land at a smaller lot size to offset loss of rural residential on industrial land. 3. The likely acceptance of such a subdivision in consideration of the Jacfin development which is proposed within the ANEC contours. 4. Whether a 'credit' may be extended to client in terms of offset to future contributions at the local level given existing approvals. 5. Likely timeframe for the provision of access and services to enable industrial development on the land. | Detailed controls will be provided in the precinct wide DCP. 4. No residential or increase in residential development will be permitted due to airport noise controls. Services are planned and will be available to match development. |
| 2 | SMITH, Michael | NA | Intermodal terminal | The delivery of the intermodal terminal should be prioritised to remove freight from the road network. | Noted. See section 4.1.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 5 | TRIMBOLI, Joe | NA | Unzoned land | 1. The submitter lives outside of precinct on the southern end of Mamre Road and would like their site to be included in the Mamre Road Precinct to allow industrial development. 2. Should sites on Mamre Road be left out of the Mamre Road Precinct, it would detrimentally impact the amenity of the remaining rural residential housing which will adjoin an industrial precinct. 3. The submission also raises concern regarding future aircraft noise impacting on these sites and their enjoyment of the land. | 1-3. The site is within the Wianamatta-South Creek Precinct within the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan. Submission concerns will be considered as part of the finalisation of the Aerotropolis Plan. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|---|--|------------|--|--|
| 29 | TRUST Company (Australia) Limited Tompany Tompany (Australia) Limited Tompany Tompany Tompany Tompany (Australia) Limited Tompany Tompany | y Mamre book a) Road, Kemps | | and land zoning boundaries with defined parcels of land, creating planning system uncertainties | Precinct boundaries were determined as part of planning for the Aerotropolis Growth Area. Planning has sought to not separate developable land over different planning instruments. |
| | | | Flooding | contradict NSW Government and Penrith City Council planning policies by using 1:100 ARI. This results in an unnecessary sterilisation of land. These flood affected areas, when adjusted to the prevailing topography, would not result in any net loss of flood storage, nor any changes to the existing flood hazard/overall flooding characteristics of the locality. 3. Using the PMF as the default building level is | 2-3. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | 4. See section 4.1.1 of the Finalisation Report. | | | |
| | | | Intermodal | 5. There is currently no sound business case for the proposed IMT. | 5. TfNSW is developing a business case for the Western Sydney Freight Line and lead ins but TfNSW intends an IMT will be delivered by private enterprise. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|-------------------------|--|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | Infrastructure | 6. Uncertainty regarding applicable s7.12 contributions and applicable SIC rates. 7. Corridor width should not exceed 60m as to not unnecessarily sterilise otherwise developable land. 8. Insufficient details on process for, as well as costs and timing of, land reservation acquisition. Acquisition should be at the highest and best industrial land use. | 6. See section 4.1.7 of the Finalisation Report. 7. The Freight rail corridor is unchanged from the proposed 60m as exhibited by TfNSW. 8. Any future acquisition would be in accordance with the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991. |
| | | | Zoning | 9. There is already adequate open space provided for in the locality. This should be sufficient without sterilising flood free industrial land. A broad range of land uses and RE2 zone should be considered. 10. General incompatibilities with SSD 9522. IN1 General Industrial zone should apply to DA in its entirety. | 9. See section 4.1.2.2 of the Finalisation Report. 10. The assessment of the SSD is considering the outcomes of planning for the Mamre Road Precinct and Aerotropolis. |
| | | | Planning controls | 11. Missed opportunity to identify and encourage opportunities for exempt and complying development to be undertaken within the Precinct. | 11. See section 4.1.6 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 78 | University of Sydney | McGarvie Smith and Fleurs Farms (Outside of Precinct) | Zoning | The university holds major land holdings which are outside of the Mamre Road Precinct but within the Western Sydney Aerotropolis. 1. Concerned that rezoning of the Mamre Road precinct has been accelerated and out of sequence. | Planning for the Western Sydney Aerotropolis and the release of precincts is being undertaken in accordance with the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan. The Mamre Road Precinct was identified to be zoned under the WSEA SEPP as it directly adjoined the existing WSEA. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | | Infrastructure | Considers a disproportional amount of open space and drainage zones have been allocated to adjoining future employment areas. | Planning for Mamre Road Precinct has considered the open space and drainage requirements to deliver the Precinct. |
| | | | Transport and traffic | Concerned that there is no local and regional network transport plan coordinated across all precincts. | 3. DPIE has worked closely with Transport for NSW on the co-ordination of the regional road network. The local road network will be considered as part of the preparation of a Mamre Road Precinct Development Control Plan. |
| 1 | WOOD, Monique | NA | Transport and traffic | There should be a greater focus on adding passenger rail and suggests a passenger railway station linking the community to Liverpool, Parramatta and the City should be provided due to traffic congestion and people currently being forced to drive. | Commuter rail is being considered for the Western City District as part of Sydney Metro Greater West and future planning for East-West Rail Link. |
| 38 | Pty Ltd Street, | Southridge Street, | Planning controls | Requests statutory heritage protection to Southridge House within the existing zoned WSEA. | 1. Heritage provisions have been included within the WSEA SEPP. See section 4.1.10 of the Finalisation Report. |
| | | Eastern Creek | Zoning | Requests amending the zoning of Southridge Plaza from IN1 General Industrial to B1 Neighbourhood Centre. | 2. No amendments have been made to existing zoned sites under the WSEA SEPP. Rezoning of this site may be considered as part of a site-specific Planning Proposal. |
| 15 | YOUKHANIS, Dunya | Mount Vernon | Transition areas | States that the transition area should be at least 1000m away from Precinct boundary and at least 500m wide and should be zoned E2 Environmental Conservation. Suggests the precinct boundary can be a 4-lane road connecting to Mamre Road. | The proposed transition area follows the existing provisions in the WSEA SEPP. See section 4.1.8 of the Finalisation Report. The precinct boundary was determined by several factors. Roads may be designed to provide buffers, where appropriate. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|---------------|---------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | Zoning | 3. Suggests rezoning all battle-axe properties (all properties next to and including lot 1295). | 3. The proposal is for properties which are not within the precinct. |
| 6 | Name Withheld | | Flooding | 1. The submission does not consider it realistic to have so much land allocated as flood zone. Only 1/3 of their property is proposed to be rezoned for development with the remaining land to be zoned E2 Environmental Conservation. | 1. Planning does not propose to zone land below the 1% AEP for development. This will ensure that the intent for development is clear and that development below the 1%AEP will not be supported. This is consistent with planning for the Aerotropolis Growth Area and the South Creek Sector Review. See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 7 | Name Withheld | | Intermodal | Supports the proposed intermodal terminal as a freight solution for Western Sydney. Suggests that the delivery of the intermodal should be the primary focus of planning for the Mamre Road Precinct. | 1-2. Noted. |
| | | | Transport and Traffic | 3. Supports the Western Sydney Freight Line which will service the intermodal terminal and freight trains from Botany to Western Sydney instead of trucks. | 3. Noted. |
| 11 | Name Withheld | | Zoning | The submitter requests their land will be zoned industrial given proximity to Aerotropolis, M12 and the intermodal. | 1. The site is partly within the Mamre Road Precinct and partly within the Aerotropolis SEPP. The part within the Mamre Road Precinct is identified as part RE1 Public Recreation and part IN1 General Industrial. The western portion will fall under the Aerotropolis SEPP and falls under the Wianamatta - South Creek Precinct. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|---------------|---------|--------------|---|--|
| 49 | Name Withheld | | Unzoned land | Properties on Mamre Road which have been excluded from the precinct should be included in the precinct. Should these properties not be rezoned the impact of industrial development will be detrimental to this rural residential area. The increased traffic and industrial development will impact existing property and there are safety concerns as properties directly adjoins Mamre Road as well as increased noise and air pollution. | See section 4.1.5 of the Finalisation Report. See section 4.1.3 of the Finalisation Report. |
| 81 | Name withheld | | Flooding | There are has been no investigation into flood prone land as part of precinct planning. | See section 4.1.4 of the Finalisation Report. An integrated water management plan is being prepared for the precinct and will form part of the DCP. It has considered flood planning. |
| | | | Zoning | 2. Aerial imagery review has revealed that no watercourse is evident along the portion of land identified as watercourse and riparian land. A hydrological investigation should be undertaken to identify the watercourse. | 2. See comments below under (80). |
| 80 | Name withheld | F | Zoning | Site identified to be zoned RE1 and E2 for riparian corridor. The draft also proposes to designate the site for partial acquisition for the purposes of Local Open Space. The submission objects to the riparian zone as considers it inappropriate for the site and does not consider that a watercourse does not exist on the site. The proposed RE1 and E2 zoning unnecessarily sterilises the land and is not an appropriate future use of the site. Provides a supplementary report which assesses the riparian land and waterways on their site. | 1-4. See section 4.1.2.1 of the Finalisation Report. The E2 and RE1 zones have been removed from this site due to further investigation. A creek is still located in the area and will have to be considered (along with any buffer required) as part of any DA for the site as well as any drainage requirements. |

| No. | Name | Address | Key issue | Summary | DPIE Response Also see relevant section(s) in the Finalisation Report |
|-----|------|---------|------------|--|---|
| | | | Exhibition | 5. Department has failed to undertake appropriate ecological and hydrogeological studies for the site. | 5. An integrated water management plan, including consideration of flood planning, is being prepared for the precinct and will form part of the DCP. A riparian corridors assessment has also been completed which has informed zoning changes. |