# Macquariedale Road, Appin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Title</th>
<th>Macquariedale Road, Appin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Summary</td>
<td>To rezone rural land fronting Macquariedale Road at Appin to allow for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- low density housing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the environmental management of ecologically important land, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the protection of a strategic road corridor for a future Appin by-pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP Number</td>
<td>PP_2011_WOLLY_014_00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dop File No.</td>
<td>11/16795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Proposal Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Planning Proposal Received</th>
<th>LGA covered</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>RPA</th>
<th>State Electorate</th>
<th>Section of the Act</th>
<th>LEP Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13-Sep-2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wollondilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wollondilly Shire Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Location Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Postcode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 Macquariedale Road</td>
<td>Appin</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>2560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1, DP 209779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Macquariedale Road</td>
<td>Appin</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>2560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 201, DP 749272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DoP Planning Officer Contact Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Contact Number</th>
<th>Contact Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mato Prskalo</td>
<td>0298738588</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mato.prskalo@planning.nsw.gov.au">mato.prskalo@planning.nsw.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RPA Contact Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Contact Number</th>
<th>Contact Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin Cooper</td>
<td>0246771173</td>
<td><a href="mailto:martin.cooper@wollondilly.nsw.gov.au">martin.cooper@wollondilly.nsw.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DoP Project Manager Contact Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Contact Number</th>
<th>Contact Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terry Doran</td>
<td>0298738557</td>
<td><a href="mailto:terry.doran@planning.nsw.gov.au">terry.doran@planning.nsw.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Land Release Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Centre</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Release Area Name</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional/Sub Regional Strategy</td>
<td>Metro South West subregion</td>
<td>Consistent with Strategy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDP Number</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date of Release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Release (Ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Lots</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>No. of Dwellings</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Floor Area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No of Jobs Created</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If No, comment:

The Department's record of contact with registered lobbyists was checked and did not indicate that any communications or meetings with lobbyists have occurred in relation to the Proposal.

Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists?

No

If Yes, comment:

### Supporting notes

**Internal Supporting Notes:**

INTERNAL CONSULTATION

The Proposal was referred to the Metropolitan Development Program (MDP) Branch of the Department for information. That Branch has raised issues primarily relating to the scale and purpose of the Proposal, including infrastructure.

The MDP team also advised that the Minister may initiate a Sydney Basin land release review in the near future. This would include an earlier, and still current, proposal covering a much larger area west of Appin for up to 18,300 dwellings, which includes the land the subject of the Proposal.

**AMENDMENT TO PLANNING PROPOSAL**

Council's covering letter and the Planning Proposal it originally provided to the Department are attached at Tag A. The Department subsequently sought Council to amend the Proposal to address the existence of Cumberland Plain Woodland on the site. The amended Planning Proposal is attached at Tag B.

**External Supporting Notes:**

The Planning Proposal seeks to extend the existing Appin village to the west.

### Adequacy Assessment

**Statement of the objectives - s55(2)(a)**

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment:

The Proposal seeks to rezone 60.14 hectares of land to allow for low density housing, the environmental management of a biodiversity corridor and the protection of a strategic...
Explanation of provisions provided - s55(2)(b)

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment: It is proposed to facilitate the Proposal by:

- amending the Land Zoning Map under Wollondilly LEP 2011 (shown at Tag 'C') to rezone the land from:

  part Zone RU2 Rural Landscape, part Zone R3 Medium Density Residential and part Zone RE1 Public Recreation,

  to:

  part Zone R2 Low Density Residential, part Zone SP2 Infrastructure and part Zone E2 Environmental Conservation (shown at Tag 'D'),

- amending the Lot Size Map under Wollondilly LEP 2011 (shown at Tag 'E') to reduce the minimum lot size from part 40ha and part 975sqm to part 100ha and part 450sqm (shown at Tag 'F'),

- amending the Height of Buildings Map under Wollondilly LEP 2011 to apply a 9 metre maximum building height to the area proposed to be zoned R2 Low Density Residential, and

- amending the Land Reservation Acquisition Map under Wollondilly LEP 2011 to show the land proposed to be zoned SP2 Infrastructure to facilitate acquisition by the Roads and Traffic Authority.

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? No

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA: 1.2 Rural Zones
   1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries
   2.1 Environment Protection Zones
   2.3 Heritage Conservation
   3.1 Residential Zones
   3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
   4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land
   4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
   6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes
   7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036

* May need the Director General's agreement

Is the Director General's agreement required? Yes

c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006:

d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? SREP No. 20 - Hawkesbury–Nepean River (No. 2 - 1997)

e) List any other matters that need to be considered:

Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? No

If No, explain:

SECTION 117 DIRECTIONS

Direction 1.2 Rural Zones

This Direction seeks to protect the agricultural production value of rural land by preventing its rezoning to certain other zones, including residential, and by ensuring
that the permissible density of land within a rural zone (other than land within an
existing town or village) is not increased.

The Proposal is inconsistent with this Direction as it seeks to rezone rural land to a
residential zone. However, the inconsistency is considered to be of minor significance
as:

- the subject land is located on the edge of an existing urban area, which restricts the
  range of potential agricultural uses due to likely land use conflicts,
- the agricultural value of the land is low, consisting of part class 3 and part class 4
  agricultural land.

If the Proposal proceeds through the Gateway, it is recommended that the Director
General (or his delegate) approve the inconsistency pursuant to part 5(d) on the basis
that it is of minor significance.

Direction 1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries

This Direction seeks to protect the future extraction of State or regionally significant
reserves of coal, other minerals, petroleum and extractive materials from being
compromised by inappropriate development.

The Direction applies to the Proposal if, among other things, it would have the effect of
restricting the potential development of coal or other resources which are of State or
regional significance by permitting a land use that is likely to be incompatible with such
development.

The subject land is underlain by an existing coal mining tenement and is also the
subject of a separate Part 3A application for underground coal mining (known as Bulli
Seam). Therefore, this Direction applies to the Proposal.

The Direction requires Council to consult with the Director General of the Department of
Primary Industries (Minerals and Petroleum). It is considered that, if the Proposal
proceeds through the Gateway, the consultation requirement should be made a
condition of the Determination.

Direction 2.1 Environment Protection Zones

This Direction seeks to protect and conserve environmentally sensitive areas. The
Direction requires the Proposal to, among other things, include provisions that facilitate
the protection and conservation of environmentally sensitive areas.

The Direction applies to the Proposal as the subject land contains Shale Sandstone
Transition Forest, which is identified as an Endangered Ecological Community under the

Most of the subject land is covered by the Forest and the Proposal seeks to rezone much
of that area to E2 Environmental Conservation. The Forest also covers the proposed
route of the Appin bypass, which is proposed to be zoned SP2 Infrastructure. Council
understands that the former Department of Environmen, Climate Change and Water has
approved, in principle, the use of adjoining land owned by the applicant to the north as
an offset against the loss of vegetation that will occur when the Appin Bypass is
constructed. The area proposed to be zoned R2 Low Density Residential will require the
removal of part of the Forest.

The Shale Sandstone Transition Forest on the subject land is a type of Cumberland
Plain Woodland. The Woodland on this site has been identified as Priority Conservation
Land (PCL) under the Cumberland Plain Recovery Plan, as adopted under the
Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995 (TSC Act). Under section 69 of the TSC Act, ministers and public authorities are required to implement measures for which they are responsible under recovery plans and must not make any decisions that are inconsistent with the provisions of a recovery plan. Action 1.4 of the Recovery Plan requires local councils to have regard to Priority Conservation Lands in identifying areas for inclusion in environment protection zones. The area proposed to be zoned E2 Environment Conservation appears to satisfy Action 1.4, but the land proposed to be zoned SP2 Infrastructure and RZ Low Density Residential does not appear to satisfy Action 1.4.

In view of the above, it is considered that, if the Proposal proceeds:
- the proposed residential area should not apply to the PCL,
- Council should consult the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) for its views on the Proposal, specifically whether the Proposal adequately addresses Action 1.4 of the Recovery Plan. It is noted that Council has previously consulted OEH's predecessor on the proposal, which did not support the Proposal due to its potential impacts on PCL. OEH also expressed concern about the proposed vegetation offsets, the adequacy of the flora assessment and the proposed route of the Appin bypass.

It is considered that the consistency of the Proposal with the subject section 117 Direction cannot be determined until the results of the consultation with OEH are known.

Direction 2.3 Heritage Conservation

This Direction requires the Proposal to facilitate the conservation of:
(a) items, places, buildings, works, relics, moveable objects or precincts of environmental heritage significance to an area, in relation to the historical, scientific, cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, natural or aesthetic value of the item, area, object or place, identified in a study of the environmental heritage of the area,
(b) Aboriginal objects or Aboriginal places that are protected under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974, and
(c) Aboriginal areas, Aboriginal objects, Aboriginal places or landscapes identified by an Aboriginal heritage survey prepared by or on behalf of an Aboriginal Land Council, Aboriginal body or public authority and provided to the relevant planning authority, which identifies the area, object, place or landscape as being of heritage significance to Aboriginal culture and people.

The subject land does not contain any heritage or archaeological items that are currently listed under Wollondilly LEP 2011. However, a heritage assessment of the subject land was carried out and identified items relating to European and Aboriginal heritage. The heritage assessment recommended measures for the conservation of these items at the development stage rather than proposing formal heritage or archaeological listings under Wollondilly LEP 2011. It is considered that, if the Proposal proceeds through the Gateway, Council should be required to consult with the Office of Environment and Heritage in relation to the need for a further heritage study and the whether heritage listings are required.

Direction 3.1 Residential Zones

This Direction applies as the Proposal seeks to rezone land within both existing and proposed residential zones.

Part 4 of the Direction requires the Proposal to include provisions that encourage the provision of housing that will:
(a) broaden the choice of building types and locations available in the housing market, and
(b) make more efficient use of existing infrastructure and services, and
(c) reduce the consumption of land for housing and associated urban development on the urban fringe, and
(d) be of good design.

Comments

(a) The Proposal will provide housing opportunities and can be expected to increase housing choice.

(b) It is expected that the Proposal will make more efficient use of existing infrastructure and services. It is noted that Sydney Water has commenced construction of a reticulated sewage service for both existing development and future growth areas at Appin, which includes the subject land. The inclusion of growth areas in the service planning has made the provision more viable and allowed it to be brought forward.

(c) The Proposal is inconsistent with part 4(c) of the Direction as it does not reduce the consumption of land for housing and associated urban development on the urban fringe. However, Appin is a small village surrounded by rural land and is not part of a broader urban area. In addition, the Draft South West Subregional Strategy acknowledges that the towns, villages and rural areas of the subregion have the potential to accommodate some additional housing. This is reflected by Council's Growth Management Strategy 2011, which identifies the subject land as a potential residential growth area. The Strategy has been adopted by Council and submitted to the Department for final endorsement. The Strategy is currently receiving consideration by the regional team, however, the identification of the subject land for potential growth appears to be sound.

If the Proposal proceeds through the Gateway, it is recommended that the Director General's approval to the above inconsistency be granted pursuant to part 6(c) of the Direction on the basis that it is in accordance with the Draft South West Subregional Strategy.

(d) While the Proposal itself will not encourage the provision of housing that will be of good design, if the Proposal proceeds through the Gateway, Council's comprehensive development control plan will apply to the development of the subject land and impose detailed controls for building form and character.

If the Proposal proceeds through the Gateway, it is recommended that the Director General's approval to the above inconsistency be granted pursuant to part 6(d) of the Direction on the basis that it is of minor significance.

Part 5 of the Direction requires the Proposal to:
(a) contain a requirement that residential development is not permitted until land is adequately serviced (or arrangements satisfactory to the council, or other appropriate authority, have been made to service it), and
(b) not contain provisions which will reduce the permissible residential density of land.

Comments

(a) If the Proposal proceeds through the Gateway, it is considered that Part 6 Urban Release Areas of Wollondilly LEP 2011 should be applied to the subject land. This would apply the model clauses requiring satisfactory arrangements to be made for the provision of State infrastructure before development of the subject land is approved.

(b) The Proposal is inconsistent with part 5(b) of the Direction as it proposes to rezone part of the subject land from R3 Medium Density Residential to R2 Low Density Residential. This will reduce the permissible residential density of the land. However, only a small part of the subject land is affected.

If the Proposal proceeds through the Gateway, it is recommended that the Director General's approval to the above inconsistency be granted pursuant to part 6(d) of the Direction on the basis that it is of minor significance.
Direction 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport

This Direction applies to the Proposal as it seeks to create a zone relating to urban land (i.e., R2 Low Density Residential). The Direction requires the Proposal to be consistent with:
- "Improving Transport Choice - Guidelines for planning and development (DUAP 2001)",
- "The Right Place for Business and Services - Planning Policy (DUAP 2001).

The Proposal is considered to be generally consistent with the above Guideline as the subject land adjoins an existing residential area. The above Planning Policy is not relevant to the Proposal as it does not propose employment uses. Appin Village includes a commercial precinct, which would serve the development envisaged by the Proposal.

The Proposal indicates that a regular bus service exists between Appin and Wollongong and Appin and Campbelltown (including Macarthur and Campbelltown stations). School bus services are also provided to high schools in the region.

Direction 4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land

This Direction applies to the Proposal as it is located within a proclaimed Mine Subsidence District and proposes to permit development on that land. The Direction requires Council to consult the Mine Subsidence Board (MSB) on specific matters and, if necessary, amend the proposed LEP accordingly. The Direction requires Council to provide the Department with a copy of the MSB's advice prior to undertaking community consultation. Council proposes to consult the Mine Subsidence Board on the Proposal and it is considered that this should be made a condition of the Gateway determination if the Proposal proceeds.

Direction 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection

This Direction applies as the Proposal contains bushfire prone land. It is considered that, if the Proposal proceeds, Council is required to comply with the Direction by consulting with the Commissioner of the NSW Rural Fire Service following receipt of the Gateway Determination, and prior to undertaking community consultation, and taking into account any comments so made.

Direction 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes

This Direction applies to the Proposal as it seeks to rezone land to SP2 infrastructure for the reservation of the Appin bypass. The reservation is proposed to be located to the west of the route endorsed in-principle by the Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA). However, it is understood that the RTA has no objection to its relocation subject to the endorsement of the Office of Environment and Heritage. If the Proposal proceeds through the Gateway, Council will need to obtain the approval of the RTA and the Director General of the Department of Planning and Infrastructure to the creation of the zoning.

Direction 7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036

This Direction requires the Proposal to be consistent with the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036. The Proposal is considered to be generally consistent with this Plan as the Plan provides for rural villages to be managed through new comprehensive local strategies prepared by local councils and endorsed by the Department. Council has prepared and adopted the Wollondilly Growth Management
STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICIES

State Environmental Planning Policy No.20 - Hawkesbury-Nepean River (No. 2 - 1997) (SREP 20) applies to the Planning Proposal as the subject land is located within the catchment of the Nepean River. The Proposal is not considered to be inconsistent with the SREP.

Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? Yes
Comment:

Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes
Comment: It is considered that the exhibition period should be 28 days.

Additional Director General's requirements

Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No
If Yes, reasons:

Overall adequacy of the proposal

Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes
If No, comment:

Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

Due Date: February 2011
Comments in relation to Principal LEP:

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal:
The Planning Proposal is the best means of achieving the intended aim as a rezoning is required to facilitate the proposal.

Consistency with strategic planning framework:
STATE AND REGIONAL STRATEGIC PLANS
The Proposal is generally consistent with the relevant objectives and actions contained within the draft South West Subregional Strategy and the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036.

WOLLONDILLY GROWTH MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2011
The Wollondilly Growth Management Strategy 2011 identifies the subject land as a potential residential growth area (see map attached at Tag G). Council has adopted the Strategy and submitted it to the Department for final endorsement. The Strategy is currently receiving consideration by the regional team.
Environmental social economic impacts:

The Proposal entails the removal of some Cumberland Plain Woodland for the construction of the Appin bypass and residential development. While vegetation offsets are proposed to be used for the Appin bypass, these would not apply to the area proposed for residential development. If the Proposal proceeds through the Gateway, consultation with the Office of Environment and Heritage will be required under s34A of the EP&As Act 1979.

It is not considered that there will be any adverse social or economic impacts from the Proposal, subject to the proponent funding all necessary infrastructure requirements.

Assessment Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal type:</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Community Consultation Period:</th>
<th>28 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe to make LEP:</td>
<td>24 Month</td>
<td>Delegation:</td>
<td>DDG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Authority Consultation - 55(2)(d):

- Essential Energy
- NSW Aboriginal Land Council
- Ambulance Service of NSW
- Area Health Services
- Catchment Management Authority - Hawkesbury / Nepean
- Delta Electricity
- Department of Agriculture
- Department of Education and Communities
- Office of Environment and Heritage
- Department of Industry & Investment (Agriculture)
- Energy Australia
- Integral Energy
- Mine Subsidence Board
- Department of Transport NSW
- NSW Police Service
- NSW Rural Fire Service
- Transport NSW
- Origin Energy
- Pacific Power
- Reporting Services Branch
- State Rail
- State Transit Authority of NSW
- Sydney Water
- Telstra
- Transgrid

Is Public Hearing by the PAC required? No

(2)(a) Should the matter proceed? Yes

If no, provide reasons:

Resubmission - s56(2)(b): No

If Yes, reasons:

Identify any additional studies, if required.

Fauna
If Other, provide reasons:

The following reports have been prepared:

- Flora assessment: it is considered that OEH should be consulted on its adequacy.
- Archaeological assessment: it is considered that OEH should be consulted on its adequacy.
Macquarievale Road, Appin

- Preliminary riparian corridor investigation.
- Traffic report.

Identify any internal consultations, if required:

Residential Land Release (MDP)

Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? Yes

If Yes, reasons:

The Proposal was also referred to the Manager, Infrastructure Planning of the Department on 16 September 2011, for comments. Advice was not received prior to the submission of the Proposal to the LEP Review Panel. Comments can be provided directly to the Deputy Director General if required.

If no comments are received, it is recommended that the following agencies be asked to comment on the need for State infrastructure:
- Roads and Traffic Authority, and
- Department of Education.

It is noted that the trunk water supply is located in proximity to the subject land, though its capacity to service the subject land would need to be confirmed with Sydney Water.

Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document File Name</th>
<th>Document/Type Name</th>
<th>Is Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Planning Team Recommendation

Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage: Recommended with Conditions

S.117 directions:
1.2 Rural Zones
1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries
2.1 Environment Protection Zones
2.3 Heritage Conservation
3.1 Residential Zones
3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land
4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes
7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036

Additional Information:

It is recommended that the Proposal proceed subject to the following conditions:

1) The Director General agrees that the inconsistency with section 117 Direction - 1.2 Rural Zones is justified pursuant to part 5(d) of the Direction;

2) The Director General agrees that the inconsistency with section 117 Direction - 1.3 Residential Zones is justified pursuant to parts 6(c) and (d) of the Direction;

3) The Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) should be consulted to determine the adequacy of the archaeological assessment and whether the listing of any heritage or archaeological items or sites is required;

4) Before any other agency consultation occurs, the OEH should be consulted under section 34A of the EP&A Act 1979, specifically to:
   - determine the adequacy of the flora assessment,
   - determine an appropriate boundary for the proposed R2 Low Density Residential zone in view of the Shale Sandstone Transition Forest on the site, that is consistent with the Cumberland Plain Woodland Recovery Plan,
   - determine the appropriateness of the proposed location of the Appin bypass reservation, and
- confirm the applicable vegetation offsets;

5) Consultation with other public authorities required below is not to commence until the consultation with OEH has been completed and any necessary further studies and zoning boundary changes have been undertaken to address any matters raised by OEH;

6) Consultation is required with the Director General of the Department of Primary Industries (Minerals and Petroleum) pursuant to Director 1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries;

7) The consistency of the Proposal with section 117 Directions 2.1 Environment Protection Zones and 2.3 Heritage Conservation should be demonstrated after the results of consultation with the OEH have been finalised;

8) Consultation is required with the Mine Subsidence Board pursuant to section 117 Direction 4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land;

9) Consultation is required with the Commissioner of the NSW Rural Fire Service pursuant to section 117 Direction 4.4 - Planning for Bushfire Protection;

10) The approval of the Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA) is required for the proposed SP2 Infrastructure zoning, pursuant to Section 117 Direction 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes. Following advice from the RTA, Council will need to seek the approval of the Director General of Planning and Infrastructure pursuant to the Direction;

11) Consultation is required with Sydney Water in relation to its servicing ability for the subject land;

12) Community consultation is required under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of the EP&A Act 1979 for a period of 28 days;

13) If no comments are received from the Department’s Manager, Infrastructure Planning, before the Gateway determination is made, the following agencies should be asked to comment on the need for State infrastructure:
   - Roads and Traffic Authority, and
   - Department of Education;

14) After being revised to comply with the above conditions and prior to undertaking community consultation, the Proposal is to be returned to the Department for endorsement;

15) General consultation is required with the other public authorities identified in this report; and

16) The timeframe for completing the local environmental plan is to be 24 months from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.

Supporting Reasons:
The Proposal rezones land adjoining an existing residential area and will help to accommodate growth within the Wollondilly Local Government Area.

Signature: [Signature]
Printed Name: [Printed Name]  Date: [Date]