

Attachment 2: Table Summarising Submissions

SUBMITTER	Summary of Comments	Section to which comments relate	Suggested Change	Response
COMMUNITY SUBMISSION				
SUBMISSION 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the policy and the clarity it provides to proponents. • The criteria for categorisation or proposals into Minor, Major (low Complexity) and Major (high complexity) is unclear. It does not provide sufficient certainty on how a proposal will be categorised which ultimately determines fees, reporting and consultation requirements. • Consultation requirements for Council should be the same as they apply to other proponents. • Questions the intent of Section 4.9.5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.2.1 • 4.4.5 • 4.9.5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use thresholds or trigger values (particularly between major-low and major-high complexity) to ensure consistency and to provide proponents with certainty • A number of changes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If Council are proposing what would otherwise be categorised as 'Major' Planning Proposal, a minimum 28 days consultation should be required, - Council should write to landowners within the site as is required for all other Minor and Major proposals, - Council should write to landowners and occupants immediately adjoining the site(s) of the proposal, as is required for all other Minor and major proposals - Council should write to landowners and occupants immediately adjoining the site(s) of the proposal, as is required for all other Minor or Major proposals, - Council should write to any adjoining Council if the site is located near the end of the Shire, as is required for all other Minor and Major proposals. • Suggests changing the wording at 4.9.5 to <i>will not be</i> 'investigated' or 'considered'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
PUBLIC AGENCY SUBMISSIONS				
NSW RFS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports intent of Section 4.7 • Where a "potential critical threshold issue" may exist in relation to bush fire, a requirement for proponents to consult with our organisation early in the strategic planning process, may result in positive planning outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.7 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific change requested 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Water NSW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Proposals must continue to be prepared in accordance with Ministerial Direction 5.2 for planning proposals within the Sydney Drinking Water Catchment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.7.1 • 4.4.5 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 4.7.1 is inconsistent with Ministerial Direction 5.2. WaterNSW owns significant water supply infrastructure in Wollondilly and expects to be consulted on draft planning proposals that have the potential to impact on this infrastructure. Section 4.4.5 only requires WaterNSW to be notified as a landowner automatically for draft planning proposals initiated by external proponents. Water NSW requests the table is amended to include consultation with WaterNSW as a minimum requirement for Council initiated draft planning proposals. WaterNSW currently does not charge any fee for the review of planning proposals. Requests continued consultation regarding planning proposals within the Sydney Drinking Water Catchment and/or the potential to impact WaterNSW's water supply infrastructure in accordance with the new adopted policy. 			
NSW Government Department of Primary Industries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the intent of the Draft Policy and is encouraged that the Policy acknowledges the need to assess impacts or limitations that a planning proposal is likely to have on surrounding agricultural enterprises. Suggests that pre-lodgement meetings should be used to filter planning proposals in the MRA to ensure they meet minimum criteria (lists some). By discouraging proponents from pursuing strategically poor planning proposals Council can reduce Council and Agency resources needed for review and comment. Provides a link to an example of a place based planning strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.2.1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None specified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
NSW Government Department of Planning & Environment - Division of Resources & Geoscience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks clarification on what is meant by 'critical threshold issue' at Section 4.7, particularly in relation to Wollondilly Mineral Resource Audit. Supports earlier consultation with agencies prior to Gateway Determination, however, mechanisms to refer relevant planning proposals to DRG for comment prior to Gateway Determination should be clarified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.7 		
NSW Government Office of Environment & Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 4.4 – early consultation for planning proposal involving items listed on the State Heritage Register or items considered to be of state significance (Even if not listed) is supported. Some Councils have resolved to seek Heritage Council comments prior to Gateway Determination to allow them to form part of the planning proposal submission. Requests timeframe for consultation with public agencies be extended to 21 days as a minimum. Section 4.7 – seeks clarification on what is meant by 'potential critical threshold issue' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.4 4.7 4.7.2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.4 – Change minimum consultation period to 21 days. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 4.7.2 – Recommends that for planning proposals involving items listed on the State Heritage Register or items considered to be of state significance, specialist studies such as a Heritage Impact Statement or Conservation Management Plan be required prior to Gateway Determination, to enable a thorough review of the proposal. 			
Transport for NSW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 4.7.1 - Supports policy to consult with public agencies prior to a Gateway Determination where there is considered to be a “potential critical threshold issue”. Seeks clarification on the criteria for an issue to be considered as a potential critical threshold issue to ensure consistency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.7.1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.7.1 – provide well-defined criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
NSW Government Department of Planning & Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council to ensure that there are no future policy outcomes that conflict with the Department’s “A Guide to Preparing Planning Proposals”. 			