



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE NO. 7 – PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

BUDGET ESTIMATES 2025-2026

Supplementary questions

Portfolio Committee No. 7 – Planning and Environment

Planning and Public Spaces

(Scully)

Hearing: Monday 25 August 2025

Answers due by: 5.00 pm Wednesday 24 September 2025¹

Budget Estimates secretariat

Phone (02) 9230 2991

BudgetEstimates@parliament.nsw.gov.au

¹ The original due date was 5.00 pm Friday 19 August 2025. Portfolio Committee No. 7 - Planning and Environment agreed to an extension until 5.00 pm Wednesday 24 September 2025 on 18 September 2025.

BUDGET ESTIMATES 2025-2026

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

Questions from the Hon Mark Latham MLC

- (1) Will the Minister ensure that the independent probity review into the Billbergia/Rhodes HDA matter takes submissions and consults with all parties affected by the HDA's, Department's and Minister's handling of the application and process which followed?

Questions from Ms Abigail Boyd MLC

Question to the Minister regarding the Gas Decarbonisation Roadmap

- (2) The NSW Consumer Energy Strategy includes a commitment to deliver a Gas Decarbonisation Roadmap for households in 2026. However, the Minister has made a number of public comments confirming that the NSW Government will not ban gas in new homes. How is the Minister and the Department working in alignment and collaboration with the Minister for Energy to ensure that new homes do not create future problems for the government to solve in the very near future, particularly in the context of building thousands of new homes with a gas connection?

Questions to the Minister regarding Part 1 of the Transport Oriented Development Program

- (3) Under Part 1 of the Transport Oriented Development Program, 60,000 new homes - in eight higher-density precincts across Greater Sydney - are expected to be approved by the government by November 2027. Of the new homes that have been approved so far under Part 1 of the TOD Program, how many are apartments, and specifically low, mid or high-rise?
- (a) Has there been any consideration as to how these new homes (and specifically the larger apartment buildings) might contribute to a more renewable energy grid, for example how solar and battery storage might help to offset the energy needs and reduce energy bills of future residents?
- (b) Is there scope to leverage existing planning instruments in the near future to ensure that between November 2026 and November 2027, all new homes approved by the State under Part 1 of the TOD Program are contributing clean energy and storage capacity to the grid, and to their neighbours?

Questions from Ms Sue Higginson MLC
--

Centennial Coal

- (4) Does the Minister for Planning consider allowing Centennial Coal to discharge up to 26.5ML/day of dirty mine water into Wangcol Creek/Coxs River at the headway of the Sydney drinking water catchment for up to 4 years reasonable?
- (5) Given the development consent for the Springvale water treatment plant to handle Centennial Coal wastewater describes the plant as a 'zero discharge solution', does the Minister concede that the purported solution has failed?
- (6) Will the Minister commit to using the neutral and beneficial effect water quality test in assessing any proposal from Centennial Coal to discharge mine water into the Sydney Drinking Water Catchment?
- (7) Will the Minister commit to strengthening the NorBe laws by extending them to modification proposals as promised by senior Labor parliamentarians when in opposition?

Climate Impacts

- (8) In July, the New South Wales Court of Appeal overturned approval for MACH Energy's proposed expansion of the Mount Pleasant coal mine near Muswellbrook. The Court found that the Independent Planning Commission (IPC) had failed to properly consider the climate impacts of all associated carbon pollution, including the local social and economic impacts and from exported coal burned overseas. It emphasised that communities must be informed and able to understand how climate change will affect their region when decisions are made about projects that impact the climate. In light of this court decision, notwithstanding an application has been made to the High Court, what are the implications for the Moolarben OC3 Extension Project?
- (9) Will the IPC now be required to assess these local climate related impacts and ensure that communities understand the social and economic impacts of climate change on their region?
- (10) Will you now review and amend the relevant guidelines - including the Social Impacts Assessment Guideline - to ensure that local climate impact assessment requirements are addressed in all new applications in accordance with the Court of Appeal?
- (11) Will you now require all mining projects in the planning system to amend their EIS to include this information and re-exhibit?

- (12) Why were critically important elements of the NSW EPA's 'Guide for Large Emitters' not followed in any of the coal-mine determinations so far this year?
- (13) Given the Guide clearly applied to HVO Mod 8 and Tahmoor MOD 3 and yet no interim & long-term GHG goals were set, why was there was no independent review of their mitigation plans and no independent review of their proposed offsets?
- (a) What steps did your department take to adhere to this guideline during assessment of these Projects?
- (14) What additional steps have you taken since Minister Sharpe wrote to you in May last year stating that "the Climate Change Act should be considered" by your Department when making planning decisions and that these decisions "should have regard" to meeting legislated climate target?
- (15) Since April 2025, with an abatement gap of 6.6 Mt CO₂-e projected for 2030, NSW DPHI has approved new coal projects that will very likely be responsible for ~24% of the projected 6.6 Mt CO₂-e overshoot in 2030 (see Table 1 above) and will therefore add to the difficulty of meeting the 2030 target. Are these decisions not contradictory to the requirements outlined by the Minister for Climate Change?
- (16) Both yourself and the Resources Minister are on record supporting an independent assessment process by the Independent Planning Commission (IPC) for "all resources projects". What steps have you taken to progress this commitment?
- (17) The Mt Arthur Mod 2 project was not referred to the IPC despite a lifetime GHG footprint of 193 Mt CO₂-e and Scope 1 emissions that will impact the 2030 GHG target that NSW is not on track to meet. Meanwhile, Chain Valley Colliery Consolidation will go to the IPC with lifetime GHG emissions roughly 1/8th those of Mt Arthur. How does the Minister explain this inconsistent approach?
- (18) Given that the majority of coal-mine expansions under assessment are mods, can you provide an assurance that all future mods will be assessed independently as per stated government policy?
- (19) Many people in the community are concerned that NSW DPHI may be on the verge of recommending to you that Moolarben OC3 be subject to a 'public hearing' which would extinguish merits appeal rights for this project. If this were to occur, this would be an abrupt departure from what has become standard practice under your government, where SSD projects with a public interest element based on environmental, economic and social

grounds have exclusively been assessed via a ‘public meeting’ pathway by the NSW IPC. Can you commit to ensuring this does not occur?

- (a) Is there anything specific that indicates to you that this Project should go through a unique assessment project when compared to dozens of other complex and controversial projects?
- (20) In relation to NSW DPHI’s decision that approved Hunter Valley Operations’ ‘Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Management Plan’, are you confident there were reasonable and feasible’ GHG abatement measures that are being implemented at that mine?
- (a) Why did the Department approve a plan with zero abatement measures in it?
 - (b) The latest data from the Clean Energy Regulator reveals that Scope 1 emissions at HVO are at their highest level since the Safeguard Mechanism was introduced 8 years ago. Scope 1 emissions in FY24 were 40% higher than they were in FY23. By any measure, abatement is failing at this mine. Minister, why - more than two years after HVO was exposed as operating without any abatement plan - are they still operating under a GHG plan with zero GHG abatement actions in it?

Emergency Services Input into Development Process

- (21) Can you rule out introducing legislation that would override RFS or SES advice with regard to development assessments and approvals?
- (22) Have you seen the independent review reportedly undertaken by former NSW Police deputy commissioner Dave Owens on behalf of Metro LALC?
- (23) Is it also your view that the RFS advice, in the case of the Lizard Rock development proposal, constitutes “overreach?”
- (24) A proposed redevelopment of an aged care home in Tweed proposes to add 3 metres of fill to the site and to shuffle floodwater off to the Gates Holding site on Turnock St, which is also proposed for development. The developer’s flood mitigation plan involves asking residents of an aged care home to go to the second floor of the building and shelter in place during a flood. Will you act to prevent this redevelopment?
- (25) The SES and Tweed Shire Council have recommended that a proposed redevelopment of the Uniting Kingscliff Aged Care development be knocked back and not be declared State Significant. Does this case not demonstrate the importance of emergency services’ input in the development approval process?

- (26) Regardless of the final determination it's clear this development has serious issues and shouldn't be declared State Significant Development, will you commit to ensuring the development is not declared State Significant?

Canterbury Racecourse

- (27) The Member for Canterbury Sophie Cotsis and Member for Summer Hill have both opposed the Mirvan development at the area 6 carpark of Canterbury Racecourse. They took that position to the last election. Why did Labor then use their new powers under the TOD SEPP to fasttrack this development?
- (28) The Labor Party introduced legislation when in opposition to put a moratorium on the development or sale of Canterbury Racecourse for 5 years. Will Labor reintroduce that legislation while it is in government?
- (29) Why did Labor make a commitment and then brazenly break that commitment when in government?
- (30) Where is the Canterbury Racecourse masterplan at?

Yamba

- (31) The Clarence Valley Council's 2022 Flood Model does not include a Wave Run-up study as recommended by the 2009 Yamba Floodplain Risk Management Plan, and therefore does not adequately determine maximum water levels during extreme weather. Is the NSW Government satisfied that the 2009 Yamba Flood Risk Management Plan complies with the NSW Government Flood Risk Management Manual (June 2023)?
- (32) Is the Department of Planning satisfied that the Clarence Valley Council's 2022 Flood Model is a reliable metric when assessing developments?

Queer Family Northern Rivers

- (33) What steps are being taken to identify a public space that could become a permanent home for Queer Family Northern Rivers, one of the only LGBTQ+ support services for at-risk queer kids in the Northern Rivers?
- (34) Will you commit to discussing opportunities for a permanent base of operations with Queer Family Northern Rivers?
- (35) Will you commit to investigating funding opportunities for Queer Family Northern Rivers?

Wood Heaters

- (36) Does the NSW Government believe it is appropriate to continue to allow new wood heaters with health costs, based on the NSW Government's estimated cost of \$302 per kg of PM2.5 emissions from wood heaters in Greater Sydney, of \$6,707 per heater per year?
- (37) The Ambient Air Quality National Environment Protection Measure includes standards of 25 ug/m3 PM2.5 (daily average) and 8 ug/m3 (annual average) reducing to 20 ug/m3 PM2.5 (daily average) and 7 ug/m3 (annual average) by 2025. The World Health Organisation Guidelines are 15 ug/m3 PM2.5 (daily average) and 5 ug/m3 (annual average). Section 3.1 of the 2024 NSW Land Use Planning Guidance Note line advises "managing wood heater emissions through use of planning provisions (e.g. development control plans) to reduce impacts". Would best practice, according to these guidelines, require local councils to update their planning procedures to refuse permission for the installation of new wood heater installations in areas with PM2.5 pollution levels exceeding the WHO guidelines or NEPM standards when there are affordable low-pollution alternatives?

Community Flood Restoration Fund

- (38) In partnership with the Minister for Emergency Services, you were allocated \$150 million in the 2023-24 budget as part of a Community Flood Restoration Fund that a media release stated would act in part as a "second instalment" of the Northern Rivers Resilient Homes Program.
- (39) Can you confirm how much of this allocation was spent on buybacks, raises and retrofits as part of the Northern Rivers Resilient Homes Program?

Hornsby Council

- (40) Hornsby Council recently resolved to introduce a new Compliance Enforcement Policy. Part of that policy deals with the investigation of breaches of development consent conditions and plans, where private certifiers have been engaged by applicants. Council's new policy states that it will not investigate building works that are not in accordance with plans, when a private certifier has been appointed. What will the Minister do to ensure that Hornsby Council rescinds or amends its Compliance Enforcement Policy which is inconsistent with their duties as a council?

- (41) What does the Minister intend to do to ensure in future that councils, and Hornsby Council in particular, do not ratify Policies that are inconsistent with their specified roles and duties as a council?

Resilient Homes Program

- (42) Minister, according to documents obtained through SO52, you received a briefing about the Resilient Homes Program on 18 May 2023 upon coming to Government. This briefing stated that “The Resilient Homes Program has significantly progressed since the program was announced on 28 October 2022 by the Prime Minister and Premier. \$700 million in funding was announced to deliver Tranche 1 of a voluntary program of buy-backs, house raising and retrofits across 7 Local Government Areas in the Northern Rivers. At the time of inception the total program cost was estimated at \$1.4 billion...A further 416 properties have been identified in a second category for buy-back, raising and retrofit to be progressed for further funding under Tranche 2. The NRRC will progress a budget request to seek to obtain further funding to progress properties in this category.” Based on this:
- (a) At any stage when provided with this briefing did you refute the \$1.4 billion figure?
 - (b) It would be correct to assume you assented to the \$1.4 billion figure outlined to you in the briefing?
- (43) When was a funding request for “tranche 2” of the Resilient Homes Program made?
- (44) Can you categorically rule out ever giving any direction, or having knowledge of a direction given by anyone in government, to reduce the number of homes eligible for tranche 1 + 2 funding from the Resilient Homes Program below the 6000 homes figure promised to the Northern Rivers Community?

Inclusionary Zoning

- (45) Is a 2% minimum affordable housing requirement for transport-oriented development really the best the NSW Government can do?
- (46) Given NSW Labor’s 2023 platform stated “Labor believes social and affordable housing should exist in every community, and supports inclusionary zoning to deliver on this goal. We require that every new residential development on private land includes a substantial proportion of social and affordable housing, to be owned by social and community housing providers,” does the Minister believe a 2% affordable housing target qualifies as “substantial”?

- (47) Under NSW Labor the in-fill development policy only requires 10% affordable housing for in-fill development and 2% for transport-oriented development. Why not meet the demands of the sector and the Greens demands for 30% minimum of affordable housing in private development?
- (48) Labor had a 15% inclusionary zoning policy in 2017, so isn't the lack of affordable housing in these developments a reduction from that?
- (49) A 2-bedroom unit in Woollahra costs \$900 per week according to realestate.com.au. 80% of that would be \$720 per week, which would still put a full-time graduate nurse or teacher into housing stress.
- (a) Can the Government commit to ensuring affordable housing delivered by transport-oriented development at Woollahra is proportionate to household income of tenants, rather than 80% of market prices?
- (b) Will the government ensure that at least 30% of the housing enabled by this rezoning will be affordable housing?

Short Term Holiday Letting Review

- (50) On 13 June 2024, the Government said they would hand down the final outcomes of the Discussion Paper on short and long-term rental accommodation "in the coming months". It's been over a year since consultation ended on the discussion paper.
- (a) When will the Government's response be handed down?
- (51) Which policy proposals is the Government considering to regulate short-term holiday lets, including AirBnBs and Stayz?
- (a) Do these proposals include:
- i. Giving Councils the power to impose 60-day caps on short-term holiday letting, similar to the Byron Shire cap?
 - ii. A process of registering short-term holiday lets?
 - iii. Outlawing new homes being used as AirBnBs in LGAs with vacancy rates below 3%?
 - iv. Allowing Councils or the State to place bed taxes on empty beds in NSW, with the proceeds going toward public housing?
 - v. Placing a levy on short-term holiday lets, similar to what occurs in Victoria?

- vi. Allowing Councils to vary rates on short-term holiday lets, similar to what occurs in Queensland?
 - vii. A permit process for short-term holiday lets?
- (52) Given regulation of short-term holiday lets could unlock thousands of existing homes as long-term rentals within months, how can the NSW Government claim to be serious about housing supply if they are yet to progress any reform in this area?
- (53) Could you please outline the positive effects you have seen of the 60-Day cap on short-term holiday letting in Byron Shire?

Synthetic Turf

- (54) A key finding of the NSW Chief Scientist and Engineer's final report was increased community involvement in the planning and approval stages of synthetic turf sports fields. The new Guidelines recommend community consultation during the planning and design stage of the development and public exhibition of the draft Review of Environmental Factors for 3 weeks. Why is this consultation not a requirement?
- (55) Why are large scale synthetic turf installations permitted without development consent, given their known environmental impacts and strong community interest?
- (56) What oversight or accountability mechanisms ensure the new guidelines and particularly the Guidelines for Division 5.1 assessments - Addendum for synthetic sports fields are followed?
- (57) What accountability is there for decision-makers?

Yancoal Moolarben Coal Mine

- (58) Given one of Yancoal's bulk coal carriers, "Captain Veniamis", was tracked from Newcastle in NSW to the Israeli port of Hadera, departing on 12 September 2024, arriving on 8 November 2024 and Hadera hosts Israel's largest power station, the state-owned Orot Rabin Power Plant: in their assessment of the mine, will the IPC consider the social impacts of exporting coal to a foreign power found to have engaged in the war crimes of starvation as a weapon of war and genocide?

Guide for Large Emitters

- (59) In regard to the application of the NSW EPA's 'Guide for Large Emitters' in the context of the assessment and determination of Hunter Valley Operations Mod 8 - Extension of time:

- (a) Were interim and long-term scope 1 GHG emissions goals set for this modification?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, what are they?
 - iii. If yes, have they been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can they be found?
 - (b) Was the mitigation assessment verified by an independent expert reviewer?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, what did the reviewer conclude?
 - iii. If yes, has the review been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can it be found?
 - (c) Were offsets proposed to meet emissions reduction obligations?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, did an independent expert review consider whether suitable high-integrity offsets are likely to be available at the time when it is proposed to acquire offsets?
 - iii. If yes, has the review been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can it be found?
- (60) In regard to the application of the NSW EPA's 'Guide for Large Emitters' in the context of the assessment and determination of Ulan Modification 6 - underground mining extension:
- (a) Were interim and long-term scope 1 GHG emissions goals set for this modification?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, what are they?
 - iii. If yes, have they been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can they be found?
 - (b) Was the mitigation assessment verified by an independent expert reviewer?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, what did the reviewer conclude?

- iii. If yes, has the review been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can it be found?
 - (c) Were offsets proposed to meet emissions reduction obligations?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, did an independent expert review consider whether suitable high-integrity offsets are likely to be available at the time when it is proposed to acquire offsets?
 - iii. If yes, has the review been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can it be found?
- (61) In regard to the application of the NSW EPA's 'Guide for Large Emitters' in the context of the assessment and determination of Tahmoor MOD 3 - Longwall S7A:
 - (a) Were interim and long-term scope 1 GHG emissions goals set for this modification?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, what are they?
 - iii. If yes, have they been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can they be found?
 - (b) Was the mitigation assessment verified by an independent expert reviewer?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, what did the reviewer conclude?
 - iii. If yes, has the review been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can it be found?
 - (c) Were offsets proposed to meet emissions reduction obligations?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, did an independent expert review consider whether suitable high-integrity offsets are likely to be available at the time when it is proposed to acquire offsets?
 - iii. If yes, has the review been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can it be found?

(62) In regard to the application of the NSW EPA's 'Guide for Large Emitters' in the context of the current assessment of Metropolitan Coal Mine Modification 4 Longwall 317 and 318 Modification:

- (a) Were interim and long-term scope 1 GHG emissions goals set for this modification?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, what are they?
 - iii. If yes, have they been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can they be found?
- (b) Was the mitigation assessment verified by an independent expert reviewer?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, what did the reviewer conclude?
 - iii. If yes, has the review been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can it be found?
- (c) Were offsets proposed to meet emissions reduction obligations?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, did an independent expert review consider whether suitable high-integrity offsets are likely to be available at the time when it is proposed to acquire offsets?
 - iii. If yes, has the review been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can it be found?

(63) In regard to the application of the NSW EPA's 'Guide for Large Emitters' in the context of the current assessment of the Moolarben OC3 Extension Project:

- (a) Were interim and long-term scope 1 GHG emissions goals set for this modification?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, what are they?
 - iii. If yes, have they been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can they be found?
- (b) Was the mitigation assessment verified by an independent expert reviewer?

- i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, what did the reviewer conclude?
 - iii. If yes, has the review been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can it be found?
 - (c) Were offsets proposed to meet emissions reduction obligations?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, did an independent expert review consider whether suitable high-integrity offsets are likely to be available at the time when it is proposed to acquire offsets?
 - iii. If yes, has the review been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can it be found?
- (64) In regard to the application of the NSW EPA's 'Guide for Large Emitters' in the context of the assessment and determination of Mt Arthur Coal MOD 2 (Pathway to 2030):
- (a) Were interim and long-term scope 1 GHG emissions goals set for this modification?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, what are they?
 - iii. If yes, have they been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can they be found?
 - (b) Was the mitigation assessment verified by an independent expert reviewer?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, what did the reviewer conclude?
 - iii. If yes, has the review been published online?
 - iv. If yes, where can it be found?
 - (c) Were offsets proposed to meet emissions reduction obligations?
 - i. If not, why not?
 - ii. If yes, did an independent expert review consider whether suitable high-integrity offsets are likely to be available at the time when it is proposed to acquire offsets?

- iii. If yes, has the review been published online?
- iv. If yes, where can it be found?

Questions from Ms Cate Faehrmann MLC

Boggabri Coal Mine

- (65) Idemitsu submitted a proposal for an expansion of Boggabri coal mine, Modification 8, which was subsequently modified to significantly reduce the amount of coal to be extracted and to shorten the lifetime of the proposed mine extension. In late 2023, while the application for modification 8 was under assessment, Idemitsu met with the Department for a prelodgement meeting to discuss a second subsequent ‘modification’ of the mining approval (later submitted as Modification 10). In any meetings about possible expansions/modifications of Boggabri Coal Mine, did the Department advise Idemitsu that they would be better off turning the original Modification 8 into two modifications rather than one?
- (a) Did the Department advise Idemitsu that they would otherwise have had to refer the original proposal for Modification 8 to the Independent Planning Commission?
 - (b) Will the Independent Expert Advisory Panel for Mining be giving advice to the Department on Modification 10 at Boggabri, particularly in relation to its water use and greenhouse gas emissions?
- (66) Will Dr Ray Williams, the former owner of the company consulted to predict emissions for Boggabri coal mine modification 8, be one of the members of the panel assessing Modification 10?
- (a) If so, has he declared a conflict of interest, perceived or otherwise?

Coal mine modifications

- (67) In budget estimates on 30 August 2024, you committed to look into this issue of coal mine approvals going through as modifications.
- (a) Did you, and if so what actions have you taken?

Tahmoor Colliery Modification Approval

- (68) When the Department approved the expansion of Tahmoor mine in May 2025, did they require a Trigger Action Response Plan or Contingency Plan from the proponent to address any potential spikes in methane emissions?

- (69) Was the Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Plan the only management plan the proponent was required to produce? If no:
- (a) please provide details of any other plans required of the proponent and their current status
 - (b) please include details on whether the Department has assessed the adequacy of any plans submitted by the proponent and the outcomes of such assessments.

Bowdens Silver Mine

- (70) The NSW Planning Department has advised that the proposal for the Bowden's open-cut mine does not require reassessment and the proponent will not be required to submit a new Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). At budget estimates, Mr Gainsford confirmed that the Department would be interested in "additional information that would be of interest to us to finalise the assessment report to go back to the IPC." How will you determine what is "of interest"?
- (a) How will you take into consideration the significant new information on the health and environmental impacts associated with open-cut lead mining and the new data on the presence of threatened species (koalas and greater gliders) at the proposed mine site in the absence of reassessment and an updated EIS?
- (71) The local communities of Lue and Mudgee have called for an updated EIS and mandatory public exhibition. When will you respond to this request?
- (72) As you are aware, Mudgee region residents and industries are calling for a lead-free exclusion zone to be established across the Mid-Western Region local government area and have requested meetings with your Department. You said you were "happy to meet with anyone if they want to raise an issue with me" but only "If I have received a request." If you have received a request or should you receive a request, will you commit to meeting with the Mudgee community and considering their request prior to the Independent Planning Commission's consideration of the proposed Bowden's mine?

Gas Decarbonisation in Housing & Sustainable Buildings SEPP

- (73) Please provide a progress update on the Sustainable Buildings SEPP review that was scheduled for 2025. Is this still on track? Please provide details of:
- (a) Whether targeted consultation is planned and, if so, which stakeholders would be included in this consultation

- (b) When public consultation is expected to occur
 - (c) When a final report will be completed, and when this will be made publicly available.
- (74) Please provide a progress update on the proposed 2025 consultation for the Gas Decarbonisation Roadmap. Is this still on track? Please provide details of:
- (a) When public consultation is expected to occur
 - (b) When a final roadmap will be completed
 - (c) How that roadmap will be implemented.

Riverstone Wetlands

- (75) I received a letter from you in April 2025, in response to my letter of March 2025, advising that the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure was continuing investigations into a potential rezoning for employment land uses for the Marsden Park North Precinct (which encompasses the Riverstone Wetlands). What were the outcomes of the Department's investigations?
- (a) Have any steps been taken to ensure protection of the Riverstone Wetlands? If so, what?

Questions from the Opposition

Housing Delivery Authority

- (76) Considering EOI 229650, for a Billbergia development in Leeds and Blaxland Roads in Rhodes:
- (a) When originally referred, the proposal has an indicative dwelling yield of 2020. Now sizeable parcels of land have been removed, is the indicative dwelling yield still 2020?
 - (b) What is the FSR on the land included in the proposal now?
- (77) Under the current Housing Delivery Authority process, what documentation — if any — must be provided to actually demonstrate ownership or control of the land on the part of an applicant when they lodge an EOI for State Significant Development?
- (78) Can more than one application be referred to the Minister by the HDA and declared as SSD, for the same site?

- (a) What if the actual owner of the land were to make an application under the HDA for the site they own, when another developer has made a separate application because they would “work to secure ownership of the balance of the land”?
- (79) What level of due diligence is undertaken by the Department before an application is advanced to the HDA for Ministerial consideration?
- (80) Are there clear mandatory checks — such as land title searches, infrastructure feasibility, and consistency with local planning controls — before an application is considered?
- (81) What mandatory checks are undertaken by the Department before an application is referred to the HDA for consideration?
- (82) Are visualisations, maps, and site descriptions independently reviewed to confirm they are factually accurate and match cadastral boundaries?
- (83) If an application contains factual errors, such as incorrect heights, incorrect boundaries, or inclusion of unrelated land, is it automatically returned for correction before progressing?
- (84) If an application is progressed to SSD via the HDA and later found to have included an issue, what powers does the Government have to revoke or amend the declaration?
 - (a) How does the process work for DPHI to recommend to the Minister that an amendment or revocation occur?
 - (b) How many amendments have occurred to declarations made by the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces, after a recommendation is made to progress to SSD via the HDA?
 - (c) How many revocations have occurred to declarations made by the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces, after a recommendation is made to progress to SSD via the HDA?
- (85) How is the dwelling yield or development capacity adjusted if the developable land area is reduced after progression to SSD via the HDA?
- (86) How many other HDA EOIs have proceeded to Ministerial consideration without full landowner consent?
- (87) How has the average assessment time changed for the SSD pathway since January 2025?
- (88) How many more assessment staff have DPHI hired since January 2025?
- (89) How many applications have been received for consideration under the HDA criteria?

- (90) How many of those applications have resulted in a formal recommendation to the Minister that the project be declared State Significant Development (SSD) under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act?
- (91) How many applications have been assessed and rejected as not meeting the HDA SSD criteria?
- (92) Since January 2025, how many dwellings have been referred for assessment under the HDA process, regardless of whether they are still in assessment or have been decided?
- (93) Since January 2025, how many dwellings in total have been approved through the HDA pathway, broken down by month?
- (94) Since January 2025, how many HDA applications also include a request for a concurrent rezoning?
- (a) Of these requests for concurrent rezonings, how many were approved?
- (95) Can you provide a monthly breakdown of HDA recommendations, rejections, and dwellings approved or refused since it began?
- (96) What is the average assessment time from initial referral to a recommendation to the Minister under s4.36(3)?
- (97) Your media release dated 22 August states: "Since the formation of the HDA in January this year, 71 projects have had Secretary Environmental Assessment Requirements issued and 5 Development Applications have been lodged."
- (a) Which 71 projects (or updated number) have had SEARs issued?
- (b) Which 5 projects (or updated number) have had Development Applications lodged?
- (98) How many development applications have been approved by the SSD pathway after being declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act following a recommendation from the HDA?
- (99) In State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 and State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 (No 2), images of land subject to an HDA EOI were added as Schedules to the Declaration Order for each EOI. Why was this practice discontinued from State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 3) 2025 onwards?
- (100) I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 3) 2025, Schedule 1, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025:

- (a) Why was Clause [1] of Schedule 1 included to amend Clause 4(1)(a) of the State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 concerning EOI 229407?
 - (b) When was the variation request made?
 - (c) Who was this variation requested by?
 - (d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
 - (e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
 - (f) Why was Clause [4] of Schedule 1 included to omit “Schedule 1 Land at 85-91 Thomas Street, Parramatta”
 - (g) Why was this Schedule not replaced?
- (101) Why was Clause [2] included to amend Clause 4(1)(d) of the State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 concerning EOI 229422?
- (a) When was the variation request made?
 - (b) Who was this variation requested by?
 - (c) Was land added to the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
 - (d) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
 - (e) Why was Clause [5] of Schedule 1 included to omit “Schedule 4 Land at 724-730 Victoria Road, Ryde”
 - (f) Why was this Schedule not replaced?
- (102) I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 3) 2025, Schedule 2, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 (No 2):
- (a) Why was Clause [2] of Schedule 2 included to amend Clause 4(1)(f) of the State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 (No 2) concerning EOI 230316?
 - (b) When was the variation request made?
 - (c) Who was this variation requested by?

- (d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
 - (e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
 - (f) Why was Clause [6] of Schedule 2 included to omit “Schedule 6 Land at 25 Macquarie Place, 46-52 Pitt Street and 56 Pitt Street, Mortdale”
 - (g) Why was this Schedule not replaced?
- (103) Why was Clause [3] of Schedule 2 included to amend Clause 4(1)(g) of the State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 (No 2) concerning EOI 230347?
- (a) When was the variation request made?
 - (b) Who was this variation requested by?
 - (c) Was land added to the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
 - (d) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
 - (e) Why was Clause [7] of Schedule 2 included to omit “Schedule 7 Land at 47-97 Marlborough Street, Surry Hills”
 - (f) Why was this Schedule not replaced?
- (104) Why was Clause [4] of Schedule 2 included to amend Clause 4(1)(q) of the State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 (No 2) concerning EOI 232547?
- (a) When was the variation request made?
 - (b) Who was this variation requested by?
 - (c) Was land added to the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
 - (d) What was the reason given for land at 22 Barry Street being omitted?
 - (e) Was “11-196 Holdsworth Ave” in the original declaration a typographical error corrected to reflect “11-19 Holdsworth Avenue”
 - (f) Aren’t Ministerial Orders proofread against the HDA minutes to ensure accuracy?

- i. If not, why not?
- (g) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
- (105) Why was Clause [5] of Schedule 2 included to amend Clause 4(1)(q) of the State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 (No 2) concerning EOI 232547?
 - (a) When was the variation request made?
 - (b) Who was this variation requested by?
 - (c) Was land added to the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
 - (d) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
 - (e) Why was Clause [8] of Schedule 2 included to omit “Schedule 17 Land at 12-22 Berry Road and 11-19 Holdsworth Avenue, St Leonards”?
 - i. Why was this Schedule not replaced?
- (106) I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 6) 2025, Schedule 1, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 3) 2025:
 - (a) Why was Clause [1] of Schedule 1 included to amend Clause 4(2) of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 3) 2025?
 - (b) Who was this variation requested by?
- (107) I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 6) 2025, Schedule 1, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 4) 2025:
 - (a) Why was Clause [1] of Schedule 1 included to amend Clause 4(2) of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 4) 2025?
 - (b) Who was this variation requested by?
- (108) I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 6) 2025, Schedule 1, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 5) 2025:
 - (a) Why was Clause [1] of Schedule 1 included to amend Clause 4(2) of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 5) 2025?

(b) Who was this variation requested by?

(109) I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 10) 2025, Schedule 1, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 5) 2025:

(a) Why was Clause [1] of Schedule 1 included to amend Clause 5(1)(n) of the State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 5) 2025?

i. Is the Department aware that Clause 5(1)(n) does not exist in State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 5) 2025?

- How did this mistake happen?
- Has it really taken the Opposition to point out this mistake?
- As of today, has EOI 235399 resulted in an development application under State Significant Development pathway?

(b) Does the Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 5) 2025 actually refer to Clause 4(1)(n), concerning EOI 235399?

i. When was the variation request made?

ii. Who was this variation requested by?

iii. Was land intended to be added to the SSD declaration?

- If yes, why?

iv. Was land intended to be omitted from the SSD declaration?

- If yes, why?

(110) I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 10) 2025, Schedule 1, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 4) 2025:

(a) Why was Clause [1] of Schedule 2 included to amend Clause 4(1)(r) of the State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 4) 2025 concerning EOI 233796?

(b) When was the variation request made?

(c) Who was this variation requested by?

(d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?

i. If yes, why?

(e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?

- i. If yes, why?

(111) I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 10) 2025, Schedule 2, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 4) 2025:

- (a) Why was Clause [1] of Schedule 2 included to amend Clause 4(1)(r) of the State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 4) 2025 concerning EOI 233796?
- (b) When was the variation request made?
- (c) Who was this variation requested by?
- (d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?

- i. If yes, why?

- (e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?

- i. If yes, why?

(112) I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 10) 2025, Schedule 3, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 (No 1):

- (a) Why was Clause [1] of Schedule 2 included to amend Clause 4(1)(h) of the State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 (No 1) concerning EOI 230106?
- (b) When was the variation request made?
- (c) Who was this variation requested by?
- (d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?

- i. If yes, why?

- (e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?

- i. If yes, why?

- (f) Why was Clause [2] of Schedule 3 included to omit “Schedule 8”

- i. Why was this Schedule not replaced?

(113) I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 11) 2025, Schedule 1, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 7) 2025:

- (a) Why was Clause [1] of Schedule 1 included to amend Clause 4(1)(o) of the State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 7) 2025 concerning EOI 240231?
- (b) When was the variation request made?

- (c) Who was this variation requested by?
- (d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
 - ii. Was this land 29 Herward Highway, Blacktown?
- (e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?

(114) I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 11) 2025, Schedule 2, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 6) 2025:

- (a) Why was Clause [1] of Schedule 2 included to amend Clause 4(1)(d) of the State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 6) 2025 concerning EOI 239896?
- (b) When was the variation request made?
- (c) Who was this variation requested by?
- (d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
- (e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?

(115) I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 12) 2025, Schedule 1, Amendment of Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 (No 10):

- (a) Why was Clause [1] of Schedule 1 included to amend Clause 4(1)(t) of the State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 (No 10) concerning EOI 233967?
- (b) When was the variation request made?
- (c) Who was this variation requested by?
- (d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?
- (e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?
 - i. If yes, why?

(116) Considered on 23 June, as EOI 250170, the SMEC Ulladulla project at 76–78B Princes Highway, the public summary described the proposal as “two 16-storey buildings” — when in fact the correct height was 16 metres.

- (a) Has the Department reviewed other HDA project listings to ensure similar height or scale errors are not present?

Housing and Productivity Contribution

(117) Minister, how much money has been collected to date from the Housing and Productivity Contribution?

- (a) Of that total, how much has actually been spent?
- (b) What proportion of HPC revenue collected so far remains unspent?
- (c) Where is the unspent HPC money currently held — in a special fund (if so, which) or in consolidated revenue?

(118) How many projects have received HPC funding so far?

- (a) If so, on what date were the first funding allocations made?
- (b) If funding has been allocated - Minister, can you table a list of all projects funded by the HPC, including the amounts and the dates of payment?

(119) Can you provide a complete list of the planned infrastructure projects to be funded by the HPC over the forward estimates?

(120) How much has actually been raised since the HPC commenced?

(121) What is the projected annual revenue from the HPC in FY 2024/25, FY 2025/26, FY 2026/27 and FY 2027/28?

Works In Kind and Infrastructure Opportunities Plan

(122) A draft Works in Kind Policy was released for public comment earlier this year. Feedback from stakeholders has indicated concern that the draft policy may not provide sufficient scope to enable the delivery of essential infrastructure needed to support housing growth across NSW. In particular, the proposed cap on the value of works that can be delivered in kind has raised questions about its potential to limit infrastructure delivery at a time when the housing crisis demands urgent and scalable solutions.

- (123) Given that many developers are in a position to deliver infrastructure more efficiently than government, will the final Works in Kind Policy reconsider this cap to ensure it supports, rather than hinders, the timely delivery of housing across the state?
- (124) Minister, what is the current status of developing guidelines for the Works in Kind scheme, and on what date will those guidelines be finalised and published?
- (125) What is the planned timeline for the Works in Kind framework to become operational and open for use by developers?
- (126) What criteria will determine whether a proposed Works in Kind project is accepted, and who will approve it?
- (127) How will you ensure Works in Kind delivers enabling infrastructure in the areas where housing growth is actually occurring, rather than ad-hoc or politically favoured projects?
- (128) Isn't it the case that without the IOP in place, Works in Kind risks being a policy on paper with no practical roadmap for delivery?
- (129) Will the final Infrastructure Opportunities Plan include a staged outlook — 5-year, 10-year, and 20-year priorities — so that the sector can actually plan around deliverable infrastructure timeframes?

Airspace Development Above Rail Corridors

- (130) Minister, is airspace development above rail corridors being actively considered by your Government as part of Plan B?
- (131) Have any specific rail corridors or stations been identified for potential airspace development, and what housing yield could they deliver?
- (132) How would airspace projects integrate with existing rail operations to ensure safety and minimal disruption?

Infrastructure Investment in TOD Accelerated Precincts

- (133) When exactly will each TOD Accelerated Precinct see its first dollar from the \$520 million allocation — and will you table a full timeline for spending in each location?
- (134) Have any Expressions of Interest or funding calls for infrastructure projects in these precincts been issued at all? If not, why not?
- (135) How much of the \$520 million has been allocated to each TOD Accelerated Precinct — Hornsby, Macquarie Park, Kellyville/Bella Vista, Bankstown, Crows Nest, and Homebush?

- (136) How much of the \$520 million funding for community infrastructure in TOD accelerated precincts will be allocated to Crows Nest?
- (a) How will the funds be allocated?
 - (b) When will the funds be allocated?
 - (c) When will the first project be announced?
- (137) What discussions have been had with North Sydney, Willoughby and Lane Cove Councils?
- (138) Will funding include the projects identified as priorities under the now scrapped St Leonards and Crows Nest Special Infrastructure Contribution Scheme?
- (139) Will funding be allocated to schools given public schools serving the precinct are already over capacity?
- (140) What extra funding is there for infrastructure and services to support uplift from the LMR policy?

Parks for People Program - \$228.2 million contribution from the Commonwealth

- (141) At what stage is the Department at in working out specific projects will be delivered in each of these precincts?
- (142) Is the funding solely for parks, or does it include other forms of public and community infrastructure?
- (143) Have you commenced consultation with the relevant councils for each of these projects, and if so, when did that start and what feedback has been received?
- (144) Given that these public space projects are being delivered in TOD Accelerated Precincts, how will they be sequenced alongside housing delivery so residents aren't left waiting years for promised community infrastructure?
- (145) Minister, has the \$228.2 million announced in the March Federal Budget for the Parks for People program been received by the NSW Government in full?
- (146) Minister, you've said these projects will be delivered over three phases — what exactly will be delivered in each phase?
- (147) What are the start and completion dates for each phase, and which TOD precincts are included in each?

- (148) How long will it take between the completion of Phase 1 and the commencement of Phase 3?
- (149) How will you ensure there is no multi-year gap between phases, leaving communities waiting for promised public spaces?
- (150) Will each phase receive a fixed proportion of the \$228.2 million, or will the funding be weighted toward certain precincts?
- (151) How will you determine which TOD precincts and projects are prioritised for Phase 2 and Phase 3?
- (152) Will each phase be fully funded and contracted before commencement to guarantee delivery, or could later phases be delayed or cancelled if budgets tighten?
- (153) Have the projects in all three phases already been scoped and costed, or will planning only occur shortly before each phase begins?

Sydney International Speedway

- (154) Melanie Hawyes said at Estimates on 27 February 2024: “The licence is with the speedway and it, again, includes a safeguard that Mr Troy Boldy is not in a managerial role over the operation of events at the speedway.” Now that Troy Boldy is attempting to run a go-karting track, is he also involved at all in the Speedway?
- (155) It is my understanding that Mr Troy Boldy asked Mr Garry Willmington to prepare a 2025-26 season calendar. Is this true?
 - (a) If it is true, isn’t he involved in a “managerial role over the operation of events at the speedway?”
- (156) It is my understanding that in January 2025, Troy Boldy dismissed an individual, terminating the planned purchase of a grader. This left that individual \$290,000 out of pocket, prompting a statement of claim currently before the courts.
 - (a) Has Mr Boldy ever terminated any employee or contractor of SIS?
 - (b) How does Mr Boldy have the power to terminate any employee or contractor of SIS?
 - (c) Is this matter still before the courts?
 - (d) Has a settlement agreement been reached with the individual?
- (157) Has Mr Troy Boldy registered his new go-karting operation with Workcover?

- (158) Has the Department undertaken any compliance checks to ensure the lease conditions are being met?
- (159) Have staff and contractors engaged at the Speedway ever gone unpaid for extended periods under the current management arrangements?
- (160) Are there any outstanding and overdue payments to staff or contractors at the Speedway?
- (161) Will the Government guarantee that any and all outstanding payments owed to staff, contractors, and suppliers are made, and by when?
- (162) On 15 July 2025, SIS released a Facebook statement claiming Garry Willmington had “decided to move on” from his Track Manager role.
- (a) When did salary (or other) payments cease to Mr Garry Willmington?
 - (b) Is there any outstanding salary owed to Mr Willmington? If so, how much?
 - (c) Has Mr Willmington be compensated for salary that was not paid to him before 15 July 2025?
 - i. Will he be compensated?
- (163) Have any former or current employees of SIS engaged in legal action against SIS to claim unpaid wages?
- (164) Have any former or current employees of SIS taken SIS to the Fair Work?
- (a) If so, how many former or current employees of SIS have taken SIS to the Fair Work?
- (165) Since rent was due from April 2024 onwards, has Sydney International Speedway (SIS) ever been late on its rental payments to GSP?
- (a) If so, how many times, and when?
 - (b) If so, on each occasion, on what date was the rent due, and on what date was the rent paid?
- (166) Since April 2024, has GSP ever waived rent (partially or in full) for the SIS?
- (a) If so, please outline on each occasion this has occurred?
- (167) Who is the Speedway currently being leased to, and subleased to from there?
- (a) Have there been any changes in these arrangements since February 2024?
- (168) How much income has SIS generated for:

- (a) FY 2023-24?
 - (b) FY 2024-25?
 - (c) FY 2025-26 (to date)?
- (169) How much profit (or loss, specify which) has SIS generated for:
- (a) FY 2023-24?
 - (b) FY 2024-25?
 - (c) FY 2025-26 (to date)?
- (170) Was the Department aware of the reasons behind these various departures, and has any formal review been conducted into why so many experienced personnel could not continue in their roles?

Housing Targets and Program Delivery

- (171) How will you differentiate between councils that are genuinely underperforming in approvals and those that are simply being impacted by broader feasibility, finance, and construction constraints?
- (172) Will your housing target framework include allowances for councils that meet or exceed approval expectations but cannot control actual delivery?
- (173) How are council housing targets currently calculated, and what is the assumed relationship between approvals and actual completions in that modelling?
- (174) Does your current framework distinguish between councils that approve sufficient dwellings but experience low construction take-up, versus councils that refuse or delay significant projects?
- (175) Will your targets framework take into account that in some high-growth LGAs, the development industry is not lodging enough viable proposals to match the housing targets you've set?

Forecasts and Feasibility

- (176) How much of the yield of the Transport-Oriented Development Program and Low and Mid-Rise reforms is actually committed by developers today, in terms of applications within the system?

- (177) Have you costed the enabling infrastructure needed to realise those yields, and is it funded in the forward estimates?
- (178) How many of those projected homes have DA approvals lodged or in the pipeline?
- (179) Industry has called for a temporary reduction or suspension of key levies during the Housing Accord to stimulate delivery — why has the Government rejected that approach?
- (180) The Planning Institute identifies construction and finance cost escalations as the real barriers to housing—not planning. What specific actions are you taking to address those cost pressures?
- (181) Industry believes it would be helpful to know, so will the NSW Government release the forecasts and modelling that underpin the assumptions being made for housing yields under the various initiatives announced – TOD stage 1, TOD stage 2, Low and Mid Rise and dual occupancies?
- (a) If this information will not be released – why not?
- (182) Will you commit to release how much these initiatives are expected to contribute to the local housing targets set of each local Government area the state?
- (183) Has the Department of Planning conducted any feasibility modelling of the following initiatives: TOD stage 1, TOD stage 2, Low and Mid Rise and dual occupancies?
- (a) What is the average cost of construction assumed for a dual occupancy development/free standing house, manor house, apartment, townhouse?
- (b) Will you release this modelling so that industry can review it?
- (184) What analysis has the Government conducted to examine how many of the approved but yet to be commenced DAs have stalled due to financial feasibility issues relating from increased costs?

Housing Approvals and Commencements

- (185) How many development applications are in the planning portal that are approved but have not commenced construction?
- (186) What is the average time taken from approval to construction commencing? What is the Minister doing to get this timeframe down?
- (187) Around measuring the different stages of approvals particularly post DA. Is the Department measuring and publishing this data? And if not why and when?

Moore Park Golf Course

- (188) Has the Government set a date for when the 18-hole course will be formally reduced to 9 holes?
- (189) When can the public expect the first stage of new parkland at Moore Park to be accessible?
- (190) Has a detailed timeline been developed for the staged delivery of the expanded public open space?
- (191) Will the Department publish a delivery program or milestones for the Moore Park conversion?
- (192) Please outline how many sporting fields there will be, how much passive recreation, the number of playgrounds, or cultural facilities?
 - (a) If this is unknown at this stage, when will these details be finalised?
- (193) Will the designs be put on public exhibition?

TOD Delivery

- (194) Are there TOD areas with no lodged applications for residential flat buildings, despite being designated under the Transport Oriented Development Program and zoned as such?
- (195) The third UDIA progress report finds that more than 75% of activity in TOD and LMR areas comes from modifications to existing DAs, not new projects - why is that the case?
 - (a) Does the Department expect this practice to continue?
 - (b) How many new homes have been generated by modifications to existing DAs in TOD areas?
- (196) How much infrastructure funding has been allocated specifically to TOD precincts to make them attractive and feasible for developers?
- (197) How will you ensure that infrastructure capacity — transport, utilities, and public amenities — is delivered in time to support the increased housing you've zoned for in TOD areas?
- (198) Have you prioritised infrastructure delivery in underperforming TOD precincts to help stimulate take-up?
- (199) Will you provide a full breakdown for each TOD precinct — including applications lodged, dwellings proposed, approvals granted, and dwellings commenced?
- (200) For all the TOD Accelerated Precincts (apart from Bays West), please provide:

- (a) The number of development applications lodged since the TOD designation was announced.
- (b) The total number of dwellings proposed in those applications.
- (c) The number of applications approved.
- (d) The total number of dwellings approved.
- (e) The number of dwellings where construction has commenced.
- (f) The number of dwellings which have been approved but not yet commenced.
- (g) All of the above, broken down by month since the relevant TOD rezoning was enacted.

(201) For all 37 of the TOD SEPP Areas, please provide:

- (a) The number of development applications lodged since the TOD designation was announced.
- (b) The total number of dwellings proposed in those applications.
- (c) The number of applications approved.
- (d) The total number of dwellings approved.
- (e) The number of dwellings where construction has commenced.
- (f) The number of dwellings which have been approved but not yet commenced.
- (g) All of the above, broken down by month since the relevant TOD rezoning was enacted.

(202) Of the total dwellings counted as being delivered due to the TOD program to date, how many come from:

- (a) entirely new projects lodged after TOD designation, versus
- (b) modifications or amendments to previously approved developments?

(203) What is the Department's current projection for total dwellings to be delivered through TOD in:

- (a) the first year,
- (b) until the end of the Housing Accord, and
- (c) the full program period of 15 years?

- (204) What proportion of TOD precincts are considered by the Department to have high, medium, or low market feasibility for new housing delivery?
- (205) What infrastructure investments have been specifically allocated to each TOD precinct to support delivery? Please list them.
- (206) Has the Department set milestone targets for each precinct? If yes, please provide them.
- (a) What monitoring is in place to track progress against those milestones?
- (207) Has the Department done any post-announcement reviews to identify barriers to uptake in precincts with low or no new activity?

Priority Growth Areas and Precincts

- (208) For each of the following Priority Growth Areas and Precincts, answer the below questions (the next fifteen questions):

- Bankstown
- Bayside West Precincts
- Burwood, Strathfield and Homebush
- Camellia-Rosehill
- Carter Street
- Cherrybrook Precinct
- Church Street North
- Circular Quay Renewal
- Explorer Street, Eveleigh
- Frenchs Forest
- Greater Macarthur
- Greater Parramatta
- Greater Penrith to Eastern Creek
- Hornsby
- Ingleside
- Leppington
- Lowes Creek
- Maryland
- Macquarie Park

- Marsden Park
- North Narrabri
- Northern Beaches Aboriginal Land
- North West Growth Area
- Orchard Hills
- Parramatta CBD
- Parramatta Road
- Penrith Lakes
- Pyrmont Peninsula
- Rhodes
- Riverwood
- Seven Hills
- Schofields
- South Eveleigh Train Workshop
- South West Growth Area
- St Leonards and Crows Nest
- Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor
- Sydney Metro North-West Urban Renewal Corridor
- Telopea
- Waterloo South
- West Schofields
- Western Sydney Employment Area
- Western Sydney Aerotropolis
- Westmead
- Wianamatta
- South Creek
- Wilton

- (a) Minister, what is the current status of planning for the [Precinct Name] — has the final precinct plan or strategy been released, and if not, when is it expected?
- (b) When was the last public update or consultation for this precinct, and what stage of the planning pipeline is it currently in?

- (c) How does the delivery timeline for this precinct compare to the commitments made when it was first designated a Priority Growth Area?
- (d) Has rezoning been completed in [Precinct Name]?
- (e) How many dwellings is [Precinct Name] expected to enable?
- (f) How many dwellings have been approved, commenced, and completed in this precinct since it was declared a growth area?
- (g) What proportion of the original housing targets for this precinct have been met, and if they haven't been met, why not?
- (h) What specific infrastructure commitments — including road upgrades, public transport links, schools, health services, and open space — have been funded for [Precinct Name]?
- (i) How much funding has been allocated to infrastructure in this precinct since its designation, and what proportion of that has been spent?
- (j) Are the necessary infrastructure upgrades scheduled to occur before, during, or after significant housing delivery?
- (k) How many development applications have been lodged in [Precinct Name] in the past 12 months, and what is the total dwelling yield of those applications?
- (l) Has the Department undertaken any feasibility analysis for development in this precinct to assess whether housing targets are achievable in the current market?
- (m) Are there known constraints — such as contamination, flooding, or infrastructure capacity — that are delaying housing delivery in this precinct?
- (n) How will you ensure that local councils, developers, and the community are held accountable for meeting the agreed delivery timelines in this precinct?
- (o) When will the public be able to see a full, updated delivery schedule for [Precinct Name] and all other Priority Growth Areas?

State Significant Rezoning Policy

- (209) Minister, what is the current status of the State Significant Rezoning Policy — is it fully operational across NSW, and if not, when will it be?
- (210) How many applications have been made under the State Significant Rezoning pathway since the policy came into effect?

- (211) Of those applications, how many have been accepted, rejected, or are still under assessment?
- (212) What is the average time taken from application lodgement to decision under the State Significant Rezoning Policy?
- (213) How does this compare to the timeframes promised when the policy was first announced?
- (214) What is the target processing time for applications, and are you meeting it?
- (215) How many dwellings have been approved, by site, as a result of rezonings under this policy?
- (216) How many hectares of employment land or mixed-use land have been rezoned under the policy?
- (217) How is the State ensuring that State Significant Rezonings are supported by timely infrastructure delivery?
- (218) What is the process for engaging local councils and communities in assessing State Significant Rezoning applications?
- (219) How will you ensure that this policy doesn't override legitimate local planning considerations in favour of poorly planned developments?
- (220) Minister, the State Significant Rezoning Policy promised rezonings would be completed within 180–205 working days from lodgement — for each of the rezonings you announced in September 2024, when were they lodged and when will they be finalised?
- (221) Minister, of all the rezonings announced under the September 2024 tranche, how many have actually been finalised within the 180–205 day window you promised?
- (222) How many working days has each rezoning now been in the system, and what is the reason for the delay?
- (223) When will communities and developers see these rezonings actually gazetted?
- (224) For each of the following rezonings announced under the State Significant Rezoning Policy as cited below, answer the below questions:
- Bankstown
 - Bayside West Precincts
 - Burwood, Strathfield & Homebush
 - Camellia–Rosehill
 - Carter Street
 - Cherrybrook Precinct

- Frenchs Forest
 - Greater Macarthur
 - Leppington
 - Orchard Hills
 - Riverwood
 - Schofields
- (a) For [Site Name], when was the rezoning officially lodged, and under which pathway—State-led or State-assessed—does it fall?
 - (b) What is the current number of working days elapsed since lodgement for [Site Name], and how does that compare with the intended 180–205 day policy benchmark?
 - (c) Has detailed infrastructure planning (e.g., transport, utilities, open space) been aligned with the rezoning for [Site Name], or is that still pending?

Data Centres

- (225) Minister, how does the Department of Planning assess the role of data centres in supporting the NSW economy, particularly with the growth of AI, cloud services, and financial technology?
- (226) Has the Department undertaken work to identify the likely future demand for data centres in NSW, and where the most suitable locations might be?
- (227) Are data centres being considered as part of the broader infrastructure planning framework, alongside roads, schools, and housing, given their economic importance?
- (228) How many development applications for data centres have been lodged in NSW since January 2024?
 - (a) Of those applications, how many have been approved, how many are under assessment, and how many have been refused?
- (229) What is the average assessment timeframe for data centre applications over the past 12 months?
- (230) What is the current longest and shortest timeframe for determination of a data centre DA?
- (231) Is there a dedicated pathway for assessing data centre applications, or are they processed under the same timelines and criteria as standard industrial developments?

- (232) What measures are in place to provide certainty and clarity to proponents around the approvals process for data centres?
- (233) Has the Government considered designating data centres as State Significant Development to provide a more consistent and efficient pathway for larger projects?
- (234) Is there a State Significant Development pathway, or access to the State Significant Development Pathway for data centres?
- (235) What planning criteria are most frequently raised during the assessment of data centre applications (e.g., power availability, cooling requirements, environmental impact)?
- (236) What role does the availability of power and cooling infrastructure play in the assessment and location of new data centres?
- (237) Has the Department identified any bottlenecks — such as grid capacity, zoning, or environmental requirements — that affect the timely approval and delivery of data centres?
- (238) How is the Department working with agencies like EnergyCo, Ausgrid, or Transgrid to ensure adequate power supply is available for current and future data centre projects?
- (239) Which agencies are consulted on electricity capacity during the DA process, and at what stage?
- (240) Has the Department mapped priority locations in NSW best suited to future data centre development?
- (241) Does the Department maintain a central database of all lodged, approved, and completed data centre projects in NSW?
- (242) Is data on job creation, economic contribution, or digital capacity from data centres tracked as part of the planning process?
- (243) Will the Department publish regular updates on data centre applications and approvals, similar to the reporting on housing approvals?

NSW Productivity Commissioner Report Response

- (244) Minister, on August 30 last year the Productivity Commissioner provided his Review of Housing Supply Challenges and Policy Options for NSW to the Government. That report identified a series of planning and construction sector reforms that would lift feasibility, cut costs, and boost housing supply – including expanding TODs, resolving post-consent delays, and relaxing rigid design controls. Given the construction sector is at the heart of

both the housing and productivity challenge, when will the Government make public its response to this report outlining which recommendations you support and what specific reforms will you prioritise?

- (a) Can you provide a list of the recommendations that have already been adopted by Government and which ones have not?

Industrial and Employment Land

(245) Minister, at the start of the year you stated that unlocking and protecting industrial lands was a priority for Government. Why, eight months later, do we still not have a clear policy framework beyond a skeletal action plan which has not yet progressed beyond Action 1?

- (a) When will the plan progress beyond Action 1?

(246) The pipeline of zoned and serviced industrial land in NSW is running critically low, driving up costs for businesses and limiting opportunities for new investment. What is the Government doing right now to ensure sufficient land supply is available over the next 5–10 years?

Luddenham Rezoning

(247) Minister, now that the Western Sydney Airport flight paths have been finalised, when will the Luddenham Village rezonings under the Interim Strategy actually be determined?

(248) How many dwellings are expected to be delivered under the Luddenham plan once rezonings are complete, and when will the community see the first approvals?

(249) What is the timeline for employment land rezonings in Luddenham Village, and when will those jobs be available to support the Aerotropolis?

(250) The Luddenham Village Interim Strategy notes the importance of sequencing land release and infrastructure. Can you provide clear timeframes for when the rezonings will be finalised and when the first developments will commence?

(251) How will the Department ensure Luddenham doesn't suffer years of uncertainty now that flight paths have been locked in and residents want clarity about what land uses are viable?

(252) What is the Government's plan to give Luddenham landowners certainty on when they can expect rezoning decisions, infrastructure commitments, and development approvals?

(253) How does the Luddenham Village rezoning align with the Aerotropolis and Bradfield City Centre plans now that airport operations are close to commencing?

- (254) Has the Government set a target for how many dwellings and jobs Luddenham should contribute toward the broader Western Sydney growth targets?
- (255) Will Luddenham be prioritised for infrastructure investment given its proximity to the airport and strategic importance to the Aerotropolis?
- (256) How is the Government consulting with Luddenham residents on what the final zoning outcomes will be, now that flight paths have clarified what is viable?
- (257) Will landowners who were told rezonings were imminent finally see concrete timelines for when their land will be rezoned and development permitted?
- (258) Can you guarantee Luddenham will not be left in limbo while other precincts in the Aerotropolis progress more quickly?

Broadmeadow Place Strategy

- (259) What transport, road, and open space infrastructure is being funded alongside the Broadmeadow rezoning, and what is the sequencing plan?
- (260) Has the Government allocated specific funding in the Budget to support the infrastructure required to make Broadmeadow viable, or is that yet to be decided?

Infill Affordable Housing Pathway

- (261) Since the introduction of the In-fill Affordable Housing pathway, how many total development applications have been approved using the bonus provisions?
- (262) How many dwellings in total have been approved under this pathway, and how many of those are designated affordable dwellings?
- (263) Can you please provide a list of the developments which have used this pathway, including the number of total dwellings and affordable dwellings for each?
- (264) Of the approved applications, how many projects have actually commenced construction, and how many have been completed?
- (265) As of today, how many affordable dwellings have physically been delivered and are now occupied?
- (266) How many applications are currently under assessment under the In-fill Affordable Housing pathway?

- (267) What is the estimated pipeline in terms of private dwellings and affordable dwellings across these applications?
- (268) The policy states that residential development with “least 10% of gross floor area (GFA) as affordable housing” is eligible – what is the average percentage of gross floor area that is being dedicated to affordable housing?
- (269) What monitoring does the Department undertake to ensure developers are delivering the required 10–15% affordable housing promised under the bonus once projects are completed?
- (270) What tenure arrangements are in place for these affordable dwellings (e.g. fixed 15 years, in perpetuity, or other)?
- (271) Has the Department assessed whether the incentive is sufficient to shift developer behaviour at scale, or is take-up still limited relative to overall housing approvals?
- (272) Is the Department tracking whether the affordable dwellings delivered are concentrated in higher-value inner city areas or more evenly spread across metropolitan and regional NSW?

Essential Worker Housing Program

- (273) Since the Essential Worker Housing program was announced, how many projects have formally been started across NSW for Essential Worker Housing?
- (274) How much funding has been dedicated to the Essential Worker Housing Program across the forward estimates?
- (275) How much funding has been dedicated to the Essential Worker Housing Program in 2023-24 and 2024-25?
- (276) How many essential worker dwellings have been approved to date, and how many are currently under construction?
- (277) How many dwellings have been completed and handed over for occupation by essential workers?
- (278) At the Camperdown site, how many of the 200 essential worker build-to-rent units are expected to be delivered by each year from 2028 onwards?
- (279) At the Camperdown site, what proportion of the 300 additional dwellings will be affordable rental versus market dwellings?

- (280) For the announced Northern Rivers and South Coast projects (110 units), when is construction expected to commence and when is completion targeted?
- (281) Who is managing the dwellings constructed under this program – is it an affordable housing provider?
- (282) What eligibility criteria have been finalised for essential workers to access this housing — which categories of workers qualify?
- (283) How do essential workers apply to live in these homes?
- (284) When can essential workers start making applications?
- (285) What is the expected rent discount percentage compared to market rent, and how will it be applied?
- (286) Will allocation be prioritised based on proximity to employment, income thresholds, or other factors?
- (287) What monitoring framework is in place to ensure the dwellings remain available to essential workers over the long term and are not lost to the private rental market?
- (288) How long is the tenure guaranteed for essential worker allocations — e.g. in perpetuity, or time-limited?

Social And Affordable Housing Rezoning Pathway

- (289) Since the Social and Affordable Housing Rezoning Pathway was established, how many proposals have been lodged through this pathway?
- (290) How many proposals have been accepted for assessment, and how many were rejected at lodgement?
- (291) How many dwellings comprise the dwellings accepted for assessment?
- (292) How many proposals are currently under active assessment by the Department?
- (293) How many rezonings have been finalised under the pathway, and on what dates?
- (294) How many proposals have been approved?
- (295) What is the total dwelling yield from proposals that have been approved?
- (296) Of that yield, how many dwellings are identified as social or affordable housing, and how many as private dwellings?
- (297) In which LGAs have proposals been lodged under the pathway?

- (298) How long, on average, has it taken from proposal lodgement to Gateway determination for projects in this pathway?
- (299) How long, on average, has it taken from Gateway determination to finalisation?
- (300) Of the finalised rezonings, have any development applications been lodged, and if so, how many dwellings have progressed to DA stage?
- (301) How many social and affordable dwellings have been completed as a result of rezonings through this pathway?
- (302) What monitoring framework exists to track whether the required percentage of social and affordable housing is delivered after rezoning is granted?
- (303) What projections has the Department made for how many dwellings this pathway will deliver for each year until 2030?

Nowra Riverfront

- (304) Since the announcement in March 2025 of up to 650 new homes in the Nowra Riverfront and Mandalay precincts, what progress has been made on each component of the project?
- (305) Has the Minister issued a formal Direction under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 to progress the Nowra Riverfront precinct rezoning as state significant? If not, is/when is this expected?
- (306) Has a planning proposal been lodged for the Mandalay precinct rezoning, and what stage of assessment is it currently at?
- (307) What milestones or delivery targets have been set for 2026, 2027, and beyond?
- (308) What technical studies (traffic, urban design, water management, flooding) have been completed to support the proposed rezoning of the 3.4-hectare riverfront land?
- (309) What is the expected timeline for the rezoning to be finalised, and when could development applications realistically be lodged?
- (310) Has the Department set targets for the proportion of social, affordable, and private housing within the 270 homes?
- (311) Has the Department identified delivery partners or is the site intended for private market development?

- (312) How will the proposed developments integrate with recent State investments in the Princes Highway upgrade, Shoalhaven River Bridge replacement, and the Shoalhaven Hospital redevelopment?
- (313) Has the Department conducted modelling on the additional infrastructure needs (schools, health, transport) to support 650 new dwellings in Nowra?
- (314) What role will Shoalhaven City Council play in delivering public domain improvements to the foreshore alongside the housing?

Georges River Council Housing Plans

- (315) What are the specific roadblocks which the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces has to overcome before approving the GRC housing plans given they can achieve the government's housing target?
- (a) How and when will the Minister overcome this roadblock?
- (316) As more than 11,000 new dwellings (30,000 people) are expected to be built in GRC within the period from 2025-2029, provide specific details (funding, dates) improved essential infrastructure:
- (a) schools
- (b) hospitals
- (c) sewerage
- (d) water
- (e) open space
- (f) sport facilities
- (g) parking stations
- (h) rail
- (317) Will heritage conservation areas and areas of unique character in GRC be protected under the current LMR policy?
- (318) Noting that tree canopy coverage on private land is a significant proportion of the overall tree canopy coverage in the GRC, how will the LMR avoid further loss of tree canopy and the resulting increase in urban heat?

Rose Bay Low and Mid Rise Zoning

- (319) Has the NSW Government conducted any analysis of Rose Bay's hydrogeological and geotechnical complexities (shallow groundwater, streams, acid-sulphate soils).
- (320) Can you confirm that parts of the area classify as "high risk" under Refinement 7 of the policy?
- (321) Is the NSW Government aware of the current Woollahra Council planning controls (including the 'enhanced' excavation controls that apply to the mapped high risk Rose Bay settlement area per the Woollahra DCP amended in December 2024) that have been ineffective in preventing cumulative excavation impacts given the hydrogeological and geotechnical complexities in Rose Bay and surrounds – and this shortcoming has been acknowledged by Woollahra Council?
- (322) Has the NSW Government received and reviewed reports of damage (including subsidence, significant structural damage, basement flooding, and groundwater displacement) in Rose Bay and the Woollahra LGA?
- (323) Considering these were caused by smaller-scale (single storey) excavations than those proposed under LMR Housing Policy, what is the NSW Governments plan to ensure these aren't exacerbated?
- (324) Is the NSW Government aware that a new site on approximately 14,000 sqm of vulnerable land, between Dover Road Wilberforce Avenue is targeted for deep, multi-level basement developments (despite the foreseeable risks to properties in Rose Bay both adjacent to, and surrounding, that block, and the foreseeable damage to the groundwater environment, being known to Woollahra Council)?
- (325) How will the complex geotechnical and hydrogeotechnical risks pertaining to the land in Rose Bay be managed, given the current planning controls are known to be ineffective in managing the vulnerable land in this area? For example: Groundwater disruption and cumulative settlement (both long and short term) from multiple deep basements being excavated on high risk sites, with a known history of damage (including subsidence, significant structural damage and basement flooding) from less intensive development/excavation; Regional groundwater flow disruption caused by tanking or dewatering where the groundwater is shallow; and, extended dewatering zones causing property settlement well beyond excavation sites with environmental impacts, including acid-sulphate soil activation and ecosystem disruption.

- (326) How will cumulative effects of such development be addressed, given that individual consultant reports typically carry broad disclaimers and are project-specific, and precinct wide development will be occurring simultaneously, in an area with a history of damage where developers simply point the finger at each other, leaving residents to bear the burden of uninsurable risks? Reports commissioned by developers, and pre-emptive actions such as dilapidation reports and vibration monitors have proved ineffective.
- (327) Given historical reports of damage and the concerns described above, when excavation-related damage occurs, who will bear financial liability where responsibility cannot be attributed to a single developer?
- (328) Given historical reports of damage and concerns described above, will the NSW Government provide public indemnities to residents to allay community concerns?
- (a) If not, why not?
- (329) Given the four amalgamated sites totalling 14,000m² in the high risk (as categorised in NSW State Govt's Refinement 7) between Wilberforce Ave and Dover Rd, are now being marketed for LMR redevelopment, will the NSW Government review approvals for all LMR development in Rose Bay and the process conducted in assessing applications to ensure the foreseeable damage is mitigated?
- (330) How many approvals have been given for developments in the LMR zone in Rose Bay.

Assistance for Hills Shire Council

- (331) When is the NSW Government going to make a budget provision to support The Hills Shire Councils, to recover from the decision to artificially cap developer contributions in the northwest sector where the budget deficit is currently around \$200M and growing?
- (332) Is there intention for the NSW Government to compensate Councils for the work they do assessing State Significant Development Applications?
- (a) (If yes) when is this likely to occur?
- (b) (If no) why not?
- (333) What is the budget cost to the NSW taxpayer to fund the NSW Government public service in managing private certifiers and dealing with dodgy buildings?
- (334) Is the NSW Government concerned about what the housing crisis means for the health of the Hawkesbury/Nepean River?

- (a) (If yes) What action is being taken to address these concerns?
- (335) Is there a budget for the NSW Government to fund Councils to construct and manage new or enlarged facilities for companion animals, given they are currently overcrowding or already at capacity?
- (336) In a media release on the 21 August 2025, you announced \$63 million for infrastructure in Western Sydney. \$11.7 million of this funding is allocated to projects in Box Hill. This funding was collected through the Special Infrastructure Contributions (SIC) fund, paid for by developers. Can you confirm how much funding remains from those contributions for Box Hill projects?
- (337) When can Box Hill expect this SIC funding to be released so that remaining projects such as drainage basins, traffic signals, local parks and roads can be completed?

Chatswood Dive Site

- (338) Concerning the former Chatswood Metro Dive Site of almost 15 000m² at 607 Pacific Highway, Chatswood:
 - (a) Has the site been transferred to Landcom to develop?
 - i. If yes, when did this transfer happen?
- (339) What is Landcom's plans for the site?
 - (a) Will it include Build to Rent?
 - (b) How many dwellings are anticipated on the site?
 - (c) Will the site be sold to a developer or will Landcom retain ownership?
- (340) What provision will be made for public facilities?
- (341) Will there be a requirement to deliver public benefit remain such as open space or other community facilities on the site?
- (342) There has been almost no public engagement or communication to date:
 - (a) What community consultation will be conducted?
 - (b) When will the community be kept informed as to what is happening?
- (343) What are the project timelines?
- (344) When is the project estimated for completion?

Driveway Crossover Certification Issues

- (345) Minister, builders are reporting that driveway crossovers are causing significant delays in getting building works certified — what data does the Department hold on how widespread this problem is?
- (346) How many development applications in the past 12 months have required variations specifically related to driveway crossovers?
- (347) Has the Department conducted a review into why driveway crossover requirements are creating such a bottleneck in the certification process?
- (348) Are councils applying consistent requirements for driveway crossovers, or does the Department accept that there is wide variation creating unnecessary complexity for builders?
- (349) What guidance, if any, has the Department issued to certifiers or councils to standardise how driveway crossover conditions should be assessed?
- (350) Has the Department considered updating the Codes SEPP or providing model conditions to reduce the need for DA variations relating to driveways?
- (351) What work is underway to make the driveway crossover certification process simpler and faster, particularly for small-scale housing projects?
- (352) Has the Department engaged with the building industry to identify practical reforms to reduce red tape around crossovers?

Macquarie Park TOD

- (353) How many of the new homes in Macquarie Park will have 3 and 4 bedrooms?
- (354) Of the new population, how many additional children does your Department anticipate will be living in Macquarie Park by 2029?
- (355) Does your department envisage a further transitioning away from business and industrial uses in Macquarie Park towards residential/mixed uses?
- (356) What is the projected population increase for Macquarie Park over the next 5, 10 and 20 years?
- (357) Of that projected growth, how many children of preschool age are expected to live in Macquarie Park over this period?
- (358) How many children of primary school age are expected?

- (359) How many children of high school age are expected?
- (360) What consultation has the Department undertaken with local councils regarding community infrastructure needs arising from Macquarie Park's growth?
- (361) Has the Department modelled demand for community facilities such as childcare, schools, open space, and road infrastructure?
- (362) Given Macquarie Park is one of eight accelerated TOD precincts, what infrastructure benchmarks has Planning set to match Macquarie Park's scale of growth?
- (363) What planning benchmarks exist to align housing approvals with state infrastructure delivery, and are those benchmarks currently being met in Macquarie Park?

Moveable and Secondary Dwellings

- (364) Bega Valley Council has called on the Government to clarify definitions and approval pathways for moveable dwellings — what progress has been made on these reforms?
- (365) What stage is the review of legislation covering moveable dwellings and caravans currently at?
- (366) Has draft legislation or a regulatory package been prepared for Cabinet or public consultation?
- (367) When does the Government expect to finalise reforms to the legislation governing moveable dwellings and caravans?
- (368) Will the reforms be introduced in this parliamentary term, and if so, on what timeline?
- (369) What interim arrangements are in place while the Government says it is still "considering" reforms?
- (370) Has the Department consulted councils, including Bega Valley and other regional LGAs, about what changes are needed to make tiny homes and moveable dwellings a viable housing option?
- (371) What feedback has the Department received from industry and community stakeholders about barriers in the current legislation?
- (372) Will councils and communities have input into the draft reforms before they are introduced?
- (373) Has the Department modelled how many additional dwellings could be delivered if the approval pathway for moveable dwellings was simplified?

(374) How will these reforms be integrated into the State's broader housing supply targets, especially in regional NSW where demand for tiny homes is most urgent?

Bombo Quarry Masterplan

(375) What is the current status of the Bombo Quarry Masterplan following the release of the draft in June 2024?

(376) Has the Department completed its assessment of community feedback received during the consultation period?

(377) What revisions, if any, have been made to the draft masterplan as a result of consultation?

(378) What work has the Department undertaken to support the preparation of the Bombo Quarry Masterplan alongside Boral and Kiama Council?

(379) Which technical studies have been completed to date — including housing yield, transport, flooding, environmental, and cultural heritage?

(380) Has the Department provided any advice on the likely dwelling yield from the Bombo Quarry site?

(381) What are the next statutory steps for the Bombo Quarry Masterplan, and when will they occur?

(382) Has a timeline been set for the rezoning process, and when is it expected to be finalised?

(383) When does the Department expect the first development applications for the site to be lodged?

(384) Has the Department modelled how many dwellings could be delivered on the Bombo Quarry site, and by what year?

(385) What consideration has been given to affordable housing within the Masterplan?

(386) What infrastructure investment — roads, schools, utilities, open space — has been identified as necessary to support redevelopment of the quarry?

Renewable Energy Projects

(387) What is the total number of:

- (a) Approved renewable energy projects located within renewable energy zones in NSW?
- (b) Approved renewable energy projects located outside of renewable energy zones?

- (c) Renewable energy projects seeking approval within renewable energy zones?
 - (d) Renewable energy projects seeking approval outside renewable energy zones?
- (388) What is the total generational capacity of:
- (a) Approved renewable energy projects located within renewable energy zones in NSW?
 - (b) Approved renewable energy projects located outside of renewable energy zones?
 - (c) Renewable energy projects seeking approval within renewable energy zones?
 - (d) Renewable energy projects seeking approval outside renewable energy zones?
- (389) What entity is responsible for naming temporary workers accommodation camps for renewable energy projects?
- (a) If the community is unhappy with how a workers accommodation camp has been named what avenues are there to have the name changed?
- (390) Who is responsible for extending the minimum exhibition period for State Significant Developments?
- (a) What matrix, if any, is used to decide what projects will receive an extended exhibition period?
- (391) What work has the Department conducted on the impact on land prices of farms neighbouring renewable energy developments or transmission lines?
- (a) If no work has been completed is there anything in the works?
 - (b) If there is no work completed or currently underway how does the Department accurately calculate the impacts of a project without taking this crucial information into account?

Fernhill Estate

- (392) What funding is being allocated to Fernhill Estate for conservation works, new works, and activation?

CFMEU meetings

- (393) Since 28 March 2023, have you met with the Construction, Forestry and Maritime Employees Union (CFMEU) that was not disclosed in accordance with the Premier's Memorandum M2015-05 Publication of Ministerial Diaries and Release of Overseas Travel Information?

ETU meetings

(394) Since 28 March 2023, have you met with the Electrical Trades Union (ETU) that was not disclosed in accordance with the Premier's Memorandum M2015-05 Publication of Ministerial Diaries and Release of Overseas Travel Information?

Ministerial disclosures to The Cabinet Office

(395) On what date did you last update/make a ministerial disclosure to the Premier and the Secretary of The Cabinet Office?

Department(s)/Agency(s) Employees

(396) In relation to redundancies, will this be made available in your respective Department(s)/Agency(s) Annual Reports?

Department(s)/Agency(s) Annual Reports

(397) Do you have plans to print the 2024-25 annual report(s) for each department / agency in your portfolio?

(a) If yes, what is the budgeted expenditure for printing for each department / agency?

State Records Act

(398) Have you and your ministerial office had training and/or a briefing about the State Records Act from State Records NSW and/or The Cabinet Office and/or Premier's Department?

(a) If yes, when?

Department(s)/Agency(s) Gifts and Hospitality Register

(399) Does your portfolio department(s)/agency(s) have a gifts and/or hospitality register?

(a) If yes, is it available online?

i. If yes, what is the website URL?

Ministerial staff disclosure of gifts and/or hospitality

(400) Does your ministerial office keep a register of gifts and/or hospitality for staff to make disclosures?

(a) If yes, what is the website URL?

(401) Have any staff members in your office been the recipient of any free hospitality?

- (a) What was the total value of the hospitality received?
- (b) Are these gifts of hospitality declared?

Ministerial Code of Conduct

(402) Since 28 March 2023, have you breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct?

- (a) If yes, what was the breach?

Senior Executive Drivers

(403) As at 1 August 2025, how many senior executives in your portfolio department(s) / agency(s) have a driver?

GIPA Act - Disclosure Log & Ministerial Offices

(404) Does your Ministerial Office have a disclosure log in accordance with the Government Information (Public Access Act) 2009?

- (a) If yes, what is the URL?

GIPA Act - Disclosure Log & Departments/Agencies

(405) What is the website URL for the Government Information (Public Access Act) 2009 disclosure log each of your portfolio department(s) / agency(s)?

TikTok

(406) Are you on TikTok?

- (a) If yes, do you access TikTok from a NSW Government device?

Signal

(407) Are you on Signal?

- (a) If yes, do you access Signal from a NSW Government device?
- (b) If yes, does Signal comply with the State Records Act?

Training

(408) Since 28 March 2023, have you had training from an external stakeholder that included an invoice and payment paid for using your ministerial budget?

- (a) If yes, what is the description of training?

- (b) If yes, how much?

Parliamentary Secretary & Ministerial Vehicle

(409) Has your Parliamentary Secretary ever used a Ministerial driver from the pool?

- (a) If yes, why?

Media releases and statements

(410) Are all the ministerial media releases and statements issued by you publicly available at <https://www.nsw.gov.au/ministerial-releases?>

- (a) If no, why?

Overseas Travel

(411) As Minister, do you approve overseas travel for public servants from your portfolio department(s)/agency(s)?

Data Breaches

(412) Does your portfolio department(s)/agency(s) keep a register of data breaches in accordance with the Privacy and Personal Information Protection (PPIP) Act?

- (a) If yes, what is the website?

Discretionary Fund

(413) As Minister, do you have a discretionary fund?

- (a) If yes, what department(s) / agency(s) administer it?
(b) If yes, what is the website URL detailing expenditure?

Airline Lounges

(414) Are you a member of the Qantas Chairmans Lounge?

(415) Are you a member of the Virgin Beyond Lounge?

Ministerial Overseas Travel

(416) Since 28 March 2023, have you formally applied to the Premier to travel overseas?

- (a) If yes, was this application accepted?

Private Jet Charter

(417) Have you travelled on a private jet charter in your Ministerial capacity?

- (a) If yes, was this value for money for taxpayers?

Ministerial Office renovations

(418) Since 28 March 2023, has your Ministerial Office at 52 Martin Place been renovated?

- (a) If yes, how much was the expenditure?

Conflict of Interest

(419) Since 28 March 2023, have you formally written to the Premier with a conflict of interest?

- (a) If yes, why?