

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
01	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?	The external independent probity advisors engaged by the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure will determine, following a review of provided documentation, what additional information they may require. This may include interviews with affected parties. The scope covers the end-to-end Expression of Interest (EOI) to declaration process and subsequent Secretary's environmental assessment requirements (SEARs) request.
02	Question to the Minister regarding the Gas Decarbonisation Roadmap 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?	The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) is leading the development of the Gas Decarbonisation Roadmap. The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure works closely with DCCEEW to give effect to relevant household level energy, water and thermal efficiency provisions through the Building Sustainability Index (BASIX), which applies to all new NSW residential buildings. In October 2023, BASIX was updated to recognise the increased share of renewable energy in the NSW electricity generation mix. This has made it easier for all-electric homes to meet BASIX standards. An applicant can still choose gas, however, must make offsets elsewhere to improve the home's overall sustainability and meet BASIX standards.
03	Questions to the Minister regarding Part 1 of the Transport Oriented Development Program 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?	The Transport Oriented Development (TOD) Accelerated Precincts have been rezoned in November 2024 and are expected to deliver almost 60,000 homes over the next 15 years. As of 22 August 2025, there have been 282 dwellings approved using the TOD Accelerated Precinct pathway. (a) This is a matter for the Minister for Energy. (b) The Building Sustainability Index (BASIX) incentivises renewable energy choices by making it easier to meet BASIX standards if solar panels are included in a home's design. BASIX does not currently include provisions in relation to home batteries. By encouraging the uptake of solar panels, BASIX will make an important contribution to reducing energy demand and energy bills.
04	Centennial Coal 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?	Any proposal to discharge water into these water sources would be subject to a comprehensive assessment in accordance with the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> . This would include considering all likely environmental social and economic impacts of the development before making an informed decision supported by the existing robust planning framework.
05	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?	The Springvale water treatment plant was designed based on best available modelled predictions and the operational requirements at the time of the development. Any modification to the Springvale water treatment plant would be subject to a rigorous assessment under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> , including environmental and community impacts.
06	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?	Any development application would be assessed in accordance with relevant legislation and guidelines, including the Neutral or Beneficial Effect (NorBE) on Water Quality Assessment Guideline. In July 2025, WaterNSW published an updated NorBE Assessment Guideline 2025. This guideline includes minor changes to the way in which current recommended practices are reviewed and clarifies how State Significant Development (SSD) should be considered. These modifications are also assessed in close consultation with relevant stakeholders, including WaterNSW.
07	Will the Minister commit to strengthening the NorBe laws by extending them to modification proposals as promised by senior Labor parliamentarians when in opposition?	The NSW Government and Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure acknowledges the importance of making sure development in the Sydney drinking water catchment is subject to a robust and transparent assessment process. The current legislative and policy framework requires all new SSD proposals in the catchment to demonstrate they will have a neutral or beneficial effect on water quality

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
		before consent can be granted. Any changes to extend provisions to modification proposals would need to be carefully considered as part of broader legislative reform.
08	Climate Impacts 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?	Refer to the response to question #06. Changes to NorBe laws are a matter for the Minister for Water.
09	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?	<p>The Independent Planning Commission is aware of the judgement. The Commission is required to consider the likely impacts of a proposed development, including environmental impacts on both the natural and built environments, and social and economic impacts in the locality. This requires the Commission to consider the causal connection between a Project and its impacts on the environment in the locality of a development, including the impact of climate change on the locality.</p> <p>Where the social and economic impacts of climate change on a region are relevant to a Commission decision, they will be articulated in the Commission's Statement of Reasons for its decision.</p>
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?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is considering the implications of the Court of Appeal judgement and reviewing the relevant guidelines in this context.
11	Will you now require all mining projects in the planning system to amend their EIS to include this information and re-exhibit?	Refer to the response to question #10.
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?	<p>A draft version of <i>the NSW Large Emitters guide</i> was published in May 2024, and the final version was published in January 2025. As with all new policies there is a transitional period for their application.</p> <p>The applications for Mount Arthur Mod 2 (determined April 2025), Hunter Valley Operation Mod 8 (determined April 2025), Tahmoor South Mod 3 (determined May 2025) and Ulan Mod 6 (determined May 2025) were lodged before the Large Emitters Guide came into effect. However, the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure carefully consulted with the EPA, including the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water's Net Zero Emissions Modelling team (NZEM) on these projects noting that draft guidelines were available prior to their determination. No residual issues were raised by either agency.</p> <p>All four modifications included conditions to prepare a Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Plan in consultation with the NSW Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) noting that the Applicants will be required to prepare and implement a Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Plan in accordance with requirements provided by the EPA under the <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i>.</p> <p>The process for setting long term goals and the review of the mitigation plan is the role of the EPA as the primary regulator of GHG emissions in NSW.</p>
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?	Refer to the response to question #12.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
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?	<p>The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure conducts detailed assessment of greenhouse gas emissions from coal mining proposals in consultation with the NSW Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) which is the lead regulator of greenhouse gas emissions in NSW. The EPA coordinates project advice from the Net Zero Emissions Modelling team.</p> <p>The Department has considered greenhouse gas emissions from coal mining projects in the context of NSW and Commonwealth initiatives, including the emissions reduction targets and principles set out in the <i>Climate Change (Net Zero Future) Act 2023</i>.</p> <p>The Department has provided this consideration in its assessment reports for recent coal mining modifications. The Department has also extended the terms of reference of the Independent Expert Advisory Panel for Underground Mining to provide advice on greenhouse gas emissions, as well as include open cut coal mines. The Panel is now known as the Independent Expert Advisory Panel for Mining.</p>
15	Since April 2025, with an abatement gap of 6.6 Mt CO ₂ -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 CO ₂ -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?	Refer to answer provided in question #14.
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?	There are specific provisions in State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning System) that determine what development applications or modification applications are referred to the Independent Planning Commission (IPC) as the consent authority.
17	The Mt Arthur Mod 2 project was not referred to the IPC despite a lifetime GHG footprint of 193 Mt CO ₂ -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?	<p>The Chain Valley Colliery Consolidation project is an SSD application that received over 50 objections during the public exhibition. The IPC is the consent authority for the application.</p> <p>The Mount Arthur project was a modification to an existing SSD consent. The IPC is only the consent authority for modification applications, if an applicant has made a reportable political donation. The Minister for Planning is the consent authority for all other modification applications.</p> <p>Both applications are (and will be) assessed in accordance with relevant policy regarding greenhouse gas emissions, in consultation with the NSW Environmental Protection Authority.</p>
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?	Refer to answer provided in question #16.
19	<p>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?</p> <p>(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?</p>	The Minister for Planning and Public Spaces carefully considers the public interest and complexity of the project in making any decision regarding a public hearing.
20	<p>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?</p> <p>(a) Why did the Department approve a plan with zero abatement measures in it?</p>	<p>The existing Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Management Plan for the mine was approved in May 2022. The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure carefully reviews management plans in accordance with the relevant conditions of consent. A subsequent version of the plan has been submitted which is currently under review.</p>

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	(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?	<p>The NSW Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) has since taken the lead regulatory role in the management of greenhouse gas emissions and has released its Climate Change Policy and Climate Change Action Plan 2023-26. The applicant will be required to prepare and implement a climate change mitigation and adaptation plans (or similar) in accordance with requirements provided by the EPA under the <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i>.</p> <p>In its assessment of Modification 8, the Department recommended a condition of consent requiring the Applicant to prepare a Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Plan in consultation with the EPA within six months of the determination of the modification.</p> <p>Hunter Valley Operations is subject to the Commonwealth Safeguard Mechanism and is required to reduce emissions intensity in line with the decline rate for its Safeguard Baseline.</p>
21	Emergency Services Input into Development Process Can you rule out introducing legislation that would override RFS or SES advice with regard to development assessments and approvals?	<p>The NSW Government recognises the critical importance of advice from experts within the NSW Rural Fire Service and the NSW State Emergency Service in assessing development applications and planning proposals.</p> <p>On behalf of the Minns Labor Government, I introduced the Environment Planning Assessment Amendment (Planning System Reforms) Bill 2025 into the Legislative Assembly on Wednesday, 17 September 2025. The Bill had its Second Reading on the same day.</p> <p>As I made clear in my Second Reading speech: “There will be no weakening of environmental protections or standards. DCA[Development Co-ordination Authority]’s experts will continue to apply the same legislation, policies and standards set by agencies. Crucially, bush fire risk will continue to be subject to rigorous assessment by experts, in line with the requirements of the Rural Fire Service.”</p>
22	Have you seen the independent review reportedly undertaken by former NSW Police deputy commissioner Dave Owens on behalf of Metro LALC?	<p>The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is aware that Mr Owens, a former NSW Police Deputy Commissioner, prepared an independent peer review for the Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council in March 2025.</p> <p>The report was submitted to the Department, who provided it to NSW Rural Fire Service for consideration.</p>
23	Is it also your view that the RFS advice, in the case of the Lizard Rock development proposal, constitutes “overreach?”	The NSW Rural Fire Service provided advice in accordance with agency consultation which was conditioned within the Planning Proposal’s Gateway Determination.
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?	<p>The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure released the Shelter-in-Place Guideline in 2025 to help consent authorities assess if shelter in place is a suitable emergency management strategy for development proposed in flash flood environments.</p> <p>The SSD application for the Uniting Kingscliff redevelopment includes infilling of an existing stormwater basin to match surrounding ground levels and includes on-site stormwater detention to manage flows. Flooding impacts and mitigation strategies, including the proposed shelter-in-place strategy and potential off-site effects, are being considered as part of the Department’s assessment. Once the assessment is complete, the Department will forward a recommendation to the IPC, for its determination.</p>
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?	The proposed development is an SSD as set out by the Planning Systems State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) because it includes a residential care facility and has an estimated development cost of more than \$20 million.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
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?	Refer to the response to question #25.
27	Canterbury Racecourse 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 fast-track this development?	The City of Canterbury-Bankstown Council formed an agreement with the NSW Government to complete their own strategic planning work which was required to meet or exceed the original provisions under the TOD Program. Council completed their own strategic planning work for the Canterbury TOD Precinct, including which areas and sites new planning controls would apply to. Council publicly exhibited their masterplan before finalising it and submitting the plan to the NSW Government. The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure undertook a review of the plan and assisted Council to finalise the plan by making an amendment to Council's Local Environmental Plan via a State Environmental Planning Policy. Questions regarding site selection or setting of controls as part of this local planning work should be directed to Canterbury-Bankstown Council.
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?	The Canterbury TOD has no impact on the Canterbury Racecourse site. The City of Canterbury-Bankstown Council's TOD alternative scheme does not rezone the Racecourse site, nor change its heritage listing.
29	Why did Labor make a commitment and then brazenly break that commitment when in government?	Refer to the response to question #28.
30	Where is the Canterbury Racecourse masterplan at?	Refer to the response to question #28.
31	Yamba 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)?	This is a question for Minister for the Environment, who administers the Flood Management Program.
32	Is the Department of Planning satisfied that the Clarence Valley Council's 2022 Flood Model is a reliable metric when assessing developments?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's (DPHI) planning framework applies information from flood studies once approved by councils. Flood studies are required to meet the requirements of the Floodplain Management Manual and Program, administered by Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water. DPHI does not review or approve the content of flood studies.
33	Queer Family Northern Rivers 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?	This is a question for the Minister for Recovery.
34	Will you commit to discussing opportunities for a permanent base of operations with Queer Family Northern Rivers?	This is a question for the Minister for Recovery.
35	Will you commit to investigating funding opportunities for Queer Family Northern Rivers?	This is a question for the Minister for Recovery.
36	Wood Heaters 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?	This is a question for the Minister for Environment.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
37	The Ambient Air Quality National Environment Protection Measure includes standards of 25 ug/m ³ PM2.5 (daily average) and 8 ug/m ³ (annual average) reducing to 20 ug/m ³ PM2.5 (daily average) and 7 ug/m ³ (annual average) by 2025. The World Health Organisation Guidelines are 15 ug/m ³ PM2.5 (daily average) and 5 ug/m ³ (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?	This is a question for the Minister for Environment.
38	Community Flood Restoration Fund 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.	This is a matter for the Minister for Recovery.
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?	This is a matter for the Minister for Recovery.
40	Hornsby Council 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?	The <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> gives discretionary powers to local councils to take enforcement and compliance action where appropriate. Compliance actions in respect of local planning matters are a matter for the relevant local 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?	This is a matter for the Minister for Local Government.
42	Resilient Homes Program 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?	The briefing to which the question refers was part of an incoming government brief from the now repealed Northern Rivers Reconstruction Corporation. Since 2023, the Government has continued to monitor the implementation of the Resilient Homes Program, seek feedback from the community and align program funding to recovery needs. The Government announced the \$150 million Community Restoration Flood Fund in 2024, of which a component of \$90 million was provided to the Resilient Homes Program. This funding was matched by the Commonwealth Government resulting in an additional \$180 million being provided to the Northern Rivers Resilient Homes Program. Further questions regarding the Resilient Homes Program should be directed to the Minister for Recovery.
43	When was a funding request for "tranche 2" of the Resilient Homes Program made?	The NSW Government is in regular contact with the Commonwealth government regarding the program. The Government has continued to monitor the implementation of the Resilient Homes Program, seek feedback from the community and align program funding to recovery needs. Further questions regarding the Resilient Homes Program should be directed to the Minister for Recovery.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
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?	The Government has continued to monitor the implementation of the Resilient Homes Program, seek feedback from the community and align program funding to recovery needs. Further questions regarding the Resilient Homes Program should be directed to the Minister for Recovery.
45	Inclusionary Zoning Is a 2% minimum affordable housing requirement for transport-oriented development really the best the NSW Government can do?	Refer to the response to question #46
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"?	The NSW Government has introduced a suite of initiatives to increase the supply of affordable housing. The in-fill affordable housing scheme provides planning bonuses where at least 10 to 15 per cent of floor space is used for affordable housing. The following statistics (as of 22 August 2025) illustrate the success of the state significant development pathway alone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 133 in-fill affordable projects have been issued with SEARs, representing 30,790 potential new homes, including over 7,720 affordable homes. Projects in the in-fill affordable SSD pathway have been approved, representing 5,801 new homes, including 1,658 affordable homes.
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?	Refer to the response provided to Question 46. In addition, I am not a member of the Greens Political Party and not required to meet its election or policy commitments.
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?	Refer to the response provided to Question 46.
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?	(a) This is a matter for the Minister for Housing. (b) The NSW Government is committed to affordable housing being provided as part of the future state-led rezoning of land around Woollahra and Edgecliff train stations.
50	Short Term Holiday Letting Review 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?	This is a matter for the Minister for Housing.
51	Which policy proposals is the Government considering to regulate short-term holiday lets, including Airbnb and Stayz? (a) Do these proposals include:	This is a matter for the Minister for Housing.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	<p>i. Giving Councils the power to impose 60-day caps on short-term holiday letting, similar to the Byron Shire cap?</p> <p>ii. A process of registering short-term holiday lets?</p> <p>iii. Outlawing new homes being used as AirBnBs in LGAs with vacancy rates below 3%?</p> <p>iv. Allowing Councils or the State to place bed taxes on empty beds in NSW, with the proceeds going toward public housing?</p> <p>v. Placing a levy on short-term holiday lets, similar to what occurs in Victoria?</p> <p>vi. Allowing Councils to vary rates on short-term holiday lets, similar to what occurs in Queensland?</p> <p>vii. A permit process for short-term holiday lets?</p>	
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?	This is a matter for the Minister for Housing.
53	Could you please outline the positive effects you have seen of the 60-Day cap on short-term holiday letting in Byron Shire?	Recent data indicates that there has been a decrease of 191 dwellings used for non-hosted short term rental accommodation in the Byron Shire since September 2023 when the amendments were introduced (60 of which occurred since September 2024 when the amendments came into force).
54	<p>Synthetic Turf</p> <p>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?</p>	<p>The requirement for consultation for projects assessed by a Review of Environmental Factors is outlined in the Guidelines for Division 5.1 Assessments.</p> <p>The Addendum for synthetic sports fields provides additional considerations.</p>
55	Why are large scale synthetic turf installations permitted without development consent, given their known environmental impacts and strong community interest?	<p>The Guidelines for Division 5.1 Assessments - Addendum for synthetic sports fields, applies to the installation of synthetic turf for both new sports fields and upgrades to existing sports fields where it is proposed to be carried out as development without consent under a SEPP or Local Environmental Plan (LEP) such as the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021</i> (NSW).</p> <p>Determining authorities (such as councils and other public authorities) must apply this Addendum when preparing a Review of Environmental Factors for this type of development.</p>
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?	Oversight for the Guidelines for Division 5.1 Assessments - Addendum for synthetic sports fields is the same for other assessments under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> (NSW).
57	What accountability is there for decision-makers?	Refer to the response to question #056.
58	<p>Yancoal Moolarben Coal Mine</p> <p>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?</p>	The management of exports and international trade is a matter for the Australian Government.
59	Guide for Large Emitters	Refer to the response to question #12.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	<p>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:</p> <p>(a) Were interim and long-term scope 1 GHG emissions goals set for this modification?</p> <p>i. If not, why not?</p> <p>ii. If yes, what are they?</p> <p>iii. If yes, have they been published online?</p> <p>iv. If yes, where can they be found?</p> <p>(b) Was the mitigation assessment verified by an independent expert reviewer?</p> <p>i. If not, why not?</p> <p>ii. If yes, what did the reviewer conclude?</p> <p>iii. If yes, has the review been published online?</p> <p>iv. If yes, where can it be found?</p> <p>(c) Were offsets proposed to meet emissions reduction obligations?</p> <p>i. If not, why not?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>iii. If yes, has the review been published online?</p> <p>iv. If yes, where can it be found?</p>	
60	<p>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:</p> <p>(a) Were interim and long-term scope 1 GHG emissions goals set for this modification?</p> <p>i. If not, why not?</p> <p>ii. If yes, what are they?</p> <p>iii. If yes, have they been published online?</p> <p>iv. If yes, where can they be found?</p> <p>(b) Was the mitigation assessment verified by an independent expert reviewer?</p> <p>i. If not, why not?</p> <p>ii. If yes, what did the reviewer conclude?</p> <p>iii. If yes, has the review been published online?</p> <p>iv. If yes, where can it be found?</p> <p>(c) Were offsets proposed to meet emissions reduction obligations?</p> <p>i. If not, why not?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>iii. If yes, has the review been published online?</p> <p>iv. If yes, where can it be found?</p>	Refer to the response to question #12.
61	<p>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:</p> <p>(a) Were interim and long-term scope 1 GHG emissions goals set for this modification?</p> <p>i. If not, why not?</p> <p>ii. If yes, what are they?</p> <p>iii. If yes, have they been published online?</p> <p>iv. If yes, where can they be found?</p> <p>(b) Was the mitigation assessment verified by an independent expert reviewer?</p> <p>i. If not, why not?</p> <p>ii. If yes, what did the reviewer conclude?</p> <p>iii. If yes, has the review been published online?</p> <p>iv. If yes, where can it be found?</p> <p>(c) Were offsets proposed to meet emissions reduction obligations?</p> <p>i. If not, why not?</p>	Refer to the response to question #12.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	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?	The public exhibition of the modification application for the Metropolitan Coal Mine Modification 4 ended on 26 August 2025. The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure has requested that the applicant prepares a submission report responding to the matters raised in community submissions and agency advice, including advice received from NSW Environmental Protection Authority. The Department will undertake a comprehensive assessment of the modification in accordance with relevant legislation and guidelines, including the <i>NSW Guide for Large Emitters</i> , as relevant. The information provided by the applicant to date (including a greenhouse gas assessment) is contained in the Modification Report, which is publicly available on the NSW Major Projects website . The Department's assessment report will become publicly available once the application is determined by the consent authority.
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?	A draft version of the NSW Large Emitters guide was published in May 2024, and the final version was published in January 2025. As with all new policies there is a transitional period for their application. The Moolarben OC3 Extension Project was lodged in 2022, prior to when the draft large emitters guide was formally released. The project is currently under assessment by the Department and will be referred to the IPC for determination. The Department is closely consulting with the EPA about the project's greenhouse gas assessment.
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?	Refer to response to question #12

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	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?	
65	Boggabri Coal Mine 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 pre-lodgement 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?	No. (a) No. (b) Refer to answer to question #66.
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?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure will await Idemitsu's lodgement of the Response to Submission before determining whether any expert advice is required. When the Panel is asked to provide advice, the Chair appoints a number of expert members (typically 3 - 5) based on experience, availability and Conflicts of Interest (COI). The Department keeps an internal register of all panel members' most recent COI declaration forms.
67	Coal mine modifications 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?	It is a technical assessment based on the facts of the modification application. When assessing the merits of a modification application, the Department must consider a range of factors, including the 'substantially the same development' test. This is to prevent a modification to an existing project being of a scale in which a new separate development application should be lodged. The Department relies on the substantially the same development test as required for 4.55(1A) and 4.55(2) developments. The Department also considers the principles established by case law, including whether the modified development is materially the same as the originally approved project.
68	Tahmoor Colliery Modification Approval 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?	Condition B18, Schedule 2 of Development Consent SSD 8445 (as modified) requires Tahmoor Coal to prepare an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Management Plan to the satisfaction of the Planning Secretary and in consultation with the NSW Environmental Protection Authority (EPA). The conditions of consent list several requirements for the management plan, including the establishment of interim and long-term (2031-2033) greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals for the development. The applicant is also required to prepare a Greenhouse Mitigation Plan in consultation with the EPA under Condition B18A.
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.	Tahmoor South development consent (SSD 8445) requires preparation of multiple management plans covering various environmental aspects, such as air quality and greenhouse gas, spontaneous combustion, noise, water, biodiversity and rehabilitation. A new condition requiring a preparation of a Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Plan was added as part of the MOD 3 approval. The conditions of consent outline the requirements for each of these management plans, including preparation of an ongoing monitoring and auditing programmes.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
		The development consent requires Tahmoor Coal to review, and if necessary, revise strategies, plans and programs within three months of the approval of any modification. Tahmoor Coal has notified the Department that it intends to lodge any revised management plans updated following the approval of MOD 3 by 30 September 2025.
70	Bowdens Silver Mine 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?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is currently considering additional information to support a finalised assessment to refer to the IPC.
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?	Refer to response to question #70.
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?	Community consultation has been an important part of the assessment process for the Bowdens Silver Project. Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure officers regularly liaise with members of the Lue community and the Mudgee Regional Action Group. Department officers have also been to Lue and met with the local community in person. The assessment process for the Bowdens Silver Project also included three separate exhibitions where submissions from the community were invited. The IPC also held a three-day public hearing for the project and invited written submissions. Departmental officials and the Minister's Deputy Chief of Staff met with Mudgee community representatives on Wednesday, 10 September 2025 at Parliament House.
73	Gas Decarbonisation in Housing & Sustainable Buildings SEPP 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.	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure has commenced a review of the Sustainable Buildings SEPP.
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.	This should be referred to Minister for Energy who is leading the development of the Gas Decarbonisation Roadmap.
75	Riverstone Wetlands 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	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure expects to exhibit a Rezoning Proposal for Marsden Park North in late 2025. The Department is considering all environmental matters, including former wastewater ponds, which are seasonably inhabited by migratory birds, as it finalises the draft Rezoning Proposal.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	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?	
76	Housing Delivery Authority 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?	(a) The dwelling numbers remain at 2020, consistent with the application lodged on 30 July 2025. (b) The FSR varies across different lots within the proposal. Please see the table below, taken from the scoping report provided by Urbis (pg. 35) For the complete report please refer to link provided below: https://majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/prweb/PRRestService/mp/01/getContent?AttachRef=PDA-87669986%2120250723T035342.295%20GMT
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?	In accordance with the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> , landowners' consent is a requirement of a development application. It is not a requirement for an EOI that sets a future assessment pathway. The Housing Development Authority EOI criteria includes a requirement to demonstrate land tenure as an indicator as to whether development will be able to proceed quickly on a site. The EOI form includes the requirement to 'demonstrate ownership or option to purchase for all land to which the proposal applies'. Once a declared project progresses to development application preparation, then owners consent becomes a requirement. In addition, please refer to response to question 1.
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"?	The Housing Development Authority has a practice of not having multiple proposals in parallel pathways.
79	What level of due diligence is undertaken by the Department before an application is advanced to the HDA for Ministerial consideration?	Before an EOI is forwarded to the Housing Development Authority (HDA) for consideration, the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure reviews a proposal against the HDA EOI and provides a review of relevant and available site context including any comments provided by the relevant council. If any part of an EOI submission is incomplete or unclear, the Department requests additional information from the applicant as needed. While the HDA may rely on briefings and information provided by the Department, the HDA panel forms a view on proposals and identifies reasons for its decisions.
80	Are there clear mandatory checks — such as land title searches, infrastructure feasibility, and consistency with local planning controls — before an application is considered?	The Housing Development Authority EOI process is not a development application; it is a process to identify and recommend projects that meet criteria making them eligible for a future state merit-based development assessment.
81	What mandatory checks are undertaken by the Department before an application is referred to the HDA for consideration?	Please refer to the response for Question #79.
82	Are visualisations, maps, and site descriptions independently reviewed to confirm they are factually accurate and match cadastral boundaries?	A site identification map and proposal descriptions are reviewed for accuracy and cross-checked against data available in the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's spatial viewer, which is part of the NSW Planning Portal.
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?	If the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure identifies any inaccuracies in the EOI submission information, it will seek clarification from the applicant as soon as possible and before the EOI is submitted to the Housing Development Authority for consideration.
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) The Minister can amend or revoke their Ministerial Order under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> .

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	<p>(a) How does the process work for DPHI to recommend to the Minister that an amendment or revocation occur?</p> <p>(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?</p> <p>(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?</p>	<p>(b) As of Ministerial Order 12, there have been 12 amendments made to Expressions of Interest declared by the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces.</p> <p>(c) As of 4 September 2025, no projects that have been declared SSD through the Housing Development Authority pathway have had their declaration revoked.</p>
85	How is the dwelling yield or development capacity adjusted if the developable land area is reduced after progression to SSD via the HDA?	Once a proposal is declared as SSD, a request for SEARs must be made. Once SEARs are issued the applicant can lodge an SSD application. Once an SSD application is lodged, an assessment of the application is undertaken which includes the assessment of the dwelling yield and the developable land area.
86	How many other HDA EOIs have proceeded to Ministerial consideration without full landowner consent?	Landowner consent is a requirement of a development application, which comes after an EOI is declared SSD.
87	How has the average assessment time changed for the SSD pathway since January 2025?	The HDA SSD assessment pathway commenced on 8 January 2025, and the first applications were lodged in June 2025, no proposals have yet been determined and we do not have average assessment times.
88	How many more assessment staff have DPHI hired since January 2025?	As of 4 September 2025, 21 assessment staff had been hired for the assessments team.
89	How many applications have been received for consideration under the HDA criteria?	As at 2 September 2025, the HDA have reviewed and considered 473 EOIs.
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?	The record of HDA recommendations, including indicative dwellings numbers, Orders declaring State Significant Developments (SSD), and details of SSD applications are all publicly available on the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure website.
91	How many applications have been assessed and rejected as not meeting the HDA SSD criteria?	As at 2 September 2025, 213 EOIs had been considered and not recommended for SSD by the HDA.
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?	As at 2 September 2025, 215 EOIs have been declared SSD, with the potential to deliver up to 79,000 dwellings, however the precise number of dwellings which will result from future SSD projects, are subject to the final outcomes of the planning and approval process.
93	Since January 2025, how many dwellings in total have been approved through the HDA pathway, broken down by month?	No projects through the Housing Development Authority State Significant Developments pathway have yet completed the approval process and been determined.
94	<p>Since January 2025, how many HDA applications also include a request for a concurrent rezoning?</p> <p>(a) Of these requests for concurrent rezonings, how many were approved?</p>	Refer to the response to question #90.
95	Can you provide a monthly breakdown of HDA recommendations, rejections, and dwellings approved or refused since it began?	Refer to the response to question #90.
96	What is the average assessment time from initial referral to a recommendation to the Minister under s4.36(3)?	The median timeframe of an EOI from submission date to Housing Development Authority briefing is 63 days.
97	<p>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.”</p> <p>(a) Which 71 projects (or updated number) have had SEARs issued?</p> <p>(b) Which 5 projects (or updated number) have had Development Applications lodged?</p>	<p>The total number of SEARs issued as at 21 August was 81.</p> <p>(a) EOI 229422, EOI 230218, EOI 229772, EOI 229420, EOI 231145, EOI 231145 EOI 231094, EOI 231670, EOI 229420, EOI 229407, EOI 234970, EOI 232228 EOI 235079, EOI 233825, EOI 231917, EOI 232525, EOI 233488, EOI 233998 EOI 229495, EOI 230316, EOI 229520, EOI 230280, EOI 232546, EOI 229412</p>

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
		<p>EOI 235555, EOI 237735, EOI 235559, EOI 234944, EOI 230106, EOI 230110 EOI 230241, EOI 232536, EOI 235399, EOI 231902, EOI 240708, EOI 232525 EOI 240798, EOI 239947, EOI 235177, EOI 232525, EOI 235419, EOI 229492 EOI 238539, EOI 240857, EOI 233529, EOI 246592, EOI 238229, EOI 238363 EOI 237137, EOI 235005, EOI 234790, EOI 231448, EOI 242722, EOI 239896 EOI 232941, EOI 244349, EOI 240857, EOI 249015, EOI 235399, EOI 249062 EOI 232597, EOI 233303, EOI 233741, EOI 254472, EOI 233796, EOI 246341 EOI 253656, EOI 234524, EOI 250003, EOI 240612, EOI 234993, EOI 244944 EOI 235229, EOI 250170, EOI 236807, EOI 256918, EOI 229412, EOI 234658 EOI 233296, EOI 255387, EOI 256336</p> <p>(b) A total of 6 projects had had development applications lodged as at 21 August SSD-82395459, SSD-81300458, SSD-82352708, SSD-82875708, SSD-82639959, SSD-80911502</p>
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?	Refer to the response to question #93.
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?	The use of Lots and Deposited Plan or Strata Plan numbers provide a legally accurate description of the land subject to the EOI for the purposes of the State Significant Development declaration orders.
100	<p>I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 3) 2025, Schedule 1, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025:</p> <p>(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?</p> <p>(b) When was the variation request made?</p> <p>(c) Who was this variation requested by?</p> <p>(d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>(e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>(f) Why was Clause [4] of Schedule 1 included to omit "Schedule 1 Land at 85-91 Thomas Street, Parramatta"</p> <p>(g) Why was this Schedule not replaced?</p>	<p>State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 was amended to correct an error in the mapped location for EOI 229407 displayed in Schedule 1. The amendment was required to ensure the SSD applies to the correct site and excluded 87A Thomas Street, Lot 141/DP537053. The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure identified the need for the amendment as part of an internal review process and the applicant was notified of the amendment on 12 March 2025.</p> <p>The Schedule in the original Order was not replaced as the approach to describing EOIs declared in State significant development declaration Orders was changed from maps to use Lots and DPs to describe the subject sites.</p>
101	<p>Why was Clause [2] included to amend Clause 4(1)(d) of the State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 concerning EOI 229422?</p> <p>(a) When was the variation request made?</p> <p>(b) Who was this variation requested by?</p> <p>(c) Was land added to the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>(d) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>(e) Why was Clause [5] of Schedule 1 included to omit "Schedule 4 Land at 724-730 Victoria Road, Ryde"</p> <p>(f) Why was this Schedule not replaced?</p>	<p>State Significant Development Order 2025 was amended to correct an error in the mapped proposal location of EOI 229422 displayed in Schedule 4. Schedule 4 mapped a smaller site than what was submitted in the EOI. The amendment was to rectify the error and ensure the SSD applies to the entire site including the following Lot/DPs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 1 DP955174, • Lot H DP380154, • Lot A DP376729, • Lot 164 DP1167216, • Lot E DP380152, • Lot B DP376729, • Lot 63 DP30343, • Lot K DP380153, and • Lot 62 DP30343

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
		<p>The need for the amendment was identified by the applicant and the applicant was notified of the correction on 12 March 2025.</p> <p>The Schedule in the original Order was not replaced as the approach to describing EOIs declared in State significant development declaration Orders was changed from maps to the use of Lots and DPs to describe the subject sites.</p>
102	<p>I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 3) 2025, Schedule 2, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 (No 2):</p> <p>(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?</p> <p>(b) When was the variation request made?</p> <p>(c) Who was this variation requested by?</p> <p>(d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>(e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>(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”</p> <p>(g) Why was this Schedule not replaced?</p>	<p>State Significant Development Order (No 2) 2025 was amended to adjust the site description to ensure all lots relating to EOI 230316 were correctly identified, as the applicant identified that two lots included in the application were not included in the map in Schedule 2. The correct lots were specifically listed in the correction on 18 March 2025 as Lot B/DP345208, Lot C/DP345208, Lot 20/D/DP2921, Lot 21/D/DP2921, Lot 22/D/DP2921, Lot 23/D/DP2921, Lot 26/D/DP2921, Lot 27/D/DP2921, Lot 28/D/DP2921, Lot 29/D/DP2921 and SP 6853319.99. The applicant identified the need for the amendment and the applicant was notified of the amendment on 19 March 2025.</p> <p>The Schedule in the original Order was not replaced as the approach to describing EOIs declared in State significant development declaration Orders was changed from maps to the use of Lots and DPs to describe the subject sites.</p>
103	<p>(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?</p> <p>(a) When was the variation request made?</p> <p>(b) Who was this variation requested by?</p> <p>(c) Was land added to the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>(d) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>(e) Why was Clause [7] of Schedule 2 included to omit “Schedule 7 Land at 47-97 Marlborough Street, Surry Hills”</p> <p>(f) Why was this Schedule not replaced?</p>	<p>State Significant Development Order (No 2) 2025 was amended to adjust the site description for EOI 230347 to ensure all lots relating to the EOI were correctly identified. Specifically, the amendment was to ensure Lot 1/DP251056 was included as part of the SSD as it formed part of the applicant’s proposal site.</p> <p>The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure identified the need for the amendment as part of an internal review process and the applicant was notified of the amendment on 11 March 2025.</p> <p>The Schedule in the original Order was not replaced as the approach to describing EOIs declared in State significant development declaration Orders was changed from maps to the use of Lots and DPs to describe the subject sites.</p>
104	<p>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?</p> <p>(a) When was the variation request made?</p> <p>(b) Who was this variation requested by?</p> <p>(c) Was land added to the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>(d) What was the reason given for land at 22 Barry Street being omitted?</p> <p>(e) Was “11-196 Holdsworth Ave” in the original declaration a typographical error corrected to reflect “11-19 Holdsworth Avenue”</p> <p>(f) Aren’t Ministerial Orders proofread against the HDA minutes to ensure accuracy?</p> <p>i. If not, why not?</p> <p>(g) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p>	<p>State Significant Development Order (No 2) 2025 was amended to adjust the site description for EOI 232547 to ensure all lots relating to the EOI were correctly identified. The amendment from 11-196 Holdsworth Avenue to 11-19 Holdsworth Avenue, and from Barry to Berry Road was required to address a typographical error. 22 Barry Road was omitted as the applicant advised that this site was incorrectly included in their application.</p> <p>The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure identified the need for the amendment was part of an internal review process and the applicant was notified of the amendment on 19 March 2025.</p> <p>Clause 5 and 8 of Schedule 2 in the State significant development were omitted as part of this amendment, and not replaced as the approach to describing EOIs declared in State significant development declaration Orders was changed from maps to the use of Lots and DPs to describe the subject sites.</p>
105	<p>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?</p> <p>(a) When was the variation request made?</p> <p>(b) Who was this variation requested by?</p> <p>(c) Was land added to the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p>	<p>Refer to the response to question #104.</p> <p>The Schedule in the original Order was not replaced as the approach to describing Expressions of Interest declared in State significant development declaration Orders was changed from maps to the use of Lots and DPs to describe the subject sites.</p>

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	(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?	State Significant Development Order (No 6) 2025 was amended to include clause 4(2) as it was identified that this had been omitted in error from State Significant Development Order (No 3). The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure identified the need for the amendment as part of an internal review process.
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?	State Significant Development Order (No 6) 2025 was amended to include clause 4(2) as it was identified that this had been omitted in error from State Significant Development Order (No 4). The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure identified the need for the amendment as part of an internal review process.
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?	State Significant Development Order (No 6) 2025 was amended to include clause 4(2) as it was identified that this had been omitted in error from State Significant Development Order (No 5). The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure identified the need for the amendment as part of an internal review process.
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?	Schedule 1 of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 10) 2025 was intended to amend clause 4(1)(n) of State Significant Development Order (No 5) 2025. The reference to Clause 5(1)(n) was made in error. The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure will seek to correct this error in the next available Order. The intent of the amendment was to adjust the site description for EOI 235399 to add an additional lot needed for stormwater infrastructure to support the development described in the EOI. The amendment was requested by the applicant of the EOI in mid-June 2025. As of 4 September 2025, no development application had yet been lodged for EOI 235399. However, SEARs were issued on 12 May 2025.
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?	State Significant Development Order (No 4) 2025 was amended to adjust the site description for EOI 233796 to ensure all lots relating to the proposal were correctly identified. The amendment was to rectify this error and ensure the State Significant Development (SSD) applies to the entire site. Two additional Lots/DPs were added to the declaration being Lot100/DP852152 and Lot 101/DP1149461.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	i. If yes, why?	<p>The applicant provided the original Lot/DP for the EOI that was used to declare the site to be SSD. Subsequently the applicant advised that additional lots were part of the proposed development described in the EOI and needed to be added to the declaration.</p> <p>The need for the amendment was identified by the applicant and the applicant was notified of the correction on 17 June 2025.</p>
111	<p>I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 10) 2025, Schedule 2, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 4) 2025:</p> <p>(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?</p> <p>(b) When was the variation request made?</p> <p>(c) Who was this variation requested by?</p> <p>(d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>(e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p>	Refer to the response to question #110.
112	<p>I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 10) 2025, Schedule 3, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order 2025 (No 1):</p> <p>(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?</p> <p>(b) When was the variation request made?</p> <p>(c) Who was this variation requested by?</p> <p>(d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>(e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>(f) Why was Clause [2] of Schedule 3 included to omit "Schedule 8"</p> <p>i. Why was this Schedule not replaced?</p>	<p>State Significant Development Order dated 17 February 2025 was amended to adjust the site description for EOI 230106 to include adjoining lots to allow for road construction.</p> <p>The applicant on 25 June 2025 provided the original Lot/DP for the EOI that was used to declare the site to be State Significant Development. Subsequently the applicant advised that additional lots were part of the proposed development described in the EOI and needed to be added to the declaration.</p> <p>The Schedule in the original Order was not replaced as the approach to describing EOIs declared in State significant development declaration Orders was changed from maps to the use of Lots and DPs to describe the subject sites.</p>
113	<p>I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 11) 2025, Schedule 1, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 7) 2025:</p> <p>(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?</p> <p>(b) When was the variation request made?</p> <p>(c) Who was this variation requested by?</p> <p>(d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>ii. Was this land 29 Herward Highway, Blacktown?</p> <p>(e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p>	<p>State Significant Development Order (No 7) 2025 was amended to adjust the site description for EOI 240231 for the purpose of extending Lismore St to connect to Hereward Highway.</p> <p>The applicant provided the original address that was used to declare the site to be State Significant Development (SSD). The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure identified that the address listed in the SEARs request by the applicant included a Lot/DP that was not part of the SSD declaration. When the Department queried this with the applicant, the applicant advised on 8 July 2025 that the full site was not included in the Ministerial Order.</p> <p>The additional lot added to the Order was Lot 135/DP15914 located at 29 Herward Highway, Blacktown.</p>
114	<p>I refer you to State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 11) 2025, Schedule 2, Amendment of State Significant Development Declaration Order (No 6) 2025:</p> <p>(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?</p> <p>(b) When was the variation request made?</p> <p>(c) Who was this variation requested by?</p> <p>(d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>(e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p>	<p>State Significant Development Order (No 6) 2025 was amended to adjust the site description for EOI 239896 following a request from the applicant.</p> <p>The applicant advised on 28 May 2025 that they had acquired an additional lot adjacent to their existing site to support better overall design outcomes and sought to incorporate that into their State Significant Development declaration. The inclusion of the additional land did not change the height, density or other planning parameters quoted from the original EOI.</p>

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
#115	<p>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):</p> <p>(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?</p> <p>(b) When was the variation request made?</p> <p>(c) Who was this variation requested by?</p> <p>(d) Was land added to the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p> <p>(e) Was land omitted from the SSD declaration?</p> <p>i. If yes, why?</p>	<p>State Significant Development Order (No 10) 2025 was amended to adjust the site description for EOI 233967 to ensure all lots relating to the EOI were correctly identified.</p> <p>In recommending this EOI, the Housing Development Authority noted in the Record of Briefing for 7 March 2025 that the applicant should undertake site amalgamation with the adjoining landowner to ensure orderly development.</p> <p>The applicant advised on 29 July 2025 that site amalgamation with the adjoining landowner had occurred. The additional lot was added as part of the amendment.</p>
116	<p>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.</p> <p>(a) Has the Department reviewed other HDA project listings to ensure similar height or scale errors are not present?</p>	<p>EOI 250170 for a 16 metre, 40 dwelling residential flat building was declared State Significant Development by the Minister on 1 July 2025 with an administrative error in the description of the proposal published on the Department for Planning, Housing and Infrastructure’s website stating the development was 16 storeys rather than 16 metres. The error was corrected by an addendum to the record of briefing on 2 July 2025.</p> <p>The Department has reviewed Records of Briefing for the Housing Development Authority. An addendum to the Record of Briefing for 19 February was published on the Department’s website to correct minor discrepancies in the number of indicative dwellings noted in the Record of Briefing as compared with the EOI applications submitted.</p>
117	<p>Housing and Productivity Contribution</p> <p>Minister, how much money has been collected to date from the Housing and Productivity Contribution?</p> <p>(a) Of that total, how much has actually been spent?</p> <p>(b) What proportion of HPC revenue collected so far remains unspent?</p> <p>(c) Where is the unspent HPC money currently held — in a special fund (if so, which) or in consolidated revenue?</p>	<p>As at 30 June 2025, the Housing and Productivity Contribution has collected \$39 million and is gaining momentum as larger developments progress through the planning system (note, the scheme commenced on 1 October 2023).</p> <p>(a) This is a matter for the NSW Treasurer.</p> <p>(b) This is a matter for the NSW Treasurer.</p> <p>(c) This is a matter for the NSW Treasurer.</p>
118	<p>How many projects have received HPC funding so far?</p> <p>(a) If so, on what date were the first funding allocations made?</p> <p>(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?</p>	<p>Refer to the response to question #117.</p> <p>Work is continuing to develop the Housing and Productivity Contribution Prioritisation Criteria and Guidelines for the 2026-27 budget cycle.</p>
119	Can you provide a complete list of the planned infrastructure projects to be funded by the HPC over the forward estimates?	Refer to the response to question #118.
120	How much has actually been raised since the HPC commenced?	Refer to the response to question #117.
121	What is the projected annual revenue from the HPC in FY 2024/25, FY 2025/26, FY 2026/27 and FY 2027/28?	This is a matter for the NSW Treasurer.
122	<p>Works In Kind and Infrastructure Opportunities Plan</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>A draft works-in-kind policy for the Housing and Productivity Contribution framework was exhibited between 19 June to 17 July 2025. During this period, 28 submissions were received.</p> <p>The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is currently reviewing the feedback received from the submissions.</p>
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?	This is a matter for the NSW Treasurer.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
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?	Refer to the response to question #122.
125	What is the planned timeline for the Works in Kind framework to become operational and open for use by developers?	Refer to the response to question #122.
126	What criteria will determine whether a proposed Works in Kind project is accepted, and who will approve it?	Refer to the response to question #122.
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?	Refer to the response to question #122. Underpinning the investment framework is the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's Urban Development Program, which takes a coordinated approach to infrastructure planning.
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?	Refer to the response to question #122.
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?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's Infrastructure Opportunities Plans will be reviewed and updated annually to ensure emerging infrastructure needs arising from new rezonings and housing development are captured and reflected in future updates.
130	Airspace Development Above Rail Corridors Minister, is airspace development above rail corridors being actively considered by your Government as part of Plan B?	This is a matter for the Minister for Transport.
131	Have any specific rail corridors or stations been identified for potential airspace development, and what housing yield could they deliver?	This is a matter for the Minister for Transport.
132	How would airspace projects integrate with existing rail operations to ensure safety and minimal disruption?	This is a matter for the Minister for Transport.
133	Infrastructure Investment in TOD Accelerated Precincts 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?	Guidelines for the delivery of the \$520.7 million funded projects in the TOD Accelerated Precincts, by local and state government, are currently in development.
134	Have any Expressions of Interest or funding calls for infrastructure projects in these precincts been issued at all? If not, why not?	Refer to the response to question #133.
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?	Refer to the response to question #133.
136	(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?	Refer to the response to question #133.
137	What discussions have been had with North Sydney, Willoughby and Lane Cove Councils?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure regularly discusses a range of planning matters 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?	These infrastructure projects are being considered for inclusion in the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's Infrastructure Opportunities Plans.
139	Will funding be allocated to schools given public schools serving the precinct are already over capacity?	Refer to the response to question #138.
140	What extra funding is there for infrastructure and services to support uplift from the LMR policy?	Refer to the response to question #133
141	Parks for People Program - \$228.2 million contribution from the Commonwealth At what stage is the Department at in working out specific projects will be delivered in each of these precincts?	Project sites at Kellyville, Bella Vista and Bankstown are currently being investigated.
142	Is the funding solely for parks, or does it include other forms of public and community infrastructure?	The \$228.2 million allocation from the Australian Government will fund open space projects through the Parks for People initiative.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
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?	Consultation with local council staff has been undertaken for all sites and the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is continuing to engage with relevant councils.
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?	Early delivery is a key objective of the Parks for People program.
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?	This is a matter for the NSW Treasurer.
146	Minister, you've said these projects will be delivered over three phases — what exactly will be delivered in each phase?	Refer to the response to question #141.
147	What are the start and completion dates for each phase, and which TOD precincts are included in each?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is currently considering the start and completion dates of projects expected to be delivered under the Parks for People program.
148	How long will it take between the completion of Phase 1 and the commencement of Phase 3?	Refer to the response to question #147.
149	How will you ensure there is no multi-year gap between phases, leaving communities waiting for promised public spaces?	Refer to the response to question #147.
150	Will each phase receive a fixed proportion of the \$228.2 million, or will the funding be weighted toward certain precincts?	Funding allocation will be determined through detailed site analysis as part of project development.
151	How will you determine which TOD precincts and projects are prioritised for Phase 2 and Phase 3?	Refer to the response to question #141.
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?	All individual project budgets will be developed prior to formal commencement.
153	Have the projects in all three phases already been scoped and costed, or will planning only occur shortly before each phase begins?	Refer to the response to question #152.
154	Sydney International Speedway 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?	The leaseholder has advised Greater Sydney Parklands that Mr Boldy provides a support role for venue operations.
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?"	The leaseholder has advised Greater Sydney Parklands that Mr Boldy provides a support role for venue operations.
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?	This is an operational matter for the leaseholder and their sublessee.
157	(Has Mr Troy Boldy registered his new go-karting operation with Workcover?	This is an operational matter for the leaseholder and their sublessee.
158	Has the Department undertaken any compliance checks to ensure the lease conditions are being met?	Greater Sydney Parklands continues to liaise with the leaseholder about lease compliance matters.
159	Have staff and contractors engaged at the Speedway ever gone unpaid for extended periods under the current management arrangements?	This is an operational matter for the leaseholder and their sublessee.
160	Are there any outstanding and overdue payments to staff or contractors at the Speedway?	This is an operational matter for the leaseholder and their sublessee.
161	Will the Government guarantee that any and all outstanding payments owed to staff, contractors, and suppliers are made, and by when?	This is an operational matter for the leaseholder and their sublessee.
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?	This is an operational matter for the leaseholder and their sublessee.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	(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?	Greater Sydney Parklands is not aware of related legal actions.
#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?	Greater Sydney Parklands is aware of one matter being lodged with the Fair Work Commission.
#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?	Sydney International Speedway as the sublessee to the leaseholder does not make rental payments to Greater Sydney Parklands.
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?	A rent abatement was applied June 10-21 2024: \$5,189.40 relating to 12 days when works completed by Greater Sydney Parklands impacted the sublessee's operation.
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?	The speedway is leased to Western Sydney International Dragway Ltd who has subleased the venue to Sydney International Speedway Pty Ltd. (a) No
168	How much income has SIS generated for: (a) FY 2023-24? (b) FY 2024-25? (c) FY 2025-26 (to date)?	This is an operational matter for the leaseholder and their sublessee.
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)?	This is an operational matter for the leaseholder and their sublessee.
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?	This is an operational matter for the leaseholder and their sublessee.
171	Housing Targets and Program Delivery 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?	The Environmental Planning and Assessment (Statement of Expectations) Order 2024 outlines expectations relating to the approval of development applications. Councils' performance against these expectations are monitored monthly and the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure informs those councils not meeting performance standards. The Order also outlines the measures used to identify underperforming councils.
172	Will your housing target framework include allowances for councils that meet or exceed approval expectations but cannot control actual delivery?	Refer to the response to question #171.
173	How are council housing targets currently calculated, and what is the assumed relationship between approvals and actual completions in that modelling?	Information around how housing targets and assumptions are developed is publicly available on the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's website.
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?	Refer to the responses to questions #171 and #173.
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?	Development applications were 26 percent higher in FY 2024-25 compared to FY 2023-24. The number of applications lodged is based on the take-up by industry.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
176	Forecasts and Feasibility 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?	There are 8,822 homes from SSDs (in the pipeline and approved) in TOD Accelerated Precincts and 5,727 homes (in the pipeline and approved) in TOD SEPP station locations. Data around Low and Mid-Rise is not currently reported on.
177	Have you costed the enabling infrastructure needed to realise those yields, and is it funded in the forward estimates?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's Urban Development Program coordinates housing growth and infrastructure planning. Investment decisions will be coordinated through this program. This will ensure infrastructure decisions are considered as part of the capital planning process.
178	How many of those projected homes have DA approvals lodged or in the pipeline?	TOD Accelerated Precincts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 projects approved totalling 1,251 dwellings • 8 projects lodged totalling 2,409 dwellings • 12 projects preparing the Environmental Impact Statement totalling 5,162 dwellings. TOD SEPP locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 35 projects approved totalling 159 dwellings • 34 projects lodged totalling 3,608 dwellings • 14 projects preparing the Environmental Impact Statement or submitted totalling 1,960 dwellings. These dwellings are all within the TOD Accelerated Precincts and TOD SEPP locations.
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?	The NSW Government continues to explore all opportunities which facilitate housing delivery.
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?	The NSW Government is leveraging its high credit rating to provide credit support in the form of pre-sale commitments, under the new Pre-sale Finance Guarantee program. This initiative will enable more residential projects to start and more dwellings to be delivered sooner by enhancing developers' ability to satisfy residential construction lender pre-sale covenant requirements.
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?	Assumptions underpinning yields for the TOD Accelerated Precincts are publicly available in documentation on the NSW Planning Portal. Assumptions underpinning yields for the Transport Oriented Development State Environmental Planning Policy vary, depending on the location. Original assumptions relied on the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's Development Capacity Model for Greater Sydney locations and a third party for locations outside of Greater Sydney. These assumptions are Cabinet-in-confidence. Detailed planning approaches for some of the deferred locations are publicly available on the relevant council websites. Modelling and forecasts on Low and Mid-Rise are Cabinet in confidence. The Department provides data on approvals and completions on the Urban Development Program dashboard. Information on data sources to inform the dashboard can be found on the Department's website.
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?	The number of homes expected to contribute to the local housing targets will be based on the take-up by industry as a result of the TOD policy and the Low and Mid-Rise Housing Policy.
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?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure undertook feasibility modelling for all housing initiatives listed. This included site specific feasibility testing and broad regional feasibility testing. Information around construction cost assumptions and modelling is publicly available.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
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?	The Housing Taskforce post-consent interview series seeks to build an evidence base of the reasons for non-commencement of approved large residential developments. NSW Treasury may be able to provide advice around financial feasibility analysis.
185	Housing Approvals and Commencements How many development applications are in the planning portal that are approved but have not commenced construction?	The Government inherited the Planning Portal from the previous NSW Liberal-Nationals Government and continues to address complex legacy issues to enhance its user experience as a key priority. Available data does not currently allow for this metric to be reported on.
186	What is the average time taken from approval to construction commencing? What is the Minister doing to get this timeframe down?	According to the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics Building Activity survey, average time from approval to construction commencing in NSW was 0.86 quarter for houses, 1.43 quarters for townhouses, and 2.61 quarters for apartments in the 2023-24 financial year. This data is publicly available The NSW Government has established the Housing Taskforce in September 2024 to make sure housing moves efficiently through the planning system. In its first six months of operation, this collaborative, whole-of-government effort has facilitated the progress of applications for more than 30,000 new homes and worked with agencies to progress a range of cases. The Government has also implemented State Significant Development (SSD) approval pathways which condition any approvals granted to commence construction within 2 years from the approval being granted. This is in place in both the TOD Accelerated Precincts and for projects which are assessed under the HDA SSD pathway.
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?	Refer to the response to question #185.
188	Moore Park Golf Course Has the Government set a date for when the 18-hole course will be formally reduced to 9 holes?	No changes will be made to the course until after the current operating agreement expires in mid-2026.
189	When can the public expect the first stage of new parkland at Moore Park to be accessible?	Public access to the new park will be staged, commencing from mid-2026.
190	Has a detailed timeline been developed for the staged delivery of the expanded public open space?	The scope of works will be finalised in response to community and stakeholder input. The design and construction program will be prepared in response to this.
191	Will the Department publish a delivery program or milestones for the Moore Park conversion?	Greater Sydney Parklands will keep the public informed about delivery timeframes.
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?	Plans will be on public exhibition in 2025 and will be finalised in response to community and stakeholder input.
193	Will the designs be put on public exhibition?	Yes, designs will be on public exhibition in 2025.
194	TOD Delivery 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	There are TOD areas where development applications have not yet been lodged under the TOD pathway. It should be noted that as some precincts had local planning work completed by councils, that some precincts have only commenced in recent months. The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure expects that when any new policy is announced, those developers or landowners with existing developments approved or under assessment may seek to alter their proposals to take advantage of changed controls or policy.
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?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure expects that when any new policy is announced, those developers or landowners with existing developments approved or under assessment may seek to alter their proposals to take advantage of more generous controls or policy changes.
196	How much infrastructure funding has been allocated specifically to TOD precincts to make them attractive and feasible for developers?	The Urban Development Program will monitor and coordinate housing and infrastructure delivery to support the development of the TOD sites.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
		The infrastructure required to support these areas has been considered in the development of the Infrastructure Opportunities Plans which will identify the infrastructure needed to support housing in the next 0 to 5 years.
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?	Refer to the response to question #196.
198	Have you prioritised infrastructure delivery in underperforming TOD precincts to help stimulate take-up?	Refer to the response to question #196.
199	Will you provide a full breakdown for each TOD precinct — including applications lodged, dwellings proposed, approvals granted, and dwellings commenced?	Refer to the responses to questions #200 and #201.
200	For all the TOD Accelerated Precincts (apart from Bays West), please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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. 	Information provided in Appendix A is current as at 21 August 2025. It is only information for SSDs and does not include council-assessed development applications and should therefore not be considered a whole account of development activity in Transport Oriented Development areas.
201	For all 37 of the TOD SEPP Areas, please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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. 	Information provided in Appendix B is current as at 21 August 2025. It is only information for SSDs and does not include council-assessed development applications and should therefore not be considered a whole account of development activity in Transport Oriented Development areas.
202	Of the total dwellings counted as being delivered due to the TOD program to date, how many come from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) entirely new projects lodged after TOD designation, versus (b) modifications or amendments to previously approved developments? 	Refer to the response to #201.
203	What is the Department's current projection for total dwellings to be delivered through TOD in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the first year, (b) until the end of the Housing Accord, and (c) the full program period of 15 years? 	<p>The TOD Program is expected to deliver almost 60,000 new homes over 15 years within the Accelerated Precincts, and more than 170,000 new homes over 15 years within the TOD SEPP areas.</p> <p>The number of new homes delivered in each year will be based on the take-up by industry as a result of the policy.</p>
204	What proportion of TOD precincts are considered by the Department to have high, medium, or low market feasibility for new housing delivery?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure undertook feasibility modelling for the TOD program. This included site specific feasibility testing and broad regional feasibility testing for all areas depending on a range of factors.
205	What infrastructure investments have been specifically allocated to each TOD precinct to support delivery? Please list them.	The NSW Government has committed \$520.7 million for the delivery of infrastructure in the seven rezoned TOD Accelerated Precincts. The allocation of this funding across the Precincts has not been finalised.
206	Has the Department set milestone targets for each precinct? If yes, please provide them. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) What monitoring is in place to track progress against those milestones? 	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure did not set milestones for TOD precincts and locations.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
		Information around total dwelling capacities for TOD precincts and locations over the 15-year period is publicly available.
207	Has the Department done any post-announcement reviews to identify barriers to uptake in precincts with low or no new activity?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is continuing to actively work with local councils and industry to address any barriers to uptake. However, it should also be noted that the Liberal-Nationals Opposition introduction of the Environmental Planning and Assessment (Disallowance of Transport Oriented Development SEPP) Bill 2024 had a chilling effect on market activity.
208	<p>Priority Growth Areas and Precincts</p> <p>For each of the following Priority Growth Areas and Precincts, answer the below questions (the next fifteen questions):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	This information is publicly available on the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's website.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wianamatta • South Creek • Wilton <p>(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?</p> <p>(b) When was the last public update or consultation for this precinct, and what stage of the planning pipeline is it currently in?</p> <p>(c) How does the delivery timeline for this precinct compare to the commitments made when it was first designated a Priority Growth Area?</p> <p>(d) Has rezoning been completed in [Precinct Name]?</p> <p>(e) How many dwellings is [Precinct Name] expected to enable?</p> <p>(f) How many dwellings have been approved, commenced, and completed in this precinct since it was declared a growth area?</p> <p>(g) What proportion of the original housing targets for this precinct have been met, and if they haven't been met, why not?</p> <p>(h) What specific infrastructure commitments — including road upgrades, public transport links, schools, health services, and open space — have been funded for [Precinct Name]?</p> <p>(i) How much funding has been allocated to infrastructure in this precinct since its designation, and what proportion of that has been spent?</p> <p>(j) Are the necessary infrastructure upgrades scheduled to occur before, during, or after significant housing delivery?</p> <p>(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?</p> <p>(l) Has the Department undertaken any feasibility analysis for development in this precinct to assess whether housing targets are achievable in the current market?</p> <p>(m) Are there known constraints — such as contamination, flooding, or infrastructure capacity — that are delaying housing delivery in this precinct?</p> <p>(n) How will you ensure that local councils, developers, and the community are held accountable for meeting the agreed delivery timelines in this precinct?</p> <p>(o) When will the public be able to see a full, updated delivery schedule for [Precinct Name] and all other Priority Growth Areas?</p>	
209	State Significant Rezoning Policy 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?	The State Significant Rezoning Policy has been in effect since September 2024.
210	How many applications have been made under the State Significant Rezoning pathway since the policy came into effect?	The State Significant Rezoning pathway is not open to applications. Site selection is an internal Departmental process as per the State Significant Rezoning Policy.
211	Of those applications, how many have been accepted, rejected, or are still under assessment?	Refer to the response to question #210.
212	What is the average time taken from application lodgement to decision under the State Significant Rezoning Policy?	Refer to the response to question #210.
213	How does this compare to the timeframes promised when the policy was first announced?	Refer to the response to question #210.
214	What is the target processing time for applications, and are you meeting it?	Refer to the response to question #210.
215	How many dwellings have been approved, by site, as a result of rezonings under this policy?	This information is publicly available on the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's website.
216	How many hectares of employment land or mixed-use land have been rezoned under the policy?	This information is publicly available on the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's website.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
217	How is the State ensuring that State Significant Rezoning applications are supported by timely infrastructure delivery?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's Urban Development Program takes a coordinated approach to infrastructure planning, including new rezonings.
218	What is the process for engaging local councils and communities in assessing State Significant Rezoning applications?	This information is publicly available on the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's website.
219	How will you ensure that this policy doesn't override legitimate local planning considerations in favour of poorly planned developments?	This information is publicly available on the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's website.
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?	Under the State Significant Rezoning Policy, there are two distinct pathways, each governed by its own set of key performance indicators. Details on lodgement and finalisation can be found on the NSW Planning Portal website. Additionally, only State-assessed rezoning proposals under the State Significant Rezoning Policy have the requirement of up to 205 working days from lodgement to finalisation.
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?	Refer to the response to question #220.
222	How many working days has each rezoning now been in the system, and what is the reason for the delay?	Under the State Significant Rezoning Policy, each rezoning has been in the system for varying durations, depending on its pathway and complexity.
223	When will communities and developers see these rezonings actually gazetted?	The timing of the finalisation of rezonings varies. Information around the status of State Significant rezoning projects is publicly available
224	For each of the following rezonings announced under the State Significant Rezoning Policy as cited below, answer the below questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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?	This information is publicly available on the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's website.
225	Data Centres 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?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure assesses the role of data centres and their significance for the growth of the NSW and National digital economy when considering if the development is within the public interest. The Industrial Lands Action Plan has been released by the NSW Government to provide a holistic and statewide approach to plan, secure, actively manage and monitor industrial lands across NSW. This includes data centres as a type of industrial land use.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
		<p>The Department is collaborating with other NSW departments and agencies to better understand the needs of data centres to support planning for them into the future.</p> <p>Additionally, large scale data centre projects are categorised as SSDs so that the Department can ensure a consistent and streamlined assessment process.</p>
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?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is in regular liaison with data centre operators in NSW on current and future projects. As part of these discussions, the Department provides feedback on issues with current proposals and advice on potential issues with prospective sites and issues particular to the proposed location.
227	Are data centres being considered as part of the broader infrastructure planning framework, alongside roads, schools, and housing, given their economic importance?	<p>The NSW Government has recently established the Investment Delivery Authority (IDA) to help make better guide businesses (including data centres) to invest, build and create jobs in NSW.</p> <p>As part of its remit, the IDA will work closely with key government agencies and utility providers to understand infrastructure needs and constraints.</p>
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?	<p>In terms of SSD proposals, 16 have been lodged since January 2024 and environmental assessment requirements have been issued for five SSD applications (yet to be lodged).</p> <p>Of the SSD applications lodged since January 2024:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • two have been approved • 14 are under assessment <p>No proposals have been refused.</p>
229	What is the average assessment timeframe for data centre applications over the past 12 months?	<p>The average assessment timeframe (government days) from July 2024 was 67 days.</p> <p>In addition, the average proponent days (preparing Submission Report or responding to requests for additional information) was 260 days.</p>
230	What is the current longest and shortest timeframe for determination of a data centre DA?	Within this term of Government, the shortest timeframe for determination has been 33 days in Government hands and the longest timeframe has been 111 days in Government hands. Comparatively, the previous Government's shortest timeframe was 65 days in Government hands and longest was 104 days in Government hands.
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?	Yes – Data centre projects with a total power consumption of more than 15 megawatts are a type of SSD and are processed under the same timelines and criteria as other SSD projects.
232	What measures are in place to provide certainty and clarity to proponents around the approvals process for data centres?	<p>The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's Rapid Assessment Framework helps to streamline the assessment of major projects (including data centre projects) and provides guidance on the assessment process.</p> <p>The framework includes ready-made assessment requirements for data centre projects which describes the issues an EIS needs to address, clear guidance on how to undertake an environmental impact assessment and a registered environmental assessment practitioner scheme to improve EIS quality.</p>
233	Has the Government considered designating data centres as State Significant Development to provide a more consistent and efficient pathway for larger projects?	Yes – refer to the response to question #231.
234	Is there a State Significant Development pathway, or access to the State Significant Development Pathway for data centres?	Yes – refer to the response to question #231.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
235	What planning criteria are most frequently raised during the assessment of data centre applications (e.g., power availability, cooling requirements, environmental impact)?	Impacts associated with data centre projects can vary significantly, depending on the location, scale and complexity of each project. Issues can include design and visual issues, noise and air emissions and risks associated with fuel storage and lithium-ion batteries.
236	What role does the availability of power and cooling infrastructure play in the assessment and location of new data centres?	The availability of power and water supply is a key consideration for the proponent and the relevant utility provider.
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?	These issues are all relevant in the assessment of data centres. Site constraints and each development proposal will mean the specific issues associated with each will vary.
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?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure receives advice from power supply companies as part of proposal assessments. Issues of overall capacity of power supply for data centres is a matter for the Minister for Energy.
239	Which agencies are consulted on electricity capacity during the DA process, and at what stage?	Applicants are required to consult with the relevant local utility provider (e.g. Ausgrid, Transgrid, etc) during the preparation of their Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure undertakes further consultation with these providers when the EIS is placed on public exhibition.
240	Has the Department mapped priority locations in NSW best suited to future data centre development?	Data centres are permissible with development consent in a number of commercial and industrial zones. Whether a site is suitable for use as a data centre is a matter for assessment of any development application lodged.
241	Does the Department maintain a central database of all lodged, approved, and completed data centre projects in NSW?	Yes – information relating to SSD applications for data centre projects is available on the NSW planning portal .
242	Is data on job creation, economic contribution, or digital capacity from data centres tracked as part of the planning process?	Refer to the response to question #241.
243	Will the Department publish regular updates on data centre applications and approvals, similar to the reporting on housing approvals?	Refer to the response to question #241.
244	NSW Productivity Commissioner Report Response 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?	This is a matter for the Treasurer.
245	Industrial and Employment Land 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?	Actions outlined in the Industrial Lands Action Plan are being progressed and developed in parallel. The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is continuing to work with stakeholders and industry to develop the actions and priorities.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
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?	Action 3 of the Industrial Lands Action Plan is to finalise and release a statewide approach for an industrial lands supply pipeline. This work is in progress.
247	Luddenham Rezoning 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?	<p>The Australian Government released the preliminary flight paths for the Western Sydney International Airport (WSIA) for runway 1 to 2055 only.</p> <p>The NSW Government has provided a submission to the Australian Government on its Western Sydney International Airport Preliminary Draft Master Plan 2025-45, particularly the airport's forecasted operational impact on Luddenham Village.</p> <p>The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is working closely with WSIA, the Australian Government, local members and stakeholders via a new working group to better understand noise impact to inform on impacts to Luddenham Village.</p> <p>This will inform the approach to future planning for Luddenham Village.</p>
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?	Refer to the response to question #247.
249	What is the timeline for employment land rezonings in Luddenham Village, and when will those jobs be available to support the Aerotropolis?	Refer to the response to question #247.
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?	Refer to the response to question #247.
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?	Refer to the response to question #247.
252	What is the Government's plan to give Luddenham landowners certainty on when they can expect rezoning decisions, infrastructure commitments, and development approvals?	Refer to the response to question #247.
253	How does the Luddenham Village rezoning align with the Aerotropolis and Bradfield City Centre plans now that airport operations are close to commencing?	Refer to the response to question #247.
254	Has the Government set a target for how many dwellings and jobs Luddenham should contribute toward the broader Western Sydney growth targets?	Refer to the response to question #247.
255	Will Luddenham be prioritised for infrastructure investment given its proximity to the airport and strategic importance to the Aerotropolis?	Refer to the response to question #247.
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?	Refer to the response to question #247.
257	Will landowners who were told rezonings were imminent finally see concrete timelines for when their land will be rezoned and development permitted?	Refer to the response to question #247.
258	Can you guarantee Luddenham will not be left in limbo while other precincts in the Aerotropolis progress more quickly?	Refer to the response to question #247.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response																																																																								
259	Broadmeadow Place Strategy What transport, road, and open space infrastructure is being funded alongside the Broadmeadow rezoning, and what is the sequencing plan?	The Hunter and Central Coast Development Corporation has recently been appointed to undertake delivery coordination which will involve work to determine infrastructure requirements and sequencing for the rezoned sites. This will inform future funding proposals.																																																																								
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?	Refer to the response to question #259.																																																																								
261	Infill Affordable Housing Pathway Since the introduction of the In-fill Affordable Housing pathway, how many total development applications have been approved using the bonus provisions?	As of 5 September 2025, 23 SSD applications have been approved (note this does not include any DAs assessed by Councils).																																																																								
262	How many dwellings in total have been approved under this pathway, and how many of those are designated affordable dwellings?	As of 5 September 2025, there have been 5,801 dwellings approved under the in-fill affordable SSD pathway, including 1,658 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?	<p>As of 5 September 2025:</p> <table> <tr> <th>Project</th><th>Total dwellings</th><th>Affordable dwellings</th></tr> <tr> <td>Lot 117 Lachlan's Line Affordable Housing, 6 Halifax Street</td><td>135</td><td>135</td></tr> <tr> <td>Affordable Housing Development, 108 Burdekin Road, Schofield</td><td>63</td><td>63</td></tr> <tr> <td>Botany Road Mascot Affordable Housing</td><td>126</td><td>126</td></tr> <tr> <td>195–213 Fitzgerald Ave and 40–64 Yorktown Pde, Maroubra</td><td>144</td><td>144</td></tr> <tr> <td>22-24 Grant Street and 33-37 Gordon Street, Port Macquarie</td><td>94</td><td>94</td></tr> <tr> <td>Mowbray Road, Lane Cove North, Affordable Housing</td><td>86</td><td>86</td></tr> <tr> <td>30-34 Padstow Parade and 10 Faraday Road, Padstow</td><td>113</td><td>21</td></tr> <tr> <td>28-34 Victoria Street, 17 George Street and 21 George Street Burwood</td><td>150</td><td>75</td></tr> <tr> <td>4 Delmar Parade, Dee Why</td><td>280</td><td>43</td></tr> <tr> <td>6-20 Hinkler Avenue and 319-333 Taren Point Road, Caringbah</td><td>288</td><td>44</td></tr> <tr> <td>Five Ways, Crows Nest</td><td>188</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr> <td>1-9 Marquet Street and 4 Mary Street, Rhodes</td><td>274</td><td>44</td></tr> <tr> <td>9 Blaxland Road Rhodes</td><td>311</td><td>55</td></tr> <tr> <td>173-179 Walker Street and 11-17 Hampden Street, North Sydney</td><td>239</td><td>67</td></tr> <tr> <td>106, 120-122 Smith Street and 3A Charlotte Street, Wollongong</td><td>145</td><td>25</td></tr> <tr> <td>178-186 Willarong Road, 41-47 President Avenue and 51 President Ave, Caringbah</td><td>188</td><td>42</td></tr> <tr> <td>Rozelle Village (Balmain Leagues Club), Rozelle</td><td>227</td><td>59</td></tr> <tr> <td>Regents Park In-fill Affordable Housing Concept Proposal</td><td>558</td><td>84</td></tr> <tr> <td>Mixed use and affordable housing - Schofields Road</td><td>468</td><td>74</td></tr> <tr> <td>41 Auburn Road, Auburn (Auburn Shopping Village)</td><td>359</td><td>67</td></tr> <tr> <td>362-374 and 376-384 Oxford Street, Bondi Junction</td><td>118</td><td>23</td></tr> <tr> <td>129-153 Parramatta Road & 53-74 Queens Road Five Dock</td><td>1185</td><td>219</td></tr> <tr> <td>136-148 New South Head Road, Edgecliff (AKA 1 Darling Point Road)</td><td>62</td><td>20</td></tr> </table>	Project	Total dwellings	Affordable dwellings	Lot 117 Lachlan's Line Affordable Housing, 6 Halifax Street	135	135	Affordable Housing Development, 108 Burdekin Road, Schofield	63	63	Botany Road Mascot Affordable Housing	126	126	195–213 Fitzgerald Ave and 40–64 Yorktown Pde, Maroubra	144	144	22-24 Grant Street and 33-37 Gordon Street, Port Macquarie	94	94	Mowbray Road, Lane Cove North, Affordable Housing	86	86	30-34 Padstow Parade and 10 Faraday Road, Padstow	113	21	28-34 Victoria Street, 17 George Street and 21 George Street Burwood	150	75	4 Delmar Parade, Dee Why	280	43	6-20 Hinkler Avenue and 319-333 Taren Point Road, Caringbah	288	44	Five Ways, Crows Nest	188	48	1-9 Marquet Street and 4 Mary Street, Rhodes	274	44	9 Blaxland Road Rhodes	311	55	173-179 Walker Street and 11-17 Hampden Street, North Sydney	239	67	106, 120-122 Smith Street and 3A Charlotte Street, Wollongong	145	25	178-186 Willarong Road, 41-47 President Avenue and 51 President Ave, Caringbah	188	42	Rozelle Village (Balmain Leagues Club), Rozelle	227	59	Regents Park In-fill Affordable Housing Concept Proposal	558	84	Mixed use and affordable housing - Schofields Road	468	74	41 Auburn Road, Auburn (Auburn Shopping Village)	359	67	362-374 and 376-384 Oxford Street, Bondi Junction	118	23	129-153 Parramatta Road & 53-74 Queens Road Five Dock	1185	219	136-148 New South Head Road, Edgecliff (AKA 1 Darling Point Road)	62	20
Project	Total dwellings	Affordable dwellings																																																																								
Lot 117 Lachlan's Line Affordable Housing, 6 Halifax Street	135	135																																																																								
Affordable Housing Development, 108 Burdekin Road, Schofield	63	63																																																																								
Botany Road Mascot Affordable Housing	126	126																																																																								
195–213 Fitzgerald Ave and 40–64 Yorktown Pde, Maroubra	144	144																																																																								
22-24 Grant Street and 33-37 Gordon Street, Port Macquarie	94	94																																																																								
Mowbray Road, Lane Cove North, Affordable Housing	86	86																																																																								
30-34 Padstow Parade and 10 Faraday Road, Padstow	113	21																																																																								
28-34 Victoria Street, 17 George Street and 21 George Street Burwood	150	75																																																																								
4 Delmar Parade, Dee Why	280	43																																																																								
6-20 Hinkler Avenue and 319-333 Taren Point Road, Caringbah	288	44																																																																								
Five Ways, Crows Nest	188	48																																																																								
1-9 Marquet Street and 4 Mary Street, Rhodes	274	44																																																																								
9 Blaxland Road Rhodes	311	55																																																																								
173-179 Walker Street and 11-17 Hampden Street, North Sydney	239	67																																																																								
106, 120-122 Smith Street and 3A Charlotte Street, Wollongong	145	25																																																																								
178-186 Willarong Road, 41-47 President Avenue and 51 President Ave, Caringbah	188	42																																																																								
Rozelle Village (Balmain Leagues Club), Rozelle	227	59																																																																								
Regents Park In-fill Affordable Housing Concept Proposal	558	84																																																																								
Mixed use and affordable housing - Schofields Road	468	74																																																																								
41 Auburn Road, Auburn (Auburn Shopping Village)	359	67																																																																								
362-374 and 376-384 Oxford Street, Bondi Junction	118	23																																																																								
129-153 Parramatta Road & 53-74 Queens Road Five Dock	1185	219																																																																								
136-148 New South Head Road, Edgecliff (AKA 1 Darling Point Road)	62	20																																																																								
264	Of the approved applications, how many projects have actually commenced construction, and how many have been completed?	Refer to the response to question #185.																																																																								
265	As of today, how many affordable dwellings have physically been delivered and are now occupied?	Refer to the response to question #185.																																																																								
266	How many applications are currently under assessment under the In-fill Affordable Housing pathway?	As of 5 September 2025, 48 SSD applications.																																																																								

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
267	What is the estimated pipeline in terms of private dwellings and affordable dwellings across these applications?	As of 5 September 2025, 8,758 market dwellings and 2,670 affordable dwellings.
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?	As of 5 September 2025, the average GFA is provided as affordable housing is 37%. (15% on average for the commercially-led projects and 88% on average for government provider led projects.)
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?	<p>The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure imposes several conditions of consent for developments which benefit from the in-fill affordable housing bonus provisions to ensure that the affordable housing is delivered. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a restriction on the title of the land requiring the affordable housing to be managed by a registered community housing provider for a period of 15 years from the day an occupation certificate is issued • submission of an agreement with a registered community housing provider to the Registrar of Community Housing • an occupation certificate for the affordable housing to be issued concurrently or before an occupation certificate for the development (or relevant stage if applicable). <p>The Department’s compliance team works to ensure that development is carried out in accordance with consents issued by the Minister.</p>
270	What tenure arrangements are in place for these affordable dwellings (e.g. fixed 15 years, in perpetuity, or other)?	Affordable dwellings must be managed by a registered community housing provider for a period of at least 15 years commencing on the day an occupation certificate is issued for the development.
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?	<p>The policy take-up of state significant in-fill affordable housing developments is resulting in a substantial market and affordable housing pipeline.</p> <p>Uptake is most evident in the northern areas of Sydney, including Ku-ring-gai and Willoughby local government areas, as well as Parramatta, the City of Sydney, Canterbury-Bankstown and Blacktown local government areas.</p> <p>The provisions and SSD pathway are also being used in regional cities such as Wollongong, Shoalhaven, Newcastle, Coffs Harbour and Port Macquarie. It is important to note that many of these local government areas do not currently have a council-led affordable housing contributions scheme. These projects will therefore deliver a meaningful supply of affordable housing in these areas.</p> <p>The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure has also observed that the policy uptake is strongest in areas where the base zoning permit high density residential development and where there is a mature apartment market and apartment development is viable.</p> <p>The Department will continue to monitor the locational uptake of the policy.</p>
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?	Refer to the response to question #185.
273	<p>Essential Worker Housing Program</p> <p>Since the Essential Worker Housing program was announced, how many projects have formally been started across NSW for Essential Worker Housing?</p>	One project (The Joinery Annandale) has commenced. A second project is currently undergoing planning and technical design.
274	How much funding has been dedicated to the Essential Worker Housing Program across the forward estimates?	The NSW Government has allocated \$450 million to the Essential Worker Housing program.
275	How much funding has been dedicated to the Essential Worker Housing Program in 2023- 24 and 2024-25?	Refer to the response to question #274.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
276	How many essential worker dwellings have been approved to date, and how many are currently under construction?	Landcom is currently in planning approvals for 220 essential worker dwellings at The Joinery Annandale.
277	How many dwellings have been completed and handed over for occupation by essential workers?	Refer to the response to question #276. The program is due for completion in Q4 2028.
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?	The program is due for completion in Q4 2028.
279	At the Camperdown site, what proportion of the 300 additional dwellings will be affordable rental versus market dwellings?	Landcom has not yet gone to tender for the remaining 357 dwellings and the housing mix will be determined through the tender process.
280	For the announced Northern Rivers and South Coast projects (110 units), when is construction expected to commence and when is completion targeted?	Construction on the South Coast site commenced in May 2025. Construction at the Northern Rivers site is commencing Q3 2025. Both projects are targeting completion in Q4 2026.
281	Who is managing the dwellings constructed under this program – is it an affordable housing provider?	Landcom will remain the owner of the build-to-rent properties, which will be managed by a suitable operator on behalf of the NSW Government.
282	What eligibility criteria have been finalised for essential workers to access this housing — which categories of workers qualify?	This is being determined by Homes NSW.
283	How do essential workers apply to live in these homes?	This is a question for Homes NSW.
284	When can essential workers start making applications?	This is a question for Homes NSW.
285	What is the expected rent discount percentage compared to market rent, and how will it be applied?	This is a question for Homes NSW.
286	Will allocation be prioritised based on proximity to employment, income thresholds, or other factors?	This is a question for Homes NSW.
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?	Tenancies will be managed by the build-to-rent operator, with tenancy allocation to be determined by Homes NSW.
288	How long is the tenure guaranteed for essential worker allocations — e.g. in perpetuity, or time-limited?	Homes part of the Essential Worker Housing program will be provided in perpetuity with details for the operation of the program to be finalised.
289	Social And Affordable Housing Rezoning Pathway Since the Social and Affordable Housing Rezoning Pathway was established, how many proposals have been lodged through this pathway?	Five proposals have been lodged through this pathway.
290	How many proposals have been accepted for assessment, and how many were rejected at lodgement?	Five proposals have been accepted for assessment. No proposals have been rejected at the time of lodgement.
291	How many dwellings comprise the dwellings accepted for assessment?	More than 3,000 potential dwellings have been accepted for assessment.
292	How many proposals are currently under active assessment by the Department?	Four proposals are currently under assessment.
293	How many rezonings have been finalised under the pathway, and on what dates?	This information is publicly available on Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's website.
294	How many proposals have been approved?	Refer to the response to question #293.
295	What is the total dwelling yield from proposals that have been approved?	Refer to the response to question #293.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
296	Of that yield, how many dwellings are identified as social or affordable housing, and how many as private dwellings?	Refer to the response to question #293.
297	In which LGAs have proposals been lodged under the pathway?	Proposals have been lodged within the local government areas of City of Orange, City of Randwick, City of Campbelltown, Inner West and City of Liverpool.
298	How long, on average, has it taken from proposal lodgement to Gateway determination for projects in this pathway?	Gateway determinations are not relevant to rezonings under the Social and Affordable Housing rezoning pathway.
299	How long, on average, has it taken from Gateway determination to finalisation?	Refer to the response to question #298.
300	Of the finalised rezonings, have any development applications been lodged, and if so, how many dwellings have progressed to DA stage?	The detail of any development application lodged following a rezoning is a matter for Landcom and Homes NSW.
301	How many social and affordable dwellings have been completed as a result of rezonings through this pathway?	The detail of completed social and affordable dwellings following a rezoning is a matter for Landcom and Homes NSW.
302	What monitoring framework exists to track whether the required percentage of social and affordable housing is delivered after rezoning is granted?	As part of finalising a rezoning, the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure amends the relevant Local Environment Plan(s) [LEP] to set the requirements for the delivery of affordable housing. As the requirement for affordable housing is in the LEP, it is a statutory control which must be considered as part of a development application. It will be up to the determining planning consent authority to monitor compliance with any issued planning consent.
303	What projections has the Department made for how many dwellings this pathway will deliver for each year until 2030?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's role is to lead the assessment of planning proposals received from Homes NSW and Landcom which have been accepted under this pathway. Information about affordable housing delivery for finalised rezonings through this pathway is publicly available on the Department's website.
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?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure has been working closely with Shoalhaven City Council to undertake studies to inform a future rezoning proposal for the Nowra Riverfront Precinct. This includes a number of technical studies including traffic, integrated water cycle management, economic feasibility and urban design. Homes NSW has also been preparing a separate rezoning proposal with supporting technical studies for the Mandalay precinct, which is expected to be lodged with the Department before the end of 2025.
305	Nowra Riverfront 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?	A central part of the Nowra Riverfront Precinct has been identified as a state significant rezoning proposal. The Secretary of the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure, under the Minister's delegation, issued the direction to progress the rezoning.
306	Has a planning proposal been lodged for the Mandalay precinct rezoning, and what stage of assessment is it currently at?	Refer to the response to question #304.
307	What milestones or delivery targets have been set for 2026, 2027, and beyond?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure expects to exhibit the rezoning proposal for the Nowra Riverfront Precinct in late 2025, with the rezoning expected to be finalised by mid-2026.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
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?	A number of technical studies were completed by Shoalhaven City Council under the Nowra Riverfront Activation Taskforce (NRAT) and the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is preparing a number of additional studies in collaboration with Council.
309	What is the expected timeline for the rezoning to be finalised, and when could development applications realistically be lodged?	Refer to the response to question #307.
310	Has the Department set targets for the proportion of social, affordable, and private housing within the 270 homes?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is investigating an appropriate affordable housing clause for the Nowra Riverfront Precinct.
311	Has the Department identified delivery partners or is the site intended for private market development?	The Nowra Riverfront Precinct will be led by private market development. The delivery of the Mandalay precinct is a matter for Homes NSW.
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?	The Nowra Riverfront Precinct seeks to leverage recent NSW Government investments and will consider linkages to this infrastructure.
313	Has the Department conducted modelling on the additional infrastructure needs (schools, health, transport) to support 650 new dwellings in Nowra?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is currently investigating additional infrastructure needs for the proposed housing uplift within the Nowra Riverfront Precinct. This includes traffic and stormwater modelling and working with Shoalhaven City Council on infrastructure servicing requirements.
314	What role will Shoalhaven City Council play in delivering public domain improvements to the foreshore alongside the housing?	Shoalhaven City Council has received Australian Government funding of \$5 million under the Regional Precincts and Partnerships Program to improve the foreshore. This includes the preparation of a Riverfront Landscape Masterplan.
315	Georges River Council Housing Plans 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?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is currently working closely with Georges River Council to identify additional housing opportunities for the LGA and remove any barriers for delivery. Additionally, the Department is working with Council to improve their Development Assessment processes. The Department is regularly meeting with Council and will have an ongoing role in monitoring key project implementation.
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	Funding and delivery timeframes for infrastructure in the Georges River local government area was announced in the 2025-26 NSW Budget which is publicly available.
317	Will heritage conservation areas and areas of unique character in GRC be protected under the current LMR policy?	The Low and Mid-Rise Housing policy applies to heritage conservation areas.
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?	Local councils prescribe landscaping and tree planting requirements via their Development Control Plans. These remain in place and tree canopy matters are for councils to consider in the assessment of development applications.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
		The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure has also developed a Tree Canopy Guide including tree canopy controls, deep soil and tree planting rates which must be considered for developments in the Low and Mid-Rise housing areas.
319	Rose Bay Low and Mid Rise Zoning Has the NSW Government conducted any analysis of Rose Bay's hydrogeological and geotechnical complexities (shallow groundwater, streams, acid-sulphate soils).	Existing legislation, including the National Construction Code and Woollahra Municipal Council's own Local Environmental Plan and Development Control Plan, sets out rules to ensure activities such as earthworks and associated construction dewatering are carried out safely, with acid sulphate soils protected. The Low and Mid-Rise Housing Policy does not prevent councils from undertaking their responsibilities under this legislation. Council remains the consent authority responsible for evaluating local development applications and is best placed to ensure development is carried out safely and in accordance with legislation.
320	Can you confirm that parts of the area classify as "high risk" under Refinement 7 of the policy?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure has investigated hazards and excluded areas subject to hazards and constraints which make them unsuitable for the policy, including high-risk flood, bush fire, evacuation, high aircraft noise, dangerous goods pipelines, coastal wetlands, littoral rainforests and coastal vulnerability areas. The Department also undertook significant consultation with all councils where the Low and Mid-Rise Housing Policy has been applied and carefully considered council feedback before finalising 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?	Potential risks associated with excavation, or the design of buildings is a matter for Council to assess as it is responsible for local development applications. These matters are best managed through the development assessment process.
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?	Refer to the response to question #321.
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?	Refer to the response to question #321.
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)?	Refer to the response to question #321.
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.	Refer to the response to question #319.
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,	Refer to the response to question #319.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	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?	Refer to the response to question #321.
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?	Refer to the response to question #321.
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?	Refer to the response to question #321.
330	How many approvals have been given for developments in the LMR zone in Rose Bay.	I refer you to Woollahra Municipal Council's website for information on development applications within its local government area.
331	Assistance for Hills Shire Council 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?	\$174.5 million in funding has been provided for infrastructure projects from the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure in The Hills Shire local government area. Council received \$132 million of this funding.
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?	Councils are not required to assess SSD applications; this role is undertaken by the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure on behalf of the Minister as consent authority for SSDs. Councils' role in this process is limited to providing optional advice to the Department at various stages of the application process.
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?	This a matter for the Minister for Building.
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?	This is a matter for the Minister for the Environment.
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?	This is a matter for the Minister for Local Government.
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?	Round 6 of the Special Infrastructure Contribution expenditure program allocated \$63.2 million which was collected from development in the Western Sydney Growth Areas (WSGA). This \$63.2 million has been distributed across the many growth precincts in the WSGAs, including Box Hill.
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?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is working with all successful applicants, including The Hills Shire Council, to execute the funding agreements or term sheets as soon as possible, with funds forecast to be paid in the 2025-26 financial year. All planning and design projects must be delivered by 30 June 2028, and all land acquisition and construction projects must be completed by 30 June 2029.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
338	Chatswood Dive Site 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? (b) If yes, when did this transfer happen?	Sydney Metro is the current owner of this site.
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?	Sydney Metro is the current owner of the site. Landcom is undertaking a master planning process to assess the best use of the site.
340	What provision will be made for public facilities?	This would be determined as part of a future planning process.
341	Will there be a requirement to deliver public benefit remain such as open space or other community facilities on the site?	This would be determined as part of a future planning process.
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?	Sydney Metro is the current owner of this site. On all its projects, Landcom undertakes comprehensive community engagement aligned to key planning milestones, e.g. planning proposal lodgement, public exhibition.
343	What are the project timelines?	This would be determined as part of a future planning process.
344	When is the project estimated for completion?	This would be determined as part of a future planning process.
345	Driveway Crossover Certification Issues 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?	This data is not captured in the NSW Planning Portal but is aware of the issue and is currently investigating opportunities to streamline the approval of driveway crossovers.
346	How many development applications in the past 12 months have required variations specifically related to driveway crossovers?	Driveway crossings are a local council matter. Councils have individual driveway crossover specifications and policies for local roads which may differ across the State.
347	Has the Department conducted a review into why driveway crossover requirements are creating such a bottleneck in the certification process?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is currently investigating opportunities to streamline the approval of driveway crossovers.
348	Are councils applying consistent requirements for driveway crossovers, or does the Department accept that there is wide variation creating unnecessary complexity for builders?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure has not issued any advice.
349	What guidance, if any, has the Department issued to certifiers or councils to standardise how driveway crossover conditions should be assessed?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure has not issued any advice.
350	Has the Department considered updating the Codes SEPP or providing model conditions to reduce the need for DA variations relating to driveways?	Refer to the response to question #346.
351	What work is underway to make the driveway crossover certification process simpler and faster, particularly for small-scale housing projects?	Refer to the response to question #346.
352	Has the Department engaged with the building industry to identify practical reforms to reduce red tape around crossovers?	Refer to the response to question #346.
353	Macquarie Park TOD	Planning controls do not set requirements for the number of bedrooms within a dwelling. The market will determine individual developments, in line with relevant design requirements.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	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?	This information is publicly available.
355	Does your department envisage a further transitioning away from business and industrial uses in Macquarie Park towards residential/mixed uses?	No.
356	What is the projected population increase for Macquarie Park over the next 5, 10 and 20 years?	I refer you to the response provided by Ms Monica Gibson on page 78 of the transcript.
357	Of that projected growth, how many children of preschool age are expected to live in Macquarie Park over this period?	This information is publicly available.
358	How many children of primary school age are expected?	This information is publicly available.
359	How many children of high school age are expected?	This information is publicly available.
360	What consultation has the Department undertaken with local councils regarding community infrastructure needs arising from Macquarie Park's growth?	<p>The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure met frequently with City of Ryde Council during the preparation of the Macquarie Park TOD to design a contributions plan which responds directly to the infrastructure needs of the rezoning.</p> <p>The City of Ryde Council adopted an updated s7.12 development contributions plan to support the Macquarie Park TOD on 29 April 2025.</p>
361	Has the Department modelled demand for community facilities such as childcare, schools, open space, and road infrastructure?	<p>Yes, local infrastructure needs were considered during the development of the Macquarie Park TOD.</p> <p>Through its Urban Development Program, the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is also preparing an Infrastructure Opportunities Plan which will ensure enabling infrastructure to support housing has been identified.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs identified for the Macquarie Park TOD has informed the Infrastructure Opportunities Plan which is expected to be released in late 2025.</p>
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?	I refer you to the response provided to Supplementary Question 361.
363	What planning benchmarks exist to align housing approvals with state infrastructure delivery, and are those benchmarks currently being met in Macquarie Park?	Through its Urban Development Program, the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is preparing an Infrastructure Opportunities Plan which will ensure enabling infrastructure to support housing has been identified. Infrastructure needs identified for the Macquarie Park TOD have informed the Infrastructure Opportunities Plan which is expected to be published in 2025.
364	Moveable and Secondary Dwellings 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?	<p>Proposed reforms to the planning and approval framework for caravan parks, manufactured home estates and moveable dwellings were exhibited for public comment in 2023 and 2024.</p> <p>The NSW Government is considering the proposed reforms and all feedback received from various stakeholders, including Bega Valley Shire Council.</p>
365	What stage is the review of legislation covering moveable dwellings and caravans currently at?	Refer to the response to question #364.
366	Has draft legislation or a regulatory package been prepared for Cabinet or public consultation?	Refer to the response to question #364.
367	When does the Government expect to finalise reforms to the legislation governing moveable dwellings and caravans?	Refer to the response to question #364.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
368	Will the reforms be introduced in this parliamentary term, and if so, on what timeline?	Refer to the response to question #364.
369	What interim arrangements are in place while the Government says it is still “considering” reforms?	Current policy settings related to caravan parks, manufactured home estates and moveable dwellings continue to apply.
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?	Yes, local councils were consulted in 2023 and 2024 on the proposed reforms. There are existing definitions and approval pathways in place under current legislation for moveable dwellings.
371	What feedback has the Department received from industry and community stakeholders about barriers in the current legislation?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure has received a range of feedback from industry, local councils and members of the community regarding the planning and approval framework for moveable dwellings. Some stakeholders are seeking the introduction of additional definitions and approval exemptions. Stakeholders have also provided feedback around how local councils are interpreting and applying the current legislation.
372	Will councils and communities have input into the draft reforms before they are introduced?	A decision as to whether further public consultation on this matter is appropriate or necessary will be made prior to the adoption of any future reforms.
373	Has the Department modelled how many additional dwellings could be delivered if the approval pathway for moveable dwellings was simplified?	Refer to the response to question #374.
374	(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?	Moveable dwellings, and in particular manufactured homes, provide an alternative to conventional construction but would not be expected to deliver a meaningful increase housing supply. This is determined by the availability of developable land and the zoning and permissibility settings rather than construction methodology.
375	Bombo Quarry Masterplan What is the current status of the Bombo Quarry Masterplan following the release of the draft in June 2024?	This is a matter for the Minister for Transport.
376	Has the Department completed its assessment of community feedback received during the consultation period?	Refer to the response to question #375.
377	What revisions, if any, have been made to the draft masterplan as a result of consultation?	Refer to the response to question #375.
378	What work has the Department undertaken to support the preparation of the Bombo Quarry Masterplan alongside Boral and Kiama Council?	Refer to the response to question #375.
379	Which technical studies have been completed to date — including housing yield, transport, flooding, environmental, and cultural heritage?	Refer to the response to question #375.
380	Has the Department provided any advice on the likely dwelling yield from the Bombo Quarry site?	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure recently worked with Kiama Municipal Council to deliver its Local Housing Strategy, which was endorsed on 15 July 2025. In this strategy, Bombo Quarry was identified as part of the Kiama Urban Expansion Area as a greenfield site for potential housing development opportunities.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
		While there is no rezoning proposal for this site at present, the Department will continue to engage with Council and relevant landowners about further opportunities to provide new, well-located homes in the region
381	What are the next statutory steps for the Bombo Quarry Masterplan, and when will they occur?	Refer to the response to question #380.
382	Has a timeline been set for the rezoning process, and when is it expected to be finalised?	Refer to the response to question #380.
383	When does the Department expect the first development applications for the site to be lodged?	Refer to the response to question #380.
384	Has the Department modelled how many dwellings could be delivered on the Bombo Quarry site, and by what year?	Refer to the response to question #380.
385	What consideration has been given to affordable housing within the Masterplan?	Refer to the response to question #380.
386	What infrastructure investment — roads, schools, utilities, open space — has been identified as necessary to support redevelopment of the quarry?	Refer to the response to question #375.
387	Renewable Energy Projects 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?	As of 3 September 2025, the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's records indicate that: a) The total number of approved renewable energy projects within REZs is 44. b) The total number of approved renewable energy projects outside of REZs is 87. c) The total number of renewable energy projects seeking approval within REZs is 75. d) The total number of renewable energy projects seeking approval outside of REZs is 73. Note that the Department has taken "renewable energy projects" to mean wind, solar, Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and pumped hydro developments that are State significant. Note that the Department has taken "seeking approval" to mean any renewable energy project that has been issued SEARs through to under assessment in the planning assessment process.
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?	As of 3 September 2025, Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's records indicate that: (a) The total number of approved renewable energy projects within REZs is 11.6 GW. (b) The total number of approved renewable energy projects outside of REZs is 10.8 GW. (c) The total number of renewable energy projects seeking approval within REZs is 30.5 GW. (d) The total number of renewable energy projects seeking approval outside of REZs is 10.1 GW. Note that the Department has taken "renewable energy projects" to mean wind, solar, BESS and pumped hydro developments that are State significant. Note that the Department has taken "seeking approval" to mean any renewable energy project that has been issued SEARs through to under assessment in the planning assessment process.
389	What entity is responsible for naming temporary workers accommodation camps for renewable energy projects?	The naming of temporary workers camps would generally be provided by a proponent in its EIS and would generally relate to the locality.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	(a) If the community is unhappy with how a workers accommodation camp has been named what avenues are there to have the name changed?	The community would need to speak with the proponent or EnergyCo to consider renaming.
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?	Exhibition periods for SSD applications can be extended by the Secretary, Deputy Secretary or Executive Directors at the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure. (a) The Department, under delegation granted by the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces, has the authority to extend the minimum 28-day exhibition period for SSD applications. Decisions to extend exhibition periods are made on a case-by-case basis, informed by a combination of statutory obligations, policy considerations and consultation with relevant stakeholders.
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?	Several studies conducted by organisations have not found a clear correlation between wind energy developments and declining property values, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NSW Valuer General in 2009 appointed Duponts and Preston Rowe Paterson to undertake an assessment of the impact of wind farms on property values which concluded that there was no conclusive evidence available at the time to indicate a universal fall in the value of properties surrounding or that could be attributed to wind farm developments. • An independent report commissioned by the former NSW Office of Environment and Heritage and undertaken by Urbis in 2016 concluded that based on the available data and review of case studies in NSW and Victoria did not identify any conclusive trends that would indicate that wind farms have negatively impacted on property values. • PRD Real Estate also produced a report in October 2022 following its review of impact on property prices in six NSW and Victoria which concluded that property values rose significantly between 35-51% of five years attributed to increased population growth, wage price growth, lower local unemployment and higher rental yields directly as a result of renewable energy developments in a region. <p>Wind energy developments may also have positive impacts on property values due to the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improved local amenities and infrastructure • increased incomes, jobs and property demand • drought-proof income streams from private agreements. <p>The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure is not aware of any further studies underway or being proposed.</p> <p>Although potential impacts on property values are not specifically a consideration in the planning decision-making process, there are a range of measures in place to ensure there are no significant impacts on surrounding properties. These include setbacks to protect visual amenity and ensure public safety, and stringent noise criteria.</p>
392	Fernhill Estate What funding is being allocated to Fernhill Estate for conservation works, new works, and activation?	Over \$3.5 million has been allocated to Fernhill Estate for operational and capital programs and projects for FY25/26
393	CFMEU meetings 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?	In accordance with the Premier's Memorandum M2015-05 Publication of Ministerial Diaries and Release of Overseas Travel Information, all Ministers publish extracts from their diaries, summarising details of scheduled meetings held with stakeholders, external organisations, third-party lobbyists and individuals. Ministers are not required to disclose details of the following meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meetings involving Ministers, ministerial staff, parliamentarians or government officials (whether from NSW or other jurisdictions) • meetings that are strictly personal, electorate or party political • social or public functions or events

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> meetings held overseas (which must be disclosed in accordance with regulation 6(1)(b) of the Government Information (Public Access) Regulation 2018 and Attachment B to the Premier's Memorandum), and matters for which there is an overriding public interest against disclosure. Ministers' diary disclosures are published quarterly on The Cabinet Office's website (https://www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/cabinetoffice/access-to-information/ministers-diary-disclosures)
394	ETU meetings 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?	In accordance with the Premier's Memorandum M2015-05 Publication of Ministerial Diaries and Release of Overseas Travel Information, all Ministers publish extracts from their diaries, summarising details of scheduled meetings held with stakeholders, external organisations, third-party lobbyists and individuals. Ministers are not required to disclose details of the following meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> meetings involving Ministers, ministerial staff, parliamentarians or government officials (whether from NSW or other jurisdictions) meetings that are strictly personal, electorate or party political social or public functions or events meetings held overseas (which must be disclosed in accordance with regulation 6(1)(b) of the Government Information (Public Access) Regulation 2018 and Attachment B to the Premier's Memorandum), and matters for which there is an overriding public interest against disclosure. Ministers' diary disclosures are published quarterly on The Cabinet Office's website (https://www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/cabinetoffice/access-to-information/ministers-diary-disclosures)
395	On what date did you last update/make a ministerial disclosure to the Premier and the Secretary of The Cabinet Office?	The Ministerial Code of Conduct (Ministerial Code) requires Ministers to make certain disclosures to the Premier and the Secretary of The Cabinet Office. I comply with my obligations under the Ministerial Code.
396	Department(s)/Agency(s) Employees In relation to redundancies, will this be made available in your respective Department(s)/Agency(s) Annual Reports?	Redundancies are published in the annual reports of the Department of Planning, Housing & Infrastructure and associated agencies under employee-related expenses.
397	Department(s)/Agency(s) Annual Reports 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?	Two hard copies of the Department of Planning, Housing & Infrastructure's annual report will be printed and provided to the Minister for tabling in the Parliament, as required under the <i>Government Sector Finance Act 2018</i> and Treasury Policy and Guidelines TPG25-10 Framework for Financial and Annual Reporting (a) The Department will prepare two copies in-house using existing printing resources.
398	State Records Act 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?	The Ministers' Office Handbook provides guidance in relation to recordkeeping obligations under the <i>State Records Act 1998</i> . The Cabinet Office also provide guidance, advice, training and support on these obligations for Ministers' offices. Further information is available on State Records NSW's website (www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/dciths/state-records-nsw). All Ministers' offices are expected to comply with their obligations under the <i>State Records Act 1998</i> .
399	Department(s)/Agency(s) Gifts and Hospitality Register 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?	Yes, the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (which includes network agencies) has a gifts, benefits and hospitality register. (a) Yes. It is available on the Department's website. i. The URL is: https://www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/department-of-planning-housing-and-infrastructure/information-access-governance-and-feedback/gifts-benefits-and-hospitality-register
400	Ministerial staff disclosure of gifts and/or hospitality	All Ministerial staff are required to comply with the Gifts, Hospitality and Benefits Policy for Office Holder Staff attached to the Ministers' Office Handbook and available on the NSW Government website.

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	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?	All Ministerial staff are required to comply with their disclosure obligations under the Gifts, Hospitality and Benefits Policy for Office Holder Staff and I expect them to do so. A breach of the Policy may be a breach of the Office Holder's Staff Code of Conduct. The Policy includes disclosure obligations for Ministerial staff in respect of gifts, hospitality and benefits over \$150. If a Ministerial staff member is required by their role to accompany their Office Holder at an event that the Office Holder is attending as the State's representative, or where the Office Holder has asked the staff member to attend, then attendance at that event would not constitute a gift or benefit for the purposes of the Policy.
402	Ministerial Code of Conduct Since 28 March 2023, have you breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct? (a) If yes, what was the breach?	All Ministers are expected to comply with their obligations under the NSW Ministerial Code of Conduct (Ministerial Code) at all times. The Ministerial Code sets the ethical standards of behaviour required of Ministers and establishes practices and procedures to assist with compliance. Among other matters, the Ministerial Code requires Ministers to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> disclose their pecuniary interests and those of their immediate family members to the Premier seek rulings from the Premier if they wish to hold shares, directorships, other business interests or engage in secondary employment (known as 'prohibited interests') identify, avoid, disclose and manage conflicts of interest disclose gifts and hospitality with a market value over \$500. A substantial breach of the Ministerial Code (including a knowing breach of any provision of the Schedule) may constitute corrupt conduct for the purposes of the <i>Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 1988</i> .
403	Senior Executive Drivers As at 1 August 2025, how many senior executives in your portfolio department(s) / agency(s) have a driver?	Zero.
404	GIPA Act - Disclosure Log & Ministerial Offices 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?	The Ministerial office disclosure log is available on the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's website.
405	GIPA Act - Disclosure Log & Departments/Agencies What is the website URL for the Government Information (Public Access Act) 2009 disclosure log each of your portfolio department(s) / agency(s)?	www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/department-of-planning-housing-and-infrastructure/information-access-governance-and-feedback/disclosure-log
406	TikTok Are you on TikTok? (a) If yes, do you access TikTok from a NSW Government device?	The Circular DCS-2025-01 Cyber Security NSW Directive - Restricted Applications List advises how NSW Government agencies are required to appropriately manage risks to NSW Government information on government-issued devices, or personal devices that are used for government business.
407	Signal 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?	Like the former Liberal-Nationals Government, the NSW Government uses a range of digital systems and communications that have been approved for use and may be utilised where there is a valid business requirement. This has been established practice under successive governments. State records are a vital public asset, and access to Government information is essential to maintaining public trust in government. I comply with my obligations under the <i>State Records Act 1998</i> .
408	Training	Ministers have undertaken a program of Ministerial induction training. Ministers have undertaken training on the Respectful Workplace Policy. Members of Parliament are provided with a Skills Development Allowance

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
	<p>Since 28 March 2023, have you had training from an external stakeholder that included an invoice and payment paid for using your ministerial budget?</p> <p>(a) If yes, what is the description of training?</p> <p>(b) If yes, how much?</p>	that may be used in a manner consistent with the Parliamentary Remuneration Tribunal Annual Determination. Ministerial Office Budgets are managed in accordance with the Ministers' Office Handbook.
409	<p>Parliamentary Secretary & Ministerial Vehicle</p> <p>Has your Parliamentary Secretary ever used a Ministerial driver from the pool?</p> <p>(a) If yes, why?</p>	The Ministers' Office Handbook provides that the Premier's Department transport services may be used by Parliamentary Secretaries for official business trips in connection with their duties as Parliamentary Secretaries, with costs paid from the Ministers' office budget.
410	<p>Media releases and statements</p> <p>Are all the ministerial media releases and statements issued by you publicly available at https://www.nsw.gov.au/ministerial-releases?</p> <p>(a) If no, why?</p>	The Department of Customer Service is responsible for managing www.nsw.gov.au/media-releases and the publication of media releases.
411	<p>Overseas Travel</p> <p>As Minister, do you approve overseas travel for public servants from your portfolio department(s)/agency(s)?</p>	The NSW Government Travel and Transport Policy provides a framework for NSW Government travelling employees and covers official air and land travel by public officials using public money. Section 2.1 of that Policy sets out approvals required in relation to overseas travel. Further information in relation to the Policy can be found here: https://www.info.buy.nsw.gov.au/policy-library/policies/travel-andtransport-policy . Treasury Policy and Guidelines – Framework for Financial and Annual Reporting (TPG25-10) requires agencies to include information on overseas visits by officers and employees in agency annual reports.
412	<p>Data Breaches</p> <p>Does your portfolio department(s)/agency(s) keep a register of data breaches in accordance with the Privacy and Personal Information Protection (PPIP) Act?</p> <p>(a) If yes, what is the website?</p>	<p>Yes, the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (which includes network agencies) publishes information about eligible data breaches on its website.</p> <p>(a) The URL is: https://www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/departments-of-planning-housing-and-infrastructure/information-access-governance-and-feedback</p>
413	<p>Discretionary Fund</p> <p>As Minister, so you have a discretionary fund?</p> <p>(a) If yes, what department(s) / agency(s) administer it?</p> <p>(b) If yes, what is the website URL detailing expenditure?</p>	Information about NSW Government grants can be found online https://www.nsw.gov.au/grants-and-funding .
414	<p>Airline Lounges</p> <p>Are you a member of the Qantas Chairmans Lounge?</p>	The Constitution (Disclosures by Members) Regulation 1983 (Regulation) sets out Members' obligations to disclose relevant pecuniary and other interests in periodic returns to Parliament. The Legislative Assembly Standing Committee on Parliamentary Privilege and Ethics Report on Review of the Code of Conduct, Aspects of Disclosure of Interests, and Related Issues (December 2010) notes that: "Advice has been received from the Crown Solicitor that use of the Chairman's Lounge by invitation is not a "gift" for the purposes of clause 10 of the Regulation, as it does not involve disposition of property. However, when the membership leads to an upgrade valued at more than \$250, it becomes disclosable as a contribution to travel, and should be reported under clause 11 of the Regulation." Clause 16 of the Regulation allows a Member to, at their discretion, disclose any direct or indirect benefit, advantage or liability, whether pecuniary or not. Relevant disclosures have been made to The Cabinet Office and to the NSW Parliament.
415	<p>Are you a member of the Virgin Beyond Lounge?</p>	The Constitution (Disclosures by Members) Regulation 1983 (Regulation) sets out Members' obligations to disclose relevant pecuniary and other interests in periodic returns to Parliament. The Legislative Assembly Standing Committee on Parliamentary Privilege and Ethics Report on Review of the Code of Conduct, Aspects of Disclosure of Interests, and Related Issues (December 2010) notes that: "Advice has been received from the Crown Solicitor that use of the Chairman's Lounge by invitation is not a "gift" for the purposes of clause 10 of the Regulation, as it does not involve disposition of property. However, when the membership leads to an upgrade valued at more than \$250, it becomes disclosable as a contribution to

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

No.	Question Text	Response
		travel, and should be reported under clause 11 of the Regulation.” Clause 16 of the Regulation allows a Member to, at their discretion, disclose any direct or indirect benefit, advantage or liability, whether pecuniary or not. Relevant disclosures have been made to The Cabinet Office and to the NSW Parliament.
416	Ministerial Overseas Travel Since 28 March 2023, have you formally applied to the Premier to travel overseas? (a) If yes, was this application accepted?	Ministerial overseas travel information is published online. https://www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/premiersdepartment/access-to-information/ministerial-overseas-travel-information .
417	Private Jet Charter Have you travelled on a private jet charter in your Ministerial capacity? (a) If yes, was this value for money for taxpayers?	Premier and Ministers’ domestic travel information is published on the Premier’s Department’s website at: https://www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/premiers-department/access-to-information/premier-and-ministersdomestic-travel .
418	Ministerial Office renovations Since 28 March 2023, has your Ministerial Office at 52 Martin Place been renovated? (a) If yes, how much was the expenditure?	Leasehold improvements for Ministerial Offices are reported within the Premier’s Department annual reports.
419	Conflict of Interest Since 28 March 2023, have you formally written to the Premier with a conflict of interest? (a) If yes, why?	<p>All Ministers are expected to comply with their obligations under the NSW Ministerial Code of Conduct (Ministerial Code) at all times. The Ministerial Code sets the ethical standards of behaviour required of Ministers and establishes practices and procedures to assist with compliance.</p> <p>Among other matters, the Ministerial Code requires Ministers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • disclose their pecuniary interests and those of their immediate family members to the Premier • seek rulings from the Premier if they wish to hold shares, directorships, other business interests or engage in secondary employment (known as ‘prohibited interests’) • identify, avoid, disclose and manage conflicts of interest • disclose gifts and hospitality with a market value over \$500. <p>A substantial breach of the Ministerial Code (including a knowing breach of any provision of the Schedule) may constitute corrupt conduct for the purposes of the <i>Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 1988</i>.</p>

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

Appendix A – Response to question 200

	BANKSTOWN (designated 27/11/24)	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Apr-25	May-25	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	TOTAL
(a)	The number of development applications lodged since the TOD designation was announced.									1 SSD		1 SSD
(b)	The total number of dwellings proposed in those applications.									186 dwellings (via SSD)		186 dwellings (via SSD)
(c)	The number of applications approved.											0
(d)	The total number of dwellings approved.											0
(e)	The number of dwellings where construction has commenced.											
(f)	The number of dwellings which have been approved but not yet commenced.											
	CROWS NEST (designated 27/11/24)	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Apr-25	May-25	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	TOTAL
(a)	The number of development applications lodged since the TOD designation was announced.							1 SSD		2 SSD	1 SSD	4 SSD
(b)	The total number of dwellings proposed in those applications.							178 dwellings (via SSD)		474 dwellings (via SSD)	168 dwellings (via SSD)	820 dwellings (via SSD)
(c)	The number of applications approved.		2 SSD		1 SSD							3 SSD
(d)	The total number of dwellings approved.		470 dwellings (via SSD)		271 dwellings (via SSD)							1021 dwellings (via SSD)
(e)	The number of dwellings where construction has commenced.											
(f)	The number of dwellings which have been approved but not yet commenced.											
	HOME BUSH (designated 27/11/24)	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Apr-25	May-25	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	TOTAL
(a)	The number of development applications lodged since the TOD designation was announced.											0
(b)	The total number of dwellings proposed in those applications.											0
(c)	The number of applications approved.											0
(d)	The total number of dwellings approved.											0
(e)	The number of dwellings where construction has commenced.											
(f)	The number of dwellings which have been approved but not yet commenced.											
	HORNSBY (designated 27/11/24)	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Apr-25	May-25	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	TOTAL
(a)	The number of development applications lodged since the TOD designation was announced.											0
(b)	The total number of dwellings proposed in those applications.											0
(c)	The number of applications approved.											0
(d)	The total number of dwellings approved.											0
(e)	The number of dwellings where construction has commenced.											

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions



(f)	The number of dwellings which have been approved but not yet commenced.											

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

	MACQUARIE PARK (designated 27/11/24)	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Apr-25	May-25	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	TOTAL
(a)	The number of development applications lodged since the TOD designation was announced.											0
(b)	The total number of dwellings proposed in those applications.											0
(c)	The number of applications approved.									1 SSD		1
(d)	The total number of dwellings approved.									510 dwellings (via SSD)		510
(e)	The number of dwellings where construction has commenced.											
(f)	The number of dwellings which have been approved but not yet commenced.											
	KELLYVILLE & BELLA VISTA (designated 27/11/24)	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Apr-25	May-25	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	TOTAL
(a)	The number of development applications lodged since the TOD designation was announced.											0
(b)	The total number of dwellings proposed in those applications.											0
(c)	The number of applications approved.											0
(d)	The total number of dwellings approved.											0
(e)	The number of dwellings where construction has commenced.											
(f)	The number of dwellings which have been approved but not yet commenced.											

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

Appendix B – Response to question 201

Notes:

- This data includes all State Significant Development applications lodged for sites within a TOD area.
- This data does not include council-assessed development applications.
- This sheet does not provide any data regarding commencements.
- This sheet only contains TOD areas for which there is data. If a TOD area is not shown below, there are no State Significant Development applications in those areas within the specified date range.

	GORDON (designated 13/05/24)	May-24	Jun-24	Jul-24	Aug-24	Sep-24	Oct-24	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Apr-25	May-25	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	TOTAL
(a)	The number of development applications lodged since the TOD designation was announced.												1 SSD	1 SSD			1 SSD	3
(b)	The total number of dwellings proposed in those applications.												100 dwellings (via SSD)	106 dwellings (via SSD)			162 dwellings (via SSD)	368
(c)	The number of applications approved.																	0
(d)	The total number of dwellings approved.																	0
(e)	The number of dwellings where construction has commenced.																	
(f)	The number of dwellings which have been approved but not yet commenced.																	
	KILLARA (designated 13/05/24)	May-24	Jun-24	Jul-24	Aug-24	Sep-24	Oct-24	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Apr-25	May-25	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	TOTAL
(a)	The number of development applications lodged since the TOD designation was announced.													1 SSD				1
(b)	The total number of dwellings proposed in those applications.													135 dwellings (via SSD)				135
(c)	The number of applications approved.																	0
(d)	The total number of dwellings approved.																	0
(e)	The number of dwellings where construction has commenced.																	
(f)	The number of dwellings which have been approved but not yet commenced.																	
	LINDFIELD (designated 13/05/24)	May-24	Jun-24	Jul-24	Aug-24	Sep-24	Oct-24	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Apr-25	May-25	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	TOTAL
(a)	The number of development applications lodged since the TOD designation was announced.												4 SSD	3 SSD		2 SSD	1 SSD	10
(b)	The total number of dwellings proposed in those applications.												350 dwellings (via SSD)	691 dwellings (via SSD)		340 dwellings (via SSD)	98 dwellings (via SSD)	1479
(c)	The number of applications approved.																	0
(d)	The total number of dwellings approved.																	0
(e)	The number of dwellings where construction has commenced.																	
(f)	The number of dwellings which have been approved but not yet commenced.																	

Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions



--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



Budget Estimates Aug 2025 – Planning and Public Spaces supplementary questions

	ROSEVILLE (designated 13/05/24)	May-24	Jun-24	Jul-24	Aug-24	Sep-24	Oct-24	Nov-24	Dec-24	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Apr-25	May-25	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	TOTAL
(a)	The number of development applications lodged since the TOD designation was announced.												1 SSD	2 SSD				3
(b)	The total number of dwellings proposed in those applications.												259 dwelling s (via SSD)	289 dwelling s (via SSD)				548
(c)	The number of applications approved.																	0
(d)	The total number of dwellings approved.																	0
(e)	The number of dwellings where construction has commenced.																	
(f)	The number of dwellings which have been approved but not yet commenced.																	