



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE NO. 7 – PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

BUDGET ESTIMATES 2025-2026

Supplementary questions

Portfolio Committee No. 7 – Planning and Environment

Planning

Hearing: Thursday 4 December 2025

Answers due by: Responses due by 5.00 pm Monday 19 January 2026

Budget Estimates secretariat

Phone (02) 9230 2581

BudgetEstimates@parliament.nsw.gov.au

BUDGET ESTIMATES 2025-2026
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

Questions from Ms Sue Higginson MLC
--

PLANNING

Bowdens Silver Proposal

- (1) Please outline the dates of any meetings (including teams or zoom meetings or phone conferences) with the Planning Minister and Silver Mines Ltd, employees or their agents or lobbyists since the Court of Appeal judgement on 16 August 2025. Include details of whether Departmental and/or Bowdens legal representatives were at the meeting.
- (2) Please outline the dates of any meetings (including teams or zoom meetings or phone conferences) with Planning Ministerial Staff and Silver Mines Ltd, employees or their agents since the Court of Appeal judgement on 16 August 2025. Include details of whether Departmental and/or Bowdens legal representatives were at the meeting.
- (3) Please outline the dates of any meetings (including teams or zoom meetings or phone conferences) with the Department of Planning and Silver Mines Ltd, employees or their agents since the Court of Appeal judgement on 16 August 2025. Include details of whether Departmental and/or Bowdens legal representatives were at the meeting.
- (4) Please outline the dates of any meetings (including teams or zoom meetings or phone conferences) with the Planning Minister and community groups or members since the Court of Appeal judgement on 16 August 2025.
- (5) Please outline the dates of any meetings (including teams or zoom meetings or phone conferences) with Ministerial Staff and community groups or members regarding the Bowdens Silver proposal since the Court of Appeal judgement on 16 August 2025.
- (6) Please outline the dates of any meetings (including teams or zoom meetings or phone conferences) with the Department of Planning representatives and community groups or members regarding the Bowdens Silver proposal since the Court of Appeal judgement on 16 August 2025.

Moore Point Development Proposal, Liverpool

- (7) Could you explain how previous Planning Department concerns regarding flood and contamination risk changed in relation to this development, allowing the proposal to gain gateway approval?
- (8) Can you provide a list of concerns you are aware of with regard to SES concerns about this proposal, including specific concerns about on-foot evacuations?
- (9) How confident are you that contamination concerns at this site are being addressed?
- (10) Have you or anyone you know ever been lobbied by Morris Iemma or anyone from Iemma Patterson Premier Advisory (IPPA), in relation to this issue?
 - (a) If so, in what way and on what precise date?
- (11) Have you or anyone you know ever been approached in any way by anyone from the Premier's Department in relation to this development?
 - (a) Specifically, on what date/s were you approached by Simon Draper and what have been the nature of your discussions with Mr Draper?
 - (b) Specifically, on what date/s were you approached by Marcus Ray and what have been the nature of your discussions with Mr Ray?
- (12) Specifically, have you been approached in any way by the Planning Minister's office, and if so in what way?

Marsden Park Development Proposal

- (13) Can you please provide a detailed breakdown of the flood risks at the Marsden Park North West Growth Area?
- (14) Have DHPI changed their lack of support for residential development in this area?
 - (a) If so, on what basis?
- (15) Have you or anyone you know ever been lobbied by Morris Iemma or anyone from Iemma Patterson Premier Advisory (IPPA), in relation to this issue? If so, in what way?
- (16) Have you or anyone in your Department ever been approached in any way by anyone from the Premier's Department in relation to this issue?
- (17) Are you aware that the area proposed for development risks destruction of critically endangered ecological communities?

- (a) If so, what steps are you taking to mitigate these impacts on biodiversity?

Wind Farm Approvals

- (18) Given the importance of building wind farms for a diversified renewable energy transition, what is the planning department doing to address delays?

DAMSHEG Decision

- (19) Has the department received legal advice on integrating the implications of the Land and Environment Court ruling in *DAMSHEG v MACH Energy* 2025 into the assessment of current and future coal mines proposals?
- (20) How will the department ensure that coal mine proponents comprehensively assess localised climate change impacts on community, infrastructure, nature, insurance, and community views of the same?

Independent Planning Commission

- (21) Since June 2023, how many renewable energy developments in NSW have been referred to the IPC?
 - (a) Of those referred to the IPC, how many days did it take on average for a determination to be made (from the date of referral to the date of the determination)?

Data Centres

- (22) Is the department working on limits to data centres in terms of water and energy?
 - (a) If so, what is this work?
- (23) Is the department working on standard conditions for data centres of a certain capacity?
 - (a) If so, what is this work?

Questions from Ms Cate Faehrmann MLC

Peer reviews undertaken on assessment documentation for the proposed Bowdens Silver mine

- (24) NSW Planning's Final Assessment Report for the proposed Bowdens Silver mine (SSD-5765) references multiple peer reviews undertaken on documentation provided by Bowdens Silver. Please provide a copy of each of the following:

- (a) Peer review conducted by Prof. Brian Priestly of Priestly Toxicology Consulting of the Human Health Risk Assessment undertaken by enRiskS;
- (b) Peer review conducted by Mr Najah Ishac of EMM of the noise and vibration assessment undertaken by SLR Consulting Australia (SLR); and
- (c) Peer review conducted by Ms Jane Barnett of ERM of the air quality assessment undertaken by Ramboll Australia (Ramboll).

Protocols for conducting Human Health Risk Assessments

- (25) Does NSW Planning have any policies, guidelines or other documentation that sets minimum expectations for the undertaking of human health risk assessments that form part of the assessment documentation for development applications?
 - (a) If so, please provide a copy of any such policies or guidelines.
- (26) Is the use of exposure-response relationships in a Human Health Risk Assessment for community exposure to particulate matter developed for a major infrastructure project such as a motorway tunnel acceptable for a Human Health Risk Assessment undertaken for a metals mine?
 - (a) If so, how is community exposure to particulate matter that may arise from the construction and operation of a metals mine that doesn't arise during construction of a motorway tunnel explicitly considered?
 - (b) Are there any requirements in place in NSW to ensure that Human Health Risk Assessments are developed using data, information and research that is of specific relevance to the industry and activity under assessment?

Habitat clearing and biodiversity protection in Leard Forest

- (27) Please describe all monitoring and compliance activities undertaken by the NSW Department of Planning between 2015-2025 in relation to any clearing of habitat/vegetation in Leard Forest undertaken by Whitehaven Coal (or any of their subcontractors).
 - (a) Please clearly differentiate between on-site versus desktop monitoring and compliance.
 - (b) Please specify whether clearing was undertaken in accordance with the conditions of the Environment Protection Licence (EPL) for Whitehaven Coal's Maules Creek Coal Mine.

- (c) Please specify whether clearing was undertaken in accordance with any restrictions and/or commitments in any environmental plan (or other named management plan) in operation at the time.
 - (d) For each monitoring or compliance activity, please provide details of any identified breaches of conditions of an EPL or restrictions/commitments in a management plan and the response taken by the NSW Department of Planning for each breach.
- (28) Please provide details of all clearing events undertaken in Leard Forest by Whitehaven Coal (or any other party they may have subcontracted) in relation to their Maules Creek Coal Mine that have taken place between 2015 and 2025. For each clearing event please confirm whether:
- (a) Clearing was restricted to between the 15 February and 30 April.
 - (b) Clearing was undertaken in a staged manner so that only the minimum number of trees needed to allow mining planned for the next year to occur are cleared.
 - (c) A licensed wildlife carer and ecologist was on site:
 - i. If so, please provide details of any wildlife rehabilitation groups the licence wildlife carer was associated with.
 - (d) Temperatures remained below 35°C throughout the clearing event
 - (e) Detailed inspections of trees were carried out before they were removed
 - (f) Any animals were relocated and, if so:
 - i. Which species and how many individuals were involved, and
 - ii. Were relocated animals fitted with radio tracking and, if so, what was done with any data collected?
- (29) Please describe all monitoring and compliance activities undertaken by the NSW Department of Planning between 2015-2025 in relation to any clearing of habitat/vegetation in Leard Forest undertaken by Idemitsu (or any of their subcontractors).
- (a) Please clearly differentiate between on-site versus desktop monitoring and compliance.
 - (b) Please specify whether clearing was undertaken in accordance with the conditions of the EPL for Idemitsu's Boggabri Coal Mine.

- (c) Please specify whether clearing was undertaken in accordance with any restrictions and/or commitments in any environmental plan (or other named management plan) in operation at the time.
 - (d) For each monitoring or compliance activity, please provide details of any identified breaches of conditions of an EPL or restrictions/commitments in a management plan and the response taken by the NSW Department of Planning for each breach.
- (30) Please provide details of all clearing events undertaken in Leard Forest by Idemitsu (or any other party they may have subcontracted) in relation to their Boggabri Coal Mine that have taken place between 2015 and 2025. For each clearing event please confirm whether:
- (a) Clearing was restricted to between the 15 February and 30 April.
 - (b) Clearing was undertaken in a staged manner so that only the minimum number of trees needed to allow mining planned for the next year to occur are cleared.
 - (c) A licensed wildlife carer and ecologist was on site:
 - i. If so, please provide details of any wildlife rehabilitation groups the licence wildlife carer was associated with.
 - (d) Temperatures remained below 35°C throughout the clearing event
 - (e) Detailed inspections of trees were carried out before they were removed
 - (f) Any animals were relocated and, if so:
 - i. Which species and how many individuals were involved, and
 - ii. Were relocated animals fitted with radio tracking and, if so, what was done with any data collected?
- (31) For the vegetated corridor between Boggabri and Maules Creek Coal Projects (condition 51 of the Boggabri conditions of approval):
- (a) Please describe what if any compliance activities have been undertaken by the NSW Department of Planning.
 - i. Please include details of any site visits to the corridor conducted by the NSW Department of Planning since the illegal blasting at the Maules Creek Coal Mine in 2020.
 - (b) Please provide details of any identified breaches of the condition and the response taken by the NSW Department of Planning for each breach.

- (c) Please outline any endeavours undertaken by Whitehaven Coal and Idemitsu to:
- i. Enhance the functioning of the area as a biodiversity corridor, and
 - ii. Minimise the impacts on the corridor.

Questions from Ms Abigail Boyd MLC

Data centres

- (32) Why is there no mandatory reporting of Water Usage Effectiveness (WUE) or Power Usage Effectiveness (PUE) in development applications, given these are industry-standard metrics?
- (33) How does the Department currently verify proponent claims about cooling efficiency, water consumption, and energy demand? Is there any independent technical review?
- (34) Is the Department aware of cases where actual water or energy usage significantly exceeded what was stated in EIS documentation?
- (35) Which planning instruments govern the approvals process for data centres?
- (36) Does the Department accept that data centres are now effectively large industrial facilities with 24/7 baseload energy demand, rather than generic “business premises”?
- (37) Has the Department considered updating the Local Environmental Plan Standard Instrument, State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021 and State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021 to include specific requirements for data-centre developments, including resource-use thresholds?
- (38) Why does the SSD threshold for data centres not include any triggers based on water consumption, electricity load, cooling method, or waste heat discharge?
- (39) Given the explosive growth in AI-focused data centres, has the Department commissioned any review of whether current approval processes and environmental safeguards are still fit for purpose?
- (40) How does the Department assess the cumulative water-supply burden from clusters of data centres on already stressed water systems in Sydney and Western Sydney?
- (41) Why are proponents still able to seek approval for evaporative-cooling systems that require millions of litres of water per day, when water-free alternatives exist?

- (42) Does the Department require proponents to justify why they cannot use water-free or low-water cooling systems? If not, why is that not mandatory?
- (43) What modelling has the Department undertaken on the impact of data-centre cooling water demand during drought periods or periods of water restriction?
- (44) Has the Department worked with Sydney Water to produce any guidance on permissible water demand for data-centre precincts?
- (45) Does the Department require proponents to model the impact of data-centre load on local network constraints, voltage stability, and downstream reliability?
- (46) How does the Department ensure that data centres do not trigger costly network upgrades that are then socialised across NSW electricity consumers?
- (47) What conditions, if any, does the Department place on proponents regarding renewable energy sourcing or emissions limits associated with their load?
- (48) Has Planning assessed whether cumulative data-centre load in Sydney and Western Sydney risks undermining NSW's legislated emissions targets?
- (49) Does the Department support requiring hyperscale data centres to be directly transmission-connected rather than relying on local distribution networks?
- (50) How does the Department assess heat-rejection impacts, given multiple large data-centre campuses can increase local urban heat and affect surrounding land uses?
- (51) Why are cumulative impacts—heat, noise, traffic, water, grid load—generally assessed on a per-DA basis rather than at a precinct or corridor scale?
- (52) Does the Department accept that data-centre clustering in industrial zones can effectively block or distort future housing, mixed-use or community-serving development?
- (53) Has the Department commissioned any spatial suitability analysis—such as GIS-based water, energy and heat vulnerability mapping—to inform where data centres should or should not be located?
- (54) What controls exist to limit the expansion of diesel backup systems, which can create significant local air-quality impacts?
- (55) Does the Department currently have in-house expertise capable of independently assessing high-load energy infrastructure, cooling systems, and water-intensive industrial processes?

- (56) How often does the Department seek advice from independent energy-system modellers, water-resource scientists, or cooling-technology experts before approving major data-centre projects?
- (57) What coordination exists between Planning, Energy, Sydney Water, IPART, and Treasury to assess the aggregate system burden of data-centre growth?
- (58) Is the Department maintaining any register or monitoring framework for the actual ongoing resource use of approved data centres?
- (59) Given that data-centre developments can lock NSW into higher long-term water and energy costs, why is there no “public interest” test in the approval process?
- (60) Does the Department agree that, without stronger controls, NSW risks replicating Ireland’s situation where data centres consume over 20% of national electricity?
- (61) What specific reforms does the Department believe are required to manage the next generation of AI-intensive data centres?
- (62) Why has the Department not yet developed a whole-of-government data-centre strategy to coordinate siting, grid impacts, water demand, and emissions?

Investment Delivery Authority

- (63) What formal governance arrangements exist between the IDA and the Department of Planning?
 - MoUs? Joint steering committees? Statutory delegations?
- (64) Does the IDA have any authority to direct the Department of Planning to accelerate or prioritise certain assessments?
- (65) What actual powers or authority does the IDA have?
- (66) Has the minister issued any joint directions to Planning and the IDA, and will these be tabled?
- (67) How does the Department ensure its statutory independence in assessments when interacting with the IDA?
- (68) What safeguards are in place to prevent IDA intervention from influencing merit-based planning decisions?
- (69) How many Data Centre projects that have applied in the EOI process for the Investment Delivery Authority already have an existing planning application, and so are essentially

seeking a concurrent application under the IDA to potentially circumvent the standard planning process?

- (70) Does the IDA sit on any Planning-led working groups such as rezoning pathways, State Significant Development panels, or major project acceleration groups?
- (71) Has the IDA seconded staff into the Department of Planning or vice-versa? How many and in what roles?
- (72) What data-sharing arrangements exist between the IDA and Planning?
- (73) How will the department coordinate with the IDA on precinct rezonings that impact major state infrastructure projects?

Questions from the Opposition

Housing Delivery Authority – General

- (74) The HDA criteria also states that an EOI needs a “Demonstrated capability to commence development quickly - within 12 months of approval”, how is it that applications such as the one at 95 Epping Road in Macquarie Park, by Sonic Healthcare, not a developer, is able to gain approval under this criteria when it’s clearly a case of property speculation?
- (75) Isn’t this similar to the concern that the Minister expressed in estimates previously about the application by the Aurora Property Partnership, where the Minister said if “they don’t intend to do that, I will take away their declaration”?
 - (a) Has that declaration in Mosman been revoked?
 - (b) Have any declarations been revoked by the Minister for that reason?
- (76) Given that new TOD SEPP controls were only finalised in 2024–25, on what basis is the HDA engaging with development proposals that seek concurrent rezoning to enable height and floor space well beyond those recently gazetted controls?
- (77) How many proposals has the HDA received since the TOD rezonings that seek densities materially higher than those contemplated in the TOD SEPP?

HDA EOI 259730 – 9-11 Mawson Avenue, Bella Vista (Urban Property Group)

- (78) In EOI 259730, why did the HDA accept a proposal for 900 dwellings in four towers up to 40 storeys, when the Kellyville/Bella Vista TOD controls were only finalised last year and did not permit development of that scale?

- (79) What criteria did the HDA use to determine that this proposal should be allowed to access the SSD pathway, despite its acknowledged departure from the TOD Accelerated Precinct controls?
- (80) Why was a concurrent rezoning considered appropriate for 9–11 Mawson Avenue when the precinct had already undergone a comprehensive TOD rezoning process only the year prior?
- (81) Was any part of the HDA assessment for EOI 259730 based on representations from the proponent or their lobbyists seeking to exceed the TOD development standards?
- (82) The HDA’s 8 August 2025 approval includes a specific instruction: “Recommended that the applicant be advised that any future assessment must address the departure from the TOD Accelerated Precinct controls.”
- (a) Why was this note necessary?
 - (b) What specific elements of the proposal constitute departures from TOD controls?
 - (c) If the applicant must “address” departures from TOD controls, why was the SSD pathway granted before those departures were fully resolved?
 - (d) Does the Department expect the assessment to reduce the scale to align with TOD planning controls, or does the HDA anticipate that the applicant may justify exceeding those controls?
 - (e) Does the existence of this note imply that the HDA is willing to accept developments that exceed TOD controls provided justification is later supplied?

HDA EOI 230904 – 1 North Terrace, Bankstown

- (83) For EOI 230904 at 1 North Terrace, Bankstown, the HDA recommended State Significant Development (SSD) status for a 1,300-dwelling proposal despite Bankstown’s newly established TOD planning controls only being finalised last year. Can the Department explain why the HDA accepted an SSD application of this scale before any precinct-level infrastructure sequencing, servicing assessment or TOD control reconciliation had been completed?

HDA EOI 268642 – 35–41 Chandos Street, St Leonards

- (84) For EOI 268642 at 35–41 Chandos Street, the applicant sought a 128-metre building, which is double the existing planning control of 64 metres. Why did the HDA support SSD declaration for a proposal that exceeds the height control by 100%, and what planning or

policy basis did it rely on to justify accepting an application so far beyond the adopted controls?

HDA EOI 232597 – 601 Pacific Highway, St Leonards

(85) For EOI 232597 at 601 Pacific Highway, the HDA supported an SSD declaration for 600 dwellings, again well beyond the TOD precinct framework parameters. What assessment did the HDA undertake to confirm that a development of this size aligns with the TOD strategic planning envelope, and why was this proposal not required to first resolve compliance with the adopted height and density controls?

HDA EOI 266163 – 290–294 Pacific Highway, Crows Nest

(86) For EOI 266163 at 290–294 Pacific Highway, Crows Nest, the HDA supported SSD declaration even though the proposal did not specify a final height while the planning control is 50 metres. Why did the HDA accept a proposal with unspecified height that evidently exceeds the planning control, and what safeguards ensure that unknown or unquantified exceedances are not approved without prior strategic assessment?

HDA EOI 251164 – 448–460 Pacific Highway, St Leonards

(87) For EOI 251164, the applicant sought a 52-storey (172m) tower where the planning control is 135 metres. Can the Department explain why the HDA progressed this SSD application before the proponent had demonstrated how such a substantial height exceedance (approximately 37m above the control) could be supported within the strategic planning framework?

HDA EOI 270846 – 66 & 1A & 1 Berry Road, St Leonards

(88) For EOI 270846, the HDA supported an SSD pathway for a 23-storey (75m) proposal where the planning control is only 25 metres. What justification did the HDA use to support an application proposing a height that is three times the adopted control, and how does this align with the Department's stated objective of retaining credibility in the TOD strategic planning process?

HDA EOI 247238 – 95–99 Epping Road, Macquarie Park

(89) For EOI 247238, the applicant sought 40 storeys (132m) where the planning control is 30 metres, a more than 300% exceedance. Why did the HDA progress an SSD pathway for a

proposal so vastly outside the existing controls, and did it consider whether this undermines the integrity of the Macquarie Park planning framework?

HDA EOI 233967 – 301–301B Samantha Riley Drive, Kellyville

- (90) For EOI 233967, the proposed height is 27 storeys (90m) against a planning control of 46 metres. How did the HDA assess the appropriateness of this exceedance given that the TOD precinct planning controls were only recently gazetted, and why was the proposal not required to align with the newly established limits?

Infrastructure in TOD Accelerated Precincts

- (91) In the supplementary questions to the last estimates, it was advised that “guidelines for the delivery of the \$520.7 million funded projects in the TOD Accelerated Precincts... are currently in development.”

Given several months have passed, can you now confirm:

- (a) whether those guidelines have been finalised
- (b) when they were or will be released
- (c) when each TOD Accelerated Precinct will become eligible to receive its first dollar from the \$520.7 million allocation?

Cherrybrook Precinct

- (92) The Cherrybrook Precinct planning material indicates that five new local sporting fields will be required to support the planned population uplift. What assessment has the Department undertaken regarding the cost, timing and delivery responsibility for those five fields, and does the Government plan to fund any of them?
- (93) Given the Department’s own modelling identifies a strong need for new open space and sporting facilities, why was funding for the nearby Westleigh Park project deferred or reduced, and how does the Department reconcile that decision with the identified demand for new fields in Cherrybrook?
- (94) What is the Department’s projected sale price for two-bedroom and three-bedroom apartments in the Cherrybrook Precinct once development is completed?
- (95) Has the Department conducted a feasibility assessment of apartment delivery in Cherrybrook, and does the Department consider medium- or high-density construction to

be financially feasible within the next five years given current construction and financing market conditions?

- (96) The Minns Government previously deferred funding for the New Line Road upgrade, including widening to four lanes between Hastings Road and Purchase Road. Has the Department modelled the increased traffic volumes arising from the Cherrybrook uplift, and does the Department consider that this upgrade is required?
- (97) What engagement has the Department had with the Department of Education or local school principals regarding school capacity within the Cherrybrook Precinct catchment?
- (98) Has the Department assessed whether a new school or significant expansion is required to support the precinct's planned population?
- (99) Planning documents indicate that adjacent sites on Radley Place may accommodate seven-storey buildings immediately beside low-density detached housing. Does the Department consider this scale transition appropriate, and what assessment has been undertaken of overshadowing, overlooking and neighbourhood character impacts?
- (100) Does the Government intend to require developers within the Cherrybrook Precinct to provide new commuter parking or visitor parking as part of development applications, given the reliance on the metro station and limited existing parking supply?

Riverstone Town Centre Masterplan

- (101) The Department's website states the Riverstone Town Centre Masterplan is scheduled for finalisation in Q1 2026. Is that finalisation still on track to meet that time frame?
- (102) Has the Department developed a full list of infrastructure improvements required to support the proposed uplift in the Riverstone Town Centre, and will this list be publicly released?
- (103) What traffic modelling has been undertaken regarding congestion impacts through the centre of Riverstone, particularly at the Riverstone level crossing?
- (104) Has the Department investigated, or consulted with TfNSW potential options for removing the Riverstone level crossing?
 - (a) If so, what options were examined, and what are the estimated costs?
 - (b) If not, why has this not been investigated given the uplift proposed?
- (105) Does the Department consider the existing level crossing compatible with the additional density proposed under the Masterplan?

- (106) Has the Department assessed or consulted TfNSW whether existing Richmond Line train capacity can support the projected population growth from the Masterplan?
- (107) What discussions have occurred with Sydney Water and Endeavour Energy regarding water, wastewater, stormwater and electricity capacity for the precinct?
- (108) Are there servicing constraints—such as trunk drainage, wastewater capacity or electricity network limits—that could slow or prevent timely delivery of the Masterplan?
- (109) What flood modelling has been undertaken for Riverstone, and will the Masterplan require any major stormwater or drainage upgrades?
- (110) Has the Department conducted feasibility modelling to determine whether mid- and high-density housing in the Riverstone Town Centre is financially viable under current construction and financing conditions?
- (111) What assumptions has the Department made about likely apartment prices, land values and construction costs in Riverstone?
- (112) How will the Masterplan manage height transitions between the proposed Town Centre and surrounding low-density residential areas, and has overshadowing or privacy modelling been undertaken?
- (113) Will the Department create a new infrastructure contributions plan or Special Infrastructure Contribution (SIC) for Riverstone to fund necessary works?
- (114) Will the Department require sequencing triggers (e.g., infrastructure delivery checkpoints) before additional dwelling numbers can be released?

Precincts

- (115) What is the status of adhering to the Bayside West Precincts 2036 plan for land use and infrastructure delivery?
- (116) When will the NSW Government make a decision on the preferred design and planning partner for the Circular Quay Renewal.
- (a) When did DPPI start considering the matter?
- (b) When does DPPI estimate the establishment of “a new planning framework for Circular Quay to guide the development of the precinct”?
- (117) For Explorer Street, Eveleigh, the DPPI website says the finalisation has occurred in 2025, but ‘further detailed design will be required’ – what does this work include?

- (118) For the Greater Parramatta Precinct, the DPPI website states: “With the finalisation of the GPOP PIC, the Department is now moving into the next phase of implementation for GPOP.” – what is the next phase of implementation and how has that progressed?
- (119) At the Orchard Hills Precinct the Stage 1 Rezoning proposal is being re-exhibited – what was the reason for this?
- (a) What was learnt during the initial exhibition in late 2024 and early 2025 to necessitate this re-exhibiting?