

Our ref: Coalcliff Eco-Tourist Facilities (SSD-76132994)

Jordan Balazs  
Senior Urbanist, Ethos Urban  
Level 4, 180 George St  
Sydney NSW 2000

18 October 2024

---

Subject: Coalcliff Eco-Tourist Facilities (SSD-76132994) - Request for Additional Information

Dear Ms Balazs

I refer to the request for the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) for Coalcliff Eco-Tourist Facilities (Pre-Development Application PDA-75447712 / SSD-76132994).


The SEARs request does not adequately detail all relevant site history, does not adequately address *State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021* (the Resilience and Hazards SEPP) and does not address the *Coastal Management Act 2016*.

Prior to further consideration of the SEARs request, the Department requires additional information that effectively addresses the above and the issues identified in **Attachment 1**. By **Monday 11 November 2024**, you are requested to

- (a) provide the information in a revised scoping report that meets the *SSD Guidelines Appendix A: Scoping Reports* (available at <https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/assessment/state-significant-development/ssd-process/secretarys-environmental-assessment>), or
- (b) notification that the information will not be provided to the Department. If you cannot meet this deadline or do not intend to provide the additional information, please advise the Department via the NSW Planning Portal. Alternately, you may wish to withdraw the subject SEARs request and submit a new, complete SEARs request when you are ready.

If you have any questions, please contact me on (02) 9228 6283 or via email at [michael.doyle@dpie.nsw.gov.au](mailto:michael.doyle@dpie.nsw.gov.au).

Yours sincerely



Michael Doyle

**A/Team Leader, Regional Assessments**

## Attachment 1 - Request for Additional Information

### 1. Scoping report

The scoping report does not include all information required by the *SSD Guidelines Appendix A: Preparing a Scoping Report*.

- a. The report does not address development application DA-2018/1175 Environmental protection works – approved 28/3/2019, including its status: The report does not include all relevant history as background to the project, and the report does not include a description of approved development for the site, including which may relate to the subject proposal.

The Department also notes advice by Wollongong City Council that a submission to the draft exhibition of *Wollongong Local Environmental Plan 2009* (the LEP) in 2008 to rezone the land to SP3 was not supported due to concerns with the significance of the coastal location and landslip, and the proposal has not otherwise been pursued as a Planning Proposal. The Department considers this advice relevant where Eco-Tourism Facilities are not permissible under the LEP.

- b. The report describes that the site is unlikely to be contaminated given it has never been developed. However, Council has identified the following:
  - *Historic aerial imagery that indicates landfilling and materials stockpiling on the subject site*
  - *There is one mapped subsurface stormwater pipe with an inlet in the rail corridor that traverses the subject site in a drainage easement. Installation will have required earthworks and backfilling*
  - *Three open stormwater lines are mapped traversing the subject site which are characterised by inlets and pits in both the South Coast rail and Lawrence Hargrave Drive road corridors. The rail corridor has a long history and continues to be used to transport freight from Port Kembla and further south to Bomaderry, including materials used or manufactured in industrial and agriculture in the Illawarra region*

### 2. Information requested by Council to enable Council to provide further advice to inform any SEARs

- a. The SEARs request does not adequately address the Resilience and Hazards SEPP, does not address the Coastal Management Act 2016 including its objectives, and does not genuinely address construction and operation feasibility.
- b. The SSD Guidelines require scoping reports to include strategies (to the extent known at scoping stage) to avoid or minimise impacts, mitigation measures (again to the extent known at scoping stage) that will be built into the design of the project, and reasons for the current project form.

The proposed site configuration is spread out and, in turn, may increase the size of any required Asset Protection Zones and clearing: Section 3.4 Analysis of Alternatives in the scoping report does not adequately address feasible alternatives, or impacts associated with them.