

APPENDIX C – STATUTORY COMPLIANCE TABLE

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
Environmental Planning and Assessment Act			
Section 1.3	<i>To promote the social and economic welfare of the community and a better environment by the proper management, development and conservation of the State's natural and other resources</i>	The proposal promotes the social and economic welfare of the community and a better environment by supporting the delivery and integration of a private hospital with ancillary uses, forming a nexus to the RPA, which is a foundation partner of the Camperdown Health, Education and Research Precinct (CHERP). The key objective of the CHERP is to build upon the existing health, education and research strengths, to create an area of international standing, with a diverse and engaging public realm. The proposal suitably aligns with the key objective and strengthens the economic development and innovation of the CHERP whilst also delivering significant social benefits to the broader local health district.	Section 2.5 Section 6.14 Appendix Q Section 6.16 Appendix T Section 6.17
	<i>To facilitate ecologically sustainable development by integrating relevant economic, environmental and social considerations in decision-making about environmental planning and assessment,</i>	The principles of ecologically sustainable development are an integral consideration in ISPT's vision for the development site. The proposed development is for a Concept Envelope only and the proposed hospital and ancillary land uses. Notwithstanding, capacity has been made within the envelope to ensure sustainability targets can be	

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
		embedded into the future detailed design. It is envisaged that the sustainability targets for the development will be achieved in an integrated approach through minimising the need for energy consumption (via passive measures) and then consumption optimisation (energy efficiency) and use of renewable resources, where required. The development will target a 5 Star Green Star rating. The design team will consider the sustainable design principles based on the following sustainability tool: Green Star Buildings Tool – Green Building council of Australia. An Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD) Report has been prepared by Integrated Group Services (IGC) (Appendix Q).	
	<i>To promote the orderly and economic use and development of land</i>	The site is located within the CHERP and has been strategically identified for land uses which contribute to the growth and economic development of this precinct. The proposal will deliver a private hospital with ancillary uses, directly co-located with the RPA public hospital, which strategically aligns with the State Governments intent and vision for this Precinct. The proposal will convert and under-utilised part of the SJC site, which was earmarked for redevelopment of a building of this scale. The	

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
		proposal is suitably designed to integrate with the broader precinct, including public domain, pedestrian permeability, open space and green linkages which transform the development site from a temporary at-grade car park to a built form and land use that offices significant social benefits. This is considered to promote the orderly and economic use of land.	
	<i>To protect the environment, including the conservation of threatened and other species of native animals and plants, ecological communities and their habitats</i>	The proposal is located within an established urban context in Camperdown and will have no impact on the conservation of threatened and other species of native animals and plants, ecological communities and their habitats. The BDAR waiver demonstrates the proposal will have no impact on threatened species or their habitats (Appendix T).	
Section 4.15	Relevant environmental planning instruments: <i>Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> <i>NSW Biodiversity Act 2016</i> <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> <i>Environmental Planning Assessment Regulation 2021</i>	See detail below under State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs).	Section 4

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
	<i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021</i> <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021</i> <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021</i> <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021</i> <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Sustainable Buildings) 2022.</i>		
	<u>Draft environmental planning instruments:</u> None relevant to the proposal.	N/A	N/A
	<u>Relevant planning agreement or draft planning agreement</u> No planning agreements relevant to the proposed development	N/A	N/A
	<u>Development control plans:</u> Sydney Development Control Plan 2012	In accordance with Section 2.10 of the Planning Systems SEPP 2021, Development control plans do not apply to State significant development. As such, there is no requirement for assessment of the proposed development against the Sydney DCP 2012 for this SSDA.	N/A

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
	The likely impacts of that development, including environmental impacts on both the natural and built environments, and social and economic impacts in the locality.	The likely impacts of the proposal including the environmental impacts on the natural and built environments, and social and economic impact on the locality are assessed in detail within the EIS.	Section 6
	The suitability of the site for the development	The proposal is consistent with relevant State and local strategic plans and substantially complies with the relevant State and local planning controls. The proposed Concept Envelope responds to the site context. The scale and form of the proposed envelope is consistent with the surrounding built character for taller cluster medical facilities that are in close proximity to smaller scale, significant heritage buildings. A BDAR Waiver granted on 16 June 2025 confirms that the proposed development is not likely to have any significant impact on biodiversity values (Appendix T). The 1% AEP event ranges from 24.2m AHD – 32.5m AHD. The lowest floor level for the development site is 25.5m AHD, which is 300mm above the NGL adjacent to the entrance. The floor levels illustrated within the reference design and factored into the Concept Envelope demonstrate that the design has been future proofed to manage any flood impacts.	Section 7.6

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
		The proposed stormwater management system ensures that WSUD stormwater quality targets are achieved and the OSD system ensures that the minimum site storage requirement and maximum permissible site discharge rates set by Sydney Water are met. The Remediation Action Plan (Appendix W) conclude that subject to proper implementation of the RAP and validation reporting confirming compliance with the RAP, the development site can be made suitable for the development.	
	Any submissions made	Submissions will be considered following exhibition of the application.	N/A
	The public interest	The proposed private hospital and ancillary uses, such as life science, research and lab facilities represents a substantial investment in health and innovation that will improve public health outcomes for the LHD and broader region. The proposed development will foster collaboration with the broader health ecosystem that is emerging within the CHERP, which will benefit the wider population of New South Wales and beyond. The proposed development will provide significant public benefits on the development site. It will facilitate a direct nexus to the public hospital at RPA, including new and upgraded pedestrian	Section 7.7

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
		connections from Missenden Road to Grose Farm Lane, new areas of open space that are strategically positioned to expand on the existing approved areas within the RPA, creating a series of green linkages from the south of the development site into the SJC oval, allowing people to easily move through the precinct and dwell in various environments. The response to the site context, private and public domains will substantially enhance connectivity and ease of movement in the area.	
<i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021</i>			
Part 8, Division 2	Part 8, Division 2 of the EP&A Reg provides that environmental assessment requirements will be issued by the Secretary with respect to the proposed EIS	This EIS has been prepared to address the requirements of Part 8, Division 2 of the EP&A Regulations and SEARs.	SEARs compliance table attached at Appendix A
<i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>			
Section 7.9	Section 7.9 of the BC Act requires preparation of a biodiversity assessment for SSD that is assessed under Part 4 of the EP&A Act. Section 7.9(2) of the BC Act allows for exemption from the requirement where the development is not likely to have any significant impact on biodiversity values.	A waiver under section 7.9(2) of the BC Act was issued by the NSW DPHI on 16 June 2025. Accordingly, a BDAR is not required to be prepared and submitted as part of this SSD application.	Section 6.16 Appendix T

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
Section 7.14	The likely impact of the proposed development on biodiversity values as assessed in the Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR). The Minister for Planning may (but is not required to) further consider under that BC Act the likely impact of the proposed development on biodiversity values.	A BDAR Waiver confirmed that the development is not likely to have any significant impact on biodiversity values.	Appendix T
State Environmental Planning Policies			
<i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021</i>	In accordance with Schedule 1 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021 (Planning Systems SEPP) development that has a capital investment value (CIV) of more than \$30 million for the purpose of hospitals, medical centres and health research facilities is classed as State significant development: <i>14 Hospitals, medical centres and health research facilities</i> <i>(1) Development that has an estimated development cost of more than \$30 million for any of the following purposes—</i> <i>(a) hospitals,</i> <i>(b) medical centres,</i> <i>(c) health, medical or related research facilities (which may also be associated with the facilities or research activities of a NSW local health district board, a University or an independent medical research institute).</i>	The proposed development has a value greater than \$30 million and is for a hospital. Therefore, the proposal is State Significant Development for the purposes of the Planning Systems SEPP.	Appendix G

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
	<i>(2) Subsection (1)(b) does not apply to development on land within the area of the City of Sydney.</i>		
<i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021</i>	Part 2, Division 10 – Health Services Facilities 2.60 Development permitted with consent (1) development for the purpose of health services facility may be carried out by any person with consent on land in a prescribed zone.	The site is zoned “SP2 Infrastructure (Educational Establishments and Health)” – which is identified as a prescribed zone (under clause 2.59). Therefore, the proposed development is permitted with consent. The proposed development is not carried out by or on behalf of public authority and therefore the remaining clauses under the Division 10 are not relevant to this Concept DA.	Section 4.1.2
<i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021 section 4.6(1)</i>	A consent authority must be satisfied that the land is suitable in its contaminated state - or will be suitable, after remediation - for the purpose for which the development is proposed to be carried out.	The Detailed Site Investigation prepared by JK Environments identified contamination risks relating to asbestos, heavy metals and synthetic mineral fibre. The proposal is for a Concept Envelope. The final remediation extent will be established following completion of the demolition of the buildings, to address data gaps and undertake further testing to delineate the extent of contamination. This will be completed prior to commencement of excavation and remediation works. The Remediation Action Plan concludes that subject to proper implementation of the RAP and validation reporting confirming compliance with the	Section 6.10, Appendix W Appendix AA

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
		RAP, the development site can be made suitable for the development.	
<i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Sustainable Buildings) 2022</i>	3.2 Development consent for non-residential development (1) In deciding whether to grant development consent to non-residential development, the consent authority must consider whether the development is designed to enable the following— (a) the minimisation of waste from associated demolition and construction, including by the choice and reuse of building materials, (b) a reduction in peak demand for electricity, including through the use of energy efficient technology, (c) a reduction in the reliance on artificial lighting and mechanical heating and cooling through passive design, (d) the generation and storage of renewable energy, (e) the metering and monitoring of energy consumption, (f) the minimisation of the consumption of potable water.	The proposal is for a Concept Development Application and therefore no detailed design or building works are being approved as part of this application. Notwithstanding, an ESD strategy has been prepared to guide the future development outcome for the development site. The principles will be imbedded into the design excellence strategy and any future detailed design. The development will target a 5 Star Green Star rating. The design team will consider the sustainable design principles based on the following sustainability tool: Green Star Buildings Tool – Green Building council of Australia. The development will be either fossil fuel-free after the occupation of the development commences or transition to be fossil fuel-free by 1 January 2035. The development will be supplied with renewable energy generation and storage infrastructure (minimum 20 kW Solar PV). The design team will provide estimations of annual energy consumption for the building and the	Section 6.14 Appendix Q

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
		volume of emissions relating to energy use in the building. This ESD strategy will be developed further prior to the Stage 2 SSDA lodgement.	
	(2) Development consent must not be granted to non-residential development unless the consent authority is satisfied the embodied emissions attributable to the development have been quantified.	As the proposal is at the concept stage, a preliminary Net Zero pre-assessment based on typical energy consumption profiles for similar healthcare buildings. A full detailed energy assessment is not feasible at this stage and would be prepared as part of a future detailed development stage.	Section 6.14 Appendix Q
	3.4 Other considerations for certain State significant development (1) This section applies to non-residential development that is State significant development specified in State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021, Schedule 1, sections 13–15. (2) In deciding whether to grant development consent to development to which this section applies, the consent authority must consider whether the development will minimise the use of on-site fossil fuels, as part of the goal of achieving net zero emissions in New South Wales by 2050.	The development will be either fossil fuel-free after the occupation of the development commences or transition to be fossil fuel-free by 1 January 2035.	Section 6.14 Appendix Q
Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012			

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
Zone SP2 Infrastructure Zone Objectives	<i>The objectives for the SP2 Infrastructure Zone are:</i> <i>1. Provide for infrastructure related uses.</i> <i>2. Prevent development that is not compatible with or that may detract from the provision of infrastructure.</i>	The proposed development is consistent with the objectives for the SP2 Infrastructure Zone as: - The proposed development is consistent with the purpose on the Land Zoning Map for the RPA Hospital site and the University site. The proposal pertains to a collaborative educational and health research facility which is a use that relates to the key term of the zoning for the site, SP2 Educational Establishment. - The proposed use is a collaborative educational and health research facility which is compatible with the surrounding educational uses within the University site and the hospital functions within the RPA site.	Section 4.1.2
Permissibility	The site is zoned SP2 Educational Establishment in accordance with the Sydney LEP 2012.	Development for the purpose of a hospital is not a form of educational establishment or ancillary to an educational establishment and is therefore prohibited in the SP2 Infrastructure (Educational Establishment) zone under the SLEP 2012. Notwithstanding, under Part 2, Division 10 of the T&I SEPP: The SP2 Infrastructure zone is defined as a prescribed zone (under clause 2.59)	Section 4.1.2

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
		▪ Development for the purpose of health services facilities may be carried out by any person with consent on land in a prescribed zone (under clause 2.60.1) Therefore, the Proposal (development for the purpose of a hospital) is permissible with consent under the T&I SEPP. Hospitals are defined as: <i>hospital</i> <i>means a building or place used for the purpose of providing professional health care services (such as preventative or convalescent care, diagnosis, medical or surgical treatment, psychiatric care or care for people with disabilities, or counselling services provided by health care professionals) to people admitted as in-patients (whether or not out-patients are also cared for or treated there), and includes ancillary facilities for (or that consist of) any of the following</i> <i>(a) day surgery, day procedures or health consulting rooms,</i> <i>(b) accommodation for nurses or other health care workers,</i>	

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
		<i>(c) accommodation for persons receiving health care or for their visitors,</i> <i>(d) shops, kiosks, restaurants or cafes or take away food and drink premises,</i> <i>(e) patient transport facilities, including helipads, ambulance facilities and car parking,</i>	
4.3 Height of Buildings	No maximum permitted building height control applies to the site under the SLEP 2012.	The concept envelope proposes varying building heights: ▪ Three (3) basement levels to a maximum depth of RL 13; ▪ Five (5) storey terraced podium with a maximum height of RL 56.4; ▪ A 10-storey tower, plus roof plant level, with a maximum height of RL 85.5;	N/A
4.4 Floor Space Ratio	No maximum permitted Floor Space Ratio (FSR) control applies to the site under the SLEP 2012.	The reference design prepared for the Concept SSDA includes an approximate GFA of 33,253m ² . Consent for the GFA is not sought as part of this proposal and will be assessed at the detailed DA stage, when a final design has been developed.	N/A
5.10 Heritage Conservation	The site is identified under the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 (SLEP 2012) as a local heritage item (no. 67). The development site is also situated within the “University of Sydney” Heritage Conservation Area, which is listed under	The proposed building envelope is the result of considerable study and review. It has been developed in conjunction with heritage advice, peer review from JPW, and feedback from Heritage NSW (HNSW) and the State Design Review Panel	Section 6.5 Appendix CC

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
	the SLEP 2012 (C5), and is within the curtilage of the State Heritage Register listing for the Sydney University campus (SHR #01974). Further, the development site is located in proximity to the “Admission Block” and “Victoria & Albert Pavilions” of the RPAH to the south of the area, which are listed on the state heritage register (listing numbers 00830 and 00829, respectively).	(SDRP) to mitigate potential impacts to the heritage significance of St John’s College and other items of state and local heritage significance in the vicinity. The concept proposal does not include any physical works to St Johns College. There are no works proposed which would impact the principal buildings or significant, original fabric on the St John College site. The proposed envelope has also been designed to maintain the significant views and vistas established in the St John’s College and RPA Conservation Management Plans (CMP), which is expanded on in Point 5. As such, the elements that make the principal contribution to the heritage significance of St John’s College will be maintained and conserved. The proposed use of the new building as a health facility is commensurate with the established, historic nature of the area as a regionally significant health and education precinct. It is also noted that the current site (Benning Building) was never used in an educational capacity. The Detailed SSDA will incorporate these recommendations and the built form will be developed in consultation with heritage advice to mitigate potential impacts to the established setting of, and key views to, nearby historic buildings including St John’s College and RPA	

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
5.21 Flood Planning	Minimise flood risk to life and property associated with the use of land.	A minor localised afflux of approximately 19 mm and 25 mm is observed between the proposed building and the Charles Perkins Centre, located to the north of the development, for the 1% AEP and 1% AEP climate change scenarios, respectively. This is a localised area adjacent to the development site boundary and is offset by reductions to flood levels immediately adjacent to this area. A very shallow overland flow path associated with all modelled flood events passes between the proposed development and the exiting St Johns College. The modelled flood depth in this area is less than 1 mm, with only minor afflux observed. These impacts are considered negligible and can be readily addressed through detailed design measures, such as good practice local stormwater drainage and external levels design to direct surface flows away from buildings and prevent localised ponding. The existing and post-development flood levels, depths, velocities, and hazard categories (ZAEM1) were assessed and the flood modelling results indicate no difference between the existing and post development scenarios.	Section 6.13 Appendix X
6.21C Design Excellence	Development consent must not be granted to development to which this Division applies unless, in the opinion of the	A Summary of the proposal against Clause 6.21C of the SLEP 2012 is contained below. Detailed	Section 6.1 Appendix I

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
	consent authority, the proposed development exhibits design excellence.	assessment of the proposal against Clause 6.21C of the SLEP 2012 is contained in Appendix I As the proposal is for a concept SSDA, a full assessment is not necessary at this stage, as ultimately it is the design excellence process that establishes whether a design is capable of achieving design excellence and satisfaction of this clause is achieved at the detailed SSDA phase. Notwithstanding, JPW's analysis of the site and its context established the ability to develop the development site specific (and well justified) key design principles that have subsequently informed a revised design approach. A bespoke design strategy has been developed to solve the unique constraints of the development site and the extensive technical requirements of the hospital. This has been brought together through the combined innovation and meaningful vision involving JPW, Bangawarra, Architectus, Aspect Studio and Urbis (Heritage). The collaborative relationship of these firms forms the project design team. The proposed envelope and the reference design present a highly specific response that comprehensively integrates the technical functional requirements of a private hospital through a bespoke and tailored arrangement to conform to an	

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
		envelope that has been shaped by detailed responses to the heritage context and the needs of the adjoining institution. Given consideration to the design principles established through the concept envelope evolution, informed by the various alternatives tested and presented throughout the SDRP processes to-date. As part of the Concept SSDA, it is requested that the DPHI (as the consent authority) and the GANSW grant an exemption to the formal design excellence competition process, as available under clause 6.21D(2) of the SLEP 2012 and instead enable an alternative design excellence process, in accordance with the Design Excellence Strategy (Appendix I) to be undertaken. Our approach to design excellence is through the establishment of a Design Review Panel (DRP), as outlined in the Design Excellence Strategy (Appendix I). The role of the DRP is to facilitate the achievement of design excellence via the detailed Stage 2 DA. A high calibre and experienced design team has been established. The cumulation of the work completed by the design team demonstrates how design excellence could be achieved, through the alternative design excellence process.	

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
7.14 Acid Sulfate Soils	(1) The objective of this clause is to ensure that development does not disturb, expose or drain acid sulfate soils and cause environmental damage. (2) Development consent is required for the carrying out of works described in the Table to this subclause on land shown on the Acid Sulfate Soils Map as being of the class specified for those works. (3) Development consent must not be granted under this clause for the carrying out of works unless an acid sulfate soils management plan has been prepared for the proposed works in accordance with the Acid Sulfate Soils Manual and has been provided to the consent authority. (4) Despite subclause (2), development consent is not required under this clause for the carrying out of works if— (a) a preliminary assessment of the proposed works prepared in accordance with the Acid Sulfate Soils Manual indicates that an acid sulfate soils management plan is not required for the works, and (b) the preliminary assessment has been provided to the consent authority and the consent authority has confirmed the assessment by notice in writing to the person proposing to carry out the works. (5) Despite subclause (2), development consent is not required under this clause for the carrying out of any of the following works by a public authority (including ancillary work	The site is identified on the Acid Sulfate Soils planning maps as containing Class 5 soils. This application is for a Concept SSDA and therefore no physical works are being sought. Matters relating to Acid Sulfate Soils will be addressed at the detailed SSDA phase, where physical works are proposed.	Section 2.1 Appendix V

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
	such as excavation, construction of access ways or the supply of power)— (a) emergency work, being the repair or replacement of the works of the public authority required to be carried out urgently because the works have been damaged, have ceased to function or pose a risk to the environment or to public health and safety, (b) routine maintenance work, being the periodic inspection, cleaning, repair or replacement of the works of the public authority (other than work that involves the disturbance of more than 1 tonne of soil), (c) minor work, being work that costs less than \$20,000 (other than drainage work). (6) Despite subclause (2), development consent is not required under this clause to carry out any works if— (a) the works involve the disturbance of less than 1 tonne of soil, and (b) the works are not likely to lower the watertable		
7.16 Airspace operations	The site is located on land identified on the Sydney Airport Prescribed Obstacle Limitation Surfaces Drawing No FSS6934 Revision 1, Declared by the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development on 20 March 2015 as being located between horizontal surface limits of 80-90 metres (AHD).	The proposal, including its construction cranes, will marginally impact aviation safety in relation to Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Aerodrome. This will require approval from aviation safety and airspace protection authorities/agencies, which will be	Section 6.19 Appendix II

Statutory Reference	Relevant Considerations	Relevance	Section in EIS
		managed by the Project team following development consent.	