



Liam Frayne
Senior Planning Officer
Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
4 Parramatta Square, 12 Darcy Street
Parramatta NSW 2150

16 October 2025

**Subject: Request for Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) –
Concord Avenue, Victoria Avenue and George Street Concord West – SSD-95341456**

Dear Liam,

Thank you for your referral received 29 September 2025 requesting advice from the Conservation Programs, Heritage and Regulation (CPHR) Group on the Request for SEARs for this State Significant Development (SSD-95341456) located at 7 Concord Avenue, 202 George Street, and 69-73 Victoria Avenue, Concord West.

The proposed development under SSD-95341456 is dependent on a concurrent rezoning to enable high-density residential development. The site is currently zoned E4 General Industrial and R2 Low Density Residential, and the rezoning seeks to amend *Canada Bay Local Environmental Plan 2013* (CBLEP 2013) to:

- rezone the site to R4 High Density Residential
- increase the maximum building height and floor space ratio.

The proposed development represents a significant increase in residential occupancy in the area as it facilitates 1300 dwellings in seven tower buildings. Two previous planning proposals in this area have not proceeded due to the significant flood constraints.

CPHR has reviewed the Scoping Report (Beam Planning, 25 September 2025) and provides comments and recommendations below and at Attachment A.

Flooding

CPHR has reviewed the Powells Creek Flood Study (WMA Water, 20 December 2022) (Flood Study) which is the relevant flood planning document for this area. The site is entirely within the flood planning area identified in the Flood Study.

The site is shown to be flood impacted in floods as frequent as 1 exceedance per year with significant flood depths of 0.5m at 7 Concord Road in a 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) event increasing to 2.14m in the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF). Depths increase towards Homebush Drive as the site falls towards a culvert which passes under Homebush Drive. This culvert is the primary constraint for flood management in this part of the catchment. The site contains flood storage in events exceeding the 2% AEP and becomes a floodway in the PMF event with hazards of H5 in this event. It is considered unlikely that flood mitigation works to the extent necessary to manage flood risks at this location would be feasible. It is likely that the number of

dwellings proposed will require basement carparking. Basement carparking will pose additional design constraints due to overland flooding

The site is classified as 'Flooded Isolated Submerged' in the Flood Study which is the most serious category from an emergency management point of view. The Flood Study has also highlighted that this location is sensitive to sea level rise affecting downstream outlets, climate change induced increase in rainfall and could have flood levels increasing by as much as 700mm in the event of culvert blockage under Homebush Drive. The results of the Flood Study indicate that rezoning of the site would be inconsistent with [Local Planning Directions](#) (DPHI, 1 July 2009) Focus Area 4.1, [Considering flooding in land use planning: guidance and statutory requirements](#) (DPIE, 14 July 2021) and the CBLEP 2013 clauses 5.21 and 5.22.

Given the above, CPHR is of the view that the site is not suitable for high density residential development. However, if the department supports the concurrent rezoning and proposed development, CPHR advises that the SEARs at Attachment A are the minimum study requirements.

Biodiversity

In relation to point 4 of the recommended biodiversity environmental assessment requirements, the minimum information and spatial data requirements are outlined in Tables 24 and 25 of the [Biodiversity Assessment Method 2020 \(BAM\)](#). Other requirements, such as those relating to the BAM Calculator and Biodiversity Offset Assessment Management System, are detailed in the [guides, tools and databases](#) webpage.

Should a waiver to the requirement for a biodiversity development assessment report (BDAR) be sought, it must be clearly demonstrated that the proposed development is not likely to have any significant impact on biodiversity values. Development that requires clearing of native vegetation or additional biodiversity impacts as prescribed by clause 6.1 of the *Biodiversity Conservation Regulation 2017* is likely to require a BDAR. Any request for a BDAR waiver must include the information requirements set out in Tables 1 and 2 of the DPIE guidelines on [How to apply for a biodiversity development assessment report waiver for a Major Project Application](#). The proponent can find further information on the BDAR waiver process on the [Biodiversity development assessment report waiver](#) webpage.

Should you have any queries regarding this matter, please contact Peter Braga, Senior Conservation Planning Officer via peter.braga@environment.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely,



Louisa Clark
**Director, Greater Sydney
Regional Delivery
Conservation Programs, Heritage and Regulation**

CHPR Environmental Assessment Requirements – Concord, Victoria and George St Concord West (SSD-95341456)

Flood Risk Management

1. A suitably qualified consultant should review the information provided in the Powells Creek Flood Study 2022 and provide the following:
 - Demonstrate feasible flood mitigation works which can be installed to reduce flood risk at the location to acceptable levels. To demonstrate 'acceptable levels', refer to [FB01 Understanding and Managing Flood Risk](#) (DPE, 30 June 2023), and [EM01 Support for Emergency Management Planning](#) (DPE, 20 June 2023) which are technical support documents for the [NSW Flood Risk Management Manual](#) (DPE, 30 June 2023). Flood mitigation works must reduce risk to a level which would allow consistency with the [Local Planning Directions](#) (DPHI, 1 July 2009) prior to rezoning. Demonstrate consultation and agreement for required flood mitigation works from relevant agencies such as Transport for NSW, Canada Bay Council and Sydney Water.
 - Proposed flood mitigation works are to be supported by a Flood Impact Risk Assessment (FIRA) developed in accordance with the recommendations of [LU01 Flood risk management guideline](#). The assessment uses the Powells Creek Flood Study 2022 as the base model however this will require updating to include the increased rainfall recommended for near term (2030) as directed by the [Australian Rainfall and Runoff Guidebook Version 4.2](#) (Commonwealth of Australia, 2019) updates. In addition, climate change scenarios should be used for 2050 and 2100 time periods to ensure robustness of measures into the future. The flood mitigation works must not result in adverse off site impacts on public or private property.
 - Sufficient design for flood mitigation works must be provided to ensure that they are feasible and can be funded by the developer.
 - The flood mitigation works should consider the proposed SSD to ensure that the impacts of the SSD can be managed by the proposed infrastructure.
 - Rezoning of the site and the concurrent SSD should not rely on shelter in place strategies and must demonstrate that self-evacuation of residents can occur. It should be noted that this is a flash flood area without warning systems in place.

Water and soils

2. The EIS must map the following features relevant to water and soils including:
 - Acid sulfate soils (Class 1, 2, 3 or 4 on the Acid Sulfate Soil Planning Map).
 - Rivers, streams, wetlands, estuaries (as described in section 4.2 of the BAM).
 - Wetlands as described in section 4.2 of the BAM.
 - Groundwater.
 - Groundwater dependent ecosystems.
 - Proposed intake and discharge locations.
3. The EIS must describe background conditions for any water resource likely to be affected by the development, including:
 - Existing surface and groundwater.
 - Hydrology, including volume, frequency and quality of discharges at proposed intake and discharge locations.
 - Water Quality Objectives (as endorsed by the NSW Government) including groundwater as appropriate that represent the community's uses and values for the receiving waters.

- Indicators and trigger values/criteria for the environmental values identified above in accordance with the ANZECC (2000) Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality and/or local objectives, criteria or targets endorsed by the NSW Government.
- [Risk-based Framework for Considering Waterway Health Outcomes in Strategic Land-use Planning Decisions](#) (OEH and EPA, 8 May 2017)

4. The EIS must assess the impact of the development on hydrology, including:

- Water balance including quantity, quality and source.
- Effects to downstream rivers, wetlands, estuaries, marine waters and floodplain areas.
- Effects to downstream water-dependent fauna and flora including groundwater dependent ecosystems.
- Impacts to natural processes and functions within rivers, wetlands, estuaries and floodplains that affect river system and landscape health such as nutrient flow, aquatic connectivity and access to habitat for spawning and refuge (e.g. river benches).
- Changes to environmental water availability, both regulated/licensed and unregulated/rules-based sources of such water.
- Mitigating effects of proposed stormwater and wastewater management during and after construction on hydrological attributes such as volumes, flow rates, management methods and re-use options.
- Identification of proposed monitoring of hydrological attributes.

Biodiversity

5. Biodiversity impacts related to the proposed development are to be assessed in accordance with section 7.9 of the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* (BC Act), the *Biodiversity Assessment Method 2020* (BAM) and documented in a biodiversity development assessment report (BDAR). The BDAR must include information in the form detailed in the BC Act (section 6.12), *Biodiversity Conservation Regulation 2017* (section 6.8) and BAM, including an assessment of the impacts of the proposal (including an assessment of impacts prescribed by the regulations).
6. The BDAR must document the application of the avoid, minimise and offset framework including assessing all direct, indirect and prescribed impacts in accordance with the BAM.
7. The BDAR is to include assessment of any potential indirect impacts on threatened entities and habitats in Bicentennial Parklands, including from lighting, overshadowing and construction noise.
8. The BDAR must include details of the measures proposed to address the offset obligation as follows:
 - The total number and classes of biodiversity credits required to be retired for the development/project;
 - The number and classes of like-for-like biodiversity credits proposed to be retired;
 - The number and classes of biodiversity credits proposed to be retired in accordance with the variation rules;
 - Any proposal to fund a biodiversity conservation action;
 - Any proposal to conduct ecological rehabilitation (if a mining project);
 - Any proposal to make a payment to the Biodiversity Conservation Fund.

If seeking approval to use the variation rules, the BDAR must contain details of the reasonable steps that have been taken to obtain requisite like-for-like biodiversity credits.
9. The BDAR must be submitted with all spatial data associated with the survey and assessment as per the BAM.

10. The BDAR must be prepared by a person accredited in accordance with the *Accreditation Scheme for the Application of the Biodiversity Assessment Method Order 2017* under section 6.10 of the BC Act.

End of Submission