

[REDACTED]

From: system@accelo.com on behalf of [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 12 October 2018 12:42 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Submission Details
Attachments: 284539_Letter_ Name Withheld_ 28.09.18.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation:

Agreed to false or misleading information statements:

Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Content:

See attached

IP Address: - 141.243.33.161

Submission: Online Submission from [REDACTED]
https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=284539

Submission for Job: #9552

https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=9552

Site: #0

https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=0

[REDACTED]

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

[REDACTED]
Friday, 28 September 2018 11:00 PM

[REDACTED]
Proposal -Rezoning of RU4 Urban small holdings workable land use to Non-Urban/Environmental Zones -South Creek Precinct Aerotropolis

[REDACTED]

The Director,
Aerotropolis Activation
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY, NSW, 2001

[REDACTED] (sorry for the looong read, but I have to get this out)

[REDACTED]

I would like to raise with you my strong objection to the proposed zoning of the South Creek Precinct.

As you are aware The Department of Planning is proposing that 1,950 Hectares mostly made up of private property currently zoned RU4 small holdings workable land to Non Urban or Restrictive Environmental zones.

This is grossly unfair, as this would clearly devalue our properties, by creating economic sterilised land. (land lock) Non Urban or Environmental Zones are restrictive and would not allow our property to reach its full potential, putting us under serious financial distress.

We have been associated with our property for over 30 years - (it was our parents & we bought it from them about seventeen years ago, when they wanted to retire down the Coast & the land got too much for them to maintain).

I am so disheartened by all of this, I really can't put into words how much stress this has caused my family and I, i have been unable to sleep, since being told about the Departments Proposal for the South Creek Precinct, as this is detrimental to our future to not have our RU4 workable land, being allowed to reach its full potential, that my husband and I have worked really hard for, over the past 35 years for this sole purpose to achieve, that our land would one day be used for development, for our future superannuation.

We didn't know when, or for what, the land would be developed for, but that it was our Superannuation policy, we planned to help our two sons with a deposit to purchase a home in Sydney (which is very hard today), so we can all stay together, and help our parents live a good quality life,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

As you can imagine, the news we got was crushing to say the least to our plans, it made me very angry & distraught, and still does to be honest!

I feel we are being treated with total contempt here, i/we didn't even know the aerotropolis was going to be in Bringelly until a month ago! I have since become aware of Advertisements overseas to try and attract investment to the aerotropolis (OUR LAND) & Forums held for Developers/investors, Chamber of Commerce, politicians etc etc for months, again without any consultation with land owners. It seems deals are being made to developers/investors at our expense & strategies are being put in place to land lock us and get control of our land, this is so wrong on every level– you negotiated with Kingsford Smith Airport to purchase a piece of land (because it could not be acquired!) recently to help with traffic congestion around the airport – but you could not see fit, to contact landowners here and try & negotiate with us, to my knowledge, Why?.

I also feel we are of very close proximity to the airport, and to my knowledge, not noise affected, and it would be a waste of excellent location, proximity & accessibility to not allow our property to reach its potential, as it would be better serviced as an economic benefit to support the airport in being able to create living, employment for the future residents or commuters, helping to decrease the amount of travel congestion we experience today from our Location to the City, be it M5, M7 & M4 increasing peoples stress levels and time away from their family trying to navigate through congested roads.

Green space is important, no body enjoys/appreciates green space, more than us living on the land, because we have chosen to give up & do without services to live on the land & love the trees, animals, family life style rural setting. I feel the area being allocated to the South Creek Precinct is just too vast and Liverpool City Council would struggle to maintain the proposed area to an acceptable level, grass kept down etc, don't forget a lot of the Creek has been untouched. To give you an example, since the RMS started clearing out the waterways opposite our house (on the Camden Council side of Bringelly Road) last summer, we had a brown snake on our verandah mat outside our front door and two black snakes in the front garden, that must have been disturbed during earth works– I can honestly say, hand on heart, I have not seen a snake here on our property before, in over 30 years, (although I am sure they are here) we keep our grass short and yard tidy. Brown snakes have also been a problem down in the New Oran Park Development in one of the children's playing parks, they have managed to get in between the large rocks/boulders which are part of the landscaping for the park, and are causing a threat to children – there are now warning signs up, I am told – this is an example of good intentions not being practical for the environment. The same would be the case here, Council would need to keep the grass short and well maintained and that is all time, money and expense, as I said the Creek has been virtually been untouched and who knows whats in there.

The other issue as I mentioned previously, our land would be seriously devalued by it being zoned Non Urban or Environmental causing it to be economically sterilised, it also would cause defragmentation which is what we are seeing through out Leppington/Austral at the moment, you see pockets of mass housing, with extra noise, people, parking, traffic all that goes with high, medium, low density housing, next to farms that elderly residents just don't want to give up! A good example of this is Kelly Street.

We are not flood affected, but we do have a easement across the rear of our property [REDACTED] when construction of the land was originally developed as Kelvin Park Estate to avoid flooding to our acreage, so as to capture the water that would flow down the hill (undeveloped land). Well it worked, because we have never flooded ever, they were also told that Council was to come back and put culverts through and close up the man made easement, but this never happened as yet! It is our opinion that any issues with flooding, if any, or sustainability can easily be resolved through design & strategies, our property offers proven flood prevention.

Our property [REDACTED] the northern arm extension of Jersey Road (6 lane transit lane to come from Campbelltown station through to Elizabeth Drive in planning to accommodate the airport) [REDACTED] it is also flat and will be very accessible with two street entrances being perfectly positioned on one corner of a new four way intersection, we have a left hand turn bay running across the front of our property to access the future transit lane and an easement at the rear of the acreage, as discussed which as part of any future development could provide easy access for stormwater management for the property.

We have always had town water, [REDACTED], they have put in sewerage, new water pipes, underground power, NBN, gas, all services, which would be no extra cost to the Government for our land to

be developed. Our property is very suitable for development and would be an asset in assisting with economic benefit to the area and help in supporting the airport's success, and the residents living in high density housing and needing employment within the precinct. [REDACTED] zoned years ago RU4 and should, remain zoned the same to achieve maximum benefit for the developing area. We have no Accommodation/Motels, McDonalds, Rashays, KFC, Subway, Red Rooster or the like, just to name a few, available out here for family and friends to gather, for social or business ventures, to work, socialise, relax or just enjoy services close within their work/life/balance concept. The area is screaming for services, especially as more people are moving in through development, even for the construction workers, working on the road upgrades, there is nothing out here – our location offers a great opportunity for visuality, accessibility to bus stops along a future transit lane and along a major upgraded arterial road Bringelly Road with a full four way intersection with lights and pedestrian crossings, and all with walking distance to the Aerotropolis, future rail, parking, parks, housing, businesses all within walking distance to Rail, but once again, needs to be zoned appropriately – not under Non Urban or Environmental because of limiting potential or opportunity for new and innovative concepts.

Surely, there has to be a good sensible outcome/compromise here:

1. The Creek is improved through Engineering & design to significantly lessen impacts along South Creeks entirety (approx. 70 kilometres from the Hawkesbury to Narellan) & the cost absorbed by Developers as they are the ones that will benefit from being able to sell multi storey apartments & office space at premium prices, benefitting from offering views overlooking South Creek & it's park lands.

Which brings me to the point, with the Northern & Bringelly Road Upgrades, Engineers are all over the place here, checking levels for the road to ensure it does not flood, (constructing huge culverts etc right opposite us on the Camden side of Bringelly Road). Why are engineers available for the roads and not the Creek? I feel through design and sustainability a lot can be achieved in overcoming many issues with South Creek, a good start would be to consider catchment areas up near the entrance to South Creek since half of our state is in drought and we have farmers in desperate need of water.

2. Or the land around South Creek be scaled back to 1:100 flood - which is the original information provided to us all from Liverpool City Council when we purchased the land, built our homes and our lives – which would then allow plenty of land to enable public space, parks, cycle paths, water treatment utilities etc & would sit better with 85% of land owners within the precinct, (it is impossible to have a one size fits all) but if more land is required, then government owned land at the back of Kelvin Park should be used, so not to impact so much on private land owners lives & land affected by the 1:100 zone be adequately compensated in relation to the whole Bringelly zone price point, as this is not about throwing anyone under the bus, for betterment of others and all receiving a fair price point for the same suburb Bringelly.

What I am also struggling with is with blanketing/overlay of 1,950 hectares with a proposed Non-Urban or E zones on paper, what then is, the exact “purpose” involving private land ownership, and what assurances do private land owners have that the exact amount of land you are proposing to rezone/acquire will be totally used, for that specified “purpose” being public use, public utilities, cycle pathways, open space etc and the like, and that no excess land/overlay can or will be later amalgamated down the track, to be rezoned & sold off to developers offering premium views over parkland and Creek views etc – which would then become a very different “purpose” for what the land was originally obtained /acquired for from the original land owner, financially benefitting other parties for a then ill defined purpose.

As you can appreciate this is quite a complex issue and as to why I think a blanket zoning cannot work, a clear “purpose”, needs to be defined to all private land owners, when land is to be acquired or rezoned by any Authority, – a paper planned zoning is not enough in this instance, when you are involving so many private land owners lives and futures, clear defined “purpose” for land use must be determined on individually circumstances and exact use of the land must be determined and transparent prior to planning execution.

Sorry for the looooong read in my letter of objection. With great expense to ourselves we have decided to engage an independent Town Planner to give us advise. Once this report is available, we look forward to being able to make an appointment with you, with the Town Planner, to discuss.

Thank you for your time today.

Kind Regards.



Pls do not publish my private details.