

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** system@accelo.com on behalf of [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 31 October 2018 9:35 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Submission Details  
**Attachments:** 291222\_Aerotropolis Letter.PDF

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation:

Agreed to false or misleading information statements: yes

Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Content:  
Submission is attached

IP Address: - 124.169.141.16

Submission: Online Submission from [REDACTED]  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=291222](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=291222)

Submission for Job: #9552  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_job&id=9552](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=9552)

Site: #0  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_site&id=0](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=0)

[Redacted]

system@ccet.com on behalf of [Redacted]

Wednesday, 31 October 2018 9:32 AM

[Redacted]

Submission Date:  
2018-10-31 09:32:00

From:  
Sent:  
To:  
Subject:  
Attachment:

Outdated as Request was

Submitted by a Partner in

Researcher Panel, please

Agreed to this or misleading information statements was

Name: [Redacted]  
Email: [Redacted]

Address:  
[Redacted]

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

Country:  
[Redacted]

IP Address: 124.168.121.10  
Submission Date: 31 October 2018 09:32:00  
[Redacted]

Submission for [Redacted]  
[Redacted]

IP: 124.168.121.10  
[Redacted]

VI

---

Saturday, 27<sup>th</sup> October 2018

The Director,

Aerotropolis Activation

Department of Planning

GPO BOX 38

SYDNEY, NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Re: Submission in response to the Proposed Re-Zoning of South Creek Precinct to Non-Urban**

I am a resident of Kemps Creek since 1989 where I with my wife, purchase our property of 5 acres. We both had a vision to develop this property from vacant land into our beautiful forever dream home. We made several sacrifices over the years working long hours, leaving our young daughter often in the care of family and friends in the hope to earn and pay for our own family paradise. It took close to thirty years before we were able to afford a family holiday. A moment treasured forever. We had a vision our family paradise to be our personal retirement sanctuary in the future.

We raised our two beautiful daughters who also enjoyed the benefit of living in his family paradise together with friends and family. We made many previous family moments with the hope we would make many more.

Since the proposed plans have been released we have experience ongoing stress and sleepless nights. I am suffering from increased blood pressure which requires constant monitoring and medication. I was recently hospitalized and admitted to ICU both at North Shore and Liverpool Hospital for intensive treatment as a result of the increase stress. I am now required to document 3 times per day my blood pressure and carry blood pressure equipment on all my journeys. I am saddened by this situation and having to observe the effects this situation is having on my wife and family. As the key provider to my family this stress and increased illness causes me further pain and anguish, something I felt I would not have to endure at my age in life.

My wife and I have discussed at length , the prospect of the new airport and what the development of the Aerotropolis will bring to this area. As a businessman I can appreciate its value. However, we initially believe it would enable us to secure our retirement both recreationally and more importantly financially without becoming a burden to the system and government support. It now appears from the current proposal we are at considerable risk of being penalized by virtue of the fact we are resident within the South Creek Precinct.

It is our constitutional right to own our land and not be forced out of our home without fair and equitable compensation as per the market value to our neighbors within close proximity such as Hoxton Park and Austral.

Since 1989 neither my wife nor I have witness flooding of our land despite being registered as 1:100 flood zone on one side of my land. In reviewing the map provided by Dept Planning and Environment the new proposed flood lines, appear to exclude properties which have always flooded yet include properties which have never flooded. It is our submission that the flood lines are returned to the original 1:100 boundary as in accordance to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 it appears that the impact of such proposal has not been taken into consideration. Further to this there

---

is no evidence supplied that conveys what alternatives have been considered to address flooding of which some could be resolved by building and design as opposed to encouraging land fragmentation. The South Creek has been identified as the core, 'the most important competent of Aerotropolis.

We are expressly concerned about the impact the proposal has caused to the valuation of our property and that of our neighbors. As a business man I welcome progress and appreciate that need for infrastructure and development as it will bring employment and increase productivity. However, not at an extreme loss to myself and my family. The proposal has deemed the South Creek Precinct as Non-Urban and although it was claimed that the recent Community Forum, this would be removed, I am extremely concerned that there has been no written withdrawal of this zoning. It is especially concerning as South Creek Precinct has been deemed by CEO of Liverpool Council as the "Spine to the South Creek Precinct. We are the most important". If we are the most important how is that alternatives to flooding has not been considered and the real-estate market has slowed significantly.

As we recognise the value of the Aerotropolis, we propose that the flood line return to its original boundary, the term Non-urban is officially and publicly removed from the proposal and any future proposal including any terms that reflect the zoning of the same area but with different description.

We seek to submit that a guarantee is given at the time of acquisition of land we receive fair and equitable compensation to that of our neighbours. I note the Land Acquisition (Just term Compensation) Act 991 is to provide for just compensation, however from my research within the area, there is little to support "Just terms Compensation" has been awarded despite the value of land post acquisition. This concern is further enforced by the newly assented legislation – Western Sydney and Aerotropolis Authority Act 2018 to be gazetted early November 2018. The legislation from my understanding provides an Authoritative body to "secure" land as required. We would like further guarantees should our land be acquired now or in the future, fair and equitable compensation is received prior to any acquisition of land occurs allowing us time to consider our financial options and ample opportunity to relocate our lives and our family paradise.

I refer to comments made in recent week by the Department of Planning and Environment and from the Bringelly presentations, that South Creek Precinct is flagged to become a recreational site and therefore surrounding land is flagged a flood zone, non-urban area. There has been no obvious up keep of South Creek in 40 years. This title must be permanent removed from the re-zoning plans. Had there been such upkeep residents would not experience the type of flash flood which is a rare occurrence. What alternatives have been canvassed to reduce the risk of flood and management of water flow as a catchment area? I understand there are other possibilities however it appears these are not being considered or have been deliberately ignored.

---

I appreciate the importance of the develop and demand to meet targets and timeframes in your role as Director, therefore sincerely thank you for taking the time to consider my submission and concerns. I look forward to receiving a written reply in the very near future.

Regards,

[Redacted signature and contact information]

1. *Chlorophyll a* (Chl a) and *Chlorophyll b* (Chl b) are the primary photosynthetic pigments in green plants. They are responsible for capturing light energy and converting it into chemical energy through the process of photosynthesis. Chl a is the most abundant pigment, while Chl b is present in smaller amounts. Both pigments absorb light most efficiently in the blue and red regions of the visible spectrum.