



Subject:
Date:

FW: Webform submission from: [webform_submission:source-title]
Monday, 23 March 2020 11:31:50 AM

[Redacted]

Sent: Friday, 13 March 2020 9:58 AM

To: PPO Engagement <engagement@ppo.nsw.gov.au>; [Redacted]

Subject: FW: Webform submission from: [webform_submission:source-title]

[Redacted]

Sent: Thursday, 12 March 2020 7:29 PM

To: DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox [Redacted]

Subject: Webform submission from: [webform_submission:source-title]

Submitted on Thu, 12/03/2020 - 19:17

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type: I am making a personal submission

First Name: [Redacted]

Last Name: [Redacted]

Name Withheld: Yes

Email: [Redacted]

Suburb/Town & Postcode: Luddenham

Submission file:
[Redacted]

Submission: Western Sydney Aerotropolis Planning Package The Western Sydney Planning Partnership As residents of [Redacted] Luddenham for the last 37 years we wish to make the following submission with respect to the Draft Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan and the exhibited Stage 2 Western Sydney Aerotropolis Planning Package. The key points we wish to raise are: 1. Objection to Rezoning Luddenham Village as Agribusiness. a) We strongly urge the Aerotropolis Planning Partnership retains current zoning/use and excise the Luddenham Village footprint from the proposed Agribusiness zone. Our family land makes up part of the footprint of Luddenham village and we live on a house block which was part of this land prior to subdivision. It is bounded by The Northern Road, Adams and Eaton Roads. This land is zoned R2 Low Density Residential with a minimum lot size of 600 sq. metres. It has been zoned as residential land since the town was surveyed and zoning was first introduced. Our family's intention has always been to develop this land into residential housing as demonstrated by a council approved DA which, unfortunately, has lapsed. The land was assessed in January 2020 with the highest and best use

valuation for 66 residential lots. Our family land represents the largest holding of residential land in the Luddenham village footprint, but we are not the only people negatively affected as all residents and owners of other vacant house blocks in Luddenham village will be negatively affected. We understand that re-zoning to Agribusiness for some rural landowners in the area may mean an increase in opportunities and the value for their properties. However, we are very concerned that rezoning the whole of the Luddenham village to Agribusiness will negatively affect the amenity of living in Luddenham village as well as the value of existing premises and vacant residential land alike. We, other owners of vacant residential land, and the current residents of the Luddenham village footprint, stand to lose a great deal of money if Luddenham village zoning is downgraded to Agribusiness.

b) Should re-zoning go ahead the owners of such land, including our family, and the residents of Luddenham village should be eligible for compensation for the reduction in value of rezoning from low density residential land to Agribusiness. Luddenham's proximity to the new airport, business park and other Aerotropolis infrastructure makes it an ideal location for residential options into the future and should be maintained as such.

c) Draft Noise Contours and Residential Land We are concerned that land may be locked out of future development and highest and best use (for example, not being able to be built upon) dependant on the airport noise contours which are yet to be determined and claim the right to residential and other highest and best uses for land in the Luddenham village. We understand the ANEF/ANEC noise contours may change over time and support the following statement in the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan: "Development within the ANEC/ANEF 20 and above contour will adopt appropriate design and construction standards to reduce aircraft noise impacts. In existing residential areas or land approved for development, the ability to construct dwellings will not be removed and renovations to existing houses or minor extensions will still be allowed, subject to appropriate noise mitigation management measures." (Page 44, 5.1.1) with the addition of new housing. If it has been assessed that it is acceptable for existing resident to live inside these zones without any noise mitigation on existing homes, then houses built according to the Australian Standard for aircraft noise abatement should be more than acceptable. As such we wish to see this approach applied to the Luddenham village and the entire R2 zoned village footprint by all levels of government given the noise contours are not finalised. This would give certainty over the next 5+ years to R2 landowners, residents and future purchasers or developers.

2. Historical Buildings and Open Spaces We strongly request the Aerotropolis Planners and Western Sydney Planning Partnership to also excise the heritage buildings and open spaces of the Luddenham village from the proposed Agribusiness zone in order to ensure their continued existence and to maintain the character, amenity and liveability of the village. Luddenham has been in existence for more than 200 years, with much of the village's infrastructure such as the churches, schools, the showground etc having been in existence for more than 150 years. We have three churches with adjoining cemeteries and grounds, two schools, a Progress Hall, a Showground, 3 parks (namely Sales Park on Roots Avenue, Freeburn Park on Blaxland Avenue and a former stock reserve, now a park on Jamison Street). These buildings and open spaces add significantly to the village and its amenity and liveability. The historic buildings and open spaces add to the village's ambience and draw people from surrounding areas, for example, to the Showground for events and Sales Park and oval for sporting activities. We are concerned that the village is under threat from re-zoning to Agribusiness and will disappear in due course, having been zoned out of existence. In summary, our response to the Draft Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan and the exhibited Stage 2 Western Sydney Aerotropolis Planning Package is:

1. that the Luddenham village and the low-density residential lands that makes up the village footprint, should be excised from the Agribusiness zone
2. that the Planning Partnership remain open to the village remaining available for residential development and where this does not occur compensation should be paid to the

affected landowners. 3. that the Luddenham village heritage, public buildings and open spaces also be excised to protect them from Agribusiness zoning now and into the future. This is by no means an exhaustive list of the issues which need to be addressed when an airport is placed in close proximity to residents regardless of zoning. We support all of the residents of this area who are attempting to deal with the negative impact that this will have on the region. In conclusion, we consider Luddenham to be a small but vital village. Our family has lived In Luddenham since the early 1800s, so we have a special connection to it, and it forms a huge part of our identity. Seven generations of our family have lived here, attended the school, churches, showground and played in the Reserve. We have maintained the family land for around 100 years and find we are being placed in the position of having this major asset potentially devalued and restricted in its potential highest and best use. We wish to safeguard the village and our residential land zoning. We strongly recommend to all levels of government that they adopt the underlying premise that no existing landowner should be disadvantaged by virtue of their land being rezoned. For those landowners whose current zoning is of lower order than the proposed rezoning to Agribusiness is advantageous. However, for those landowners in the reverse situation the disadvantage cannot be ignored, is manifestly unfair and needs to be compensated. Yours Sincerely, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Luddenham. 2745

URL: <https://pp.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/draftplans/exhibition/western-sydney-aerotropolis-planning-package>

[REDACTED]

Western Sydney Aerotropolis Planning Package

The Western Sydney Planning Partnership

As residents of [REDACTED] Luddenham for the last 37 years we wish to make the following submission with respect to the Draft Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan and the exhibited Stage 2 Western Sydney Aerotropolis Planning Package.

The key points we wish to raise are:

1. Objection to Rezoning Luddenham Village as Agribusiness.

a) We strongly urge the Aerotropolis Planning Partnership retains current zoning/use and excise the Luddenham Village footprint from the proposed Agribusiness zone.

Our family land makes up part of the footprint of Luddenham village and we live on a house block which was part of this land prior to subdivision. It is bounded by The Northern Road, Adams and Eaton Roads. This land is zoned R2 Low Density Residential with a minimum lot size of 600 sq. metres. It has been zoned as residential land since the town was surveyed and zoning was first introduced. Our family's intention has always been to develop this land into residential housing as demonstrated by a council approved DA which, unfortunately, has lapsed. The land was assessed in January 2020 with the highest and best use valuation for 66 residential lots.

Our family land represents the largest holding of residential land in the Luddenham village footprint, but we are not the only people negatively affected as all residents and owners of other vacant house blocks in Luddenham village will be negatively affected.

We understand that re-zoning to Agribusiness for some rural landowners in the area may mean an increase in opportunities and the value for their properties. However, we are very concerned that rezoning the whole of the Luddenham village to Agribusiness will negatively affect the amenity of living in Luddenham village as well as the value of existing premises and vacant residential land alike. We, other owners of vacant residential land, and the current residents of the Luddenham village footprint, stand to lose a great deal of money if Luddenham village zoning is downgraded to Agribusiness.

b) Should re-zoning go ahead the owners of such land, including our family, and the residents of Luddenham village should be eligible for compensation for the reduction in value of rezoning from low density residential land to Agribusiness. Luddenham's proximity to the new airport, business park and other Aerotropolis infrastructure makes it an ideal location for residential options into the future and should be maintained as such.

c) Draft Noise Contours and Residential Land

We are concerned that land may be locked out of future development and highest and best use (for example, not being able to be built upon) dependant on the airport noise contours which are yet to be determined and claim the right to residential and other highest and best uses for land in the Luddenham village.

We understand the ANEF/ANEC noise contours may change over time and support the following statement in the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan: “Development within the ANEC/ANEF 20 and above contour will adopt appropriate design and construction standards to reduce aircraft noise impacts. In existing residential areas or land approved for development, the ability to construct dwellings will not be removed and renovations to existing houses or minor extensions will still be allowed, subject to appropriate noise mitigation management measures.” (Page 44, 5.1.1) with the addition of new housing. If it has been assessed that it is acceptable for existing resident to live inside these zones without any noise mitigation on existing homes, then houses built according to the Australian Standard for aircraft noise abatement should be more than acceptable.

As such we wish to see this approach applied to the Luddenham village and the entire R2 zoned village footprint by all levels of government given the noise contours are not finalised. This would give certainty over the next 5+ years to R2 landowners, residents and future purchasers or developers.

2. Historical Buildings and Open Spaces

We strongly request the Aerotropolis Planners and Western Sydney Planning Partnership to also excise the heritage buildings and open spaces of the Luddenham village from the proposed Agribusiness zone in order to ensure their continued existence and to maintain the character, amenity and liveability of the village.

Luddenham has been in existence for more than 200 years, with much of the village’s infrastructure such as the churches, schools, the showground etc having been in existence for more than 150 years. We have three churches with adjoining cemeteries and grounds, two schools, a Progress Hall, a Showground, 3 parks (namely Sales Park on Roots Avenue, Freeburn Park on Blaxland Avenue and a former stock reserve, now a park on Jamison Street).

These buildings and open spaces add significantly to the village and its amenity and liveability. The historic buildings and open spaces add to the village’s ambience and draw people from surrounding areas, for example, to the Showground for events and Sales Park and oval for sporting activities.

We are concerned that the village is under threat from re-zoning to Agribusiness and will disappear in due course, having been zoned out of existence.

In summary, our response to the Draft Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plan and the exhibited Stage 2 Western Sydney Aerotropolis Planning Package is:

1. that the Luddenham village and the low-density residential lands that makes up the village footprint, should be excised from the Agribusiness zone
2. that the Planning Partnership remain open to the village remaining available for residential development and where this does not occur compensation should be paid to the affected landowners.
3. that the Luddenham village heritage, public buildings and open spaces also be excised to protect them from Agribusiness zoning now and into the future.

This is by no means an exhaustive list of the issues which need to be addressed when an airport is placed in close proximity to residents regardless of zoning. We support all of the residents of this area who are attempting to deal with the negative impact that this will have on the region.

In conclusion, we consider Luddenham to be a small but vital village. Our family has lived In Luddenham since the early 1800s, so we have a special connection to it, and it forms a huge part of our identity. Seven generations of our family have lived here, attended the school, churches, showground and played in the Reserve. We have maintained the family land for around 100 years and find we are being placed in the position of having this major asset potentially devalued and restricted in its potential highest and best use.

We wish to safeguard the village and our residential land zoning.

We strongly recommend to all levels of government that they adopt the underlying premise that no existing landowner should be disadvantaged by virtue of their land being rezoned. For those landowners whose current zoning is of lower order than the proposed rezoning to Agribusiness is advantageous. However, for those landowners in the reverse situation the disadvantage cannot be ignored, is manifestly unfair and needs to be compensated.

Yours Sincerely,

████████████████████

██████████ Luddenham. 2745