[redacted]

From: [redacted]

Sent: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]

Submitted on [redacted]
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: [redacted]
Submission file:
Submission: HI my name is [redacted] and I have been living on our property [redacted] for 30 years. We have loved living in Bringelly and have considered this place our home. We were always aware that the airport is coming, and we support the development and infrastructure as it is a great for the economy of Western Sydney. The airport will greatly benefit Liverpool, Penrith, Camden and Campbelltown as well as broader Western Sydney. However, what we do not support the misinformation, lack of transparency from the NSW government in the planning the Western Sydney Aerotropolis. We understand and accept that another airport is coming and were quite thrilled that we would be down the from this huge development until this was exposed… Since these maps have been released my family has been in a state of depression of not knowing where our future lies. I do not agree with the proposal of rezoning the land Environmental/recreational in SCP and leaving it under private ownership. This zone will render that section of our properties worthless. No one would purchase e zone land as it is essentially useless in a developable sense. Is this a tactful way the government trying to retain carbon credits to offset the concrete jungle known as the western Sydney aerotropolis? How is it fair that the residents are caught up in this mess with the stroke of the pen? Is this to achieve more greenspace at the expense of land owners and no expense to the government? We understand that the government needs greenspace for this aerotropolis and we do not oppose that. All we want fairness and equality. If you want the land for park, buy it! It is as simple as that. When we purchased our properties, we paid for every square meter of it. NSW planning has not been forthcoming with the full details with defining the recreational/environmental zone and we would like to make sure that we will be compensated a fair value for the land needed for open space. We are currently zoned RU4 which is small primary lots in Liverpool council. Currently we can place a second dwelling on our property. As long as we meet the DA requirements minimum height for building, distance from fence etc (it would likely be approved theoretically). Once our property is e zoned, we will not be able to build this second dwelling in that area. The planning department reassures us that we have existing land use rights. However, this is misleading because we will not have the same opportunities to use our land to the full potential. RU4 land is far more flexible than a recreation/e zone. Furthermore, how is it that the government are acquiring properties a few doors down in Thompson creek (which has the same flood boundaries as ourselves), but they are saying that they will not be acquiring ours? It is like there are two classes of citizens. Where is the fairness, equality and justice in that? If the government cannot afford to purchase all of south creek due to the huge size of the area. It is our suggestion that the government purchase the south creek space that is directly adjacent to the core (the South Creek land in Kelvin Park Drive). This will allow the developers to masterplan and transition the area in accordance with its surroundings. It will also allow for a more succinct development. Why is the government not using the Rossmore grange (200 acres) first? it is already zoned as RE1 and owned by Liverpool council… Any land required for open spaces/environment/ recreation/green spine should be zoned RE1 and acquired. The creek is heavily polluted with chemicals, cars and rubbish it has not been maintained in the last 30 years of us living on our property. How is it that the government are using outdated flood maps supplied by Liverpool council which have not been updated since 2004? The council and waterboard have

never undertaken any measures/recommendations that were outlined in the 2004 flood study. These old studies are not an accurate measure of the flood risk in the creek. How can they build an aerotropolis without on-site surveys and assessments? I am sure if the creek was cleaned, widened and deepened that the water will flow better and reduce the risk of flood in south creek in Kelvin Park Drive. The plans have outlined that the government would like to plant millions of trees in the western parkland's city. While we think it would look appealing and also benefit the environment overall, it is also a huge risk for bushfires. Attracting leaf litter and debris to high density, highly populated areas is target for ember attack and bushfires. How will this impact on the safety of the people who will live and work in the future area? You only have to look at Australia's bushfires over the 2019-2020 period to see the countrywide devastation and damage. Furthermore, planting these trees will also place the airport at risk of bird and bat strike. Wildlife strikes to aircraft have been responsible for loss of human lives and damage to aircraft worldwide. Most risk minimization strategies involve the airport environment to reduce its attractiveness to hazardous species or undertaking disturbance regimes to frighten wildlife from airport. The Australian Airports Association has outlined that all bird management strategies should seek to reduce the attractiveness of the airport to birds, focusing on food, water and shelter availability. By retaining water in the creek and planting more trees it will attract more species and wildlife to the area. Planting millions of trees within a 5-kilometre radius of a 24 hour international airport (Nancy Bird International Airport at Badgerys Creek) seems counterproductive especially when it impacts on international aviation standards. [redacted]. By placing us in this new environmental zone and not acquiring you land it will now be worthless. How is this possible in this country and how is it fair? If the government requires greenspace/environmental space it must be acquired so that they can move on with their lives. How would you feel and react if you were put in this position? We the residents have rights, we need to ask for a serious investigation here to bring the light to the disgraceful lack of information and transparency. I would like to know what private land ownership actually means in NSW??? I believe this meaning been corroded over time through legislation. We will not stand for this and we deserve better than how we have been treated, we are only asking for fairness. If we continue to face these injustices, we will be initiating proceedings in the Land and Environment Court.

[redacted]