

The Director,
Aerotropolis Activation
Department of Planning

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE:- Final Submission, South Creek Precinct. Rossmore.

Our name is [REDACTED] We reside in Rossmore, (Name and address details noted below however are **not** for publication). In this final submission we are writing in response to the current Western Sydney Aerotropolis Planning Draft 2 and to express the ongoing frustration that access to information that directly affects my future, my son's future and the future of my parents and sister have created massive concerns. Where opportunities were made available to have answers to our individual circumstance, were in fact, not answered, we wish to present these concerns before you to respectfully convey our perspective with what has occurred until this point over the last three years and that we are well aware that these events affect the decisions that are to be finalised in due process.

Firstly, we wish to confirm that we are not against the overall progress for the Aerotropolis. We are however opposed to several key points identified within the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Draft Plan for South Creek Precinct and for Rossmore. We will submit that whilst it is clear a great deal of work and time has been applied to the publishing of the draft itself, the contents lack detailed and accurate up to date research information thus publishing inaccurate material which affects the livelihood of many residents such as family members who reside at our home in Rossmore, future retirement and security. In fact, this is one of the most frustrating factors of this whole process that impacts the future decisions of our family's property.

REZONING OF ROSSMORE. We submit that WSAP draft 2 has not adequately addressed all key and significant components of rezoning for Rossmore and South Creek Precinct - Rossmore.

Rossmore is North of Kelvin Park and Bringelly and part of Aerotropolis future design but is one of the main Suburb with incredible and potential urban growth for revenue raising and employment yet it has been determined that it will not be included as part of the initial precincts. I and my son, mother, and my sister, (my father could not attend due to his deteriorating health expedited by the stress his property value is not developable or sellable stressors and concerns), attended the One-On-One Meeting recently to have our concerns and questions answered. As the only piece of information that could be confirmed at the meeting is that Rossmore will not be developed.

We submit that the Draft although provides significant detail, it provides a false hope as it does not clearly identify that Rossmore is highlighted as Urban land, and as it is not clear and definite, it is only a proposed possible future mapping design. We submit that the WSAP draft does not identify timeframes, for planning, from the one to one meeting as the information received was inconsistent; Rossmore will never be developed, to maybe in 10 years. The dates of when it is likely to be developed were inconsistent and non-committal. We submit that the WSAP draft has relied upon information provided by Liverpool council which is incorrect and outdated.

We note the draft does not identify how it was determined Rossmore should not be zoned as Urban land even as staged legislative land release. We submit that the WSAP and Department

of Planning should reconsider this portion of the WSAP draft and include Rossmore and our property within the initial Precinct zoning as an Urban medium to high to medium density developable land over a staged legislative land release period over 5 to 10 years commencing from December 2020. The WSAP does not provide any detail as to the benefits staged legislative land release that would assist in the development of infrastructure within the Aerotropolis plan itself. Therefore, does not identify it has adequately researched these benefits to the community, government, local, state and Federally.

We submit that a staged legislative land release provides for better planning, assured consideration of the bio-diversity and environmental concerns as our street (not our property itself) supports the South Creek Precinct Environmental Parkland area. Therefore a stage legislative land release should include all or part Rossmore side of South Creek Environmental Parkland with the Urban zoned land.

1. Further benefits which have not been identified and included as part of the WSAP draft:-

a. Zoning Rossmore as Urban High to Medium density land

For instance, development of any kind affords employment opportunity, as seen with the recent RMS and Traffic NSW; State and Local government revenue increases from increased but not limited to land taxes and rates. That this if rolled out over a staged period of time and in accordance to legislative land release notices there are reasonable and fair guarantee developers or changes to environment and land as a whole will include providing for bio-diversity and environmental parkland was given the South Creek Precinct – Environmental / Parkland proposed zones.

- b. We consider ourselves as competent to comprehend the complexity of determining written information such as noted within the WSAP draft, which has been distributed for public comment or at meetings both community and one 2 one. We submit and oppose the WSAP draft identifying Rossmore is proposed to be considered 'low potential growth'. That from responses received from representatives of the WSAP indicates these decisions were made based upon information received from Liverpool Council, old and out of date research which as inadequate and unjustly influenced the WSAP and Department of Environment and Planning. We submit that the sign off of the WSAP draft to not include Rossmore and the Rossmore –South Creek Precinct as part of the Initial Precincts to be rezoned is unjust and based on poorly researched and out of date information.
- c. Had the evidence been adequately presented by Liverpool Council and the WSAP representatives of the calibre of surveys and research completed with appropriate time for Community feedback it may have had a completely different result and more residents supporting the WSAP draft. We find this astonishing more than ever considering that with all the information presented before us at present, this to be in juxtaposition to our own personal experience, the overall view and professional opinion of this area.
- d. **Release of Rossmore as Urban land at a stage legislative land release inclusive of the Environmental / Parkland ensures a staged approached to environmental rebirth, expansion and acquisition of land for those in either precinct is fair, comparable and reasonable to the value of key property in local surrounding and at the time developers are able to effectively purchase land from private owners at a comparative and fair rate to our neighbours within the Aerotropolis Core.**

- e. Meanwhile, suburbs at the furthest fringes of the other side of Rossmore have been released for development and advertised as “Next to the Airport” and Initial Precincts for development. The next point is the One-On-One Meeting. We were hopeful before the meeting that we would have answers to our questions. This did not turn out to be the case, as, we received feedback from those that attended before our family, that do not expect to have any answers, expect conflicting information and there will only be an umbrella representative present, to which we discovered in our own experience there should have been present those from Council, Water Board, Town planner and Roads and Transport present with direct information, knowledge and expertise to answer our questions.
- f. As to the concern of the zoning of our family’s land, to which is connected directly to the above-mentioned factors, any formally deemed zoning conflicts with the stalling of the development of Rossmore, to which we presented this main point at the meeting. These points were factors such as roads that are being built around or through Rossmore and the questions of timeframe for infrastructure to be commenced and completed, such as piping along our roads and development of the South Creek, that should have been implemented years ago but have be stalled as we suspect, due to the continued placing Rossmore on the back burner instead of immediate development.
- g. Furthermore, we submit the WSAP has not considered approximately 200 acres of government-owned land on Ramsay Rd, inline of the South Creek Precinct and of which is appropriate land to be utilised as environmental / parkland and meets the requirement for environment parkland for the Rossmore area with minor pockets included in any development in the future. We submit WSAP cannot exclude this as part of meeting the Environment planning

2. Maximum Probable Flood lines

We oppose the Maximum flood lines as identified for our property is a 95% total property cover. We note the 1:100 flood lines have been drawn back and now affect only 0.8% of our property. We submit that the Maximum Probable flood lines should be removed completely in line with all other properties along the north side of the South Creek Precinct and Rossmore line. These lines are based upon old surveys completed by Liverpool Council; RMS and Transport NSW have approved road expansions of Bringelly Rd through Rossmore, causing the natural waterway to be altered and of whom have failed to complete appropriate environmental and waterway upgrades in over 40 years.

The Recent Rains in The Area and Sydney Catchment Evidence;

Close to 200 mm of rain in some areas and flash flooding, etc. (With massive evacuations and roadblocks), Rossmore / South Creek Precinct did not receive any alerts for evacuations and my street was not cornered off. We noted police vehicles also attended our street late Sunday 9 February 2020 and leaving the road open. We can appreciate the lower end of [REDACTED] and South Creek Precinct both Rossmore and Kelvin park sides were affected by the downpour however as a long term resident (over 48 years) note no upgrades have been conducted by Liverpool Council and Transport NSW, therefore, failing to ensure the local area upkeep is maintained and ensure minimum impact to bio-diversity and the environmental/parkland.

Our property was still accessible to such levels that passer-by and other local residents were given permission to use our property to save their cars from rising waters. Our land and property did not sustain any flooding or damage and submit the WSAP as relied upon poorly designed survey as presented by Liverpool Council to determine [REDACTED] end to end is flood

zoned and or part of the MPF. This is clearly incorrect and should not be included as part of the 1:5 flooding or 1:100-year flood. We note the previous flood was caused by a major local landowner opening personal flood levies spilling high levels of water into South Creek – causing sudden flooding. Survey and decisions to keep our land as 95% PMF is unacceptable and based on inappropriate information. We submit this should be removed and our land turned into Urban land with no MPF.

3. We oppose the WSAP zoning South Creek Precinct to environmental/parkland leaving upgrades and maintenance to be paid by the landowner when this is publicly owned land. We submit that this land should be acquired as a whole prior to rezoning and paid at today's fair and equitable value of land as per the land Acquisition and fair compensation Act and in line with sales of the Aerotropolis value.

4.

In conclusion: -

Progress and planning are important for development which brings about economic growth, employment etc. However, the process has been long, arduous with information shared and delivered to the community has been inconsistent and caused significant unrest and delays that our family and is unable to move forward. The stress of this situation is concerning, as a single mother, the portion of the home that I and my son reside was purpose-built. At my age, should our land not be open to Urban zoning / developable it is highly probably I will require increased government support later in life including nursing home/retirement. Due to the deteriorating health of both parents, decisions need to be made as to the best environment of care. The impact of knowing our land at this stage is not developable land or is to be zone as MPF has increased my stress levels as I have observed the deterioration of the health of my aging parents and is requiring more and more support to manage daily issues and increased doctor's appointment most of which is stressed related to the above mentioned factors.

It was planned that this property was to provide a positive future, and as with many residents, living under this constant uncertainty for their future prospects has taken a great total, including both of my parents. Although this, in turn, is myself and my son's opportunity to be heard, we are a family that have made sacrifices in our lives for a better future. We respect our community and would hope that as part of the community will be respected in return. Therefore, we are hopeful that the concerns voiced in this submission presented to you reflect exactly the situation that is happening to our family and we are sure similarly to other families in Rossmore.

Thank you for considering our submission and hope that in preparing the final draft and zoning the DPP will agree that this submission is reasonable, fair and considers key factors for such a mammoth development and therefore acknowledged by removing the MPF lines on our property permanently and zone our land Urban land with a staged legislative land release.

Yours' sincerely....

Signed:-.....

[Redacted signature area]