

[REDACTED]

From: system@accelo.com on behalf of Mike Healy [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 25 September 2018 2:02 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Submission Details for Mike Healy (comments)
Attachments: 281890_Letter_ Mike Healy_ 24.09.18.pdf

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation:

Agreed to false or misleading information statements:

Name: Mike Healy

Email: [REDACTED]

Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Content:

Please see attached letter from Mr Mike Healy.

IP Address: - 141.243.33.161

Submission: Online Submission from Mike Healy (comments)

https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=281890

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: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 24 September 2018 8:31 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Zoning Proposal at Kemps Creek

To whom it may concern,

Dear Catherine and Brett,

I am one of the owners of [REDACTED]

I am writing to express my absolute disgust regarding the proposed rezoning of many properties along the South Creek precinct to a non urban zoning.

I would like to have clarified in a very clear and thorough way as to how the planning department has arrived at this outrageous proposal.

I have arranged for an engineer to review this State Govt proposal and he is at a loss to explain how the government could possibly have arrived at such a zoning proposal. His initial response has been as follows:

Although a line has been drawn based on an ambiguous 1:10,000 annual exceedance event, I would also like to point out that as a chartered structural engineer I am fully aware that even bridges are designed against a 1:2,000 year event as anything in excess of this is an unusable number in terms of design, this is not justification for new zoning.

When reviewing the documentation associated with the Western Sydney Aerotropolis, I can't help but be appalled by the Government's attempt to orchestrate zone changes that benefit the government, developers and other big business entities at the expense of the current land owners. Under the guise of an "open space network," the proposed zoning changes will set up lots as "Non Urban Land," effectively grossly lowering the value of these lots and making them perfect for future development offsets. The question I have is simple, what benefit to current land owners is there in changing their property zone from a RU4 Primary Production Small Lot (allows for Agriculture; Animal boarding or training establishments; Bed and breakfast accommodation; Building identification signs; Business identification signs; Cemeteries; Community facilities; Crematoria; Dual occupancies; Dwelling houses; Entertainment facilities; Environmental facilities; Environmental protection works; Farm buildings; Farm stay accommodation; Flood mitigation works; Helipads; Home businesses; Home industries; Landscaping material supplies; Places of public worship; Plant nurseries; Recreation areas; Recreation facilities (indoor); Recreation facilities (outdoor); Roads; Roadside stalls; Rural industries; Rural supplies; Rural workers' dwellings; Secondary dwellings; Veterinary hospitals; Water recreation structures) and changing this zone to Non Urban Land (**which does not even allow for a dwelling to be built**).

I have owned my home at the abovementioned address since [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Now it appears that I would not even be allowed to extend my home if this proposed rezoning eventuated. I feel that my whole life has been ripped from under me because of this proposal.

I suspect that the government may be trying to arrange bio diversity offsets to compensate for all the trees that will probably be removed as part of the airport and/or aerotropolis development. My objection is that this should not be arranged in such a way that impoverishes the current land owners. My understanding in relation to new developments is that the developers would arrange for parklands and bio diversity offsets as part of their process of developing and thereby paying for property at their genuine market value so why is the government taking the extraordinary step of financially crucifying many land owners along the South Creek precinct when their land is as valuable and important as the rest of the property being set apart for the aerotropolis.

If a catastrophic event were to happen in the western Sydney basin due to rainfall in the Warragamba catchment area the whole of Penrith would be underwater well before Kemps Creek so why this ludicrous 1:10,000 year event model for Kemps Creek?

Would you please provide me with a timely and exact response to describe how such a rezoning idea was arrived at and how current land owners will be fairly compensated in a manner that would enable us to purchase another small acreage in Kemps Creek should the government go ahead with such a "dezoning" because rezoning our properties to non urban would render our properties as being worth only a fraction of their current market value.

Thank you in advance for your prompt response,

[REDACTED]