


[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 18 October 2018 4:30 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: 9552 Western Sydney Aerotropolis Stage 1 Land Use and Infrastructure Implementation Plan: Submission Details for Daniel Healy (comments)
Attachments: 281619_Current Land Zoning for Kemps Creek and South Creek.pdf

 Activity entry made by [REDACTED] for 9552 Western Sydney Aerotropolis Stage 1 Land Use and Infrastructure Implementation Plan

Time Logged: 01m **Class:** General Details **Priority:** Medium **Visibility:** All

----- Forwarded message -----
From: Daniel Healy [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, Sep 24, 2018 at 10:25:07 AM
Subject: Submission Details for Daniel Healy (comments)
To: [REDACTED]

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation:

Agreed to false or misleading information statements: yes

Name: Daniel Healy

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], NSW
[REDACTED]

Content:

PLEASE EXPLAIN!

When reviewing the documentation associated with the Western Sydney Aerotropolis, I can't help but be appalled by the Governments attempt to orchestrate zone changes that benefit developers and other business entities at the expense of current land owners. Under the guise of an "open space network," the proposed zoning changes will set up lots as "Non Urban Land," effectively 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 owner is there is 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 would like an exact response to describe how current land owners will be benefited. Should such a response not be provided, I wish to ask how current land owners will be compensated?

Although a line in the sand has been developed 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. The run through an example, why should a property on one side of the new line be worth in excess of \$10 million, but one on the other only \$1 million. May I ask where is this differential in profit going to end up? Perhaps in the pocket of a developer who needs to procure undervalued land to secure their offsets?

Finally, I ask why the zoning of the current area should not be made consistent (as it is now) and allow those that wish to develop the land pay fair value, and then create the desired "open space network". Why is the cost of such a network to be funded only by a small majority, instead of shared across all those that will benefit from such networks?

Within this submission there are four questions and I shall reiterate them here so as to ensure I get a clear response.

1. What is the tangible benefit to those property land owners who will have their zoning changed from RU4 to Non Rural Land?
2. Why was a 1:10,000 AEP selected, as it seems to serve no other purpose but then providing an excuse to change zones in particular areas.
3. What is the moral ground to allow some properties under the new zoning to make millions of dollars and others to lose money?
4. Why is the zoning not made consistent as it is currently? The local government has seen no reason over the last decades to have an inconsistent zoning, so why the sudden change in approach? And don't use your ambiguous 1:10,000 AEP as the reasoning. As I have pointed out, this value has no grounding in the real world of civil engineering.

I look forward to your timely response.

Kind regards,
Daniel

IP Address: - 101.178.177.146
Submission: Online Submission from Daniel Healy (comments)
https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=281619

Submission for Job: #9552
https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=9552

Site: #0
https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=0


Senior Planning Officer

NSW Department of Planning

P: 
E: 

[Configure your email notification preferences](#)

[NEWS](#) | [WHAT TO](#) | [FORMS & DOCUMENTS](#) | [INFO](#) | [CONTACT](#) | [TOOLS](#)



Address
 28 BRAIKFIELD AVENUE
 KEMPS CREEK NSW 2178
Lot Description
 2DP800072

Frequency Information
 More information

Zoning (LEP)
 More information
 R14 - Primary Production Small Lots (100.0%)

Minimum Lot Size (LEP)
 More information
 A81 - 10 ha (100.0%)

Zoning (LEP)
 More information
 R14 - Primary Production Small Lots (100.0%)

Zoning (LEP)
 B1 - Neighbourhood Centre
 B2 - Local Centre
 B3 - Commercial Core
 B4 - Mixed Use
 B5 - Business Development
 B6 - Enterprise Corridor
 E1 - Natural Parks and Nature Reserves
 E2 - Environmental Conservation
 E3 - Environmental Management