

6th January 2021

To whom it may concern

RE: [REDACTED] Adams Rd Luddenham [REDACTED]

We are writing in response to the Draft Aerotropolis Precinct Plan that is on exhibition and depicts land use for properties around the new airport.

With reference to my family's property above we are disappointed to see that our entire property has been designated for "Aboriginal Planting and Management," and struggle to understand how this would be deemed "best use" for the land.

The original 25 acre holding was bought around 1980 by my parents who farmed it and took their produce to Flemington Markets for some two decades before economics made it unviable as a small market garden enterprise. More recently the RMS made a compulsory acquisition of approximately 8 acres for the Northern Rd, Luddenham bypass, leaving 17 acres remaining in our possession. The property was split into two by the bypass and was not granted two separate titles. The intersection with

Adams road is fully signalized and the bypass now open and is designated a “key intersection” as it has a high importance in linking Luddenham with the Aerotropolis. My parents, after some 40 years of living at a quiet rural address, have relocated. The generation of noise from the new Northern Rd stretch is, of course, very high, and their house and land is greatly exposed to constant traffic.

In spite of the upheavals and home relocation my parents have had to make due to the bypass, one could be forgiven for believing that the intersection of two main roads would prove a bright development future for our remaining 17 acres.

With the following attributes, the property lends itself to many of the Agribusiness zoning uses set out in the State Environmental Planning Policy (Western Sydney Aerotropolis) 2020, particularly “related supply chain industries”, “food processing”, and “logistics”, if not highway service-related industries that may be permitted within the Agribusiness definition:

- The sheer proximity of the land by road to the airport means a rapid and efficient connection of people and goods – this is perfectly in line with the government’s vision for “a 30 minute city.”
- The land falls either side of a “key signalized intersection” that links Luddenham Village with the airport – Luddenham is described in the Precinct Plan as intended to become a visitor destination for locals and international travelers and to “have a future on the global stage.”
- The land is high-set, making it well suited to development as it provides easy drainage; where lower lands and waterways would be more obviously suited for parkland and recreational use.
- A long frontage to Adams Rd provides for good development as there is direct driveway access for businesses which can quickly access the signalized intersection and travel in either direction along the Northern Rd. A long frontage along the Northern Road would be less desirable for development as access direct to the Northern Rd obviously complicates traffic management and indeed would most likely lead in only one direction of the Northern Road.
- The land benefits from extremely good sight lines and exposure coming either North or South along the Northern Road which is of course a by-product of good RMS signalized intersection design. This is inherently important for many businesses as traffic is well informed of the business’s location long before reaching the intersection.
- The land is indicated in the Precinct Plan as having “low sensitivity” to Aboriginal Heritage.
- The land has no items or structures of heritage significance.
- The land has no vegetation or woodland.

The Precinct Plan is stated as being used as a blue print for all development applications and will be the plan each development application is judged against. So what then will the future hold for our property if this draft goes ahead? We feel that once finalized there will be little hope of any development application's attempt to argue forward the merits of the property and/or reverse the Precinct Plan's designation of the property as green space. So perhaps we will be faced with one of either two unattractive outcomes - the remainder of our land is again subject to a compulsory acquisition by the State for tree planting or otherwise is left in limbo with no future having been earmarked to remain green. The asset value of the property will have been erased: incredibly difficult to comprehend for an elevated property lying on a signalized intersection so close to the airport.

We acknowledge dedications to Aboriginal Heritage are a part of Australian culture and embrace this as Australians; we also appreciate that the city is to be woven through with parks and greenery to reflect a city of the future within a Parkland setting.

Our issue is not with the objectives of the Precinct Plan and certainly not with any tributes to our indigenous people; our issue is with suitability and best land use appropriation. Our property which lies across a key intersection of the Aerotropolis and owning those features, as outlined above, surely can far better serve the business needs of a smart city than recreation, where lower lands and quieter, less trafficked allotments can better serve this purpose.

Regards

Jason and Ron Camenzuli on behalf of our parents Michael and Jean Camenzuli