

**From:** [noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au](mailto:noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au) on behalf of [Planning Portal - Department of Planning and Environment](#)  
**To:** [PPO Engagement](#)  
**Cc:** [planning.exhibitions@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:planning.exhibitions@planning.nsw.gov.au)  
**Subject:** Webform submission from: Western Sydney Aerotropolis Draft Precinct Plans  
**Date:** Wednesday, 3 March 2021 2:38:54 PM

---

Submitted on Wed, 03/03/2021 - 14:38

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

**Submission Type**

I am making a personal submission

## Name

**First name**

Isaac

**Last name**

Camilleri

**I would like my submission to remain confidential**

Yes

## Info

**Email**

[REDACTED]

**Suburb/Town & Postcode**

2557

**Submission**

Inconsistency between Land Zoning and Precinct Plan

The Precinct Plan provides a vision of large commercial/business buildings and high density residential apartments intersected and bounded by swathes of parklands. Yet under the current land zoning and the proposed precinct plan, his vision will never see fruition.

This is a direct result of the inconsistencies between the land zoning that has been gazette through the State Environmental Planning Policy (Western Sydney Aerotropolis) 2020 and the Draft Aerotropolis Precinct Plan. The SEPP (WSA) 2020 applied land zonings with broad land applications. The draft aerotropolis precinct plan proposed specific land applications, many of which are inconsistent with the SEPP (WSA) 2020.

The SEPP (WSA) 2020 feature five land zones, one of which is an Enterprise Zone. The land use table associated with the Enterprise Zone is considered to be an "open schedule" because the term "any other development not specified in item 2 or 4" is purposely listed with consent in Item 3. Therefore, Recreation Areas such as linear and nature parks are permitted with consent in the Enterprise Zone as it is not listed in Item 4 Prohibited Items. However, this type of use is not consistent with the zone objectives and are considered contrary to the zone. If recreation areas such as linear and nature parks within public ownership are essential to the aerotropolis vision, this issue must be resolved.

The SEPP (WSA) 2020 should be amended to rezone all land earmarked for parks to RE1 Public Recreation Zone. By rezoning future parkland to RE1, it will prohibit future development of the land, which is consistent with the draft precinct plan. Crucially, it provides the mechanism for this parkland city to be realized, through acquisition by the relevant acquisition authority. This acquisition will mean all parkland is under consolidated ownership and within public ownership, allowing for a key vision of the parkland city to be delivered.

**Amalgamation Map**

The precinct plan proposes that lots be consolidated prior to re-development to allow for larger holdings and enhanced planning outcomes.

Amalgamation as envisaged within the precinct plan typically occurs in all growth centre's and re-developments, regardless of it being required by a Precinct Plan or Development Control Plan, due to the reasons highlighted above.

However, his amalgamation plan will unnecessarily influence business decisions and mean re-development of certain sites will be unfeasible as obtaining adjoining lots may not be profitable. Further, the orderly and timely re-development of land is one of the critical underpinnings of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. The orderly development of land can be realized without an amalgamation control as is evident within adjoining growth centres and subdivisions.

**I agree to the above statement**

Yes

## Disclaimer

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, on behalf of **Liverpool City Council**.