

**From:** noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au on behalf of Planning Portal - Department of Planning and Environment <noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 March 2021 9:09 AM  
**To:** PPO Engagement  
**Cc:** eplanning.exhibitions@planning.nsw.gov.au  
**Subject:** Webform submission from: Western Sydney Aerotropolis Draft Precinct Plans  
**Attachments:** green-space-submission-(002.docx

Submitted on Wed, 10/03/2021 - 09:02

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

**Submission Type**

I am making a personal submission

## Name

**First name**

Peter

**Last name**

Bartolo

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

No

## Info

**Email**

**Suburb/Town & Postcode**

Bringelly 2556

**Submission file**

[green-space-submission-\(002.docx\)](#)

**Submission**

08th March 2021

To whom this may concern

As a resident and home owner of over 30 years I wish to express my dissatisfaction with the currently exhibited WSAP Precinct Plans due to the EXCESSIVE amount of green space and lack of priority given to SAFETY against bird and bat strike on aircraft operations within a conflicting landscape approach to precinct planning.

I question why did the Department of Planning & Environment & Planning Partnership engage Avisure to do a Western Sydney Aerotropolis Draft Wildlife Management Assessment Report and inform Avisure what visions were "not negotiable" in enabling the vision for the Parkland City to be achieved? I feel that safety should always be put first, it would seem a landscape led approach with planning cannot be compatible with safe operations of 24hr airport that meets Government standards or legislation.

The Avisure report suggests that the precinct planning conflicts with airport operation and it is a safety risk to aircraft having so much greenspace in close proximity.

To achieve its "vision" why has the Department of Planning & Planning Partnership not put safety at the forefront of designing an Aerotropolis surrounding a 24hr Airport. The issue of creating vast green tracts of largely unkept green corridors and increasing wetlands has put safety at risk by increasing environments for the existing abundance of bird life and wildlife to remain in the area

to breed and does nothing to detract more bird life & wildlife to the area from surrounding areas like the Blue Mountains & Western Sydney Parklands. It has also increased the risk of fire though out the area with long unmaintained corridors, harbouring long dry grass and a reported increase of 40% tree canopy, on top of the dry eucalyptus trees and other dry scrub & debris adding to more ground fuel and increasing fire risk.

Fifty per cent of my 5 acre property is earmarked as green space, there are more dead gumtrees than living trees due to a virus that effected tall established trees some 10 years ago. These effected trees pose a risk to the safety of property and people with several trees falling usually with high winds not to mention the fire hazard risk. These trees will need to be removed in the near future. Why are these concerns not been considered? How is this fair or even responsible planning?

The second portion of my property marked as greenspace is a 40-meter x 65 meter sand horse arena established 20 years ago, I fail to see how this space meets the criteria of green space, there is nothing green about it. This is a large portion of my land devalued without again consultation or acknowledgement of the property's layout or structure.

The Airport has been 40 years in the making to get to this point of commencement of development and it is now envisaged that the development of the initial precincts will take 30 years to develop.

Is the Department of Planning & Planning Partnership seriously expecting land owners that now find themselves land locked by green zones, through no fault of their own, to be held prisoners on their land, and deprived of their basic freedom right to get on with life taken away from them for an undefined period of time, that this is acceptable planning?

This view has placed a huge strain on me and my family, the uncertainty of not knowing and not being consulted on these issues effects my family's mental health and impacts on my ability to plan our future. Not knowing how, when or where are questions I am often asked by my children, these are questions I am unable able to answer because of the inconsistency in information passed on as a property owner, the unrealistic expectation that the green space devalues my property and the information missing around the government's proposal of acquiring green space zones?

As a single income family of 5, I am a tax and rate payer with a mortgage, I struggle to meet my financial obligations. Land rates have since increased dramatically as I am informed that 50 percent is green space effected and my land value has decreased. I struggle to make sense of the government's decision to fanatically disadvantage me and my family because of "a vision" the government has that may occur in 15yrs time when stage 2 is released. I was informed this at a scheduled department of planning meeting I attended on the 05/03/21, I am less than 1 kilometre away from the airport and I'm expected to wait for another 15 years with half of my property effected by green space, I was told "nothing changes" and that I can continue living at my Bringelly address, plenty has changed and continues to change after living at this property most of my life I believe a more realistic "vision" and expectation should be given to the property owner to transition out of a community that I have been a part of for so many years, how is this even close to reasonable or fair?

My request is simple I would like an individualised assessment of my property and for my entire 5 acres to be zoned without the green space zoning so that 4 Shannon road Bringelly can be acquired in the near future at the existing zone rate with out the green space allocation.

If the government wants to keep the green space on my property, then it should be acquired by the government at the cost of acres not effected by green space within a 5-year time frame. As a property owner of 30 years I am asking for a fair go and an approach that is reasonable and justified. I am not prepared to accept that portions of my property is worth less because a planner has put a green corridor through based on a tree canopy outline.

I am willing to meet for an inspection or discuss my concerns further if required.

Regards

Peter Bartolo

[REDACTED]

**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**.

08<sup>th</sup> March 2021

To whom this may concern

As a resident and home owner of over 30 years I wish to express my dissatisfaction with the currently exhibited WSAP Precinct Plans due to the EXCESSIVE amount of green space and lack of priority given to SAFETY against bird and bat strike on aircraft operations within a conflicting landscape approach to precinct planning.

I question why did the Department of Planning & Environment & Planning Partnership engage Avisure to do a Western Sydney Aerotropolis Draft Wildlife Management Assessment Report and inform Avisure what visions were “not negotiable” in enabling the vision for the Parkland City to be achieved? I feel that safety should always be put first, it would seem a landscape led approach with planning cannot be compatible with safe operations of 24hr airport that meets Government standards or legislation.

The Avisure report suggests that the precinct planning conflicts with airport operation and it is a safety risk to aircraft having so much greenspace in close proximity.

To achieve its “vision” why has the Department of Planning & Planning Partnership not put safety at the forefront of designing an Aerotropolis surrounding a 24hr Airport. The issue of creating vast green tracts of largely unkept green corridors and increasing wetlands has put safety at risk by increasing environments for the existing abundance of bird life and wildlife to remain in the area to breed and does nothing to detract more bird life & wildlife to the area from surrounding areas like the Blue Mountains & Western Sydney Parklands. It has also increased the risk of fire though out the area with long unmaintained corridors, harbouring long dry grass and a reported increase of 40% tree canopy, on top of the dry eucalyptus trees and other dry scrub & debris adding to more ground fuel and increasing fire risk.

Fifty per cent of my 5 acre property is earmarked as green space, there are more dead gumtrees than living trees due to a virus that effected tall established trees some 10 years ago. These effected trees pose a risk to the safety of property and people with several trees falling usually with high winds not to mention the fire hazard risk. These trees will need to be removed in the near future. Why are these concerns not been considered? How is this fair or even responsible planning?

The second portion of my property marked as greenspace is a 40-meter x 65 meter sand horse arena established 20 years ago, I fail to see how this space meets the criteria of green space, there is nothing green about it. This is a large portion of my land de valued without again consultation or acknowledgement of the property’s layout or structure.

It is unacceptable to burden land owners with green space within the mixed use zone, fully knowing developers will approach land owners and negotiate a price based on the those controls, severely impacting land owners.

If developers are going to buy land and develop they make enough money from their sales and it should be their responsibility to provide open space as part of their planning proposal which meets the DOP & PP requirements, which could be done through a VPA arrangement, it should not be the burden of mum & dad land owners by voiding all development potential from their land.

Current exhibited precinct plans are too inconsistent, and in its current form will clearly benefit major developers and cripple land owners saddled with enormous tracts of green space unnecessarily.

The Airport has been 40 years in the making to get to this point of commencement of development and it is now envisaged that the development of the initial precincts will take 30 years to develop.

Is the Department of Planning & Planning Partnership seriously expecting land owners that now find themselves land locked by green zones, through no fault of their own, to be held prisoners on their land, and deprived of their basic freedom right to get on with life taken away from them for an undefined period of time, that this is acceptable planning?

This view has placed a huge strain on me and my family, the uncertainty of not knowing and not being consulted on these issues effects my family's mental health and impacts on my ability to plan our future. Not knowing how, when or where are questions I am often asked by my children, these are questions I am unable able to answer because of the inconsistency in information passed on as a property owner, the unrealistic expectation that the green space devalues my property and the information missing around the government's proposal of acquiring green space zones?

As a single income family of 5, I am a tax and rate payer with a mortgage, I struggle to meet my financial obligations. Land rates have since increased dramatically as I am informed that 50 percent is green space effected and my land value has decreased. I struggle to make sense of the government's decision to fanatically disadvantage me and my family because of "a vision" the government has that may occur in 15yrs time when stage 2 is released. I was informed this at a scheduled department of planning meeting I attended on the 05/03/21, I am less than 1 kilometre away from the airport and I'm expected to wait for another 15 years with half of my property effected by green space, I was told "nothing changes" and that I can continue living at my Bringelly address, plenty has changed and continues to change after living at this property most of my life I believe a more realistic "vision" and expectation should be given to the property owner to transition out of a community that I have been a part of for so many years, how is this even close to reasonable or fair?

My request is simple I would like an individualised assessment of my property and for my entire 5 acres to be zoned without the green space zoning so that 4 Shannon road Bringelly can be acquired in the near future at the existing zone rate with out the green space allocation.

If the government wants to keep the green space on my property, then it should be acquired by the government at the cost of acres not effected by green space within a 5-year time frame. As a property owner of 30 years I am asking for a fair go and an approach that is reasonable and justified. I am not prepared to accept that portions of my property is worth less because a planner has put a green corridor through based on a tree canopy outline.

I am willing to meet for an inspection or discuss my concerns further if required.

Regards

Peter Bartolo

