

# *Paul & Monica Taglioli*

██████████ *Badgerys Creek Rd Bringelly*

*N.S.W. 2556 M: ██████████*

## **Draft Precinct Plan – State Infrastructure Contributions (SIC)**

I feel it needs to be made clear that on review of the exhibited materials, namely the Draft Precinct Plan and the draft contribution plan and framework, one of the crucial concerns that I have as a landowner, and that needs to be reviewed by the Department, is the apparent disconnect between those contributions that landowners would be faced with under the draft contributions framework versus the form and density of development that the draft precinct plan indicates for the site. Both do not align, and there is a crucial need for the Department to reconsider this for the subject site, for in their current form the draft plans do not support the orderly and economically viable unlocking of land.

The NSW Government is highly invested in getting the Aerotropolis, centered around the Federal Government's investment in the airport, off the ground and support the unlocking of priority lands starting with the Aerotropolis Core precinct. The exhibited draft SIC and Precinct plans do not enable this for the reasons set out in this submission.

The Draft Precinct Plan states that mixed use employment and residential development is to be prioritised within 800 metres of the Metro station. Part of the landholding is within this 800m catchment, but no residential development is being permitted. However, in the Draft State Infrastructure Contributions scheme, also on exhibition, *“the Station Precinct charge will apply to land within approximately 1.2 kilometres of the proposed Metro station.”* The result is an additional development levy or burden being applied to the *DRBC landowners* despite no development benefit from the proximity to the proposed Metro. This is neither reasonable nor equitable.

This SIC charge is in addition to the extremely high Local Infrastructure Contributions charges which have been exhibited by Liverpool City Council to be at 6.5% of the cost of carrying out development, which for a site as large as the DRBC Landholding would incur an unreasonably high contribution when combined with the SIC.

Whilst I do not dispute the need for **contributions by developers** for community needs.

As a property owner I feel that this increase will not only deter Developers from looking to purchase in the Aerotropolis but also deter property owners from accepting a less than what would otherwise be deemed a reasonable offer.

This **levy** will be a handbrake, making the development possibly unviable.

It will slow down sales of land for development, as well as potentially making the finished product prohibitively expensive at a time when the economy needs all the support it can get.

Jobs are important **“No Development - No jobs”** as simple as that.

All levels of Government are currently putting unprecedented amounts of taxpayer monies into infrastructure (*Particularly into the Aerotropolis*). This levy along with councils has the potential to slow investment and negate the benefits of this new infrastructure spending.

**State Government** along with Councils are taking a utopian view and have compiled a wish list of amenities and purchases that would in most cases be developed through other mechanism by the developer.

This impost has been applied across all of the Aerotropolis far from the residential areas (where these facilities are most needed).

The **Precinct Draft Plan** (*Parkland aside*) indicates that majority of amenities needed by Government are required in the **Mixed-Use Zone** and I would think it only reasonable that should this levy prevail that the developers of the Mixed-Use Zone pay this levy.

### **Rates and Land Tax are a form of Value Capture:**

Whilst Government and Council sees landowners as the beneficiaries of these rezoning's, I see no mention or factoring in of the increased land taxes and rates payed by the current landowners .

My Rates for this next 12 months have increased by nearly 50% and I expect this will be a continuing trend.

On completion of any new development on my property, Government and Council will continue benefit from increased Land Taxes and Rates.

Where is this money going ?

The NSW State Government is seeking infrastructure contributions and like council are not factoring in the millions of dollars in income that they will be receiving (if not already) in the form of increased Land Taxes from the uplift in property prices.

Government and Council has not included this substantial increase in income (Taxes and Rate Increases) in it's submissions.

Council is seeking an unprecedented increase in developer contributions, while at the same time appearing to have no regard as to the sustainability of these contributions.

As stated at the beginning of this submission I don't dispute the need for contributions.

But at the end of the day they need to be fair, equitable and affordable.

Services and amenities need to be placed where they are needed in residential areas, not in industrial and employment areas where they will have minimal use.

Regards

Paul & Monica Taglioli  
Landowner