



Our reference: InfoStore  
Contact: Natalie Stanowski  
Telephone: 4732 7403

26 February 2021

Sent via: NSW Planning Portal

### **Submission- Draft Western Sydney Aerotropolis Special Infrastructure Contribution**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments in respect to the Draft Western Sydney Aerotropolis Special Infrastructure Contribution (SIC). Council considered a report on this matter at its Ordinary Meeting of 22 February 2021. Please find Council's endorsed submission below:

#### *Relationship between SIC and Local Contributions*

In order to deliver robust, equitable and transparency infrastructure contributions plans for the Aerotropolis and Mamre Road Precinct, the SIC and Council's local contributions plan should be consistent in their land use and planning assumptions and should not seek to deliver the same infrastructure.

Penrith and Liverpool Council, in conjunction with the Western Sydney Planning Partnership (WSPP) are undertaking a comprehensive comparison of the assumptions and deliverables in the draft local contributions plan, precinct plans, SIC and PIC to understand any misalignment between the plans. For example, the SIC makes provision for new and upgrades community facilities. As Council has traditionally played a role in the delivery of community facilities, these facilities have also been accounted for in the draft Aerotropolis Contributions plan.

We note that DPIE has offered their assistance in this important review, and request that the SIC should not be finalised until this work is complete and the outcomes are reviewed and actioned.

#### *Relationship between SIC and PIC*

The recently exhibited Western Sydney Place Infrastructure Compact (PIC) has directly influenced the proposed infrastructure list within the SIC through its assumptions on population and employment growth. Council, in its submission to the PIC, has identified a range of issues with the assumptions used to underscore the outcomes of the PIC. If the foundation of the PIC is incorrect then the infrastructure listed in the SIC may not be suitable to the future needs of the residents and workers.

The comparative analysis, as mentioned earlier, will examine these assumptions. The SIC and PIC should not be finalised until this work is complete and the outcomes are reviewed and actioned. We seek to work collaboratively with both DPIE and the GSC to achieve this.



### *Infrastructure to be delivered*

The SIC does not provide enough detail on the extent of infrastructure it is proposing to fund. The items in the infrastructure list are not detailed with a location, size or capacity. This does not provide Council or the community a clear indication of the exact nature of infrastructure to be delivered and whether this is fit for purpose.

The SIC should provide greater detail regarding the extent of infrastructure under the SIC, whether this is fit for purpose and the proposed timing for delivery.

The SIC should extend to other significant areas of development, outside of the Aerotropolis, such as Greater Penrith to Eastern Creek Precinct (including Orchard Hills) in order to deliver state infrastructure to support these future growth areas.

### *Luddenham Road Upgrade*

An upgrade to Luddenham Road is indicated in the SIC infrastructure list, however there is no detail provided on the extent and location of the upgrade. While the PIC refers to an upgrade to 8km of Luddenham Road, confirmation is sought whether this is reflected in the SIC and includes the full length of Luddenham Road, particularly a small section of road that is outside the extent of the SIC boundaries between the Sydney Water Pipeline and Mamre Road.

### *Implications for Sydney Science Park*

Council has entered into a VPA with Sydney Science Park, which includes a number of upgrade works to Luddenham Road as a result of the rezoning of the site in 2016. The SIC also proposes an upgrade to Luddenham Road. There is concern that this may impact the works in the VPA. Council should be consulted in respect to the implications of the SIC infrastructure on the existing obligations of this VPA.

Additionally, a state VPA has already been struck between Sydney Science Park and the State Government. We seek to understand the applicability of the existing State VPA on the SIC for this precinct.

### *Strategic biodiversity certified land*

The SIC has particular requirements regarding the payment of monetary contributions towards biodiversity offsets for the Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan. This is supported in principle; however further information is sought regarding how the monetary contributions are to be allocated. Will the SIC funds be used for land acquisition purposes or just for offsets? Is there a planned relationship between the blue/green grid and Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan?

### *Relationship between SIC, WSEA & Draft Mamre Road DCP*

The SIC is proposed to apply to the Mamre Road Precinct within the Western Sydney Employment Area (WSEA). It is noted that the final Development Control Plan, include road network has yet to be completed. The SIC should not be made until the DCP is finalised, to ensure that the SIC supports the infrastructure needs of this precinct.



### *Funding infrastructure gaps*

The cost of the identified infrastructure of the SIC, for the majority of items, will not be covered entirely by the SIC. This does not provide certainty in respect to the deliverability of this infrastructure. We raise concern that the additional funding of these items will be left to future business cases, an unsatisfactory outcome for such an important city shaping precinct. We seek to further work with State and Federal government to ensure that all infrastructure required to deliver the Aerotropolis can be funded, identify responsibilities and mechanisms for this.

### *Ongoing management of certain infrastructure*

The SIC does not provide any detail of future ownership and ongoing maintenance of funded infrastructure items. Because of the unknown location of many of the items, it is unclear whether Council could end up with ownership of certain assets. This should be clearly identified by DPIE.

### *Clarity of land versus works costs*

The SIC does not provide a clear separation of costs land costs and works costs for infrastructure items. Transparency in these costs is critical, particularly as land costs are likely to increase as development increases and may have future implications on the ability to fund infrastructure.

### *Interim development and application of SIC*

A number of development applications have already been lodged and/or determined within the SIC boundary area, predominately in the Mamre Road Precinct. These have been lodged ahead of the finalisation of this SIC. We seek assurance that there is a consistent application of charges for development applications across the precinct and that there is no shortfall in SIC funding.

We look forward to working with DPIE on reconciling the infrastructure requirements for the Aerotropolis. If you have any questions about this matter, please contact [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]