

**Western Sydney Aerotropolis  
Community Consultative Committee**

**Meeting No: 3**

**Date:** 8 November 2021

6pm – 8pm

**Venue:** Zoom

<b>Attendees</b>	
<p><b>Community members</b></p> <p>Sam Aloï Helen Anderson Paul Buhac Gabriella Condello Rob Heffernan Joe Herceg Carleen Markuse Roger Moss Ross Murphy Paul Taglioli Sascha Vukmirica Diana Vukovic Wayne Willmington</p>	<p><b>Independent Chair</b></p> <p>Professor Roberta Ryan, Independent Community Commissioner</p> <p><b>Minute taker</b> Sophie Alais</p> <p><b>Apologies</b> Kate Robinson – Office of the Community Commissioner</p>
<p><b>Non-community members</b></p> <p>Alison Morgan, Western Parkland City Authority</p> <p>Natasha Borgia, City Planning Manager, Penrith City Council</p> <p>Catherine Van Laeren, Executive Director, Western Parkland City, Department of Planning, Industry and Environment</p> <p>Lina Kakish, A/Manager City Planning, Liverpool City Council</p> <p>Justine Kinch, City Director for Western Sydney Parkland, Transport for New South Wales</p>	
<p><b>Apologies:</b> No apologies.</p>	

Item	Description	Action
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome</b>	
	<p>RR welcomes everyone to the meeting. RR notes that Kate Robinson is on leave. RR introduces tonight's minute taker, Sophie Alais.</p> <p>RR introduces JK from Transport for New South Wales (TfNSW).</p> <p>JK introduces herself as the City Director for Western Sydney Parkland for TfNSW. JK is a landscape architect by training and has worked in infrastructure for most of her career.</p> <p>RR introduces AM from the Western Sydney Parkland Authority.</p> <p>AM introduces herself. AM says she had been involved in Western Sydney for many years as part of the NSW Government. AM has spent the last 20 months working in disaster recovery after the Black Summer bushfires and then in flood recovery for the agency now known as Resilience NSW. Now, AM is back with City Deal and Western Sydney Parkland.</p>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	
	No apologies.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Last meeting's minutes – matters arising</b>	
	RR apologises for not distributing last meeting's minutes before today's meeting.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Transport – Justine Kinch</b>	
	<p>JK says in her presentation she'll be responding to questions sent to her by RR.</p> <p>JK shares her screen to show a diagram – Western Sydney Aerotropolis plan from DPIE (State Environmental Planning Policy (Western Sydney Aerotropolis) 2020 Transport Corridors Map) JK says the red/orange/yellow lines show the M12 as it connects to the M7 and the airport. Tenders have closed for construction (west and Central sections) and those tenders will be assessed between now and next year. Many members may have seen the place of design (PDLP) which is on exhibition. It shows a strong connection to country scene using Indigenous artwork. TfNSW has received an unsolicited proposal for the eastern end of the project which will be considered.</p>	

	<p>PT asks about Badgerys's Creek Road – the diagram shows nothing but it will be the access to Bradfield City.</p> <p>JK says the roads in blue currently have no timing or plans on delivery which will be developed with DPIE. Badgerys Creek Road will become the entry to the Aerotropolis and will function as a 40m road corridor. There is more detail in the SEPP as each cross section is covered in detail.</p> <p>PT notes that a roundabout has been built, presumably to ensure orderly access to the old air force base where Bradfield City will be built. Allegedly will be building next year.</p> <p>JK says there is no timing on those roads. JK is not sure about the roundabout and assumes it separate.</p> <p>JK says that all roads in blue, JK does not know if they are local, regional, or state roads. JK says that new roads have to be married to where the growth will be coming from and the type of development adjoining the roads, and this needs to be coordinated with developers, water and electricity/services. JK says there is currently no timing on these roads.</p> <p>JK gives a brief update on Elizabeth Drive and says that currently in it is in planning phases - no funding for delivery yet. Community consultation has finished on the strategic designs.</p> <p>RM says that something needs to be done regarding the traffic on Devonshire and Western Road. RM says given the amount of building and truck use of the road has made the road dangerous, a fatality waiting to happen. RM has reported it to the council traffic authority, but council says it is a state road.</p> <p>JK says she will follow up on this issue, and states that TfNSW are aware of this issue (with respect to Elizabeth Drive)</p> <p>GC says that when residents see the blue line on the diagram and see that it has no planning or funding yet, they get worried. GC says residents see the lines coming through their properties, and it does not help residents manage their anxieties. GC says that some those roads will not be touched for 15 – 20 years.</p>	<p>JK to follow up on the dangerous traffic on Devonshire and Western Roads.</p> <p>JK will follow up on other queries raised by GC.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>GC also notes that the roads are very dangerous and that they are a disaster waiting to happen. GC says at night, the roads are used from drag racing. GC would appreciate that more work be done on this issue and asks for a more definitive response.</p> <p>JK says thank you for raising the safety issue. JK notes that it was not something she was aware of but part of her role is to understand the 'here and now' like the immediate needs of the community. JK also appreciates that new projects bring in additional traffic into these areas. JK will come back to RR regarding the safety issue. JK says that ultimate road alignment will still have to be worked through.</p> <p>PT says the problem is that the traffic has already arrived, and this is just the beginning of the project. PT notes that traffic is thick so that entering and exiting the roads is dangerous, and that there was a traffic accident two months ago.</p> <p>SA asks JK why designing the new roads takes so long. SA says it is frustrating to just see a line on the map. SA says he is not complaining specifically to JK but says that government takes a long time.</p> <p>JK says that they are building a new city but also integrating existing communities. JK says in the planning process it is important to understand where the developments will be and where these roads will be best served, which probably contributes to the amount of time it takes to plan them.</p> <p>JK says that funding is another issue. JK says the government has to collect the contributions from the developers plus funding from state and federal governments.</p> <p>GC says if you are a local in the area, you know not to pull up at the end of the road because there may be an accident. Western Road and Devonshire Road are dangerous and should be a priority. GC thinks these roads need new infrastructure like roundabouts or new traffic lights to improve traffic conditions.</p> <p>JK says thank you and says she will bring these issues back to her team.</p> <p>DV asks when 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue will be funded. DV thought it was the responsibility of Liverpool Council.</p>	<p>JK to get back to the CCC regarding safety issues.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>JK says she will take the question on notice because she does not know the timing or the funding.</p> <p>LK says she can answer that question after JK has finished.</p> <p>JK updates the CCC on the proposed metro line from St. Marys to the airport. There will be two stations in the airport, then on to the Aerotropolis. There is a corridor gazetted between the Aerotropolis and Leppington. It is unknown at this stage whether the metro will run underground or overground.</p> <p>JK also updates the group on the rapid bus route. Three routes have come out of the city deal, connecting the airport to Penrith, Campbelltown and Liverpool. TfNSW also have looked at Blacktown and Paramatta. Transport is waiting for Government to make a decision on the routes.</p> <p>RR asks about the OSO corridor gazettal.</p> <p>JK says there is nothing on the timing of the gazettal. JK shows new map. Stage 2 down south now have a preferred corridor. The blue line is the OSO, comes round Camden to Appin. Another route is being investigated into the Illawarra. JK will follow up on the gazettal for RR.</p> <p>RR thanks JK and notes that the wide corridor gazettal has been there for some time and continues to cause landowners uncertainty.</p> <p>RR thanks JK for joining the meeting at short notice and for answering the member's questions.</p> <p>LK updates the group on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, as promised earlier in the minutes. LK says that TfNSW are considering Liverpool City Council's lobbying to turn 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue into a classified road in control of TfNSW. LK says the latest update is that they are making applications for classifying the road so they can submit a design. LK told that it will be a few months away. LK says she will keep the group up to date in meetings.</p> <p>DV asks what is happening with Western Road, a council road. DV says the road is in a bad state, right up to the cemetery due to Sydney Water installing water infrastructure.</p>	<p>JK to follow up on OSO corridor gazettal for RR</p> <p>LK to look into planned works for Western Road, after Sydney Water infrastructure installation.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>LK said that there should be a plan in place to repair the road after Sydney Water installs infrastructure. LK will investigate for DV.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<b>DPIE - CVL</b>	
	<p>CVL informs the group that the exhibition for the amendment to the SEPP closed on Friday. Currently analysing the submissions, so CVL will inform the group of the high-level issues raised to show the group where DPIE is heading.</p> <p>DPIE received around 300 submissions, a good number. 250 of these submissions were classified as responses to the EIE. 40 submissions were considered out of area where submissions were not responding to the issues on exhibition but raising other issues such as Horsley Park (which is a different process – steering committee looking at future plans). A response will be provided to these landowners but will not result in an amendment to the SEPP.</p> <p>Regarding the EIE, the response to the roll back of the E&amp;R zone for the non-initial precincts was positive, so CVL will recommend this amendment to the SEPP to the Minister.</p> <p>Regarding submissions of the stormwater land noted for acquisition, submissions stated it was too much and in the wrong place. CVL says DPIE are focusing on getting the message across that they are taking an environmental approach, rather than concrete drains as we might have seen before, so it will respond to the topography of the area. Some submissions were site specific such as a map error or in the wrong location. These submissions will be reviewed prior to the finalisation of the plans</p> <p>In general, CVL says that the concepts for the stormwater will be the same, and we will have to look at specific concerns.</p> <p>CVL says there is support for the reduction of the open space network. Those against were mostly from outside the Aerotropolis. Still looking at individual issues, but open space has been reduced by over 40 percent.</p> <p>CVL says a fair few letters regarding the potential transfer of FSR (floor space ratio), to add value to the E&amp;R land and that currently DPIE is working through this and the implications. CVL taking feedback on board.</p>	

	<p>CVL says that acquisition and valuation is still a concern, DPIE will continue to work with the Valuer General (hereafter referred to as VG). This is an ongoing governance issue.</p> <p>CVL says the submissions contained requests for land to be rezoned from enterprise to mixed use. CVL says there is no proposal for this on the table and they are not looking at it. To change zones, means it must be exhibited. CVL says they are taking a cautious approach as requested by Liverpool Council to residential development near the airport.</p> <p>CVL says there were submissions regarding the timing of potential development in Kemps Creek and Rossmore and Dwyer Road and request to make them initial precincts. There is no proposal on the table to bring forward the rezoning of these precincts CVL says they have to look at what is the trigger, cannot predict it. Ie these precincts will remain non-initial precincts.</p> <p>CVL says the above are the main issues. Work on the development control plan (DCP) will continue into the next year.</p> <p>CVL says they are looking at environmental targets like tree canopies. There is a need to work through the implications of these as well.</p> <p>Regarding Luddenham, CVL says there were 31 submissions. The general consensus from the October 20 and 21 workshops is that there is community support for the growth scenario. At the same time, the discussion paper was on exhibition consultation was undertaken with government agencies. CVL says that not all agencies are aligned with the community's feeling so there is a need to do more work on Luddenham. CVL says currently they are working on the issues raised by the agencies.</p> <p>RR asks LK and NB why the council submission were not included in the bundle sent to her.</p> <p>NB says that Penrith Council has submitted a draft proposal which reached the Department on Friday 5<sup>th</sup> November. It will get endorsed by the 22<sup>nd</sup>. It will not be too different. NB can send it to RR.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>RR says she is interested on behalf of the community. Community should know the council's view given that there is an election of December 4<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>LK says that Liverpool City Council is putting together the submission, pending its finalisation with the Director. The latest timeframe is Wednesday.</p> <p>NB says Penrith Council's submission will go public on November 22<sup>nd</sup>.</p> <p>LK says that Liverpool City Council's submission has to go to council first, then it will go to the public. The council's meeting is November 24<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>RR asks that NB and LK email her the councils' submission because, generally speaking, council websites can be difficult to navigate.</p> <p>NB says that Penrith's submission identified that need to have a funding stream to make infrastructure.</p> <p>Next, CVL says she will talk to the precinct plans (hereafter referred to as PP). CVL says there were many submissions about the PPs, so members can expect the PPs to be simplified. The old PPs had too much background information and were too complex. Now, the PPs are more to the point.</p> <p>CVL says that some controls e.g., maps that required the consolidation of land had raised concerns with people. Maybe that there is a minimum size of lots where it interreacts with other controls, i.e., requirements for deep soil planting. Focusing on those important controls.</p> <p>CVL says there is also a focus on job creation and a environmentally friendly city. In the PP rather than the SEPP, there is also responses to the FSR if integrated. This is a response to the submissions.</p> <p>CVL also talks about the street layout – it will be a more indicative layout. Important to guarantee connectivity as developers will deliver roads as part of the development. CVL says the days of Radburn style designs (i.e., lots of cul de sacs, no through roads) are gone. The aerotropolis will be an adapted grid pattern aligned with the boundaries.</p>	
--	--	--



	<p>CVL says that at the end of the year, the Finalisation Report will be released. This outlines what has been delivered and why. CVL says it is a technical report and it's a requirement to show that DPIE has considered everything. A finalisation report is done in every situation with a SEPP. It explains why we did or did not change something.</p> <p>CVL also says that an amended SEPP will also be released as well as the Masterplan Guidelines which are still being worked on. The Masterplan Guidelines are not exhibited.</p> <p>CVL says still working with VG and acquisitions.</p> <p>RR asks the group for questions for CVL. RR says the aim is to provide the most forward information to the group.</p> <p>DV asks about the overlay in SP2. Will the zoning be kept as is when Sydney Water apply to the land.</p> <p>CVL says the EIE makes a commitment to the overlay. The overlay will be implemented when the SEPP is agreed to. When there are specific problems then DPIE will have a close look at the acquisition and how it aligns.</p> <p>CVL clarifies that she does not personally sign off on the SEPP but instead she makes a recommendation to the Minister. CVL says she will recommend to the Minister that it is be an overlay not a SP2.</p> <p>DV says thank you very much.</p> <p>RR says she is asking the storm water authority for a fix on timing. Then RR will get staging information. RR says this is always subject to how quickly the precinct is developed.</p> <p>SA says that CVL mentioned the roll back of the E + R land in Kemps Creek. Will it be an E + R zone sometime in the future?</p> <p>CVL says it is a possibility that it will happen – it is not possible to say what will happen this far into the future.</p> <p>SA says that E + R sterilised land in the future anyway. People just want to know where they stand, like do they stay or do they go now.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>CVL says there are no guarantees on what it will look like. Landowners have different positions on the flood line, the current boundary reflective of the adopted one in one-hundred-year levels. Investigation of options for the creation of value for the E and R zone is being undertaken. Rossmore and Kemp Creek can take advantage of the knowledge gained by the implementation in other areas of the Aerotropolis.</p> <p>SA says if the creek changes, then the one in one hundred year flood line would not matter. SA says that Liverpool City Council has never cleaned the creek.</p> <p>CVL says the plans do not change the creek that much.</p> <p>SA ask why no one talks to the residents about what they need to do. SA asks why the creek cannot be clean up and become a lovely walkway.</p> <p>RR says she appreciates SA's points.</p> <p>GC asks for clarification on why the Master Guidelines will not be public.</p> <p>CVL says that the Master Guidelines will be released publicly, but would not be exhibited for comment. Master Guidelines are a procedural guideline. So, someone will write to DPIE and say that they want to develop a particular area, and they will be told yes or no. If it is an area that can be considered, then they will be issued requirements for the proponents similar to State Significant Development. There will be the technical assurance committee to provide advice from the government departments as the plan is developed. Then it will be submitted to DPIE. Then there is an assessment process. Then it will go to the Minister. CVL says the above is a fly over description, the guidelines would describe that process.</p> <p>GC says that like SA, council has told her that do not own the creek. GC asks if it can be tabled in early 2022 that there is more dialogue about whether the landowners are responsible for cleaning up the creek up until the invisible fence in the middle. Then landowners will be able to work collaboratively with the department and council. GC says it does not seem strategic to work on one side and not the other side. GC says lets fix it collaboratively.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>RR says that she has written to Liverpool City Council for answers and asked for clarification on this issue. RR will share the information when she can.</p> <p>GC thanks RR and CVL. GC says that the last meeting was well structured.</p> <p>WW says that CVL mentioned agency concerns with the Luddenham plan for scenario 4, growth.</p> <p>CVL says that DPIE does need to consider the agency concerns and work through what was raised, though it has only been a few days since submission closed. CVL is not saying that Scenario 4 has been thrown out but there still needs to be more work. Important to work with the community but still thinking it through. CVL says the aim was to deliver by the end of the year, but it may take longer. The agencies did throw up some issues that were not expected but it is important to find a middle path. The Luddenham plan may have to be exhibited.</p> <p>JH asks if the E + R rules could be applied on the SP2 and the open space network. So, still have green space but have it more as an overlay not as zoning.</p> <p>CVL says it is important to look at the objectives of the controls. FSR is about controlling the bulk of buildings. Now, they are carefully looking at the mechanisms for E + R. CVL says using E + R rules over open space is not a solution that would work across the Aerotropolis, it is only stipulated in mixed-use. Otherwise it may result in unforeseen outcomes on the ground.</p> <p>SA asks how long it takes DPIE to get back to the developers?</p> <p>CVL says she is meeting with big landowners tomorrow who will be developing concerning the master plan guidelines. We want to encourage the use of masterplans as they can delivery good outcomes. One of challenges is to identify for developers the advantages of master planning to encourage them to use this planning pathway.</p> <p>CM has questions for CVL. CM requests clear clarification on the proposed reform of Infrastructure Contributions, in particular “Land Value Contributions” proposed to come into effect 1/7/2022. RR previously told CM that she did not think it applied to the Aerotropolis, however, there is a lot of</p>	<p>RR to share information from Liverpool City Council regarding the creek – if she is able.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>questions uncertainty within the Community, due to DPIE's advertisements on FB asking for feedback. CM says it is acknowledged that the NSW Government has accepted the Productivity Commissions 29 recommendations and it is being proposed that the Land Value Contributions is to replace the 7.11 Contributions. So, CM's questions are: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will this affect Landowners within the Stage 1 initial land release?</li> <li>2. Part of the recommendations is that Councils can review building contribution agreements every three years, can the changes, if successful, be applied in retrospect as part of the transition?</li> </ol> <p>CVL takes the question on notice.</p> <p>RR asks for AM's update from the Authority.</p> <p>AM says the Authority is mostly concentrating on supporting CVL's work on the exhibition and engagement process which is a key priority. The Authority is also working with other agencies on questions like the storm water authority as well as more broader questions on the approach to land acquisitions.</p> <p>AM says there is now significant planning on the Bradfield centre and confirmed that 114 hectares of Commonwealth owned land at North Bringelly was formally transferred to the NSW Government (held by the WPCA) in September. This will form the future Bradfield City Centre.</p> <p>AM says the Authority is also moving ahead in the digital space as part of the Western Sydney City Deal, there are two pilots now funded and underway across council areas: the Smart Kerbs project and the Digital Twin Augmentation project. .</p> <p>AM says they have finished the Strategic Business Case for the Vocational Education &amp; Training (VET) facility in the Aerotropolis was endorsed by the NSW Government in August clinic and the TAFE facility. Construction expected to begin in 2023.</p> <p>Yesterday, there was an announcement in the media about a project in Campbelltown to commence the business case process for a new South West Sydney Community and</p>	<p>CVL to take CM's questions on notice.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Justice Hub. This will provide a Federal and State court precinct with government and non-government facilities in training new skills, support and legal advice amongst other the things as a way to better integrate services around the justice system.</p> <p>RR asks about the consultation for the new building in the Bradfield City Centre.</p> <p>RR asks about the consultation for the new building.</p> <p>AM says she does not have the numbers to hand but everyone is very pleased. AM has not seen a summary on the issues.</p> <p>LK updates the group on Martin Road. LK says that the Infrastructure and Environment Directorate is carrying out field investigation to be used in the identification of future improvement works. So there is no current road works along Martin Road. However, Martin Road is one of the possible north-south roads that could be upgraded in future as part of a proposed Eastern Ring Road, east of the airport.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Community update - RR</b>	
	<p>RR says she wants to take this opportunity to signal about a few things. There needs to be a conversation soon about how to engage on the outcomes of the PP and the finalisation of the SEPP. There are still some government restrictions on face-to-face gatherings, but RR hopes to have a community drop-in session late in December. RR says there are issues with the timing – plans will be finalised, the Minister signs off on them, and it goes to Cabinet. RR hopes to get in this process before it is finalised. RR says that late December is an awful time of year. RR says the aim is to provide people with information as we go along so there is not too much new information before the end, but we do have to wait for Ministerial sign off.</p>	

	<p>RR says the group also must set a new date for the CCC. RR is happy to take advice on these ideas for engagement.</p> <p>RR has to seek formal permission to talk to the community between sign off and the plans going to Cabinet.</p> <p>RM and DV says it sounds like a plan.</p> <p>RR says everything is getting together quickly. RR will talk to WW separately.</p> <p>RR says that like CVL mentioned, a limited number of issues will come through at the point.</p> <p>WW says that it is good to have RR doing what she is doing, otherwise the community would be steamrolled. WW says it is good for the community to get information as we go along, it is good for everybody.</p> <p>RR asks the group if anyone looked at the WPCA engagement on the building website. RR could not get the audio to work.</p> <p>SA says no. SA says the area is an older generation, there are no young families. The older generation are not computer savvy. There was no one in the meeting who viewed the engagement.</p> <p>RR says that is why the community's own networks face-to-face are important. RR says the members have been very good at getting the information into the community.</p> <p>RR says that she and CVL have presented to the councils twice so there has been plenty of opportunity for them to ask questions and see where the community is at.</p> <p>JH asks for the date in December that the PP is released?</p> <p>RR says it is December 17<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>CM asks about land value contributions.</p> <p>RR says she did ask CVL but she did not know. She will ask them to the next meeting and it has been put as a question on notice.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>CM says that the issue has progressed to stage 2, DPIE are advertising on Face Book requesting feedback, but how can anyone give feedback, when it is not fully understood if it will apply to the Stage 1 initial precinct release and if it can be applied in retrospect (transition).</p> <p>SV says that if the group requires a venue for the next meeting, SV's family has a facility that could be available – it has toilets, chairs, and all the necessary facilities. SV also says that given that Penrith Council has been out of action, SV is running for council because she is tired of the councillors not showing up, or not having an opinion on issues that are important to the community.</p> <p>DV asks when people from the airport will be invited.</p> <p>RR says she has invited them but will follow up.</p> <p>RR notes that CVL is doing excellent in what is a difficult role with very challenging timelines.</p>	RR to follow up on airport people.
<b>6</b>	<b>Next meeting</b>	
	RR says the next meeting will be when more information is available.	

Approved by:

Professor Roberta Ryan  
Western Sydney Aerotropolis Community Commissioner