

Western Sydney Aerotropolis
Community Consultative Committee

Meeting No: 16

Date: 30 May 2023, 6:30pm - 8pm

Venue: Zoom

Attendees	
Community members Sam Aloï (SA) Helen Anderson (HA) Paul Buhac (PB) Gabriella Condello (GC) Rob Heffernan (RH) Anh Le (AL) Ross Murphy (RM) Sascha Vukmirica (SV) Diana Vukovic (DV) Wayne Willmington (WW)	Government representatives Rex Wightley, Chief Engineer, Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) (RW) Rob Hodgkins, A/g Director Central (Western), DPE (RH) Rebecca Lynch, Community Engagement Officer, WSA (RL) Jabin de Keizer, WSA (JdK) Fiona Duncan, Communications Manager, DPE (FD) Justine Kinch, Western Parkland City Director, Transport for NSW (JK) Elizabeth Low, Senior Communications Manager, Sydney Metro (EL) Anne Power, Director Strategic Communications and Engagement, Western Parkland City Authority (AP) Fernando Ortego, Western Sydney – Commercial Partnerships Manager, Sydney Water (FO) Natasha Williams, City Planning Manager, Penrith City Council (NW) Luke Oste, Coordinator Strategic Planning, Liverpool City Council Maruf Hossain, Coordinator Floodplain and Water Management, Liverpool City Council (MH)
Other Attendees Kate Robinson, office of the Independent Community Commissioner (KR)	
Independent Chair Professor Roberta Ryan, Independent Community Commissioner (RR)	
Minutes Isa Crossland Stone, office of the Independent Community Commissioner (ICS)	

Apologies Rob Parker, Manager Community Engagement Airport Construction, Western Sydney Airport (RP) Binod Parajuli, A/g Manager Infrastructure Planning, Liverpool City Council (BP) Catherine Van Laeren, Executive Director, Western Parkland City, DPE (CVL) Joe Herceg (JH) Paul Taglioli (PT)	

Item	Description	Action
1	Welcome and introductions - RR	
	RR welcomes everyone to the meeting. KR notes that AL is standing in for PT. KR notes that JdK is standing in for RP from WSA. AP introduces herself; she is the director of communication and engagement at the Western Parkland City Authority. She has attended in the past in her previous role at Sydney Metro. RL introduces herself; she is the senior community engagement officer for WSA. She oversees the Landside Package, Business Precinct and Community Engagement.	
4	Briefing: Technical Working Group - RW	
	RW introduces himself is the chief engineer with DPE. RW also chairs the Technical Working Group (TWG), which arose as a subgroup of the Utilities Collaboration Group (UCG). RW presents on the emergence, purpose and function of the TWG. RM introduces himself to RW. RM represents residents in Kemps Creek. RM feels strongly that the TWG group should offer more directed support to the Kemps Creek community. He says that the community is suffering as a result of the works on Elizabeth Drive and traffic congestion. RM offers an example of a small business on Elizabeth Drive which, due to construction on the road and associated road access issues, has experienced a reduction of approximately \$15,000 weekly revenue. This case has had ripple effects in the community, as the business owner has been a sponsor of a local football team and the local primary school.	

	<p>RM notes that the construction also causes major for those who commute to work. RM's journey to work has increased from approximately 15 minutes to 42 minutes.</p> <p>RM also raises significant damage to Elizabeth Drive because of construction.</p> <p>RM says that for the sake of conserving time in this meeting, he would like to speak to RW offline in more detail about these issues.</p> <p>RW says that he is very happy to speak to RM offline. He is happy to make a site visit to speak in person.</p> <p>KR will provide RM with RW's contact email.</p> <p>RW notes that these issues do not sound like utility issues, but rather temporary works problems.</p> <p>RW says TfNSW attends to road construction concerns. TfNSW are part of the TWG. RW is happy to facilitate RM's access to relevant contact people in this area.</p> <p>RR suggests that JK may be able to offer insight from TfNSW perspective.</p> <p>RR thanks RW for his presentation and attendance.</p> <p>RW thanks the group and takes his leave from the meeting.</p>	<p>KR to provide RM with RW's email.</p> <p>RM and RW to meet offline regarding construction and access on Elizabeth Drive.</p> <p>RW to put RM in contact with relevant TfNSW representatives in the TWG.</p>
5	Agency updates	
	<p>Transport for NSW (TfNSW) – JK JK shares a diagram with the group.</p> <p>JK updates that the timeframe of the temporary Devonshire Street roundabout has shifted. Construction was initially planned to commence in March/April of 2023, but has been pushed back to August. This is because TfNSW is working through some additional planning approvals, which involves various environmental investigations.</p> <p>JK says that the M12 team that is delivering this project will be spending time in the community in the next 2 weeks to discuss traffic changes associated with the Devonshire Street roundabout.</p>	

	<p>There is a concrete barrier extending West of the Devonshire roundabout which will make Salisbury “left-in left-out”.</p> <p>Vehicles turning right out of Salisbury can use the roundabout to do a U-turn. Vehicles over 12.5m that cannot use the roundabout will use Devonshire and Western to turn right.</p> <p>Vehicles coming from a Westerly direction along Elizabeth Drive turning into Salisbury will have to turn up the Western Distributor to get back into Salisbury.</p> <p>JK notes that the long-term plan for Elizabeth Drive limits right-hand turns, as there will be a central median along the road.</p> <p>JK refers to the planned roundabout at Clifton, which she discussed previously with the CCC. This roundabout was aimed to aid traffic issues relating to vehicle-turning at the M12 construction site. JK says that construction traffic levels here have decrease and are not intended to increase. For this reason, they will not go ahead with this roundabout.</p> <p>JK adds that the Sydney Water team is currently doing works along Clifton Street and performing minor intersection improvements.</p> <p>JK says that the temporary traffic control will continue until this project is complete. Following feedback from the CCC at the last meeting, the traffic controllers have had some extra training and made some changes to signage to better manage flow. This has involved more staging of traffic in smaller groups of vehicles rather than one consistent flow.</p> <p>JK notes that there will continue to be congestion issues along Elizabeth Drive as works continue, but the CCC is a valuable forum for raising issues and informing solutions.</p> <p>The advocacy within this group has encouraged TfNSW to create a rapid business case across Aerotropolis to see how future works can be better planned. This way, when funding is approved they will be able to go forward with projects rather than having to pursue funding and development after receiving community feedback.</p> <p>Regarding intersection improvements for the Western Distributor, JK says that they are progressing with design work but do not yet have access to funds.</p> <p>JK explains that earlier this year the government announced funding for safety improvements along Elizabeth Drive. This would include the Western roundabout. This funding is currently under review with the new NSW government.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>JK says that the M12 team would like to attend the next CCC meeting to present their design work. They would also like to discuss the delivery of the Devonshire roundabout.</p> <p>SA revisits his question about the upgrades on Elizabeth Drive at Northern Road. Will that section be upgraded and re-widened again?</p> <p>JK say that there will be some works there, but she is not fully informed, as they have not received concept designed for that area. She suspects that this area is in its ultimate configuration, but there may be some small works which will disrupt the area.</p> <p>JK will take this on notice and update KR offline.</p> <p>SA says that would be good. He is not against an upgrade, but would like some clarity.</p> <p>JK says that grappling with developer-led works is a challenge. It is difficult to work with developers, access their sites and have them deliver part of the works. They are trying to avoid sacrificial works, wherein a site is developed more than once.</p> <p>In the Zoom chat, AL asks about the roundabout of Badgerys Creek Road, referred to in RW's presentation. Will it be removed at some point?</p> <p>JK says that in the ultimate configuration of Badgerys Creek Road there will not be a roundabout. She says that the timing for the removal is undefined. She refers the question to EL.</p> <p>EL says that she will take it on notice and respond later.</p> <p>AL asks about traffic studies. He says that each developer has their own standards for specifications about how much traffic occurs in front of a property.</p> <p>As a landowner AL has been asked by developers for these specifications and would like to know when this information will be available.</p> <p>JK says that TfNSW has recently completed a model that provides assumptions for traffic and transport across Aerotropolis. This is the first consolidated model they have created, as it involves assumptions about growth and change. The model is currently being tested by a developer, who will provide feedback. JK say that by June-July this year, they will be able to share this with developers.</p>	<p>M12 team to present the CCC with design work and Devonshire roundabout delivery plans.</p> <p>JK to provide information regarding Elizabeth Drive upgrade</p> <p>EL to provide an update on the timing for the removal of the temporary roundabout on Badgerys Creek Road.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>AL asks if landowners will have access to this model?</p> <p>JK specifies landowners and developers alike. Access will involve some confidentiality conditions as well as a charge-back arrangement.</p> <p>JK say that she is happy to discuss this in more detail offline.</p> <p>AL says that would be helpful.</p> <p>Sydney Water – FO</p> <p>FO updates that there is a lot of activity by Sydney Water in the Aerotropolis, including around Elizabeth Drive.</p> <p>Within the next 1-2 months (approximately), Sydney Water plans to commence construction of a treated water pipeline which will travel along the northern side of Elizabeth Drive. In the meantime, there will be surveying and preparation occurring along that area.</p> <p>FO also updates that works investigations will soon commence for the wastewater servicing, including along Cosgrove Creek, Thompsons Creek and South Creek. FO says that these preparations are part of a plan to deliver services by the year 2027. He notes that timelines such as these are subject to change depending on weather events, among other circumstances.</p> <p>FO notes that the package he presented at the previous CCC meeting in March has been updated. He projects that at the next meeting on July 18, he will be able to deliver an updated package presentation which will include information about timelines.</p> <p>FO says there are also works along Lawson Road and Pitt Street for a new station which will service the new Badgerys Creek wastewater system. They are in Phase 1, which includes building a tank, and in the next few years a pumping station will be built.</p> <p>SA asks if the design for the wastewater system has been completed?</p> <p>FO says no, they are in a very early stage of concept design. The concept design was shown in FO's presentation at the previous CCC meeting.</p> <p>SA notes previous upgrades at the intersection of Elizabeth Drive and Northern Road. Will it be upgraded again according to the new plans?</p>	<p>JK and AL to speak offline regarding TfNSW's traffic and transport modelling.</p> <p>FO to present Sydney water's updated concept design plan, including servicing timeframes and the pipeline across Northern Road</p>
--	--	--

	<p>FO says that as far as he is aware, the intersection SA is referring to is now complete from a transport perspective.</p> <p>FO says that the properties at that intersection will be minimally impacted.</p> <p>There will be a pipeline delivered across Northern Road. FO can present on this planned pipeline at the next meeting.</p> <p>AL asks about landowners interested in developing land along Badgerys Creek Rd. What should they know about how to connect to sewer systems?</p> <p>FO says it depends on the property's location, and which catchment it will fall into.</p> <p>FO says that for Badgerys Creek Road there are two catchments; one is the Badgerys Creek wastewater Network, and the other is Thompsons Creek wastewater network.</p> <p>FO says that the Badgerys Creek wastewater network is estimated to be delivered by 2026, and Thompsons Creek wastewater network to be delivered by 2027.</p> <p>AL asks: if development occurred prior to 2027, could it tap into one catchment and be transferred to the other later?</p> <p>FO says no, it is very difficult and expensive to transfer a property from one catchment to another; each network is expected to service the catchment it is dedicated to.</p> <p>AL asks if this is true even within precinct sequencing?</p> <p>FO says the precinct is divided into two different catchments, which means they use separate sewer lines before ultimately being drained to the same treatment plan.</p> <p>AL says that his aim on behalf of the residents is to receive a provisional clarity on this matter.</p> <p>FO says that now that they have more clarity on how Bradfield will be serviced, they can offer more clarity overall.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>FO says that he is happy to speak to specific owners about their land and how they require draining. It is up to each development area to connect to one truck system over another.</p> <p>Sydney Metro – EL</p> <p>EL updates that Sydney Metro has spent a lot of time in the community in the last few months. They attended the Hawkesbury Show, and spoke with approximately 1500 community members.</p> <p>EL says that Sydney Metro also held an information session at Twin Creeks, where they spoke with community and other stakeholders and received good feedback about the Orchard Hills stabling maintenance facility.</p> <p>EL shares that Sydney Metro Aerotropolis Community Open Day is scheduled for this Sunday, May 4. She asks that anyone experiencing issues with registration email KR, who will follow up with EL. The Open Day is expected to be very well-attended and will span 8:30am-4:30pm.</p> <p>EL adds that there is a Sydney Metro shopping centre pop-up which is moving around the area. They are currently at the Nepean Village shopping centre, where the stall is attended 3 days per week. They will be at this location for the next few weeks, and the team is eager to chat with community members.</p> <p>EL updates that the Sydney Metro Connect app is now live. This app is a good resource for receiving community notification, updates, and event information.</p> <p>EL says that works are continuing on Luddenham Road. She also notes delivery of oversized vehicles. Works are continuing around the Airport business park and airport terminal, including concrete form works.</p> <p>At Aerotropolis and Bringelly, there is ongoing shaft excavation work.</p> <p>Western Parkland City Authority (WPCA) – AP</p> <p>AP introduces herself: she joined WPCA a few months ago, after being at Sydney Metro. She is enthusiastic about strengthening WPCA's connection with the community.</p> <p>AP shares a presentation which shows plans for the Bradfield City Centre.</p> <p>There are no questions following AP's presentation.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>WSA Co – JdK</p> <p>JdK updates that there is lots of construction movement around the site. They are developing the airport terminals and developing the landside area, which includes lots of concreting for roads.</p> <p>JdK shares that the WSA community Open Day is scheduled for June 17, and some tickets have been set aside for CCC members.</p> <p>JdK will provide KR with Open Day event details for distribution.</p> <p>DV asks JdK about the concrete structural buildings in Elizabeth drive. What are these for?</p> <p>JdK says that it depends on the specific building. He names two she might be referring to; a terminal equipment room and the lighting and equipment room.</p> <p>JdK offers to speak with DV offline to go over a map of this area and answer her questions more specifically.</p> <p>WW adds that he has heard very positive feedback from community members who attended the recent WSA community breakfast. He congratulates WSA.</p> <p>Liverpool City Council – MH and LO</p> <p>MH provides an update on flood studies by Liverpool Council.</p> <p>The flood modelling is now complete, and they are now in the processes of preparing the report and mapping.</p> <p>MH says that in the July CCC they will invite a consultant to update the community on this project.</p> <p>LO updates that the draft contributions plan is going to Council in Liverpool tomorrow. This is the draft 7.12 contribution plan. This plan deals with a percentage levy on development costs, as opposed to a 'per dwelling' development rate.</p> <p>This plan was initially exhibited in 2020 at a 6.5% rate.</p> <p>LO says that the rate has been reduced to 4.5% at Liverpool and 5% in Penrith. The percentage difference here is because development costs are generally higher in Liverpool, which tends to have more residential developments while Penrith has mostly industrial. The percentage levy takes this into account.</p>	<p>JdK and DV to speak offline to discuss the concrete buildings on Elizabeth Drive.</p> <p>Liverpool City Council consultant to present on flood modelling and mapping at the next CCC meeting.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>LP says that information on this plan will be available on the Council website in the business section. If supported by Council, it will soon go on exhibition for community feedback.</p> <p>RR clarifies that these levies are triggered only by DA lodgement. Landowners who are not planning development will not be subject to them.</p> <p>LO says that this contributions plan is the final hurdle to DAs being approved. Currently DAs can be lodged, and this will allow for them to be approved.</p> <p>SA asks why some similar plan cannot be applied for landowners whose rates are currently being increased significantly due to rezoning, even when they don't have development plans.</p> <p>NW says that this is a separate issue, and a significant one. It is one of the Council's concerns going forward. There has been a lag in the rezoning of the land a Council developing a contribution plan. They now have more current information and are better-positioned to create a contribution plan that targets this issue.</p> <p>RR agrees that the aim is get this sorted as soon as possible. She acknowledges the delay in development of contribution plans and the consequences for the community.</p> <p>RR suggests that at the time of exhibition, both Councils provide community members with an information sheet on rates rate deferral possibilities.</p> <p>NW agrees that this is a good idea. NW and LO will ensure that this is included.</p> <p>AL asks a question on behalf on landowners in the Dwyer Road precinct. Given the long-term rezoning plans to make it industrial, are landowners permitted to develop residential building?</p> <p>RH says it depends on the constraints of their site. Council is not a zoning authority, but they do offer a pre-DA service to landowners in the Council area.</p> <p>AL says this is a good option.</p>	<p>Penrith Council and Liverpool Council to include information about land rates and rate deferral in the exhibition of the 7.12 contribution plan.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Penrith City Council – NW NW says that Penrith Council has been working closely with Liverpool Council on the 7.12 contributions plan.</p> <p>They have aimed to align public exhibition times. Currently, this dual-exhibition is projected to occur around June 15. There will be an FAQ sheet attached, as well as opportunities for community members to speak with community members directly.</p> <p>NW says that when the plan has been exhibited and then returned to Council for approval, it will go to the Minister for Planning for approval. This process occurs when a percentage exceeds 1%.</p> <p>Department of Planning (DPE) - RH RH updates the Precinct Plan Amendment 1 has been finalised. This amendment aims to help facilitate the development of the first 750 dwellings in the Science Park at the Northern Gateway precinct.</p> <p>RH updates on the master plans, which were discussed in more detail by Stephen Murray (SM) at the last meeting.</p> <p>RH says that that these are all progressing through the process, and they are still on track for the Bradfield centre master plan to be to the Technical Assurance Process (TAP) in August. Following this, the WPCA will update its plans to then submit a formal master plan. At this stage there will be a public exhibition to open for community comments. This will be well-publicised.</p> <p>RH says that two other projects going through the TAP are Greenfield Development Company site and the Ingham site. There is information on these sites available on the DPE website.</p> <p>RH says that it is becoming clear that there is a lot of interest in development for warehousing and logistics sites. There are a few State-significant development proposals coming through currently.</p> <p>RH updates that rezoning for the Luddenham Village and Agribusiness precinct is being drafted, and drafts are expected to be ready for review by RR and KR in June.</p> <p>RH shares that there will be more of an update on this point by the next CCC meeting in July.</p> <p>WW asks about the Luddenham Village planning. Will it offer solutions to the rezoning challenges?</p> <p>RH says that it will offer clarity around what can and cannot be done in the agribusiness zone. It is not finalisation for the Luddenham Village</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>plan, which requires more information about the flight paths. They do not yet have a defined date for this, but hope to offer updates soon.</p> <p>WW expresses frustration on behalf of the Luddenham Village community. This uncertainty about timing and plans has been extended, and they would like more information.</p> <p>RR agrees that this is a longstanding concern, and while they are working on it, progress is slow.</p> <p>KR follows up with WW his questions in the previous meeting about a heritage museum planned at Luddenham.</p> <p>WW says that early in the planning process there was mention of a heritage museum plan. He is concerned that as land is sold off in the rezoning process, artefacts that might be valuable for this project are being discarded or lost.</p> <p>RH says that he has not heard of this. Generally, these kinds of projects would not be state-level. Does WW remember who was planning to take on this project?</p> <p>WW notes that he has not read any follow up about this project in more recent plans.</p> <p>RH says that perhaps the project was an early-stage idea which has been let go. He will follow up and provide an update at the next meeting.</p> <p>HA asks: is the GDC site in the South-West corner of the Agribusiness precinct meant to be an agriport as proposed in the original documents?</p> <p>RH says that the WPCA did the agriport EOI, but the GDC site is not proposing for the agriport to be part of their site.</p> <p>HA asks if there is still a plan to build an agriport as per the 2019 plans?</p> <p>AP from WPCA says that she will take this on notice and provide an update.</p> <p>RH says that in his understanding, if it were being developed then it is in early planning stages. They are still clarifying the intent of the agribusiness zone overall.</p> <p>HA says that she is surprised it has not come to fruition, as the agriport was a primary concern in original planning discussions. It is of interest to the community.</p>	<p>RH to follow up on WW's questions about a Luddenham Village heritage museum.</p> <p>AP to follow up on the status of plans for an agriport.</p>
6	Progress on key issues (discussion with community members only) - RR	

	<p>RR and KR run the community through the Office of State Revenue Advice.</p> <p>The notes provided by Revenue NSW have been provided to RR and KR.</p>	
7	Other business: Refresh of CCC community membership	
	<p>RR notes that some members may have been contacted for a study by the University of Newcastle.</p> <p>RR clarifies that this project is unconnected to her. She notes that she has suggested that the researchers redirect their research subject focus from individual landowners to agencies.</p> <p>RR notes that as members leave the Aerotropolis area, they will also leave the CCC. New community representatives will be brought in.</p> <p>RR asks that those who are planning to move on soon alert KR to their exit and to recommendations for particular new members, so that their places can be filled appropriately and in good time.</p> <p>RR feels that the Aerotropolis CCC will continue for some time into the future, although it is likely to become less frequently held over the years as things progress.</p> <p>RR notes that some of the funding allocated to these CCCs is uncertain, which is reflective of some uncertainty across machinery of government. Some of the movement and changeover of senior bureaucrats has caused challenges. This includes freezing of funding across the West Invest plan to various sectors, and particularly transport.</p> <p>RR updates that she will be speaking with the minister in the coming weeks. They will continue working with the Commonwealth around aircraft noise concerns.</p> <p>RR updates that she will soon be issuing a new report with recommendations regarding Luddenham Village and the related community concerns that have been discussed in this CCC forum.</p> <p>SV raises the issue of land tax. Residents are paying rates according to the rezoning but are unable to use their land for developments in line with their new zoning.</p> <p>SV says this is having devastating impacts. Many of her neighbors have been forced to sell their properties because they cannot afford new rates. SV sites that the cost of land tax for her family business is \$1000 per day.</p> <p>SV asks: can this issue be raised with the Land Tax department?</p>	

	<p>RR says that KR can connect SV and any of her contacts to RR's contacts.</p> <p>A new Valuer General has been appointed, and RR is planning to brief her.</p>	<p>KR to provide SV with contacts to discuss land tax issues under the rezoning process.</p>
7	AOB - RR	
	<p>WW updates that a strip of land at Eden Road and Northern Road is being developed into a memorial park for residents of that area who went to war and never returned.</p> <p>RR says this sounds good.</p> <p>RR proposes that the Commonwealth is invited to the next meeting to provide an update on flight paths. This would be useful to the CCC's conversations overall.</p> <p>RR thanks all attendees and wishes them well.</p> <p>Next meeting: July 18, 6:30-8pm</p>	<p>Commonwealth to present on flight paths at the upcoming CCC meeting.</p>