

**Western Sydney Aerotropolis
Community Consultative Committee**

Meeting No: 5

Date: 1 March 2022, 6:30 – 8pm

Venue: Zoom

Attendees	
<p>Community members</p> <p>Sam Aloï Helen Anderson Paul Buhac Rob Heffernan Joe Herceg Carleen Markuse Roger Moss Ross Murphy Diana Vukovic Wayne Willmington Gabriella Condello Sascha Vukmirica</p>	<p>Independent Chair</p> <p>Professor Roberta Ryan, Independent Community Commissioner</p> <p>Minute taker</p> <p>Georgia Peters, office of the Independent Community Commissioner</p> <p>Apologies</p> <p>Paul Taglioli Justine Kinch, City Director for Western Sydney Parkland, Transport for New South Wales Lina Kakish, A/Manager City Planning, Liverpool City Council</p>
<p>Non-community members</p> <p>Natasha Borgia, City Planning Manager, Penrith City Council</p> <p>Catherine Van Laeren, Executive Director, Western Parkland City, Department of Planning and Environment</p> <p>Wendy Carlson, Precinct Place Manager, Western Parkland City Authority</p> <p>Scott Mackillop, Chief Corporate Affairs Officer, Western Sydney Airport</p> <p>Katy Hannouch, General Manager Community Engagement and Partnerships, Western Sydney Airport</p> <p>Tim Nairne, Senior External Affairs Advisor, Western Sydney Airport</p>	

<p>Rania Zahab, Transport for New South Wales</p> <p>Patrick Bastawrous, Team Leader Transport Management, Liverpool Council</p> <p>Emma Phillips, Communications Manager, Department of Planning and Environment</p> <p>Kate Robinson, office of the Independent Community Commissioner</p>	
--	--

Item	Description	Action
1	Welcome	
	<p>RR welcomes everyone and thanks them for their participation. She highlights where to find tonight's agenda and indicates an openness to rearrange to better fit everyone's schedule.</p> <p>PT, JK and LK are apologies. RZ is attending in JK's place.</p>	
2	Minutes and actions	
	<p>KR provides an overview of the actions from last meeting. She says that the update from Liverpool Council on road safety and conditions is in progress. Also that RM is following up on accident reports for TfNSW.</p> <p>RR proposes inviting Liverpool Council to the next meeting regarding flooding.</p> <p>DV updates that the blockage on Lawson Rd has been resolved, however a meeting with WSA is yet to be held regarding the water complex.</p>	
3	Matters arising	
	<p>RM raises Western Rd as an ongoing issue and that a meeting regarding the road is to take place in future. He finds the assessment of the road as being in "satisfactory" condition problematic and is unsure how they came to this conclusion.</p> <p>RZ says she understands that data collection about incidents at certain intersections is taking place and that she is waiting on videos and pictures.</p> <p>KR says that these images have been sent to JK.</p> <p>RR suggests a Council and Transport for NSW meeting.</p>	<p>JK to forward these images to RZ.</p>

	<p>PB (LCC) says that Transport for NSW has seen the images and that they are currently assessing the priority order of the location. They will be added to the program list.</p> <p>RR notes the usefulness of tracking when this resourcing becomes available.</p> <p>RM asks whether the contractor who did the work on Western Rd will be responsible for fixing it? He assumes that the contract stipulates that the road must be repaired to its original state.</p>	<p>Transport for NSW to notify the group of the progress of the topic on the program list.</p> <p>Transport for NSW to follow up with the contractors responsible for the damage on Western Rd.</p>
4	Update from Department of Planning – CVL	
4.1	Precinct Plan status	
	<p>CVL provides the following update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no change in status on the Precinct Plan. - The Department is currently briefing government and working toward getting the package finalised. <p>CVL says that she is unable to provide a timeframe at the moment as it is in the hands of the Minister’s office.</p> <p>CVL acknowledges that it is a frustrating process, and that she will be relieved to move onto the next stage once the Precinct Plan is released.</p>	
4.2	Land acquisition for E&R and high ANEF/ANEC affectation	
	<p>RM is concerned about the rezoning excluding properties on the western side of the creek. He says that lives will be significantly impacted and he is planning on meeting with a Minister to discuss this. RM stresses that rezoning will give people some opportunity, however people will not be buying properties for rural living.</p> <p>CVL rejects that anyone has been excluded. She says that a specific criteria will be developed in later stages that will contain more specificities about the properties impacted. As of right now, the project is working with high-level and abstract numbers. As the project progresses, so too will the clarity of the criteria.</p> <p>RM asks that consultation with relevant property owners be held during these later stages.</p>	

	<p>RR confirms with RM that they will be in touch when these later details come up. The above pertains to recommendations 17 and 18 produced by RR.</p> <p>SA shares RM's concerns.</p> <p>RR agrees that the delays are regrettable, however there is nothing sinister about it. She notes that this package got caught up in the Ministerial changes that occurred late last year.</p> <p>EP, who is responsible for Aero Comms, seeks feedback on the approach. RR agrees and asks for feedback or concerns on the proposed approach.</p> <p>EP proposes that once the announcement occurs a special CCC meeting will be held. She says that there will be a community session for real estate agents and planning consultants. This is to address previous misunderstandings which led to misinformation.</p> <p>CVL says that a community drop-in day on a Saturday will be held for residents to speak one-on-one with planners about their property. There will be a morning and afternoon sessions.</p> <p>CVL adds that a meeting with Luddenham residents will occur to keep them up-to-date about where the package sits. This session is likely to be held virtually.</p> <p>RR also notes that the materials will be available on the website and that there will be an opportunity to send through comments and questions. RR says that there is work going into the creation of an online portal.</p> <p>CVL says that interactive maps will be developed a bit later down the road. She also says that letters will be sent out to residents with information about the Precinct Plans including the opportunity to meet with a planner.</p> <p>RR reiterates the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Individual letters will be sent out to residents with information- CCC meeting will be held when details about the package are released	
--	--	--

- One-on-one meetings will be available to discuss personal property
- Luddenham village resident meetings will be held.

RR also notes that it may be useful to have Sydney Water in these discussions to provide accurate information.

CVL says that this program is about the planning package and stresses that the above meetings are not the last time you will be able to ask questions. She says that the purpose of the above is to give people an avenue for understanding. They will be available in a range of capacities to answer questions over time.

GC asks when it is reverting to RU4? GC also seeks clarification on the details of why the package is taking so long.

CVL says that she cannot provide a timeline, and that the package is following standard procedure wherein it goes up to the Minister and his staff. The staff will provide advice to the Minister. Then, the Minister will receive detailed briefing sessions about the package. Once he is satisfied, it goes to the EXCO (Executive Committee) meeting. After this it is published on a Friday.

CVL says the previous Minister was involved throughout the process, whereas the new Minister has to take time to get across all of these issues.

GC asks if they understand the immense impact this constant delay is having on residents? GC says a lot of community members are giving her attitude about the process, and she can understand why. GC expresses her disappointment that, once again, no timeframe has been provided. The community feels as though this constant delay is evidence of the government's lack of commitment.

RR recognises the slowness and emphasises that they are pressing the matter.

GC says that residents cannot understand the slowness.

RR says the changes to the E&R zone are proposed for East of WSC and South of Elizabeth Drive.

	<p>CVL confirms the above.</p> <p>CM asks if it is likely that the package will come out around 8/9 March alongside the Aerotropolis Summit?</p> <p>CVL says that there is no relationship between the Summit and the release date. Government departments will be present, but they are not responsible for the Summit.</p> <p>JH asks CVL the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the worst- and best-case scenarios? 2. Is Anthony Roberts the only Minister who will need to approve it? 3. Is the package still being developed or is it the same as when he saw it? <p>CVL responds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing any projection would be misleading. 2. Other Ministers that may be involved include Stuart Ayres MP and John Anderson MP (the Minister for Water). 3. The package is the version that JH saw. However, ministerial changes can be made. <p>JH says that it would be ridiculous if after three years, changes were made to the package in a Ministerial office. He says that when he met with the former Minister three years ago, his impression was that things would be moving quickly.</p> <p>PB thinks that it is unlikely it will be approved before the election.</p> <p>RR disagrees.</p>	
4.3	Kemps Creek planning and suggested working party	
	<p>RM asked for the following to be included on the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NSW Department of Planning to create a working party to investigate the effects of the proposed planning on the Kemps Creek area. <p>The matter was not discussed in depth. KR will speak with RM post meeting to advance the proposed working group.</p>	KR to follow up with RM and CVL.

5	Update from Western Sydney Airport – SM	
	<p>SM and KH provide a presentation on development progress.</p> <p>KH notes that by the time the airport opens in 2026, they will have returned to pre-pandemic growth levels.</p> <p>Important takeaways from the presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opening in late 2026 (10 million passengers/year) - The current workforce is comprised of 50% local workers - 3.7km runway - Projected size to be as large as airports such as the Dubai International Airport. <p>WW asks about accessing airport construction updates. Can KH clarify where those are located on the website?</p> <p>KH says that the notifications and updates are published on the website.</p> <p>WW also raises the Adams Road closure and says that he struggled to find a copy of the update regarding this issue on the website. He shares with the group that Adams Road will be open the next day (2 March).</p> <p>RM raises the issue of stormwater. Stormwater from the site is going into Badgerys Creek and residents are growing concerned. He asks if there is going to be a stormwater capture process to reduce the flow into the creek?</p> <p>KH says that they recently met with the environment team where they asked the same questions. They are currently implementing precautionary measures and are monitoring the increase in rainfall.</p> <p>RM says that the amount of rainfall coming off the site may cause houses to go underwater. There are big concerns in the community.</p> <p>KH says that a physical inspection on the site will be happening soon.</p> <p>RM says that measures should have been implemented before the rainfall.</p>	<p>KH to share this link with WW.</p>

<p>SA asks how big the catchment area is?</p> <p>KH says it is approximately 400 megalitres.</p> <p>TN confirms the above and adds that there are 11 temporary basins and 4 permanent basins.</p> <p>TN highlights that the constant rain we have seen recently over the past month means that there were limited opportunities for further additional preventative measures.</p> <p>GC asks whether they will build more dams? She highlights that the water dumping into other residences is going to cause huge issues down the line and that now is the best time to address these issues. She says that the wet season we are currently experiencing is an opportune time for WSA to regroup and create strategies.</p> <p>KH says that this will be taken on notice.</p> <p>TN highlighted the project is designed to accommodate a 1:100 year flood and the project was only recently awarded an international award for water management. The site contractors are also putting in place interim measures such as bunding and mulch.</p> <p>GC would appreciate the development of contingency plans for when flooding such as this occurs.</p> <p>CM raises the WSA submission and asks how the Daily Telegraph has a copy of it?</p> <p>SM says WSA is unsure how this happened – it was leaked, however it was not done by anyone from WSA .</p> <p>CM says that it is unfair that the people impacted by the submission are unable to access it while a copy is provided to a newspaper.</p> <p>CVL confirms that DPE did not make the submission public.</p> <p>WW thinks that the newspaper doesn't have a full copy since it didn't sound like they knew much about it.</p>	<p>KH to provide further information about stormwater management and contingency plans to the CCC members and residents.</p>
--	--

	<p>SM said that the journalist he spoke to confirmed that he had a full copy of the submission.</p> <p>WW says that big news events such as the invasion of Ukraine and the floods in Lismore have seen the news story about Luddenham Village postponed but that there is a TV network keen to take up the Save Luddenham Village case.</p> <p>WW says that there is a progress meeting scheduled for tomorrow (2 March) and that a lot of emotions are involved.</p> <p>WW says that they are lucky to have parliamentary support and says that if WSA withdrew the submission many issues would be resolved.</p> <p>SM says that their position has been endorsed by the highest levels of the organisation and that their view is informed by concern for the future community.</p> <p>SM reiterates that he does not understand the evidence that claims of “develop or die” are premised on.</p> <p>WW says that Luddenham is not giving up and that a lot of pressure will be put on WSA. WW claims that the community is aware of the WSA’s “dirty washing”.</p> <p>SA asks for clarification about the claim that WSA will be as big as Dubai International Airport. He asks where these projected numbers are coming from and is unsure about how such high numbers will be possible.</p> <p>SM says that WSA’s plan is to develop in four stages. In the development of this plan they have considered Australia’s aviation plan and projected numbers 60 years into the future. He says that Sydney Kingsford Smith airport cannot develop or grow any further because of the density of residents nearby. This means that all future aviation growth will be occurring at WSA. 82 million passengers/year is the projected number in 60 years’ time and this is the number that the Dubai comparison is made from.</p> <p>HA understands that a primary purpose of WSA is to provide produce internationally from NSW. Is this still</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>the plan and, if so, how does this factor into air traffic flow?</p> <p>SM says that Sydney needs a 24-hour airport. NSW is losing economic activity because of the curfews at Sydney Kingsford Smith Airport. Produce is currently sent from Brisbane or Melbourne airports. He says that the 24/7 schedule of WSA is what will make it successful – it is fundamental to the proposition that the airport will create jobs and increase economic activity.</p> <p>HA asks for clarification. She understands that 80% of NSW produce is exported via Brisbane and Melbourne airports and asks if that will be redirected to the WSA.</p> <p>SM says he is not familiar with these figures and is therefore unable to answer.</p> <p>HA asks about the agribusiness precinct.</p> <p>SM says that the agribusiness precinct is still a proposition by the NSW Government. The airport fuels the agribusiness precinct, rather than the other way around. The agribusiness precinct will be fuelled by its proximity to a 24/7 airport. However, not all cargo will come from agribusiness. Other cargo may include the shipping of online orders.</p> <p>CVL says that the agriport has not been forgotten. Agribusiness will be a gateway. It is not the area where the produce will be growing. Rather, it will be technology and buildings. They are focused on the value added. CVL confirms that without the presence of the WSA there would not be an agribusiness precinct in that location.</p> <p>RR thanks KH and SM for the presentation.</p>	<p>WC and KR to follow up on DPIE progress on the agriport.</p>
6	Update on road safety and conditions	
	<p>RZ provides an update on road safety. As part of the Road Safety campaign, information is being passed onto truck companies. The Truck Aware campaign is also in the works.</p> <p>RZ says that residents on Elizabeth Drive would have received property access forms.</p>	<p>RZ to send through these notifications as a part of the minutes.</p>

	<p>PB asks why residents on the section of Elizabeth Drive that have already been upgraded received these notifications? Is this an administrative error?</p> <p>RZ says that this is because they need a wide database.</p> <p>SA concurs with the issues raised by PB. He does not understand why those residents on Elizabeth Drive were notified.</p> <p>RZ clarifies that it is not an environmental assessment, but they are tracking environmental sensitivities including flora and fauna, and waterways when planning for the road upgrade.</p> <p>DV stresses that when driving on Elizabeth Drive, drivers have to dangerously dodge water and potholes. She anticipates that this may cause a head-on collision with a truck. She notes that it is Council’s responsibility to address this and keep people safe.</p> <p>GC asks why Council is conducting an assessment that has previously been conducted? She notes that this may be a waste of resources. GC also stresses how dangerous Elizabeth Drive is. She says it is dangerously dark.</p>	
7	Community Participation Plan – Prof. Ryan	
	<p>WC says that the Blueprint and Economic Development Roadmap are on the website for comment until 31 March. This can be accessed on the Western Parkland Authority Website under Blueprint and Economic Development Roadmap. On the website there is a section for comments.</p> <p>RR is keen for feedback, discussion and questions on the Community Participation Plan. She says that a draft will be prepared in the next couple of weeks which will be sent to community members for comment.</p>	<p>KR to send GC information about RR’s Community Participation Plan presentation.</p>
8	Community Consultative Committee operations – Prof. Ryan	
8.1	Kemps Creek representative	
	<p>RR highlights the need for a representative from Kemps Creek. They have received some interest but no applications as of yet. RR asks if community and Council</p>	

	<p>members could reach out to their networks to see if anyone is interested.</p> <p>RR asks if people can send names to Kate.</p>	
9	Other business	
	<p>RM says that the contractors providing services around the airport have a lack of consideration for local residents. This erodes the confidence of residents in WSA. They have been enduring months of road issues, including at Cross St, Western Rd and Elizabeth Drive at Kemps Creek. This work was the upgrade/installation of main water. He notes that although the issue has been raised repeatedly, no progress is being made. Community members are starting to disengage because they feel like this meeting achieves little.</p> <p>GC concurs and adds that Devonshire and Western Roads have been discussed on Facebook. The issue of roads not being fixed is seriously eroding people's confidence in this process.</p> <p>GC notes that other roads such as May and Bellfield Avenues have been issues since 2016.</p> <p>RM notes that there were claims that the above roads would be fixed ages ago.</p> <p>RR recommends that this conversation continue in person.</p> <p>RR notes the lack of response and difficulty with coordination. The difficulty of cross-agency coordination results in problems with securing a response.</p> <p>DV says that a resident at 85 Lawson Rd has noted that contractors were working on power underground. DV is seeking clarification on what these works are about.</p> <p>WW suggests that this may be the work of the Metro.</p> <p>DV raises an issue flagged to her by a resident northside of Elizabeth Drive. A sewer pipeline is going along the Eastern side of the creek rather than the agreed original position on the opposite side. She asks why this was not raised in the 2-3 years worth of discussion on the issue?</p>	<p>KH or TN to clarify what these works are. WSA will contact Metro to confirm.</p>

	<p>PB says there are access issues. Sydney Water is unable to access Federal land to maintain the pipeline.</p> <p>DV says that one-on-one meetings with Fernando Ortega from Sydney Water confirmed that the sewer pipeline would be on the airport's side of the creek. Now, it is on the residents' side of the creek.</p>	<p>KR to follow up with Sydney Water.</p>
10	Next meeting	
	<p>RR thanks everyone for their participation and wishes people well, particularly in the face of the floods.</p> <p>5 April 2022, 6:30pm – 8pm</p>	