

**Western Sydney Aerotropolis  
Community Consultative Committee**

**Meeting no:** 17

**Date:** 5 September 2023

**Venue:** Zoom

<b>Attendees</b>	
<p><b>Community members</b></p> <p>Anh Le (AL) Sam Aloï (SA) Paul Buhac (PB) Gabiella Condello (GC) Joe Herceg (JH) Ross Murphy (RM) Diana Vukovic (DV) Wayne Willmington (WW)</p> <p><b>Independent Community Commissioner</b></p> <p>Professor Roberta Ryan, Independent Community Commissioner (RR)</p> <p>Isa Crossland Stone, minute taker, office of the Independent Community Commissioner (ICS)</p> <p>Kate Robinson, office of the Independent Community Commissioner (KR)</p>	<p><b>Government representatives</b></p> <p>Catherine Van Laeren, Executive Director, Western Parkland City, Department of Planning (DPE) (CVL)</p> <p>Casey Joshua, Director Central (Western), DPE (CJ)</p> <p>Rob Parker, Manager Community Engagement Airport Construction, Western Sydney Airport (RP)</p> <p>Peter Gresser, Project Manager Stakeholder Interface, Sydney Metro (PG)</p> <p>Simon Cousins, Senior Manager Partnerships and Engagement, Transport for NSW (SC)</p> <p>Fernando Ortega, Western Sydney – Commercial Partnerships Manager, Sydney Water (FO)</p> <p>Cassie Perente, Sydney Water (CP)</p> <p>Alexie Bull, Sydney Water (AB)</p> <p>Natalie Stanowski, A/g City Planning Coordinator, Penrith City Council (NS)</p> <p>Luke Oste, Coordinator Strategic Planning, Liverpool City Council (LO)</p> <p>Maruf Hossain, Coordinator Floodplain and Water Management, Liverpool City Council (MH)</p>
<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Paul Taglioli (PT) Helen Anderson (HA) Sascha Vukmirica (SV) Abdul Cheema, A/g City Planning Manager, Penrith City Council (AC) Justine Kinch, Western Parkland City Director, Transport for NSW (JK)</p>	

Item	Description	Action
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome, introductions and Acknowledgement of Country - RR</b>	
	<p>RR introduces herself to the group.</p> <p>RR introduces KR and ICS to the group. She invites the new attendees to introduce themselves.</p> <p>SC introduces himself; he is from TfNSW, and is standing in for Justine Kinch (JK) who could not attend.</p> <p>NS introduces herself; she is a city planner at the Penrith City Council.</p> <p>CP introduces herself; she is from Sydney Water.</p> <p>CJ introduces herself; she is the Director of Central Western team at DPE, and began this role very recently.</p> <p>AB introduces herself; she is from Sydney Water and began her role very recently.</p>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Approval of minutes: 18 July 2023 – RR/all</b>	
	SA and PB approve the minutes of the previous meeting on July 18, 2023.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Actions from last meeting – RR and KR</b>	
	<p>KR refers to an Action 1 on the register, which is an outstanding item, regarding the status of the Agriport.</p> <p>KR notes that there is no member from the WPCA present to discuss this matter. RR asks CVL to provide an update on the status both of the Agriport and the WPCA.</p> <p>CVL says that WPCA has been moved into the DPE but they are still a separate entity to the DPE. They are will responsible for the Agriport.</p> <p>There are staffing changes at WPCA, and a new representative will have to be identified for the CCC.</p> <p>There are staffing changes occurring due to Machinery of Government changes.</p> <p>KR will follow up with WPCA.</p>	<p>KR to follow up with the WPCA regarding membership on the CCC and status on the Agriport.</p>

	<p>KR refers to Action 2 on the register, regarding LCCs sharing of information about land rates and rate deferral being published as part of the 7.12 contribution plan exhibit.</p> <p>LO will provide KR with a link to the relevant webpage.</p> <p>KR refers to Action 3, regarding the Commonwealth providing detailed information on cargo flights and specific noise contours. This action is ongoing.</p> <p>KR refers to Action 7 on the register, regarding providing a link to the Ingham Master Plan.</p> <p>CVL says that the information available publicly will be put on exhibition on the DPE website. CVL will provide KR a link for distribution.</p> <p>CVL confirms that no decisions have been made regarding the Eastern Ring Road alignment at this stage. It is still in the phase of assessment by the Technical Assurance Panel (TAP). CVL reminds the group that the master plan must go through the TAP before its public exhibition.</p> <p>KR refers to Action 8 on the register, regarding the Agribusiness zone. CVL says that it has been drafted but is still going through the approvals process.</p> <p>KR refers to Action 10 regarding the close of the shoulders at the Eastern end of Elizabeth Drive at 7am. SC confirms that these plans have been abandoned. However, they will be introducing some concrete barriers along that area of the road. The speed limit will be reduced from 70 km/hr to 60 km/hr.</p> <p>SA asks for more details on Action 12, which is a closed item, as it was dealt with offline between LO and RM. RM will find the relevant information, shared in email correspondences, and provide it to SA.</p>	<p>LO to provide KR with a link to the webpage for the information of land rates and rate deferral.</p> <p>KR to follow up with the Commonwealth on outstanding information.</p> <p>CVL to provide a link to information on the Ingham master plan when it is exhibited.</p> <p>RM to provide SA with the email correspondence from LO regarding the E &amp; R Zones.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>Update: Councils draft Contribution Plans – LO (LCC) and NS (PCC)</b>	
	<p>NS provides an update on the Penrith City Council (PCC) draft contributions plan, which is currently on public exhibition on the PCC website.</p> <p>The PCC draft plan was submitted for exhibition in late-May, when the LCC contributions plan was also submitted. Both</p>	

	<p>Councils submitted a 7.12 Contributions Plan, which involves a percentage levy, rather than a specific contribution, imposed when a development consent or complying development certificate is issued.</p> <p>The PCC draft contributions plan includes a percentage levy of 5.5%.</p> <p>The LCC levy is 4.5%.</p> <p>NS explains that contributions will be collected for local roads, open space and drainage land and community facilities.</p> <p>The plan no longer collects for stormwater, as Sydney Water is now the area-wide provider. Sydney Water has a separate contributions scheme.</p> <p>NS says that during this current exhibition period, the PCC has received a high volume of submissions, which will be assessed in the next phase.</p> <p>The PCC draft contributions plan will go to Council, and then the Minister for Planning for sign off.</p> <p>LO says that the Liverpool City Council (LCC) draft contributions plan is also still on the Council website.</p> <p>Like PCC, LO says that the LCC has also had a high volume of submissions.</p> <p>The LCC hope to have their draft plan signed off by the Council in October, and hope for it to go up to the minister in November for endorsement at the State level.</p> <p>DV asks about the timing. Many property owners have had their development plans stalled as the plan is drafted.</p> <p>LO is unable to provide much detail about timing, but he agrees to inform the CCC when the draft plans have been sent to the Minister for Planning.</p> <p>He says that it will be best for the department to provide more specific information regarding timing.</p> <p>KR asks about community submissions on the draft plans. How much influence will they have on changing the draft?</p>	<p>LO to update the CCC when the LCC draft contributions plan has been sent to the Minister for Planning.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>NS says that this is dependent on the matters raised in the submissions. Some matters are beyond the scope of Council's control.</p> <p>However, NS says, recurring or primary concerns expressed through community submissions include details around payment, payment schedules and ensuring that the contributions are equitable. These are matters that the team will continue to look at in more technical detail.</p> <p>NS notes that many submissions raise issues relating to other agencies. While the Council cannot deal with these issues directly, they are passing the submissions on to the relevant agencies.</p> <p>KR asks NS to provide more detail on these.</p> <p>NS says that they are mainly regarding infrastructure delivery across the area. Namely, making sure that there is no doubling-up (across Liverpool and Penrith) with the involvement of other agencies such as Sydney Water.</p> <p>KR asks about identification of land for special infrastructure, particularly in the LCC draft contributions plan.</p> <p>LO says that these special infrastructure sites are identified for acquisition in the LCC draft contributions plan. They are denoted by yellow dots on the precinct plan map.</p> <p>LO says that the SEPP does not currently identify these sites for acquisition, and therefore the SEPP will be updated if this element of the contributions plan is adopted.</p> <p>CVL clarifies that the only things identified in the State Infrastructure Contributions Plan are related to state infrastructure, such as State hospitals as opposed to local infrastructure, such as local libraries.</p> <p>CVL adds that in a state contributions plan, contributions do not cover the full cost of infrastructure.</p> <p>NS clarifies that conversely, local contributions do cover the full cost of infrastructure.</p> <p>RR asks about the State Infrastructure Contributions Plan (SIC).</p>	
--	---	--

<p>CVL explains that there is a SIC already operating in the Aerotropolis. It was adopted when the plans were finalised.</p> <p>CVL explains that to determine the state infrastructure contribution rate, studies are done on capacity to pay. This involves contracting economists to ensure that the amount for contribution does not unduly impact the feasibility of a development to be carried out.</p> <p>The Aerotropolis is being determined at a state level. An allowance was made to compliment the contributions plan.</p> <p>CVL notes that adjustments to these plans are made over time, and there is some reform occurring across NSW in terms of contributions.</p> <p>AL asks if it is true that the development contributions for the Aerotropolis are higher than other areas.</p> <p>CVL says that State Infrastructure contributions apply in areas which are seeing significant rates of development. In the Aerotropolis, contributions are based on a per-hectare measurement of developable land. They also relate to the class of the zone and the proximity to the metro station.</p> <p>CVL explains that in a Mixed-Use zone (within the station precinct), 2% of the costs proposed development are added to the contribution. In an Enterprise Zone (within the station precinct) 1% of the costs proposed development are added to the contribution.</p> <p>CVL says that the precinct plans involved an assessment of the future demands for local or state facilities. The contributions plans aim to propose a fair and equitable way of getting contributions towards new facilities.</p> <p>CVL notes that developers factor local and State contributions into their feasibilities when buying property.</p> <p>CVL says that there is a per-hectare State Contribution, which includes an additional percentage if a property is close to the metro station. The Council Contributions plan is added to this. Thirdly, there is an additional Sydney Water fee.</p> <p>CVL acknowledges that this is a complex specialist area. KR will arrange to have DPE present on this topic at the next CCC meeting.</p>	<p>KR to arrange DPE presentation on the State Contributions Plan at the next CCC meeting.</p>
--	--

	<p>AL would also like to know more about the rules surrounding current land use (for example, for parking cars) which is set to be developed under a new zoning. He knows of a case in which people parking on undeveloped land have been asked to pay contributions.</p> <p>CVL reiterates that the contribution comes into play only when someone lodges a DA for a piece of land. It is not a recurring cost, such as a land tax. On this basis, CVL guesses that in the case AL describes, the Council has asked the landowners to lodge a DA to change the use of the land, and this process involves a contribution.</p> <p>NS agrees that this is likely the case.</p> <p>JH would also like to hear from Sydney Water on their development fee.</p> <p>FO explains that the Sydney Water fee will be introduced from July 2024. There will be development charges for drinking water and wastewater, as well as stormwater. The calculation of these fees is complex, as they depend on the proximity of a property to infrastructure.</p> <p>FO says that he can present on this matter in detail at a future meeting.</p>	<p>FO to present on Sydney Water’s new development fees at the next CCC meeting.</p>
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>Update: Liverpool Flood Study - MH</b></p>	
	<p>MH says that there is not much to update.</p> <p>The next community consultation event is scheduled for 12 September at Bringelly Community Centre from 4-8pm. MH will be in attendance.</p> <p>Consultants from Manly Hydraulics will be in attendance to discuss the flood study. The consultant will present on the historic flood events, as he did at the previous CCC meeting.</p> <p>Following this event, MH explains that they will go back to the Council to discuss the community’s submissions. MH will provide KR with the link for this consultation, for distribution.</p> <p>RM asks about the information flyers for this event. RM personally received 50 flyers to distribute to his immediate neighbors, but it seems that most of the surrounding residents have not received a flyer.</p>	<p>MH to provide KR with the event information for the 12 September community consultation event at Bringelly Community Centre.</p>

	<p>JH says that he also distributed the 50 flyers that were provided to him, and has also found that many surrounding did not receive one by any other means. It seems that the Council’s delivery system has not been successful.</p> <p>MH says that approximately 100 flyers were delivered to the post office. He says that in total, there were approximately 1,000 out for distribution in the South Creek area and other areas affected by flooding.</p> <p>MH says that he will follow up the issue of non-delivery first thing in the morning (Wednesday, 6 September). MH will update KR.</p> <p>JH asks CVL about the new flood studies. There are certain properties that have been adversely affected according to the recent flood modelling, which identifies them as being in flood zones. How does this affect precinct plans and future zoning?</p> <p>CVL says that this was addressed in the Responding to the Issues report (linked <a href="#">here</a>).</p> <p>CVL clarifies that the department is not looking at wholesale zone changes, but instead will look at how flood provisions apply to each site.</p> <p>CVL says that as per the What We Heard report, DPE will look at the Flood Affection Map and will consider zone changes if appropriate. The Government must be satisfied that the Liverpool Flood Modelling takes into account climate change, among other factors.</p> <p>JH raises the ongoing CCC discussion about the significant differences between the data from 2019 flood study by Infrastructure NSW and data gathered through ground truthing by the landowners.</p> <p>Residents continue to be confused and frustrated by this incongruency, given the implications of the flood modelling on impacted landowners.</p> <p>RR acknowledges that this conversation is ongoing. She advises that they are limited in their ability to progress the conversation until the flood study is approved.</p>	<p>MH to follow up the issues with delivery of information flyers.</p>
--	---	--



	<p>In the Zoom chat, RR shares the following quote from the Responding to the Issues report:</p> <p><i>“In the Aerotropolis - Responding to the issues report (September 2021), the Department of Planning stated that if Liverpool City Council adopts a new flood study, the flooding provision in the Aerotropolis SEPP will be amended to reflect the new flood study. Where the flood affection is reduced, the Environment and Recreation zone will be reduced to align with the new flood information as long as the land is not mapped with high biodiversity value. If the affectation is increased, there will not be an expansion of the Environment and Recreation zone although the flood provisions of the Aerotropolis SEPP will apply.”</i></p> <p>JH asks if it would not make more sense to do the flood studies in a few years’ time, after the work in the Aerotropolis is finalised?</p> <p>CVL says that the foundational flood modelling informs the planning decisions. This planning work relied on the Liverpool flood studies.</p> <p>Following the recent major floods, the flood enquiry has changed the way the flood modelling is done and flood risk is considered, accounting for more extreme flood events due to climate change.</p> <p>There will be changes in modelling as flood policy continues to change in the coming years.</p> <p>CVL says that when Liverpool does their new study, the planning will be reflect the updated data.</p> <p>JH and CVL discuss flood mapping as a contested area.</p> <p>CVL says that it will continue to be a controversial matter across the state, as this topic involves questions of safety and risk to life among other issues.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b>TfNSW Briefing: major road upgrades - SC</b>	
	<p>SC discusses the major road upgrades. He presents a map which was published in the DPE’s State Environmental Planning Policy in 2020.</p> <p>SC discusses the upgrade of Bringelly Road. The upgrade has been completed and will provide access to Bradfield and to the Aerotropolis from the south.</p>	

	<p>The Northern Road upgrade was completed in 2021. This provides access from the western side to the airport and freight access to the airport and Agribusiness precinct.</p> <p>The M12 is under construction and will provide access to the Airport from the north from 2026, when the airport is operational.</p> <p>The Elizabeth Drive upgrade will also run along the east-west axis, parallel to and south of the M12.</p> <p>SC says that there will be an exhibition of the environmental impact assessment and concept design of the Elizabeth Drive upgrade within the next few weeks. SC will keep KR informed regarding this event, so that CCC members can provide feedback.</p> <p>SC updates that the northern section of the Mamre Road will be under construction from early-2024. SC says that the design for the upgrade between Erskine Park and Kemps Creek is being scoped out currently.</p> <p>SC discussed the Strategic Business Case for the Prioritised Road Network (“7 Roads”). The Strategic Business Case will look at the function of each road, and will consider the order of prioritisation for how the road upgrades is delivered.</p> <p>DV asks about the Elizabeth Drive upgrade. The road has experienced significant damage due to heavy vehicles and has been the site of many accidents and fatalities. DV feels that Elizabeth Drive should be prioritised more immediately.</p> <p>SC says that unfortunately, the funding for this project is currently not available. The Environmental Impact Assessment will inform the funding decisions regarding this road.</p> <p>SC notes that they are working on some shorter-term safety and access improvements, in the meantime. This includes the current work on the Elizabeth Drive roundabout.</p> <p>SC assures that they are currently working on more detailed, longer-term upgrade plans for Elizabeth Drive.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>In the Zoom chat, GC ask about the timeframes for the Devonshire Road extension to Bringelly Road. She would like to confirm that this is considered a 'priority road'.</p> <p>SC says that they are not yet able to talk about timeframes. They are currently establishing an order of prioritization. SC hopes that these timeframes will be confirmed within the next months.</p> <p>SC will confirm whether Bringelly Road is considered a 'priority road' and will provide an update offline.</p> <p>GC asks about timeframes for the works on 'non-priority' roads such as the Whitaker Road extension and the Western Road extension. She also asks when residents will be approached about acquisition for these projects.</p> <p>SC says that a lot of these roads fall within the scope of Council's responsibility.</p> <p>SC says that the roads in the Prioritised Road Network will be a mixture of State roads and Council-administered roads.</p> <p>RM asks about the new section of Elizabeth Drive, which extends from Adams Road up to the Badgerys Creek Road intersection. A few years ago, construction works involved digging into the middle of the road. The resealing, or 'make good' of the road here is quite poor, RM says, and seems to interfere with driving by pushing drivers into the breakdown lane for approximately 1km. This work should be reviewed and corrected.</p> <p>SC will take this on notice and follow up RM's note.</p>	<p>SC to answer GC's question about whether Devonshire Road is considered a 'priority road'.</p> <p>SC to follow up RM's note about the poor resealing of Elizabeth Drive between Adams Road and the Badgerys Creek intersection.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>Agency Updates</b>	
	<p><b>Department of Planning and Environment – CVL</b></p> <p>CVL says that the DPE has been focusing on the TAP process, which has been working through three master plans.</p> <p>The Bradfield plan has not completed the TAP process and will be lodged for assessment.</p> <p>The Inghams and the GDC masterplans are still being processed by the TAP.</p>	

	<p>DV asks about the regional infrastructure contributions plan (RIC). Is it true that development cannot progress until the RIC is finalised?</p> <p>CVL says that the Aerotropolis SIC will continue to apply in the Aerotropolis region for some time. The RIC will apply on a broader basis on other areas. In some areas, a contributions plan must be in place prior to development consent being granted, but a voluntary planning payment can be arranged.</p> <p>CVL therefore doubts that many developments have been unable to progress on account of the RIC.</p> <p>WW asks CVL if there is any news on Luddenham Village.</p> <p>CVL says that there is still no news. DPE has met with the Commonwealth, who advised them to wait for the EIS to be released in September before they can progress with plans for Luddenham.</p> <p>DV asks about the hotel at the business park on the airport site. The hotel is planned to be 10 storeys, and to have a height of 30m. The neighbouring residents and business are restricted to 24m, on account of flight path heights. Why is this the case?</p> <p>CVL says that the state planning controls do not apply to the airport site. She notes that DPE has made a submission to the proposal for the business park, noting that WSA Co has been inconsistent with the controls that they have asked the DPE to apply to the surrounding area.</p> <p><b>Transport for NSW – SC</b></p> <p>SC notes that TfNSW is hoping to begin on the Devonshire Road/Elizabeth Drive roundabout that will hopefully start this month.</p> <p>They have conducted consultation with residents about night works, and the results of this consultation will inform plans going forward.</p> <p>SC says that they are running a truck awareness campaign in the Aerotropolis area. This will involve social media information, signage and other information materials.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>The new TfNSW website will be up within the coming weeks, and KR will share this link with the group.</p> <p>SC reminds the group of the agency community consultation on 23 September at the Bringelly Community Centre.</p> <p><b>Sydney Water – FO</b></p> <p>FO says that Sydney Water is progressing with concept designs on the wastewater networks across the initial precincts.</p> <p>The Cosgrove Creek Wastewater Network is included among these. It will soon enter early phases of works. Sydney Water will be contacting residents in this area for site investigations.</p> <p>There are works being conducted on Thompsons Creek and the South Creek carrier.</p> <p>Regarding RM’s question about works being conducted around Kemps Creek and Elizabeth Drive, FO says that the concept design is still in its very early stages. The location of the right alignment has not been confirmed.</p> <p>Towards the end of the concept design phase, Sydney Water will begin the community consultation phase and more detailed information will be available to the community.</p> <p>On the community consultation even on 23 September, the Sydney Water team will be available to answer questions in more detail.</p> <p>FO provides an update on the treatment plant that is being constructed north of Kemps Creek. The construction phase has begun, and the site compound has been established. There is an access road which can be used to view the site, and Sydney Water hopes to take community members to view the compound in future.</p> <p>DV asks about the Stage 1 and Stage 2 at Lawson Road and Pitt Street.</p> <p>Regarding Stage 1, FO says that the construction of the pumping station has commenced. The pumping station is a priority, for servicing the airport.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Stage 2 is in the concept phase. Detailed planning will hopefully start in early November.</p> <p>FO will send a relevant information pack to KR for distribution.</p> <p>SA asks about properties on Elizabeth Drive that have open space and water infrastructure constraints. Has there been any clarification on how much land Sydney Water wants to use for the stormwater infrastructure?</p> <p>FO says that they had hoped to have a scheme plan for the stormwater infrastructure sooner, but this project has been pushed to early 2024, as focus has been on the Mamre Road scheme plans.</p> <p>FO says that a number of properties on the northern side of Elizabeth Drive will likely be affected by the construction of the water treatment plan, as new pipelines will be built partially on private properties. Impacted landowners will be contacted directly to discuss the related implications.</p> <p>SA asks, since the Mamre plan was reduced drastically, is it expected that Elizabeth Drive plan will undergo a similar change?</p> <p>FO says that it is too early to say. There was a review of the scheme plans for Mamre, and this may inform plans going forward.</p> <p><b>Sydney Metro – PG</b></p> <p>PG notes that Sydney Metro will attend the cross-agency community day at Bringelly on 23 September. They look forward to interacting with the community.</p> <p>PG notes that the Sydney Metro drop-in session on 18 August was very successful.</p> <p>PG says that Sydney Metro has conducted 4500 community interactions across 18 events this year, since the Caretaker period finished in March.</p> <p>Regarding the tunnel boring machines mentioned in the previous CCC meeting, PG says that now all four machines are in the ground; 2 tunnelling south and 2 tunnelling north. Both of the machines travelling south have completed the first half of their journeys. They have reached the WSA and</p>	<p>FO to provide KR with an information pack for Stages 1 and 2 of development at Lawson Road.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>are preparing to continue with the second half of their journeys.</p> <p>PG reminds the group that the Sydney Metro website has detailed information on these machines, their routes, and a live machine tracking tool.</p> <p>JH asks PG about the tunnels at terminal heading south. Will they go further south from the Bradfield City Centre?</p> <p>PG will follow this up. His understanding was that the tunnel ended at the station box.</p> <p><b>WSA Co – RP</b></p> <p>RP says that from Monday 11 September, WSA Co’s asphalt batch plant will begin commissioning. All asphalt will be batched on-site. This project will involve a 400m length of Elizabeth drive from the WSA site.</p> <p>RP cautions that the operation may release some steam, which can sometimes be mistaken for fire or smoke, but it is not dangerous.</p> <p>RP updates that the WSA Co community barbeque will be held on-site at the airport in November. He will provide KR the event link for distribution.</p> <p>DV revisits her previous question about the airport hotel, which is not held to the same height restrictions as the surrounding buildings.</p> <p>RP says that he will follow up this matter and confirm the details with KR.</p> <p>DV asks about the basins at the airport site, which were not correctly emptied prior to rain events, as agreed by the WSA.</p> <p>RP says that he has provided an email update to KR, who will pass this on the DV.</p> <p>DV asks about the 24-acres owned WSA Co near the airport. This property is very overgrown and poses a serious bushfire concern. The WSA Co property on Martin Road and Lawson Road also poses bushfire and snake dangers. It is vacant land with a lot of shrubbery and trees.</p>	<p>PG to confirm whether the southbound tunnel will extend beyond the Bradfield City Centre station.</p> <p>RP to provide KR with the information for the WSA Co community barbeque.</p> <p>RP to get clarification around the disparate building height restrictions between the airport hotel and surrounding buildings.</p> <p>KR to provide DV with RP’s email response regarding WSA Co’s management of the basins on the airport site.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>RP notes that this is Commonwealth-owned land, and simply reserved for the airport. However, he will follow up this issue internally with the WSA CO asset team.</p> <p><b>Liverpool City Council – LO</b></p> <p>LO says that there are no major updates from LCC.</p> <p>RR asks LO to follow up about organising maintenance for the overgrown properties mentioned by DV.</p> <p>DV asks for Cuthel Street to be reopened to connect to Martin Road, as an emergency exit road for residents at the end of Lawson Road. Previously the gates were closed to prevent illegal dumping, but DV suggests that the Council install security cameras to mitigate this.</p> <p>LO will follow up at the Council regarding the reopening of Couple Street.</p> <p>LO says that compliance has been a challenging area for the LCC to keep up with, and relatively minor issues such as overgrowth may take a longer time to deal with.</p> <p>KR clarifies that the potential dangers associated with overgrowth are major. LO understands this concern. He will take it on notice and follow up with KR.</p> <p>RM has a question about Overett Avenue. The residents were informed that in this financial year the road would be resurfaced making the road suitable for heavy vehicles.</p> <p>LO is not aware of this plan, but will follow up at the council for clarification.</p> <p><b>Penrith City Council – NS</b></p> <p>Having discussed the PCC contributions plan at length, NS has no major updates to provide.</p>	<p>RP to follow up with the WSA Co asset team in regard to the maintenance of overgrown shrubbery on reserved property.</p> <p>LO to follow up about the maintenance of overgrown shrubbery on WSA Co’s reserved land and reopening Cuthel Street.</p> <p>LO to follow up at the LCC for further information on resurfacing works on Overett Avenue.</p>
<b>5</b>	<b>Other Business - RR</b>	
	<p>The government representatives leave the meeting.</p> <p><b>Community Commissioner’s next report to Government</b></p> <p>RR updates that she met with the Minister for Planning, Paul Scully, on 31 Augustday. She provided him with an updated</p>	



	<p>report on the progress of the issues that are being raised with respect to Aerotropolis.</p> <p>This report contained 18 recommendations, several case studies and covered the primary areas of community concern.</p> <p>This report cannot yet be shared with the CCC members, as the Government must first respond to it.</p> <p>RR shares that she is meeting with the Minister for Transport, Minister Haylen, tomorrow (6 September).</p> <p>RR notes that there has been a significant loss of funding to DPE and limited funding in general.</p> <p>There are cross-government coordination issues around infrastructure delivery and forward funding. These issues are generally related to budget limitations. RR notes that the budget released in September will provide insight for future progression.</p> <p>RR notes the question of the Agribusiness precinct. She says that there is some clarification around the zoning and information about landuses. There has been no change in the zoning, but rather there is more detail and clear language provided around the zone in response to community concerns.</p> <p>RR says that her report places emphasis on the non-initial precincts and a focus on Luddenham Village.</p> <p>RR says that there is an appendix to the report which aims to list the things that have been done or achieved in relation to the issues discussed over the recent years.</p> <p>JH asks about RR's previously planned meeting with the CEO of Liverpool Council to discuss the flood modelling inconsistencies, among other matters.</p> <p>RR says that it is now rescheduled for 25 September.</p> <p>JH notes that he and RM met with MH at the LCC to discuss the issues of the flood modelling and hydraulic engineering. JH does not feel that their meeting was very productive.</p> <p>RM notes that he recently sent an email correspondence to the LCC, reinforcing the community's position.</p>	
--	--	--

	RR says that there will be opportunities to express these concerns directly to the elected level at the Council.	
<b>6</b>	<b>Next Meeting – RR</b>	
	RR notes that it is difficult to schedule these meetings to accommodate the range of attendees.  A date will be arranged offline and KR will schedule the next meeting shortly.	