

**Western Sydney Aerotropolis
Community Consultative Committee**

Meeting no: 20

Date: 14 May 2024

Venue: Zoom

Attendees	
<p>Community members</p> <p>Sam Aloï (SA)</p> <p>Helen Anderson (HA)</p> <p>Joe Herceg (JH)</p> <p>Gabriella Condello (GC)</p> <p>Paul Taglioli (PT)</p> <p>Diana Vukovic (DV)</p> <p>Paul Buhac (PB)</p> <p>Ross Murphy (RM)</p> <p>Sascha Vukmirica</p> <p>Wayne Willmington</p> <p>Independent Community Commissioner</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>Government representatives</p> <p>Sally Dale, NSW Valuer General (SD)</p> <p>Josh Etherington, Special Advisor, Rating and Taxing Valuations, Valuation NSW (JE)</p> <p>Ben Gresham, Manager Place and Infrastructure Central (Western), Metro West, Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI) (BG)</p> <p>Katy Hannouch, Manager Community Engagement Airport Construction, Western Sydney Airport (KH)</p> <p>Rebecca Lynch, Senior Community Engagement Officer, Western Sydney Airport (RL)</p> <p>Simon Cousins, Senior Manager Partnerships and Engagement, Transport for NSW (SC)</p> <p>Chris Davis, Stakeholder Interface Manager, Sydney Metro (CD)</p> <p>Catherine Crichton, Sydney Metro (CC)</p> <p>Fernando Ortego, Western Sydney – Commercial Partnerships Manager, Sydney Water (FO)</p> <p>Vishal Sharma, Advisor – Engagement, Revenue NSW, Department of Customer Service (VS)</p> <p>Matthew Saunders, Rates Coordinator, Penrith City Council (MS)</p> <p>Christine Gough, City Planning Manager, Penrith City Council (CG)</p> <p>David Grasso, Rates Coordinator, Liverpool City Council (DG)</p> <p>Dan Riley, Manager Development Engineering, Liverpool City Council (DR)</p>

	<p>Mark Hannan, Manager City Planning, Liverpool City Council (MH)</p> <p>Other Attendees</p> <p>Kate Robinson, office of the Independent Community Commissioner (KR)</p>
<p>Apologies</p> <p>Justine Kinch, Western Parkland City Director, Transport for NSW (JK)</p> <p>Tanya Davies MP, Member for Badgerys Creek (TD)</p> <p>Gina Metcalfe, Director Aerotropolis Strategy and Coordination Infrastructure and Delivery, Western Parkland City Authority (WPCA) (GM)</p>	

Item	Description	Action
1	Welcome and introductions - RR	
	<p>RR introduces herself and welcomes all attendees to the group.</p> <p>As there are presentations today, attendees will make their introductions when giving their updates to optimise the meeting time available.</p>	
2	Briefing and discussion: land value assessments - SD	
	<p>SD introduces herself; she is the Valuer-General. SD presents on the Valuation NSW team and the land value assessments. SD's presentation includes a video on how land values are calculated, which is available on the Valuer General's website. Other video material is also available on the website including how land values relate to council rates and land tax.</p> <p>Following the video, SD explains that land values are based on market value, which is determined by sales evidence. This is legislated in the <i>Valuation of Land Act</i> and by case law. Sales evidence considers zoning, and any constraints on land such as if they are flood affected or have open space zoning. The location and topography are also considered. She emphasises that valuations are based on sales evidence, and sales that have occurred in the market that are open transactions.</p>	

	<p>PT asks SD about the current valuations in some areas in the Aerotropolis; specifically, properties impacted by open space and trunk drainage constraints. In the case of these constrained properties, it seems that the valuers have only valued the developable portion of the land with the constrained parts valued at \$0. When it comes to acquisition, the landowners are concerned that they are being lowballed on the basis of constraints on their property. They feel that their properties should have been valued in totality, as per their enterprise zoning.</p> <p>SD says that the land value that people get for general valuation or for land tax is based on the <i>Valuation of Land Act</i> which is the market value for rating and taxing. The value for land acquisition under the <i>Just Terms Act</i> is a totally separate process and when it comes time to be acquired the acquiring authority will send a valuer who will value the land based on the <i>Just Terms Act</i> and the compensation that is required under the Act.</p> <p>PT explains that his property has no constraints and has increased in value by 40%. On the other hand, PT's direct neighbour has had 75% of their property earmarked for open space, and on the basis of this constraint the property has been devalued by 40%. This is a vast area, and street by street the valuations vary.</p> <p>SD says she can't comment on individual properties or areas. She reiterates that Valuer-General valuations are for land rate and tax purposes based on the sales evidence. The compensation for land being acquired will come down to the different nuances of the property.</p> <p>SV says that there are issues with priority areas not being recognised or accounted for. Depending on which priority area you are in impacts how land can be used. Eg priority area 1 prices are skyrocketing. This means that priority areas 2 and 3 are deemed similarly valuable even though they are not at the same stage of being developer-ready. She feels that there are inconsistencies in values between neighbours where for example a battle axe block is valued higher than its neighbour.</p> <p>SV cites Burra Park and per square metre values which have increased and decreased in recent years despite recent record sales.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>SV says that the Valuer-General’s office is difficult to contact and the lack of expertise in the customer service team means they can’t speak to the issues. The objection and reply process is convoluted making it difficult for the average person to navigate the system and achieve lower rate levels.</p> <p>SD asks if SV has filed an objection.</p> <p>SV says she did attempt to in February, but reiterates that the reply process has been convoluted and the customer service team has appeared to be under-equipped to assist. The reply protest is underway.</p> <p>SD asks SV to share her details through Roberta for the customer service team to follow up. SV says that the customer service team cannot help her. SD says that she will have JE follow up SV’s case directly. SD goes on to say that other members of the community with concerns will need to go through to Roberta.</p> <p>SV says there needs to be a dedicated hotline for people.</p> <p>KR suggests that it would be helpful to arrange for a dedicated customer service team who have knowledge of the Aerotropolis to answer community queries. Revenue NSW has set up this process and it is working well.</p> <p>SD says that she will follow up with RR and KR to discuss.</p> <p>SA agrees with SV’s points. He says that many of these landowners in question are elderly, and their wellbeing is being seriously impacted. It seems clear that the land rates should not increase until the rezoning occurs. There needs to be a dispensation in cases where land has not yet been rezoned or until a DA has been approved.</p> <p>SD acknowledges the frustration. She reiterates that her role is independent and impartial, and that she is governed by the legislation to value land at market value.</p> <p>JE says that there are rate and tax relief options available.</p> <p>JH asks how far back into the record of recent sales does the valuer go in the process of valuing.</p>	<p>JE to follow up on SD’s case.</p> <p>SD, KR and RR to meet offline to discuss the potential of a dedicated and specialised team at the Valuer General’s office who can offer more specific and informed support to customers in the Aerotropolis.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>SD says that they aim to look at the most recent sales evidence available, but may need to go back a number of years. They also adjust for market movement.</p> <p>JH asks if the most recent sale is the best-evidence example of value.</p> <p>SD says that they look at a number of factors and will look at a number of sales. A wide range is best. There is no specific rule in regard to timeframes - it is guided by the sales evidence that is available.</p> <p>SV asks if both sales and options are used to value sales. SD says that only settled sales are used. JE adds that sales are primarily used. That they will look at secondary evidence in the absence of sales.</p>	
3	Briefing and discussion: Council rates - MS, DG	
	<p>MS introduces himself; he is the rates coordinator at Penrith Council.</p> <p>MS says that there are 2 components to rates: land value multiplied by the rate for your rating category rating category (e.g. farmland, residential, business and mining). The way to reduce rates is to reduce land value.</p> <p>MS says that there is a rate postponement option available for farmland and residential properties. Penrith Council provided a community newsletter with this information. Information is also available on Council's website and on the back of rates notices. MS will send through this to KR and RR.</p> <p>Under this arrangement, you pay a lower rate upfront but there will be a deferred amount that you will need to pay if you sell or develop within 5 years. If you hold the land for more than 5 years, Council waives some of the postponed rates and interest.</p> <p>DG says that Liverpool Council does not rely solely on land values to determine the rates. They only use land value for 50% of rate income which flattens rates, and makes them less susceptible to big fluctuations.</p> <p>DG says that pensioners are able to accrue rates against their property until they decide to sell. Also, under section 585 people can defer their rates if they have land valued at</p>	<p>MS to forward the Penrith Council community newsletter on rate postponement to KR and RR, who will share with the CCC.</p>

	<p>a higher use. Particularly beneficial for people who hold their land for more than 5 years after which time Council starts writing-off rates each year so they will only carry with them a maximum of 5 years rates when they eventually sell.</p> <p>DG says that the values Council has now are being used for the current year and the next 2 years. It is very unlikely that residents will not see any increases in their rates for the next 2 years other than 4-5% for CPI.</p> <p>JH notes that Council rates are updated every 3 years. If the VG decides to revalue properties in the Aerotropolis next year, would Liverpool Council not increase rates right away?</p> <p>DG says no, they are not expecting to raise Council rates in the next 2 years.</p> <p>SD says for rating and taxing they have the general valuation for rates purposes. The VG provides to Councils the land values in their areas every 3 years for rates. They value all properties every year for land tax, but only a small proportion of properties are subject to land tax. Because it is not know which properties will be subject to land tax, they value the 2.7 million properties in NSW every year but Councils only receive the valuation every three years.</p> <p>DG says that the rates for 2024-25 will be on exhibition soon with a 5% IPART increase across the board.</p> <p>PT notes that even though his rates have increased 20-fold, none of the infrastructure and services (roads, waste removal, etc) have improved in this time.</p> <p>SV says that it would be helpful for Councils to make it clearer how landowners can seek assistance. There are many elderly and vulnerable people in the Aerotropolis who do not currently have clear access to assistance. SV notes that MS has been especially helpful in her own dealings with the issue of Council rates.</p>	
4	Briefing and discussion: Land tax - VS	
	<p>VS says that it was good to meet some of the community members at the recent Aerotropolis expo event. The organisation got a lot of insights from many different landowners, and received follow-up questions from community attendees.</p>	

	<p>This event highlighted a lack of community understanding in some areas, especially among those who are getting an exemption for primary production land and were worried that as they got older they would want to wind up that activity and will no longer get the exemption.</p> <p>For many, their principle place of residence was on the property and this is also exempt.</p> <p>VS said payment options have been expanded in their notices this year, and people will have longer to pay without penalties. He said that there is a tax debt unit to support people who are struggling to pay their land tax. He said that it has been quiet from the Aerotropolis and surrounding areas.</p> <p>SV asks if there is a 5 acre limitation on the land size of primary places of residences.</p> <p>VS says that there is no size limit or value limit. Where a person owns a property that contains more than one parcel of land i.e. more than one lot, it can get more complicated. However, there are no size or value limitations as long as the land is only used for principle residential purposes.</p> <p>He says that if landowners are running a business from the property, Revenue NSW considers this mixed use which changes things. If a small portion of the land is used for the residence and the rest is for a business, then they will consider splitting the value.</p> <p>SV some landowners in the Northern Gateway who have been renting their properties and are considering moving back. They are wanting to revert to primary production. She asks how long would it take to have their changed usage recognized by Revenue NSW.</p> <p>VS says land taxes are based on the taxing date of 31 December each year. If people want to change their landuse: for principle place of residence they need to have been living there for 6 months prior to the tax date; for primary production land it is more complicated. Due to rezoning to Enterprise they conduct the commerciality (or business) test to see the capital investment, business plan and financials to support the activity being run for the purposes of a profit. It needs to be the dominant use of the land and also a commercially viable activity.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>VS shares some general information for land tax exemptions and concessions on the Revenue NSW website, including Principal Place of Residence (PPR) and Primary Production Land (PPL): Apply for an exemption or concession Revenue NSW</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Agency updates</p>	
	<p>• Transport for NSW – SC SC says that the Australian Government has announced funding of \$1.9 billion for Western Sydney. Funded projects included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$500m for Mamre Road stage 2 delivery • \$400 million for Elizabeth Drive upgrade priority sections • Over \$100 million for Western Sydney bus services • \$147.5 million for planning projects including Western Sydney freight line intermode network in the airport precinct and the Eastern Ring Road and Badgerys Creek Road south • \$20 million for planning of the South-West rail <p>TfNSW is working with the Australian Government on the scope of this funding, and defining the priority projects. He will provide an update to the CCC at the next meeting after the NSW Government budget is handed down in June.</p> <p>WW asks about the status of Luddenham Road interchange (Mamre Road stage 1).</p> <p>SC says that stage 1 construction is expected to start before the end of this calendar year.</p> <p>SC notes that TfNSW has announced the new bus services that will connect the airport precinct to Penrith, Liverpool, Campbelltown, Mt Druitt and Leppington. TfNSW will be consulting on these locations later in the year.</p> <p>SC advises that there is a new wave of the Be Truck Aware campaign, which is set to launch in the coming weeks.</p> <p>WW is dismayed that there are no bus services offered west of the airport and the whole area up to Wallacia and Silverdale.</p>	<p>SC to provide an update on priority projects funded by the Australian Government.</p> <p>SC to pass on WW’s concern that the new bus routes exclude areas West of the airport, and to provide an update on TfNSW’s response.</p>

	<p>SC notes WW's concern and will raise within the Department within the context of local bus routes.</p> <p>• Sydney Metro – CD CD introduces CC, who is filling in for him this week at Metro.</p> <p>CD updates that the TBMs Eileen and Peggy have progressed about 5 kilometers of their 5.5km journey. Catherine and Marlene are 3.7 kms and getting close to St Marys.</p> <p>Around the airport terminal, works are underway to support the tunnel and operations, and earthworks are beginning on the future site compound.</p> <p>Airport business park, tunnelling has been completed between the park and terminal sites.</p> <p>In Luddenham, the contractors has completed the scans where the station will be and they will be doing earthworks to support track alignment in the coming months.</p> <p>JH asks if business cases are being conducted for the extension south and the extension to Leppington.</p> <p>CD confirms that funding was announced in the last NSW Government budget to start looking into rail connection options between Glenfield-Leppington from the Aerotropolis, and further south to Macarthur / Campbelltown region, and north between St Marys and Tallawong.</p> <p>CD says that timing varies for the development of the business cases, and they are aiming for 18-24 months on these projects.</p> <p>JH asks if they are planning to do any drilling going south in the next 18 months. He notes that the corridor has been in place for 10 years and notes that it is remarkable that a business case has not been done before now.</p> <p>CD says that drilling works are unlikely in the next 18 months. He explains that corridor preservation work is distinct from an investment decision by the Government in infrastructure.</p>	<p>KH to share the information on the WSA Co's community open day with RR and KR, to be passed on to the group.</p>
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSA Co - KH KH says that they issued their quarterly construction update in March, which contains details on progress and planning. WSA Co is planning a major community open day in the coming months and will provide information on this open day to the group via KR. • Liverpool City Council – MH/DR MH has no updates to share. • Penrith City Council – CG CG has no updates to share. 	
6	Any other business (AOB) and actions from previous meeting	
	<p><u>AOB</u></p> <p>WW says that there is a push by Luddenham locals about the need for another high school because there are lot of people from Warragamba, Wallacia, Silverdale and Mulgoa ago to Glenmore Park High which is at capacity. Another high school in the south has been discussed for several years. He has contacted the Minister about the suitability of Luddenham.</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <p>KR guides the group through the actions register, and the following actions are discussed as follows:</p> <p>In relation to the question from last meeting about the data used for flood modelling, JG says she understands there is dissatisfaction with where the sewer line has been located which is generally located in the 1/100 flood level. She confirms that Sydney Water has used the Infrastructure NSW data, which is consistent with their wider approach. This is also consistent with the data used by the Department of Planning.</p> <p>JG explains that the DPE is restructuring around function rather than place. This means that rather than staff allocated to Western Sydney, for example, they are now responsible for State-led rezonings. Anthea Sargent is the new Executive Director and the new Director looking after this area is Isabel Vergona. Contact details will be published on the website.</p>	

	<p>JG says that there are a number of projects across DPE that are being considered in terms of prioritisation and timeframes especially as part of the State-led rezonings. This includes Luddenham which the Minister has signalled that he would like to see progress. The Department is looking at this within the context of all projects to make sure it can be resourced. She anticipates that they will have more information in the next few weeks.</p> <p>SA asks if the South Creek precinct is on the priority list particularly between Elizabeth Drive and Bringelly Road.</p> <p>JG says that while this is an important project, it is not in the top tier of priority projects (e.g. responding to the Housing Accord).</p> <p>SA asks if the Government’s intention is to acquire some or all of that land. JG says the long-term plan is to bring that land into public ownership. However given the scale of the area and the high cost, it will be a very long-term project. So we need to be realistic and really clear about what happens in the short-term (next two years).</p> <p>BG says that landowners have existing use rights. He acknowledges that there has not been clarity in the last few years, and that providing clarity is important. BG adds that they will keep the community updated.</p> <p>RM says that this is the first time that any government agency has acknowledged that there is intent to acquire the land within the South Creek corridor. We have been told for many years that it wouldn’t be acquired.</p> <p>RM adds that the SEPP heavily restricts what landowners can and cannot do with their land to the point where it is unsellable. He says landowners do not, in effect, have existing use rights.</p> <p>BG notes that although the department is in a transition phase, community members are still welcome to send questions and enquiries to him. Alternatively, people can use the Aerotropolis email aerotropolis@dpie.nsw.gov.au</p> <p>Regarding the upgraded section of Elizabeth Drive, SC says that this will happen around the same time that the M12 opens in 2026.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>SC responds to congestion at Mamre Road and Luddenham Road intersection saying it will be signalized and there will be turning lanes installed. Construction management plans are being developed including coordinating movements, detours etc.</p> <p>In relation to JH's question at the last meeting about the length of the new train tunnels beyond the new station, CD says that 62m is required to install the tunnel stubs at the end of the station box. Stubs are there to safeguard future extensions.</p>	
--	---	--