

Re: Greater Macarthur Land Release

I respectfully submit the following in response to your opportunity for public comment:

- I have owned property in the affected area since the early 1970's. Back then the NSW Government suggested that they would be buying the land back from landowners. They then put on conditions that the land could not be sold privately putting many people in limbo. The 40 hectare conditions imposed on the land and the refusal by the NSW Department of Planning to adjust boundaries, again constrained landowners options.
- The NSW Government of course changed and the land was not acquired. I disposed of some lots 5/6 years ago still constrained by the hectare allowances.
- A 1998 application to Wollondilly Council for rezoning was supported by the Council but rejected by the DoP stating that the land 'deserves better than that'.
- Many of the affected landowners have held their properties for decades. Over the years there have been many changes by State and Local Governments which have placed landowners in a position of uncertainty. There have been a range of mixed messages as to the intended land use, and this ambiguity has led to reduced prices, constraints on subdivision options and delays in approvals.
- Landowners have been continually told that the township of Appin will be needed to accommodate the expansion of greater Sydney. I agree, but to delay this expansion until 2036 is counter-productive and more costly to the NSW Government. It is easier and cheaper to consider the Appin Township in this current round of development as it is surrounded by the nominated options, Wilton to the South and Mount Gilead to the North. To not include the area at one time makes no sense given the infrastructure requirements of the proposal, not the least of which is an Appin Road upgrade.
- The lands in consideration are no longer viable for food production and the concessions now granted federally around imported products mean that growers in this region cannot compete on any market, local, state, nationally or in the export market. The land is ready for development now and we have been paying land rates consistent with this proposition for some time as our land is assumed to include a potential for urban expansion.
- Landowners are aware of the local opposition to development but it is acknowledged that their concerns are really about infrastructure capacity rather than not growing the value of the community in real terms – with families and social value capture. Appropriate development is a universally accepted proposal and any such development should be conducted concurrently with the Greater Macarthur timelines to best represent value for money for the State and Local Government stakeholders.
- The studies conclude that Appin Village can be protected and we support this finding. Protected however, means delivering sustainable investment, building on infrastructure, developing the small business centre as an attractive 'stop', maintaining the 'village feel' of the township but also attracting investment from those who wish to live in a semi-rural community with access to the City of Wollongong to the South and Campbelltown to the North

- There is sufficient greenspace, natural habitat and bushland for all. Robust ecological corridors are already in place and no-one is suggesting the large scale development of this important ecological aspect of the community. There are many significant examples of sustainable national development that can be applied to this issue.
- The study concludes Menangle Park, Mt Gilead and Wilton can deliver 35,000 homes over 20 years. Given the opportunity to disperse this number of homes and create a mix of medium to low density/rural residential housing – the proposition becomes more attractive to a range of investors rather than concentrating the market on 600sq metre housing and creating enclaves of a type market.
- The study finds that parts of Mt Gilead and Menangle Park have some of the most fertile soils in the region with access to irrigation. Given that finding it appears counter-intuitive to set aside high value agricultural lands for housing and then preserve quality agricultural land at Appin until 2036.
- There is no reason not to include Appin in the first tranche of the Greater Macarthur Land Release. The community will support well planned growth that protects bushland and habitat and retains the country qualities of larger lots and large areas of open space protecting views into bushland and into our rivers and gorges.
- Please also seek that road trauma data over the last five years on Appin Road and consider the implications of 'stacking' communities north and south of Appin township without dual lane access.
- I have no objection to rezoning now or at any time if appropriate. The 'doughnut scenario' described in the SMH on 14th November 2015 really hits the pint as it is more costly, wasteful and less efficient to not include Appin in the initial plans – than it is to delay

Kind Regards

Tony Brticevich