

2 March 2017

## **AIRPORTS AMENDMENT BILL 2016**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the above. The City of Cockburn provides the following response:

### **MASTER PLANS**

#### **Submission Cycle and Review**

It is the City's opinion that the current submission cycle timeframe is appropriate for the review of MPs. At present, there do not appear to be any significant pressures on the current timeframe that would suggest any significant change is required.

At present, should there be some need for the airport to submit a new (draft) MP prior to/after the expiry of the previous five year submission cycle, it should be done so at the discretion of the Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development, in accordance with to Section 76 (1)(b) of the *Airports Act 1996*. This clause allows airports the ability to submit their MP early, or late, depending on their specific circumstances.

Should the timeframe cycle be increased, important social, environmental or economic factors affecting each site may not be adequately addressed within a new MP that may not be readdressed for up to 8 years. This is considered to place particular risk in respect of the relationship of airports with their community context and with the local planning framework they need to function within.

The imposition of different MP timeframes appears to infer smaller general aviation airports as not creating the same impact as passenger jet airports. This assumption does not appreciate that a general aviation airport like Jandakot has and continues to grow at a fast rate with activities that do generate significant changes upon the surrounding community. It would be more efficient to undertake the assessment of MPs on a consistent five yearly cycle review, than to determine to review MPs based on passenger numbers or individual airport development rates or aircraft movements, all of which may fluctuate year to year.

One of the biggest factors affecting airports and the surrounding community is the issue of traffic and the adequate management of the major transport links in and around an airport. The City notes that one of the reasons for having five yearly cycles is the need to adequately manage the MP ground management plan. The possibility of adverse effects on the airport and surrounds should the timeframe for revision of the MP be extended are significant.

### **MAJOR DEVELOPMENT PLANS**

MDPs are proposals for 'significant' developments which are submitted to the Federal Government for approval in accordance with the requirements of the Airports Act 1996. MDPs play a vital role in the control of developments that will have significant impact on airport operations and may be developed for a range of reasons, from airport terminal construction to the development of new warehouse and distribution services for a private company located within the airport precinct.

The City suggests that the current monetary trigger of \$20 million is appropriate for MDPs. Any development over this amount is seen to have the potential to have significant impact on not only operations within the airport precinct, but also surrounding lands and should therefore be carefully assessed to understand the impact this level of development may have on surrounding communities. Deciding to lift the MDP threshold especially for general aviation airports creates a further level of risk for the community and local government in its ongoing relationship with federally regulated airports. It is unclear where the pressure to lift the monetary MDP values has come from, however if it is from the major airport operators it would appear to be at the detriment of surrounding communities and local governments who rely on MDPs for its ongoing involvement in the changes occurring at airports.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Yours Faithfully,

**ANDREW TROSIC**  
**MANAGER STRATEGIC PLANNING**