

Perth Airports Municipalities Group Inc.

Correspondence to be addressed to: Secretariat, Belmont City Council, Locked Bag 379, CLOVERDALE WA 6985
Telephone: (08) 9477 7293 - Facsimile: (08) 9478 1473

Our Ref : 15/001
Your Ref :
Enquiries : Lesley Howell on (08) 9477 7293

29 July 2010

Ms Jeanette Radcliffe
Committee Secretary
Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600
Australia

Dear Ms Radcliffe

AIRPORTS AMENDMENT BILL 2010

The Perth Airport Municipalities Group (PAMG) represents the interests of eleven local governments affected by the Perth International Airport and Jandakot Airport. Councillors and/or Council staff represent each Council.

The PAMG makes the following comments in regard to the Airports Amendment Bill 2010.

It is evident that the Airports Amendment Bill 2010 has been prepared taking into consideration the Airport Commissions, Developer Interests, State Governments, Local Governments and Community Groups. Overall, Option C as recommended is a 'balanced' option to provide a little more detail for Local and State Governments but also attempts to streamline the development approval process to reflect the interests of the Airport operators. While the Option foreshadows improvement in 'consultation' via Planning Coordination Forums and Community Aviation Consultation Groups; there is little detail as to how these will operate. Further detail is required on how and when the forums are to be established and what measurements/ reporting will be put in place to ensure the forums are effective. The effectiveness of C should also be reviewed after a 10 year period and if it is shown to be ineffective (particularly in terms of community engagement) Option B should then be implemented.

On more specific matters the following points are made:

- The detailed information that is only required to be provided in relation to the first five years of the Master Plan should be required on an ongoing basis. Transport



and economic impacts of a master plan should be reviewed in the same way that environmental matters are to be revisited.

- Incorporation of the airport environment strategy into the master plan is strongly supported as it will reduce administrative burdens.
- The amendments to the major development plan triggers are supported. However, there needs to be clear guidelines produced as to what a significant community impact is and how it is triggered. The examples given in the discussion paper are not helpful.
- The ability of airport-lessee companies to seek a reduction in the public consultation period is supported however 15 working days is far too short. It is suggested a minimum of 20 working days should be applied. There should also be provision for the Minister to opt to extend the advertising period to the full 60 days if a significant issue arises during the reduced consultation period.
- For those development types highlighted as incompatible with airport operations, it may be worthwhile removing the blanket prohibition as the uses can be considered under other avenues. It is therefore questionable to refer to them as 'prohibited' as that only has the effect of increasing administrative burdens and a belief in the wider community that airports and communities are basically incompatible. A better approach would be to require a major development plan for those landuses rather than a blanket prohibition.
- The requirement of subsection 71(2) (ga) for a ground transport plan on the landside of the airport is supported.
- The requirement of subsection 71(2) (h) for the inclusion of the airport environment strategy in a draft or final master plan is supported.
- The amendment of subsection 71(6) to include another paragraph which requires a master plan to contain justification for any inconsistencies between the master plan and planning schemes is strongly supported. The subsection should also require that landuse classifications and definitions are consistent with planning schemes.
- Section 72 'Planning period' of the Act specifies that "A draft or final master plan must relate to a period of 20 years. This period is called the planning period." The consequential amendment referred to adds a second clause which states "However, the environment strategy in a draft or final master plan must relate to a period of 5 years." The planning period and the environmental strategy should relate to the same period of time. It is strongly recommended that the planning period and the review period for environmental strategies be amended to a consistent timeframe of 10 years.
- The intent of the addition (nb) to clause 89(1) is highly applauded. However, the example questions given to ascertain if there is a significant impact on a local or regional community are too vague and open for interpretation. While the administrative guidelines referred to may clarify this point there is concern that unless the criteria are clear substantial problems will be encountered by both airport operators and the general public in trying to apply/interpret this requirement.



- The addition of new paragraph (ga) after paragraph 91(1)(g) requiring that a major development plan set out likely effect on traffic, employment, and the local and regional community is an excellent amendment.
- The amendment of existing subsection 91(4) to include another paragraph (which requires justification if a major development plan is inconsistent with planning schemes) is supported.
- The addition of new subsections 92(2A) and (2B) allowing the Minister to shorten the 60-business-day consultation period to a shorter period of not less than 15 business days is not supported as the 15 business day shortened timeframe is too short. It is suggested that a minimum of 20 working days be applied consistent with the Western Australian Planning Commission's reduced advertising period of 28 days for some scheme amendments. There should also be a provision that where an issue arises during the reduced advertising period (which indicates there are additional issues that would have a significant impact), the Minister can extend the advertising period to the full 60 days.
- Where the Minister agrees to shorten the public consultation period the Minister should be required to publicly release information on why the draft major development plan aligns with the details of the proposed development set out in the final master plan; and why the development proposal does not raise additional issues that have a significant impact on the local or regional community.
- The Minister should also have regard to amenity issues when considering incompatible development.

Should you have any enquiries or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the PAMG's Secretary, Lesley Howell on 9477 7293 or email lesley.howell@belmont.wa.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Glenys Godfrey', written in a cursive style.

Cr Glenys Godfrey
PAMG CHAIRPERSON &
MAYOR OF THE CITY OF BELMONT