

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Seaplanes](#)  
**Subject:** A strong NO from me  
**Date:** Wednesday, 2 June 2021 10:23:23 AM

---

Dear NCA,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the seaplanes proposal. In my view, this proposal is a gimmick that should not proceed.

I have been a devoted Canberra resident for over 50 years, and am proud of my unique city. I am not opposed to reasonable development, and have been happy to see the reinvigoration of places like Civic and Kingston foreshore, for example.

I realise that any development proposal will bring tensions. Townplanning developments that benefit the local community broadly while not compromising our stunning environment are good.

However, developments that are essentially gimmicks for the benefit of the very few (most of whom are probably not locals anyway), and which in fact work against the broad interests of locals, are bad. My specific objections are these:

1. The place for planes is at the airport. It is hardly a long commute from Canberra Airport into Civic.

2. Apart from planes, there are cars, buses and trains to get people to Canberra. Hopefully, these options will become more emissions-neutral over the next few years, no doubt with great support from Canberrans. Why on earth move in the opposite direction now by encouraging a fossil-fuelled mode of transport for so few passengers?

3. Locals who are lake users (sailors, paddle boarders, etc) are right to be aghast at this proposal. The practical and safety problems have been well-addressed by the Commodore of the Canberra Yacht Club:

Lake Burley Griffin seaplane proposal open for public consultation as Canberra's largest sailing club says plan is 'not feasible'

<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-06-01/seaplane-proposal-yacht-club-concerns/100180740>

4. Even the many Canberrans who do not venture onto the lake would have their lakeside serenity seriously degraded - picknickers, fishers, photographers, cyclists, walkers, joggers, family groups, visitors at the NMA, etc. We should be encouraging locals to use their lake, as per several recent development initiatives. This seaplane proposal contradicts those initiatives.

5. Proposed operators of these services insist there will be hardly any extra noise and a "manageable" pollution risk. This is a self-serving and unbelievable assertion. Again, we should be working to eliminate pollution of any kind from the lake, not introducing new risks.

6. I imagine our valued wildlife on the lake, particularly water birds nesting in the proposed mooring sites, will be adversely affected.

7. I can't agree with the suggestion that, just because seaplanes work on Sydney Harbour, they will work on our lake. The two environments are completely different - for example,

the much shorter commute time into the CBD from the airport in Canberra, and the fact that Sydney Harbour users must be prepared for high traffic risks - their horse has bolted. In answer to your discussion point, I can't see that making Canberra any more like Sydney would do anything to assist in raising awareness of Canberra as the National Capital - quite the contrary.

8. I note that this proposal could open the door for other seaplane services. It could also lead to calls from other commercial operators of motorised transport to open up the lake to them too. Therefore, this proposal is essentially the thin end of the wedge.

In summary, I add my voice to those opposed to the seaplane proposal. We should take care not to sacrifice Lake Burley Griffin to the self-interest of developers. Thank you again for the chance to comment.

Regards,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the sender's name.

Sent from Samsung tablet.