

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Seaplanes](#)
Subject: Consultation about seaplanes in lake burley Griffin.
Date: Monday, 21 June 2021 9:09:07 AM

I welcome the opportunity to participate in the consultation about seaplanes in lake burley Griffin. Responses are structured following the questions set out in the consultation document.

What is your initial response to the idea of seaplanes operating on Lake Burley Griffin?

Authorising the sea plane is in clear violation of the NCA's administration of the National Land Ordinance 1989 and applied provisions, including the Lakes Ordinance 1976 according to which water skiing, wakeboarding, hovercraft and jet ski are not permitted on the Lake because they have been identified as likely to have a significant impact on the social and aesthetic heritage values of Lake Burley Griffin. It contravenes the Heritage Management Plan's aim to conserve the social and aesthetic qualities of the Lake by promoting the 'non-motorised' recreational use of the Lake, 'minimizing the noise and disruption to the water surface'.

There does not seem to be a force majeure compelling the NCA to go against well accepted practices and policies. Canberra is easily reachable by road, by train and by plane.

Seaplanes are highly likely to affect the social quality of the lake. Lake Burley Griffin is now very accessible and accessed by all Canberrans regardless of age, ethnic or social group who paddle, row, swim, walk, fish, exercise, cycle, picnic, celebrate, meet, watch the ducks and the swans, listen to the water and the wind in the branches of the trees, meditate in and around the lake. The lake is of real benefit to the broad community and its importance is increasing as more people live near the centre of Canberra.

The proposed landing space simply covers most of Lake Burley Griffin's best swimming, watersport, picnic and quietest sitting and walking spots and will affect tranquillity, safety and use of the lake. How it will do that is covered in the next point.

• What are the top three things the NCA should consider in making a decision regarding seaplane operations on Lake Burley Griffin?

1. Social impact

Noise

Noise monitoring activities that took place during the seaplane demonstration have concluded that 'the noise and general disturbance to the Lake during the demonstration did have a minor adverse impact on the heritage values of the Lake, specifically the 'quiet and still' qualities of the water in the Lake'. The lake is perfectly reachable via its airport which is at 15' drive from the lake. Without compelling reason or benefit for the whole Canberra community any noise is not acceptable.

Authorising seaplane operations sets up a precedent for further disregard of the NCA's administration of the National Land Ordinance 1989 and applied provisions. It opens the door for extra operations, growth of services.

Access of existing users

Existing users will need to modify their behaviour to adapt to the sea planes. Or in other words non-commercial, community minded activities will need to adapt to commercial needs that will only benefit a few. While best practice to insure a safe operation is considered in the May 21 *SEAPLANES ON LAKE BURLEY GRIFFIN, Discussion Paper*, it seems to be based around the need to make sure that existing users stay clear of the proposed sea-plane *includes advice concerning staying clear of and safety zones around seaplanes, manoeuvring, rights of way, take-off and landing (p21)*. Considering the policies in place, I would have thought that Seaplanes needed to

work within bounds set by existing practice.

2. **Environmental impacts**

Seaplanes are commonly used by environmental organisations to reach otherwise hard areas, but the experience of seaplanes in hard-to-reach areas cannot be applied to Canberra. Canberra is not a hard-to-reach area and any environmental cost is not warranted.

According to the discussion paper 'The exhaust from seaplane engines discharges well above the water surface and dissipates in the air'. The operations are also likely to include short scenic seaplane operations around Canberra. Why in 2021 take any extra unneeded environmental risk, without a compelling need or problem that requires solving. There are beautiful viewpoints from the many mounts in Canberra.

3. **Who will benefit?**

Most people will never use the seaplane and if they did it would have to be sponsored by the government to be affordable and would require so many flights that it would be environmentally unsustainable.

The people who might benefit are those who can afford to pay to avoid common transport routes, their requirements, and their crowds. Canberra's airport is rarely crowded and is very close to the city. The creation of extra transport services for those who can afford it imposes environmental and social penalties to the rest of the community, while providing it very little if no benefit.

Tourist attractions can perfectly well be packaged without a seaplane. The development of existing infrastructures, that would also benefit the general public, would seem to be a far better option to attract more Sydney siders. Considering the maximum capacity of the seaplanes, they could only bring a maximum of 28 people a day to tourist spots. Is that worth the social and environmental sacrifice?

• Has the NCA appropriately covered the range of issues requiring consideration before making a decision concerning seaplane operations on Lake Burley Griffin?

The discussion paper suggests that social impacts might have been minimised, while hypothetical commercial advantages and arguments brought forward by seaplane operators have been maximised.

• Could seaplane operations assist in raising awareness of Canberra as the National Capital and how could this benefit Australians?

Seaplanes are known to be used by busy politicians or rich businessmen, enabling them to fly in and out of their ivory towers without having to interact with the general public. Canberra already tends to be seen as an ivory tower. The seaplanes can only increase this negative view of Canberra.

Joelle Vandermensbrugghe

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]