

Bubb, Hannah

---

**From:** noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au on behalf of Planning Portal - Department of Planning and Environment <noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au>  
**Sent:** Friday, 12 March 2021 5:15 PM  
**To:** PPO Engagement  
**Cc:** eplanning.exhibitions@planning.nsw.gov.au  
**Subject:** Webform submission from: Western Sydney Aerotropolis Draft Precinct Plans  
**Attachments:** nobca-submission-for-aerotropolis-consultation.docx

Submitted on Fri, 12/03/2021 - 17:08

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

**Submission Type**

I am submitting on behalf of my organisation

## Name

**First name**

Linda

**Last name**

Weaving

**I would like my submission to remain confidential**

No

## Info



**Suburb/Town & Postcode**

Springwood

**Submission file**

[nobca-submission-for-aerotropolis-consultation.docx](#)

**Submission**

See attached a submission by NoBCA - No Badgerys Creek Airport Inc made on behalf of our thousands of members, supporters and followers from across western Sydney.

For more information, please see our website:

<https://westernsydneyairportsucks.com/>

Dr Linda Weaving BSc hons PhD

President

NoBCA

**I agree to the above statement**

Yes

## **Disclaimer**

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, on behalf of **Liverpool City Council**.

# **NoBCA Submission on the Western Sydney Aerotropolis Plans**

## **About us**

NoBCA is an incorporated community group opposed to the development of a 24/7 airport in western Sydney. NoBCA is made up of ordinary locals from across western Sydney and the Blue Mountains. We represent the interests of the community and environment above the billionaires and vested interests. We work to the myriad of expose false and misleading information promulgated by airport proponents. We fight lies with evidence. We know we are the underdogs, but together underdogs can achieve great things. It's hard work, and sometimes exposes us – particularly our committee members - to harm at the hands of proponents. However, our commitment is such that no amount of threats, derision, vilification, intimidation, vandalism or other efforts on their part will stop our fight for justice.

Below is our submission on the plans for a so-called 'aerotropolis' to be centred in western Sydney. Further information can be found at our website:

<http://westernsydneyairportsucks.com>

## **Submission Summary**

The plans for a 'Parkland City' and 'aerotropolis' (from hereon in to be referred to as aerocrapolis) look like something out of Utopia. The reams of brochures, pretty pictures, documents and advertising must have cost the taxpayer a small fortune! Nevertheless, the sentiment, if genuine, is positive. More green space, open water, trees, reserves and gardens are exactly what western Sydney needs to beautify and cool our cities and suburbs. As you well know, the impact of the urban heat island effect, exacerbated by climate change, is an enormous issue, with predictions that our area will become unliveable in the not-too-distant future. We fully support the stated precinct planning drivers such as the 'intent of a landscape-lead approach' to planning and 'sustainable practices in terms of resilience, the circular economy, job creation and the Greater Sydney green grid'. An evidence based planning document called 'Jobs for the West' was released several years ago with these approaches in mind. You could have saved yourselves (and the taxpayer) an awful lot of time and expense if you had taken this community backed plan on board back then. You can read more and view the document here:

[Jobs for the West](#)

The provision of a north-south rail line is very welcome and long overdue. It is very disappointing, however, that the proposed line is tokenistic at best. It does not have any stops

in existing communities bar St Marys. It is to be a so-called 'metro' construction, completely incompatible with the existing network. Changing trains would therefore always be a necessity, one that increases travel times and is a big nuisance, particularly for travellers with luggage. Pretty bad planning when the idea is to provide access to an airport. It doesn't even connect to the south west growth area! Of course, it is obvious why this route was chosen rather than something that would actually be useful. It's because it was dictated by the property developers Celestino, who included a rail line and station within the original rezoning application they made for their land way back in 2011, through, as they say in one of their documents submitted to the NSW government, 'property developer lead planning with support from all three levels of government'. So much for the Greater Sydney Commission and Parkland City Authority. It's property developers doing the planning. The GSC and PCA are just the patsies who will take the fall when the aerocropolis turns out to be the hell hole that living with a 24/7 airport always is, and the associated 'planning' ends up as a complete dogs breakfast.

You see, we do not for one second believe any of your plans, your pretty pictures, your promises of a 'liveable', 'sustainable', 'parkland' utopia with thousands of jobs. The aerocropolis concept is about increasing profits for big business, not about residents or lifestyles. Certainly not about sustainability or liveability! Airports consume vast quantities of fossil fuels, generate heat, produce noise pollution, air pollution, water pollution, huge quantities of greenhouse gases, and are generally very unpleasant places to be that normal people see as a necessary evil at best, and that even the most avid of travellers want to spend the minimum possible time in. They impact not only those in the immediate vicinity, but anyone so unfortunate as to find themselves under a flight path (which is why the flight paths are being kept secret, obviously).

Of course, in respect to the western Sydney airport there is also mass deforestation, eradication of critically endangered species and ecosystems, and covering thousands of hectares of what currently IS 'green space' (and some of Australia's best agricultural land) with concrete and asphalt. Plus the fact that Badgerys Creek, which is currently a 'cool zone' (getting back to that urban heat island thing), will become a 'hot zone'. Currently, breezes from the south over Badgerys Creek are one of the few things keeping summer temperatures in Penrith below 50°C. Turn it into a hot zone by building an airport and Penrith will fry.

Then there's the safety issue.

Our comments on specific details in the planning document are provided in the sections below. This list is not exhaustive. We have many other concerns, but time and resources available to our community group are limited compared to those of the government.

## **Bird & Bat Strike Risk**

Since the very first days of the planning process for a so-called 'Parkland City' and surrounding a 24/7 airport, we have tried rather exhaustively to bring to the attention of the

Greater Sydney Commission and Parkland City Authority the impossibility of their plans. They are completely incompatible with an airport or an aeropolis. Rural land, environmental zoning, lakes, creeks, reserves, trees, 'green space'. These are the very things that should NEVER be located in the vicinity of an airport if it can possibly be avoided! They are all features that create a high risk of collision between aircraft and wildlife!

If you are inclined to believe that this is not a serious safety issue, recall the famous 'miracle on the Hudson', which happened as a direct result of a collision of an aircraft with several birds. The reason it was called a miracle is that the safe landing was unprecedented. Landings on water virtually always end in disaster. If the plane had come down anywhere but the river, the results would have been catastrophic, since there's nothing but houses and high-rise as far as the eye can see. If such a thing happened in western Sydney the outcome would be deadly. There is nowhere to attempt a safe landing.

Collisions between wildlife and aircraft cost in excess of US\$1.2 billion every year in repairs, delays and cancellations (Allen, 2000), so this is about economics as well as risking lives.

The EIS did identify a number of 'high risk' species during the survey. These are species that are responsible for the majority of incidents in this country, or pose the greatest risk of damage to aircraft due to their size, numbers and/or behaviour. Species such as Galahs, White Ibis, Kites and Eagles.

Since this airport is supposed to operate at night, it is essential that nocturnal species are also surveyed, yet this was not done.

The EIS survey authors stated that further work further afield would have to be done in order to determine the TRUE risk of collisions between wildlife and aircraft. So has this been done? A recent FOI request submitted to the Department of Infrastructure says NO (FOI 21-120). There are reportedly no records of so much as a discussion of bird and bat strike risk within the department, never mind any actual assessment!

So it is clear that the government has forged ahead with construction of an airport with a complete disregard for safety.

If the government HAD performed the necessary risk assessments, they would have found that this airport would have the highest risk of bat strike in the country, with what is probably the highest risk species there is. The Grey Headed Flying Fox. These animals have a wingspan of 1.5m and travel en masse between their daytime camps and feeding grounds every night, with a return journey of up to 100km. It is common knowledge that there is a nightly migration of Flying Foxes along the length of the Nepean valley, over which aircraft were predicted to fly at a height of only 2,500 feet (760m) (WSA EIS). Those living in the area have said that 'the night sky is black with bats'. If one refers to the government's own records (the National Flying Fox Monitor), which records the locations and surveyed numbers of bats at every known flying fox camp in the country, one will see confirmation that Badgerys Creek is an unsafe location for an airport (fig 1).

So, in conclusion, the aerocropolis, as described in all those expensive documents and pretty pictures, is a fantasy. The GSC, the PCA, the Department of Planning, the NSW government, are selling the public a lie. That is corrupt and immoral. For goodness sake, just come out and call a spade a spade. Drop the charade and have the guts to tell the truth. If Badgerys Creek was to be made a high speed rail hub instead of an aerocropolis, then all those plans for a 'vibrant', 'liveable', 'sustainable' city COULD well come true. However, whilst ever that white elephant called western Sydney airport is in the room, they will not, and it will be some beurocrat patsies who take the blame and cop the slack. Not the politicians and property developers who are REALLY pulling the strings. Unless the planners come clean now.

Sorry. We don't buy the lie.

**Australian Government**  
**Department of Agriculture,  
Water and the Environment**

# Location of Flying Fox Camps Around Western Sydney Airport

National Flying-fox monitoring viewer

RETURN TO MEEP FLYING-FOX CAMPS LEGEND BASEMAPS TOOLS > HELP

Scale - 1:288,895 Coordinates - -33.99113, 150.8827

The numbers of animals found most recently (2020) at each camp are as indicated. These bats migrate in large groups up to 100km every night to forage. GHFFs have a wingspan of 1.5 metres.  
Camp locations & numbers make collisions with aircraft flying in & out of WSA highly likely.

Key:  
GHFF - Grey Headed Flying Fox  
BFF - Black Flying Fox

These are known camps. Further camps as yet unknown may exist in the Blue Mountains

Accessibility | Disclaimer | Privacy | © Commonwealth of Australia (CC BY) | © Commonwealth of Australia (Geoscience Australia) 2015. © PSMA Australia

## **'Agribusiness' Precinct**

We believe that the 'agribusiness' hub is the result of 'consultation' (collusion) between the two largest landholders and the Federal and NSW governments. These are the Perich brothers, who own Leppington Dairy Corporation, the largest dairy industry company in Australia, and Baiada, the largest poultry company in Australia. Both are looking towards export markets as consumer competition law prevents them from growing any further or buying out any more competitors, due to the size of their market share. Both are also large scale property developers (the property developer arm of Baiada is called Celestino). Both have and will benefit enormously in financial terms from the zoning, planning and infrastructure decisions that have been made and are outlined in the aerocropolis planning document. The Perich brothers/Leppington Pastoral Company were also the ones paid 10 times the value of land acquired by the government for potential use at an undetermined time in the future. This plan gifts them with comprehensive electricity infrastructure as well. They own virtually all of the land designated as 'agribusiness'. Celestino have been granted the rail line and rail station within their massive new housing estate, as they 'proposed' back in 2011, when they first sought rezoning from rural to mixed commercial/residential, long before there had been so much as a scoping study for a north south rail line in western Sydney. They are the big beneficiaries of the proposed rail line. It is certainly of no benefit to any existing communities.

In contrast to all this, small landholders have faced disadvantageous rezoning decisions and compulsory property acquisitions at well below market prices. Local market gardeners and rural/agriculture based small business owners are being forced out of business and off their land. None of THEIR properties are being preserved by 'agribusiness' zoning.

The entire aerocropolis plan, in reality, is all about billionaires, property developers and big business and NOTHING about the regular Joe. It should be thrown in the bin and started over. Planners with any sense of ethics would stand up and call for the airport project to be cancelled and 'Jobs for the West' to be implemented instead.

As an aside, allowing agriculture or associated businesses in close proximity to an international airport creates an enormous biosecurity risk. It would only take one escapee – a pest, disease or parasite – and Australian agriculture could be decimated. This would, of course, mean that the Leppington Dairy Corporation and Baiada might get their comeuppance, but even that's not worth the impact it would have in general. The agribusiness idea should be dropped altogether.

## **Noise Exposure**

Noise exposure is the most obvious and severe impact created by an airport, especially a 24/7 airport. The aerotropolis plan, with its large component of residential development,



takes virtually no account of this. Nowhere in this document or any other information provided by the relevant planning authorities, are noise contours provided. Noise contours provide an estimate of the amount and volume of noise expected and are the only means of informing the public about future noise levels. ANEC/ANEF contours provide no information about noise and are meaningless to non-experts. It is disingenuous of the planning authorities to withhold information about noise impacts from those who will suffer most.

The description of Luddenham township as a future 'tourism and cultural hub', that 'the village will become a destination for local, regional, national and international visitors' and a 'a destination for food and arts', but at the same time be 'maintaining the village's character, amenity and lifestyle' is contradictory and absolutely laughable. The noise pollution alone make all of these claims preposterous. It is only ONE KILOMETRE from a 24/7 RUNWAY! The ground noise alone will make it an unpleasant place to be, and the stinky fumes from aircraft burning thousands of tonnes of kerosene will not exactly add to its attractiveness (figure 2). The quiet rural lifestyle of Luddenham will be completely gone, and that's pretty much all it has to recommend itself. It's not what any normal person would call a characterful or historic village. To make it a 'destination' as described it would have to be changed beyond recognition. To claim that it could be a tourist destination, situated as it is right next to a 24/7 airport, is just as ridiculous as claiming that an 'airport experience' centre will become a tourist attraction rivalling the Opera House.

In conclusion, the entire aerocropolis planning document is just a marketing magazine full of unsubstantiated, grandiose and unachievable claims. It appears to be written with the aim to deceive the public. Either that or it is the imaginings of some very ignorant people. To do this is immoral and corrupt. It should be thrown in the garbage bin, along with the entire airport project, and the community instigated 'Jobs for the West' plan implemented instead.

Figure 2. Aerotropolis precinct overlaid with noise contours from ground operations at western Sydney airport.

