

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation:

Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Content:

I would like to comment on the review of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007, with regard to Telecommunication Facilities and Exempt & Complying Development (Division 21,114, 116 & 116A & Schedule 3A Part 2, 5). I find it discriminatory that a Public Authority or carrier does not have to submit a DA for the erection of a new Telecommunications Tower on private property. Although the Public Authority or carrier may have the approval of the owner of the property on which the tower is to be erected, the adjoining property owners have no say. Yet, the adjoining property owners are greatly impacted by the new tower, sometimes more so than the owners of the property on which the tower is to be erected ie visual Impact and proximity to the tower. The tower was not there, nor proposed, when they purchased their property and causes great concern for many reasons. An exception is if a tree or trees need to be removed or pruned then a DA or approval from the local council is required.(Division 4. Note 2. 20 (2). The draft amendment to the SEPP (Schedule 3A, Exempt & Complying Development in relation to Telecommunication Facilities Part 2. 5. (a1) ) makes provision that the tower must not be located within 100metres of a dwelling. This is not far enough away, these are family homes, often with young families, the recommended distance of a tower from a school is 500metres. This distance, at the very least, should apply to all dwellings as these dwellings are normally family homes whether they are on land zoned R1,2,3,4,or4 or RU5 or RU1,RU2, RU3 or RU4.

In Zones RU1,RU2,RU3 or RU4 the tower can be up to 50metres tall before requiring a DA. In the case of RU4 Primary Production Small Lots, the properties are small holdings often 2ha - 3ha, hobby farms, or ordinary family homes with a bit of land around them, most with road frontages similar in size to residential homes. These telecommunication facilities were not there when they purchased their properties and if they were its unlikely they would have purchased them. I don't believe the heights of the telecommunication towers should vary between land use zones, either.

I agree with the fact that tree removal or pruning needs a DA if a telecommunications facility is to be erected, but isn't a family home just as important?

I feel this legislation gives far too much power to the carrier or public authorities and takes all rights away from the adjoining home owners and the local Council. In a country like Australia, that is suppose to have freedom of choice and freedom of speech, I find this undemocratic.

I ask the department in the revised legislation, to give more consideration to home owners on adjoining and surrounding properties to proposed telecommunication towers, especially the distance of towers from homes. Thank you.

IP Address: - [REDACTED]

Submission: Online Submission from [REDACTED] (comments)

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=200506](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=200506)

Submission for Job: #8118

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_job&id=8118](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=8118)

Site: #0

[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view\\_site&id=0](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=0)