

---

**From:** Gregory Charles Blades [gblades@optusnet.com.au]  
**Sent:** Friday, 21 February 2020 1:04 PM  
**To:** DPE PSVC Central Coast Mailbox  
**Subject:** Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996 Review

**Categories:** Reply Sent

The Director

Central Coast and Hunter Region  
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment  
PO Box 1148  
GOSFORD NSW 2250

Email: [centralcoast@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:centralcoast@planning.nsw.gov.au)

Dear Director,

**Submission in relation to the Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996 review.**

**I understand and agree that my submission will be made public.**

The statement below represents my personal opinion pertaining to the act review:

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have been an itinerant user of this small general aviation airfield for many years and own and operate a small homebuilt private aircraft hangered here at Mittagong airfield. Sometimes I visit friends and family located on the Central Coast in this small machine and use the airfields convenience to where they live.

I see the Warnervale airfield as an important part of the Central Coast's infrastructure as any other asset is like roads, bridges, railways, parkland etc

**THIS ACT IS NEITHER RELEVANT OR NECESSARY**

It is a waste of time and money to levy such restrictive terms on this facility

I have had a long career in commercial aviation as a regional airline pilot.

in commercial operations all over NSW South Queensland and Vic/Tas

Many of these communities love having these airports close by. At Warnervale there is only a single runway which severely limits its ability to cater to commercial operations

This is also due not only due its its short length but its strip width.

The runway pavement strength is limiting as indeed the taxiways, apron and parking

hard

stands to the degree of weight that they can bear and consequently aircraft size.

The climb and approach gradients are also limiting off the ends of the runways.

The infrastructure, that is, access to public transport, terminal facilities with lounge food-beverage toilets and showers is limited too.

Proximity to Sydney and Bankstown airports negates any airline or heavy charter activity as well, from a commercial viewpoint.

In short, allow the airfield to continue to operate with no restrictions as it has historically.

My background:

I have flown 27000 hours from 1978-2019 for

Hazelton Airlines

East Coast airlines

Eastern Australia Airlines

Qantas Link

Virgin Australia Airlines

Thank you for your intelligent, hoped for response to the responses that you must be receiving by now

from many of us in the aviation fraternity.

Yours Sincerely

Gregory Blades

ARN120183

[gblades@optusnet.com.au](mailto:gblades@optusnet.com.au)

**Is the Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996 (the Act) relevant or necessary?**

The Act is neither relevant nor necessary.

- The Act was enacted to protect the community from large jet transport operations. The runway has never been sufficiently long enough for any jet transport aircraft operating in Australia.
- The airport is surrounded by terrain which makes it very difficult to physically lengthen the runway (wetlands immediately South, a major road and rising terrain to the North).

- Environmental zoning surrounding the Airport requires that State Government must consent to any lengthening of the runway.
- There is no economic case for jet airline or freight operations at Warnervale, as Warnervale is within a 2 hour radius of Sydney, Newcastle and soon, Western Sydney Airport, all of which cater to these operations.

**If the Review concludes the Act is to remain.**

Clause 2 of the Act limits aircraft movements to 88 per day in the event the runway is lengthened. The department has made a determination that the former Wyong council lengthened the runway, triggering this clause.

- The current flight training provider has operated for over 4 decades without being constrained by the movement cap and at the time the Act was put in place was regularly performed over 300 movements a day.
- Training aircraft regularly perform up to 20 movements per hour. Multiple training aircraft may be operating at once; therefore the movement cap may be reached within 2 hours or less of commencing operations for the day.
- Once the cap is reached, no other users of the airfield will be permitted to operate, save in an emergency.
- As the movements will almost exclusively be absorbed by the flying school, the Aero Club members based on the field and itinerant operators wishing to fly into Warnervale, including patient transfer and Rural Fire Service refuelling and positioning flights, will regularly be excluded from operating.

Clause 2 of the Act should be removed, or amended to apply only to aircraft above 5,700 kgs – a figure used by the Civil Aviation Safety Authority to designate large aircraft. This still gives the community protection from large and jet transport operations, but allows the existing operators to continue their current, low impact operations.

Warnervale Airport is the only aviation infrastructure servicing the 340,000 residents of the Central Coast. The Act is unique, no other airport of this type in Australia is constrained by such a limiting piece of legislation. The Act, and Clause 2 specifically, serve to heavily cripple the ability of the Airport to serve its purpose, and threaten to heavily restrict, or completely destroy, the ability of operators to continue a viable business on the site.

I respectfully recommend that the Reviewers take appropriate action through repealing of the Act, or amending its structure, to create a legislative environment which is fair and workable for the Central Coast community and the operators who rely on this important asset.

I thank you for taking the time to consider this submission.

Yours Faithfully

Gregory Charles Blades

[gblades@optusnet.com.au](mailto:gblades@optusnet.com.au)

Mittagong 2575