
From: Anthony Tavella on behalf of DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox
Sent: Friday, 31 January 2020 4:32 PM
To: DPE PSVC Central Coast Mailbox
Subject: FW: Webform submission from: Review of Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996

From: noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au <noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Friday, 31 January 2020 1:08 PM
To: DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox <eplanning.exhibitions@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Webform submission from: Review of Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996

Submitted on Fri, 31/01/2020 - 13:07

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type: I am making a personal submission

First Name: Barry

Last Name: Henwood

Name Withheld: No

Email: barryhen@bigpond.net.au

Suburb/Town & Postcode: HOLGATE 2250

Submission file: [webform_submission:values:submission_file]

Submission: I own a light sport aircraft hangared at Warnervale. There is a waiting list for hangar space at Warnervale, Cessnock, Maitland, Lake Macquarie and Luskintyre. These are the airports closest to North Sydney though none are nearly as close or convenient as Warnervale so it is clear the demand for hangar space is high. Maitland council has approved the construction of additional hangars at Luskintyre and Maitland. Warnervale has a large area of cleared land within its existing security fence. No tree or shrub would need to be cleared to increase the available hangar space tenfold at Warnervale. The runway at its existing length of 1196 metres is sufficient for general aviation activities. It does not need to be longer, though if it were wider it would enhance safety in crosswind conditions. The RWS is cambered and so of poor design but I repeat, the runway does not need to be longer. In times of bushfires Warnervale is quite capable of supporting smaller agricultural spraying aircraft such as those currently housed at Mudgee. These provide quick response. Heavy a/c would continue to require Richmond or similar. The Warnervale Restrictions Act 1996 was enacted to prevent heavy aircraft movements. It has no relevance to general aviation activities. The limitation of 88 movements/day is unprecedented in general aviation. It is unnecessary. Bankstown has no such limit and it is surrounded by residential suburbs. Warnervale does not have any realistic noise issues. A motorbike in a suburban street has a higher noise profile than ANY general aviation movement at Warnervale. Thank you for considering my submission. Feel free to contact me for any further information or clarification, Barry Henwood

URL: <https://pp.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/draftplans/exhibition/review-warnervale-airport-restrictions-act-1996>