
From: Louise Tennant [gynthamaree@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, 16 February 2020 11:40 AM
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

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:

Central Coast airport is everything to me. We moved to the Central Coast 30 years ago because of the airport. My husband is the Chief Engineer for the local Flying school, and now my son has an apprenticeship there following his dream of a career in aviation. We are members of the aero club, own a small aircraft that we use to be able to travel to regularly visit our ageing parents in Wagga. We take part in the fundraiser days the club have, and have many friends as a result of the social aspects of the airport.

My family also run an aviation business that supplies certificates of airworthiness and inspections to home built aircraft, and selling radial aircraft engines, which we base at Central Coast airport.

The WAR Act restricting aircraft movements to 88 would be devastating to not only the local flying School, but all involved with it. 88 movements doesn't just restrict business, but emergency services, tourism, and the social aspects as well. It will stop small aircraft owners from flying into the Central Coast where they spend money. I already

have family and friends who have stopped flying into the airport regularly due to the requirements to give advanced notice, etc.

Tourism will suffer as they will be no local business that will be able to do joy flights, etc. personally, when the flying school is forced to close as they will not be able to fly enough to survive my husband and son will lose their jobs. It is highly likely that we would have to move from Coast, meaning I would have to leave a job I love as well.

The Act needs to be removed completely, or at the very least adjusted so that it only applies to larger jet aircraft. The airports runway does not need to be extended, nor does it need to expand in outside its current boundaries. The airport has existed for decades with no issues. I live directly under the flight path in Warnervale and work at a school right nearby, and can tell you that aircraft noise from the smaller aircraft is not an issue. Trains, traffic, the neighbours motorbikes, and lawnmowers have a greater auditory impact than the planes.

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

Louise Tennant
gynthamaree@gmail.com
Warnervale 2259

