
From: ycy1159@awcp073.server-cpanel.com on behalf of Chris Dawes [cdawes@scientific-devices.com.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 25 February 2020 9:19 PM
To: DPE PSVC Central Coast Mailbox
Subject: 2020 03 10 Dawes, Chris Individual 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

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

Dear Director,

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

Submission Type: I am making a personal submission

The statement below represents my personal opinion pertaining to the act review: Central Coast Councillors, the democratically elected representatives of Central Coast residents, resolved on 27 November 2017 to fully support the Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996 (Act) and to not approve any development that is inconsistent with the Act. Councillors also resolved to retain the runway as is, thereby determining the future of the airport and providing community certainty.

In its current form, the Act serves all the stated requirements of the Central Coast Aero Club and airport proponents, including dissenting Councillors. The Act is fair to all

stakeholders, allowing expansion of Warnervale Airport if after following the proper and independent assessment and full community consultation stipulated in the Act, the expansion is justified and supported.

The Act provides for Central Coast Council and the Central Coast Aero Club to apply to have the 88 movement restriction raised. All Council management have to do is apply to the Minister for a runway over 1200m, say 1201m, in the location of the current 1196m runway and at the Minister's direction have the 1201m runway independently assessed under Part 4 of the Act. If the 1201m runway is approved, Council can apply to have the 88 movement restriction raised under Part 2 of the Act. I believe Council management, the Aero Club and airport proponents are not confident that their airport expansion plans would survive the independent review of any environmental impact study, an independent noise study and notification to all residents within 7.5km radius of the runway, asking for submissions on the advantages and disadvantages of proposed operations of Warnervale Airport as stipulated in the Act. This is why airport proponents are pressing for the repeal of the Act.

The previous NSW Planning Minister Anthony Roberts, decided to retain the Act with a view to strengthening it if required following a 16 month review in 2017. Minister Roberts said "Expanding the operations to create an aviation hub or regional airport is a big deal to local communities and not a decision that could ever be taken lightly." The Act ensures that any airport decision is not taken lightly and that the environment and interests of the affected and rapidly growing community surrounding the airport and under the proposed flight paths are properly considered independently of Council. Please retain the Act in its current form as it serves the needs of and is fair to all stakeholders, allowing change if justified, following independent assessment and full and wide ranging community consultation.

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 alleged large jet transport operations. The runway has never been sufficiently long enough for any jet transport aircraft operating in Australia. The current Council Airport Draft Business Plan supports a maximum Category 3 Runway. NO RPT Jet Airliner Aircraft!
- 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

(Nancy Bird-Walton) Airport, all of which cater to these operations.

I therefore say and ask that the legislation be repealed and discarded

Or, 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 Council has made a determination that the former Wyong council allegedly 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 performing 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.

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 destroy, the ability of operators to continue a viable business on the site.

I respectfully ask that the Reviewers take appropriate action to repeal the Act.

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

Yours Faithfully,

Chris Dawes

cdawes@scientific-devices.com.au

Doyalson North, 2262

