
From: Anthony Tavella on behalf of DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox
Sent: Friday, 28 February 2020 7:14 AM
To: DPE PSVC Central Coast Mailbox
Subject: 2020 03 10 Moffatt, Tony and Donna Individual Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996 Review

Categories: Reply Sent

From: noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au <noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 26 February 2020 5:18 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 Wed, 26/02/2020 - 17:15

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type: I am making a personal submission

First Name: Tony and Donna

Last Name: Moffatt

Name Withheld: No

Email: tonymoffatt@hotmail.com

Suburb/Town & Postcode: CHELTENHAM 2119

Submission file: [webform_submission:values:submission_file]

Submission: Thank you for looking into the Warnervale Restrictions Act 1996 (the "Act"). We are unaware of any other piece of NSW legislation that is quite like the Act. So narrow in its application. So unintelligible in terms of its application. Completely unique in terms of the management of any single piece of infrastructure in the state. I think it is apparent from these things that the Act was a knee-jerk reaction to a fear campaign orchestrated by a nearby resident with a dislike for aviation and this airport. Since 1996, the Act has had relatively minimal impact on the usual use of the airport, most likely because of its incoherent application. Of more recent times, however, it has become a potential weapon against the Central Coast Aeroclub (CCAC) and its training activities conducted at the airport. The weapon is being wielded by a Local Councillor who runs on the same political ticket as the agitator who drove the Act through the legislature in 1996. An outcome from this review must, at the very least, reduce the ability for the Act to be used as a weapon. The CCAC, of which I am a member, was the original motivating force behind the construction of the airport more than 40 years ago, long before nearby homes were even thought about much less constructed. The CCAC has operated at the airport continuously since that time, training new pilots, assisting visiting pilots, hosting the Air League and other similar organisations. It has been a source of jobs, economic activity and community engagement. It is a community organisation that should be supported, not harried out of existence. The training activities of the CCAC rely on planes being flown, taking off and landing. When I learned to fly at Warnervale in the mid-2000s a single hour long lesson could involve 10 or more "touch and goes". Each of those landings would appear to count as a movement under the Act. Each of those take-offs, another movement. It is easy to see how 88 movements would occur in a very short space of time. If the cap was to be enforced, the airport would become effectively useless as a training facility. Once the daily 88 movement cap is hit, how does a pilot flying in know that (s)he cannot land anymore? If s(he) lands, an offence will be committed but there is no way for that pilot to know that they are about to commit an offence. The Act in its current form is ridiculous. It is practically unenforceable or, if it were enforced, any magistrate would have severe difficulty coming up with a reasonable penalty for the pilot who innocently committed the relevant offence. The Act is simply not required. There is no other airport that to my knowledge has a similar legislative control over it, other than Sydney Airport which obviously is a much larger piece of infrastructure and effects a vastly greater number of residents. Although my personal view is that the communities of the central coast could massively benefit by the Council investing the airport infrastructure in the same way that Ballina, Coffs Harbour, Port Macquarie and many other Councils have, the fact is that the airport will not be able to be used for large commercial jets. It is simply not long or strong enough. It is not possible that it could legally be lengthened sufficiently to carry jet traffic without relevant planning approvals. The Act should therefore be

repealed. If the Review decides that the Act remains required, the State Government should amend the Act so as to make its desired effect clear: the movement caps and curfews should only apply in respect of aircraft over 5,700 Kg. Thus, the continued operations of the CCAC and other light aircraft users of the airport will be safe from interventionist and negative councillors. Alternatively, the review should conclude that the current runway length is not capable of supporting large jets (which it is not) and should stipulate that the “extension” needed to trigger the curfew and movement caps is an extension to increase the runway length beyond 2000m.

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