

---

**From:** Anthony Tavella on behalf of DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 5 February 2020 4:13 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](mailto:noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au) <[noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au](mailto:noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 5 February 2020 3:28 PM  
**To:** DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox <[eplanning.exhibitions@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:eplanning.exhibitions@planning.nsw.gov.au)>  
**Subject:** Webform submission from: Review of Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996

Submitted on Wed, 05/02/2020 - 15:27

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type: I am making a personal submission

First Name: Bruce

Last Name: Robinson

Name Withheld: No

Email: [brucerobinson@outlook.com](mailto:brucerobinson@outlook.com)

Suburb/Town & Postcode: Merewether

Submission file: [webform\_submission:values:submission\_file]

Submission: I would like to voice my support of the Central Coast Aero Club in lifting the limitation of flights per day as they propose.

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

---

**From:** Bruce Robinson [brucerobinson@outlook.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 19 February 2020 8:06 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](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:

This submission has my full support.

**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

Bruce Robinson

[brucerobinson@outlook.com](mailto:brucerobinson@outlook.com)

Merewether 2291