

---

**From:** Danny Horstead [gumby1181@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, 15 February 2020 9:00 PM  
**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:

Warnervale Airport is of great interest to me as a student pilot as well as a resident of the central coast. The training area of the central coast has very little air traffic so it is ideal as a value for money training area. Having started my training at Bankstown I know how busy an aviation training area can be. Bankstown is also situated around a dense residential area and has no conflict with it's surrounding area let alone movement caps. Warnervale is situated in a great location and has great potential to continue training pilots for years to come. The current school is streaks above anything at Bankstown and students like myself would travel from Sydney to get trained at Warnervale. This actually lead me to moving to the central coast and purchasing property here. So indirectly as a result of using Warnervale to train as a pilot it has lead to me investing money into the region both to the aero club flight school and purchasing property and expanding my Sydney based business up here. I am far form the only person to do this.

As a resident Warnervale is significant for serving the community. Whether it be fire fighting ability as demonstrated during this summer or medivac or emergency services

it is ideal for them to access and serve the central coast. It is irreplaceable and many regional areas either promote and maintain their local airport or others that don't have one are left wanting one. The location right next to the freeway is enviable and something that shouldn't be lost. It is a community asset and shouldn't be taken away or as heavily restricted as it currently is.

**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

Danny Horstead

[gumby1181@hotmail.com](mailto:gumby1181@hotmail.com)

Umina Beach 2257