
From: ycyc1159@awcp073.server-cpanel.com on behalf of Michael Chamley
[chamley2004@optusnet.com.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 25 February 2020 4:37 PM
To: DPE PSVC Central Coast Mailbox
Subject: 2020 03 09 Chamlet, Michael 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:
I am writing as a private commercial pilot, who has had their Unrestricted Private license for some 40+ years. The restrictive act on Warnervale airport is entirely non-sensical for the following reasons: - Any commercial operation undertaking flight training would undertake more than 88 movements on a given fine weekend day. When one considers that a student undertaking touch and go's (take-off and landing training) would possible conduct 12-16 movements in an hour it can be seen that the restriction on flight operations is beyond comprehension; - The introduction of

Badgery's creek airport (hereinafter BCA) into the Sydney basin will put restrictions on flight training from Bankstown, Camden and other minors airfields that use the designated training area. BCA is situated in the middle of the current training area, so restrictions due to controlled airspace and lanes of entry and departure will make flight training impractical. - Training organisations will be looking outside the basin for training areas, and airfields and this will put Warnervale squarely in the need for a flight training field outside of the restrictions of controlled airspace. This can only benefit the economy of the central coast as visiting students and pilots will be spending in the local area. -If anything the recent fires have proven is the importance of publicly facilities which assist in the conduct of RFS operations be it water, effective communications, a road network and flight landing areas for the use of fixed wing and rotary wing aircraft. Further, as an airfield is located in areas of clear, flat spaces it would provide a central mustering area for fire crews seeking shelter, accommodation and victualing. -There is a misunderstanding, by some members of the public, that small airfields and general aviation facilities are an imposition on the quiet ambiance of the environment, yet are happy to have shopping centre's, noisy roads and other crown inducing areas in their environs. Airfields are, by and large, areas of peaceful recreation and business as the flight operations are often conducted away from the area, and it is only on the weekend that activity may be heightened, weather permitting. -Airfields can be also be used for other activities such as festivals, exhibitions and family activities and are an asset to any area that has them. If the Council considers this statement incorrect speak to Temora council, which is the area for the annual warbirds spectacular, or Illawarra council, who host the Wings over Illawarra airshop annually. Both events bring thousands of visitors to the district and benefit not only the respective museums, but also local businesses in hospitality and other services. I could continue on but I feel just the above points justify the repeal of the Act. Thank you for your time in reading my statement.

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,

Michael Chamley

chamley2004@optusnet.com.au

The Entrance, 2261

Sent from [Your Central Coast Airport](#)