

---

**From:** ycyc1159@awcp073.server-cpanel.com on behalf of Robert Bell [r.bell@bcrc.com.au]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 25 February 2020 3:16 PM  
**To:** DPE PSVC Central Coast Mailbox  
**Subject:** 2020 03 09 Bell, Robert 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](mailto: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 run small specialist Civil Engineering Consultancy business (started 3 years ago and now employing 4 staff). As a result of successes and growth we are joining a national group. Our growth potential and consequently prospects of providing further employment opportunities is good. Much of our success is quickly, efficiently and cost effectively reaching areas typically not serviced by our area of speciality. Much of this success has been facilitated by private air travel. I am a GA pilot and members in the syndicate I belong are happy to assist in flying my staff as and when required. Going forward we plan to leverage this to a much greater extent.

My firm will rely on not being constricted in our private air travel to regional areas. We bring in services and spend money in the regional economies.

We would respectfully appeal to relevant decision makers not to limit our ability to have an integral part in the economies in regional areas.

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,

Robert Bell

[r.bell@bcrc.com.au](mailto:r.bell@bcrc.com.au)

The Gap, 4061

Sent from [Your Central Coast Airport](#)