
From: Rhonda Odlum [rjoyodd@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, 6 February 2020 5:29 PM
To: DPE PSVC Central Coast Mailbox
Subject: Submission re retaining the Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996 intact

Re Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996 Review

The Director
Central Coast and Hunter Region
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
PO Box 1148
GOSFORD NSW 2250

06/02/2020

Retain the Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996. It is supported by Council and considers all stakeholders.

Dear Director,

The Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996 is all that stops airport proponents from proceeding with development of a Warnervale Regional Jet airport.

We don't need jet noise in Wyee Point the helicopter pad has just been okayed near me and extra planes will mean more noise and air pollution on top on the pollution from Vale's Point Power Station

Central Coast Councillors, the democratically elected representatives of Central Coast residents, resolved on 27 November 2017 to fully support the Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996 (Act) and to not approve any development that is inconsistent with the Act.

Council's resolution supporting the Act with a 9 to 5 vote, has been tested by way of rescission motions five times since 2017, with Councillors voting 8 to 6 to support the Act on 11 June 2019, the most recent of the rescission motions. The rescission motion duplicates many of the provisions of the Act. For example it asks for community consultation, wants to engage with the community for the first time of this issue through an independent survey and then consider whether to exhibit the central coast airport draft master plan. All of these requirements are enshrined in Part 4 of the Act with the Minister to undertake the community survey and consultation as part of the review to expand operations. It appears the dissenting Councillors actually support the Act, so why mount a rescission motion against the Act only to support it?

All Council needs to do is apply to the minister for a runway extension beyond 1200m and the dissenting and approving Councillors requirements are satisfied assuming the Minister approves the application.

Council's position is reinforced by the fact that the Act serves all the stated requirements of the Central Coast Aero Club and airport proponents including dissenting Councillors in its current form. The Act is fair to all stakeholders, allowing expansion of Warnervale Airport if after following the proper and independent assessment and full community consultation stipulated in the Act, the expansion is justified and supported.

The Act provides for Central Coast Council and the Central Coast Aero Club to apply to have the 88 movement restriction increased. All Council management have to do is apply to the Minister for a runway over 1200m, say 1201m, in the location of the current 1196m runway and at the Minister's direction have the 1201m runway independently assessed under Part 4 of the Act. If the runway is approved, Council can apply to have the 88 movement restriction increased under Part 2 of the Act.

I believe the problem for Council management, the Aero Club and airport proponents is that Part 4 of the

Act stipulates that any proposal is to be independently reviewed, with the Minister to appoint an independent person to review any environmental impact study, put in place arrangements for community input on the review, undertake an independent noise study and notify all residents within 7.5km radius of Warnervale Airport, asking for submissions on the advantages and disadvantages of proposed operations of Warnervale Airport.

I believe airport proponents do not want to allow an independent review or independently assessed community input out to the Act's stipulated 7.5km radius from the runway.

Rhonda Odlum

29 Mulwala Drive Wyee Point

rjoyodd@yahoo.com.au