

---

**From:** TERENCE P CURTIS [terencepcurtis@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, 28 February 2020 1:55 PM  
**To:** DPE PSVC Central Coast Mailbox  
**Subject:** 2020 03 11 Curtis, Terence 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)

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:

As an aircraft owner, (light sports category), and as I live in Woongarah, I wish to base the Aircraft at Warnervale, as alternate options are very limited, with in 1 hour drive.

Based at Warnervale would include hanger cost / space rental as the AC need to be stored out of the weather, and include cost FUEL and SERVICE locally in an ideal world.

I know a number of PILOTS that are also AC owners but have to travel many hours by road to fly, which is clearly not practical, and I know PILOTS that would purchase AC and HANGER, if there was space and movement available to use at Warnervale. the investment in new hanger and facility would be dependent on new taxi way and runway conditions.

I also know may country PILOTS that would fly in to Warnervale so they can access the Central coast region and also access to Sydney by TRAIN, as this is very close to Warnervale.

This would contribute considerably to the local economy with Hotel and food, local costs, and also AC maintenance , FUEL and Service costs.

As a further comment , most of , if not all PILOTS are very aware to fly "neighbourhood friendly" . there is considerable effort to avoid overflying houses and property where ever that can be avoided, even though these new LSA aircraft and very quite and unobtrusive to the area. this is just good practice.

### **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

TERENCE P CURTIS

[terencepcurtis@gmail.com](mailto:terencepcurtis@gmail.com)

Woongarra 2259