
From: Philip Orr [frereop+centralcoastcouncil@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, 18 February 2020 7:19 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

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 is the only viable airport to use between Sydney and Newcastle for private operators. I support the repeal of Clause 2 of the Act for the reasons below. I fly into Warnervale several times a year and always pay my landing and parking fees which supports local businesses and Council. The business opportunities presented by the airport for the Central Coast region are enormous with aviation businesses such as flying schools, maintenance organisations, fuel sales and other aviation service providers keen to build their presence in regional locations by moving out of expensive city airports. This is occurring in other regions including Brisbane and Melbourne.

The airport provides the ONLY site between Newcastle and Sydney where aviation training can take place.

The airport preceded the surrounding housing developments and should not be penalised because those people have made a conscious decision to build near an airport. Light aircraft up to 1,850kg (CASA category for most recreational pilots and

single engine light aeroplanes) make very little noise. Their movement numbers should not be restricted during daylight hours. Local housing developments and the Wyong Hospital could be designated a "Fly Neighbourly" areas to minimise noise impacts on their lifestyle. Alternatively, all circuits could be to the west (this option has been trialed already).

If movement numbers are to be restricted - and there is no case for this for single engined aircraft under 1,850kg - a session of circuits should be considered as a single movement to provide the local flying school(s) with sufficient landing slots to not have to curtail their operations, while leaving sufficient landing slots for private operations and itinerant aircraft.

A runway is always active and to prevent excess landings, the runway must be closed. This requires deployment of an "X" at each end of the runway and adjacent to the wind sock which requires someone (presumably a Council staff member) to do this. A resource which Council could put to better use.

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

Philip Orr

frereop+centralcoastcouncil@gmail.com

Westlake, Qld 4074

