

---

**From:** ycyc1159@awcp073.server-cpanel.com on behalf of Aminta Hennessy  
[aminta6861@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 26 February 2020 12:00 PM  
**To:** DPE PSVC Central Coast Mailbox  
**Subject:** 2020 03 10 Hennessy, Aminta 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:  
Why does General Aviation have to lose another airport due to some act. Warnervale is a staging post for "emergency services", is generator of business in the area. If closed jobs will be lost, industry will lost and another General Aviation airport will be lost and in a FIRE SEASON hundreds of homes could be lost through the inability of aircraft to refuel. Quite apart from that why are movements being restricted? The modern small aircraft is not noisy - and in any case the airport was there long before houses may well have been built so the house owners knew presumably what they

were doing. Something is drastically wrong with this country and its lack of aviation policy which is a huge generator of business for those in the bush.

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,

Aminta Hennessy

[aminta6861@gmail.com](mailto:aminta6861@gmail.com)

Condell Park, Sydney, 2200

Sent from [Your Central Coast Airport](#)