

---

**From:** Paul Crittenden [crittenden0@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, 28 February 2020 2:14 PM  
**To:** DPE PSVC Central Coast Mailbox  
**Subject:** 2020 03 11 Crittenden, Paul Individual Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996 Review

**Categories:** Reply Sent

To : The Director, Central Coast & Hunter Region, NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment  
From: Paul Crittenden, Caves Beach 2281

I attempted to lodge the submission appearing below through the Departmental portal "Have-Your-Say" although it is unclear whether it was accepted. In any event, the stylistic aspects of my submission were not permitted through the aforesaid portal. I am happy for my name to be publicly associated with my submission, and request that the version below appear as the publicly available one.

The Submission is as follows:

---

I contend that the Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996 ("the Act") remains relevant and necessary.

Primarily, I am writing to oppose any change to provisions imposed under the Act relating to:

- A. the 88 aircraft movements per day restriction; and
- B. the curfew requirements (and related emergency safeguards).

As the former Member for Wyong (May 1991 - March 2007) who was primarily responsible for the Act, I would point out that the drafting of the the Bill by Parliamentary Counsel, was based on the Cabinet Minute that I wrote. The Bill and subsequent Act **clearly met the then Wyong Council's worse case scenario for proposed air movements at Warnervale Airport as 88 movements per day in the event that the existing airport runway was extended but that such runway extension (or new runway) was to be no more than 1200 metres.** My understanding is that the runway has indeed been extended to almost 1200 metres.

My main concern was, and remains, that families had purchased land, released by Landcom, at Watanobbi in the late 1980's that was directly under the flightpath of the Warnervale Airport runway at the southern end (some properties were as close as 900 metres and directly under the flightpath arising from the then proposals). These people had built houses and were trying to service substantial mortgages whilst also travelling up to five hours per day "door to door" to obtain work, usually in Sydney. The stresses and strains on families with a depreciating home asset, not to mention the noise pollution from substantial air movements were potentially catastrophic.

Good planning necessitated that Landcom should not have released the Watanobbi land and that the Wyong Council was complicit in this although the proposed Warnervale Airport expansion did not come to public attention (and certainly to my knowledge) until around February 1995.

I certainly hope that the residents of Watanobbi have been directly consulted for their input on this matter through a personally addressed mailout, because I suspect many residents would be unaware of this review unless so contacted.

Many residents in the then Wyong Shire were concerned that Wyong Council's intentions had not been fully stated even with its foreshadowed 1800 metre runway proposal, probably with good reason based on its track record.

My view is that the Central Coast Aero Club is being used as a "stalking horse" in this present saga. The "Wyong Regional Chronicle" on 5 February 2020 quoted a Andrew Smith, President of the Central Coast Aero Club as stating (apparently based on Media Release dated 3 February 2020 from Mr Smith):

"A light training aircraft can do around 10 of these circuits per hour, and each equates to two movements under the Act, a take off and landing.

"We could easily hit the 88 movement cap within one or two hours.

Assuming there are 88 aircraft movements every two hours (and the curfew requirements & air movement restrictions under the Act are removed), potentially, there could be 1056 (88\*12) aircraft movements in a 24 hour period!

The people of Watanobbi and other affected communities should be able to avail themselves of reasonably quiet enjoyment of their lives within their residence.

---

Kind regards

Paul Crittenden

---

**From:** Anthony Tavella on behalf of DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox  
**Sent:** Friday, 28 February 2020 2:17 PM  
**To:** DPE PSVC Central Coast Mailbox  
**Subject:** 2020 03 11 Crittenden, Paul Individual Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996 Review

**Categories:** Reply Sent

---

**From:** [noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au](mailto:noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au) <[noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au](mailto:noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au)>  
**Sent:** Friday, 28 February 2020 1:48 PM  
**To:** DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox <[eplanning.exhibitions@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:eplanning.exhibitions@planning.nsw.gov.au)>  
**Subject:** Webform submission from: Review of Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996

Submitted on Fri, 28/02/2020 - 13:48

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type: I am making a personal submission

First Name: Paul

Last Name: Crittenden

Name Withheld: No

Email: [crittenden0@gmail.com](mailto:crittenden0@gmail.com)

Suburb/Town & Postcode: Caves Beach 2281

Submission file: [webform\_submission:values:submission\_file]

Submission: I contend that the Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996 ("the Act") remains relevant and necessary. Primarily, I am writing to oppose any change to provisions imposed under the Act relating to: A. the 88 aircraft movements per day restriction; and B. the curfew requirements (and related emergency safeguards). As the former Member for Wyong (May 1991 - March 2007) who was primarily responsible for the Act, I would point out that the drafting of the the Bill by Parliamentary Counsel, was based on the Cabinet Minute that I wrote. The Bill and subsequent Act clearly met the then Wyong Council's worse case scenario for proposed air movements at Warnervale Airport as 88 movements per day in the event that the existing airport runway was extended but that such runway extension (or new runway) was to be no more than 1200 metres. My understanding is that the runway has indeed been extended to almost 1200 metres. My main concern was, and remains, that families had purchased land, released by Landcom, at Watanobbi in the late 1980's that was directly under the flightpath of the Warnervale Airport runway at the southern end (some properties were as close as 900 metres and directly under the flightpath arising from the then proposals). These people had built houses and were trying to service substantial mortgages whilst also travelling up to five hours per day "door to door" to obtain work, usually in Sydney. The stresses and strains on families with a depreciating home asset, not to mention the noise pollution from substantial air movements were potentially catastrophic. Good planning necessitated that Landcom should not have released the Watanobbi land and that the Wyong Council was complicit in this although the proposed Warnervale Airport expansion did not come to public attention (and certainly to my knowledge) until around February 1995. I certainly hope that the residents of Watanobbi have been directly consulted for their input on this matter through a personally addressed mailout, because I suspect many residents would be unaware of this review unless so contacted. Many residents in the then Wyong Shire were concerned that Wyong Council's intentions had not been fully stated even with its foreshadowed 1800 metre runway proposal, probably with good reason based on its track record. My view is that the Central Coast Aero Club is being used as a "stalking horse" in this present saga. The "Wyong Regional Chronicle" on 5 February 2020 quoted a Andrew Smith, President of the Central Coast Aero Club as stating (apparently based on Media Release dated 3 February 2020 from Mr Smith): "A light training aircraft can do around 10 of these circuits per hour, and each equates to two movements under the Act, a take off and landing. "We could easily hit the 88 movement cap within one or two hours. Assuming there are 88 aircraft movements every two hours (and the curfew requirements & air movement restrictions under the Act are removed) potentially, there could be 1056 (88\*12) aircraft movements in a 24 hour period! The people of Watanobbi and other affected communities should be able to avail themselves of reasonably quiet enjoyment of their lives within their residence.

URL: <https://pp.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/draftplans/exhibition/review-warnervale-airport-restrictions-act-1996>