

I am a recreational pilot and a member of the Central Coast Aero Club (CCAC). I live on the Central Coast and I am aware of some horrible injustices happening against our community in regards to our airport at Warnervale (Central Coast Airport).

I am speaking of the **Warnervale Airport Restrictions (WAR) Act 1996**.

Unbelievably, this piece of legislation was written by “the minister for planning”!

At the time there was fear a third Sydney airport would be built at Warnervale.

The property owner of 47 Fishburn Crescent Watanobbi, argued that any future extensions or improvements to the runway would devalue her home and that cost to her would outweigh any benefit to the community. Those fears are untrue and that property value has increased from \$115K to \$460K today.

This bill was rushed through to become law because someone convinced enough people that Boeing 737 and Airbus were looking for somewhere to fly and land 24/7.

The fact is that larger aircraft will never operate from Warnervale. Both the current length of the runway and the restrictions placed on the site, being the wetlands to the south and tree line to the north, make an extension impossible.

Warnervale Air and the Central Coast Aero club just want to continue to operate small aircraft as they have for the past 47 years. They aren't interested in such expansion.

Council planned for an aviation hub to be established and signed a 40 year lease with an aircraft manufacturer (AAI). However, Council had a change of Mayor (Jane Smith), who put a stop to any work or development on the site. AAI was paid out at a cost to the public of \$50 million.

It has now been suggested that work carried out by Council in 2015, when the runway was resurfaced, “may have triggered the WAR Act”.

The airport has been the subject of an unfair law that now restricts it's daily operations and the stakeholder's ability to compete in business as a flying school and maintenance facility.

The WAR act limits aircraft movements to just 88 day. Please keep in mind that a standard takeoff and landing is considered as being 2 movements. This restriction means that the flying school can only operate for approximately 2hrs a day before the cap will be reached. No business could survive on such a restriction to trade.

Limiting the amount of landing's that a pilot can carry out, increases the chance of an incident or accident, as it's important to practise such skills.

This also leaves no room for Central Coast Aero Club members, locally based aircraft or private pilots to use the airport.

Ever since this legislation was made the airports future has been the subject of debate.

The WAR act is stopping the airport surviving in its current form.

Under **National Competition Policy, Deregulation, and microeconomic reform** this act needs to be repealed. These important guidelines direct law makers and reviewers to remove restrictions from airports, to make decisions to the benefits of its users and to encourage open access to third party users.

Our council are not managing this airport like it is the asset that it is.

Council have raised their operating costs. They employ staff to be onsite. There is a lack of maintenance eg. on tree trimming. This makes the approach and departure angles non-standard and more dangerous.

Council have reduced the usable runway length by approx. 60 metres by placing sandbags and unserviceability cones on the southern end of the runway. This is another safety issue as it is an emergency stopping area when it is unobstructed.

Another unworkable issue we as pilots are faced with (due to the WAR Act possibly being triggered) is that council require 24hrs written notice prior to using the airport. This is virtually unheard of and very difficult to adhere to.

I don't understand why complainer's have unique power over our airport.

The runway built in 1972, was here a long time before the developers, the houses, the complainers. This is as good an argument as a person who buys near a night club complaining about music, Or buy near a school and complain about kids screaming, buying a waterfrontage and complaining about boat noise and waves, or buying near a road and complaining there is traffic.

This then becomes an argument about Precedents in LAW. This act if left in place will be that precedent why every complainer wants other infrastructure regulated.

The people of the Central Coast deserve a level playing field with the rest of Australia. This Act does not benefit the majority of the central coast, it is to the benefit of a few noise complainers.

Getting back to the rush job of this bill going through parliament without debate.

CCAC members were not represented. We are part owners of this site. The many flaws in the legislation were not examined or tested. A "platform" has been created for anti airport groups.

If you want to compare Central Coast Airport to other airports please do so and make sure there is a level playing field. Warnervale should have the same freedoms other airports enjoy.

This act is 34 years old, and outdated. It is not required, fair, relevant or workable.

Thank you for taking the time to hear my concerns.

Regards,

Warwick Calleia

From: Warwick Calleia [mybuilder@live.com]
Sent: Friday, 21 February 2020 4:52 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:

I am a recreational pilot and a member of the Central Coast Aero Club (CCAC). I live on the Central Coast and I am aware of some horrible injustices happening against our community in regards to our airport at Warnervale (Central Coast Airport).

I am speaking of the Warnervale Airport Restrictions (WAR) Act 1996.

Unbelievably, this piece of legislation was written by "the minister for planning"!

At the time there was fear a third Sydney airport would be built at Warnervale.

The property owner of 47 Fishburn Crescent Watanobbi, argued that any future extensions or improvements to the runway would devalue her home and that cost to her would outweigh any benefit to the community. Those fears are untrue and that property value has increased from \$115K to \$460K today.

This bill was rushed through to become law because someone convinced enough people that Boeing 737 and Airbus were looking for somewhere to fly and land 24/7.

The fact is that larger aircraft will never operate from Warnervale. Both the current length of the runway and the restrictions placed on the site, being the wetlands to the south and tree line to the north, make an extension impossible.

Warnervale Air and the Central Coast Aero club just want to continue to operate small aircraft as they have for the past 47 years. They aren't interested in such expansion. Council planned for an aviation hub to be established and signed a 40 year lease with an aircraft manufacturer (AAI). However, Council had a change of Mayor (Jane Smith), who put a stop to any work or development on the site. AAI was paid out at a cost to the public of \$50 million.

It has now been suggested that work carried out by Council in 2015, when the runway was resurfaced, "may have triggered the WAR Act".

The airport has been the subject of an unfair law that now restricts it's daily operations and the stakeholder's ability to compete in business as a flying school and maintenance facility.

The WAR act limits aircraft movements to just 88 day. Please keep in mind that a standard takeoff and landing is considered as being 2 movements. This restriction means that the flying school can only operate for approximately 2hrs a day before the cap will be reached. No business could survive on such a restriction to trade.

Limiting the amount of landing's that a pilot can carry out, increases the chance of an incident or accident, as it's important to practise such skills.

This also leaves no room for Central Coast Aero Club members, locally based aircraft or private pilots to use the airport.

Ever since this legislation was made the airports future has been the subject of debate.

The WAR act is stopping the airport surviving in its current form.

Under National Competition Policy, Deregulation, and microeconomic reform this act needs to be repealed. These important guidelines direct law makers and reviewers to remove restrictions from airports, to make decisions to the benefits of its users and to encourage open access to third party users.

Our council are not managing this airport like it is the asset that it is.

Council have raised their operating costs. They employ staff to be onsite. There is a lack of maintenance eg. on tree trimming. This makes the approach and departure angles non-standard and more dangerous.

Council have reduced the usable runway length by approx. 60 metres by placing sandbags and unserviceability cones on the southern end of the runway. This is another safety issue as it is an emergency stopping area when it is unobstructed.

Another unworkable issue we as pilots are faced with (due to the WAR Act possibly being triggered) is that council require 24hrs written notice prior to using the airport. This is virtually unheard of and very difficult to adhere to.

I don't understand why complainer's have unique power over our airport.

The runway built in 1972, was here a long time before the developers, the houses, the complainers. This is as good an argument as a person who buys near a night club complaining about music, Or buy near a school and complain about kids screaming, buying a waterfrontage and complaining about boat noise and waves, or buying near a

road and complaining there is traffic.

This then becomes an argument about Precedents in LAW. This act if left in place will be that precedent why every complainer wants other infrastructure regulated.

The people of the Central Coast deserve a level playing field with the rest of Australia. This Act does not benefit the majority of the central coast, it is to the benefit of a few noise complainers.

Getting back to the rush job of this bill going through parliament without debate. CCAC members were not represented. We are part owners of this site. The many flaws in the legislation were not examined or tested. A "platform" has been created for anti airport groups.

If you want to compare Central Coast Airport to other airports please do so and make sure there is a level playing field. Warnervale should have the same freedoms other airports enjoy.

This act is 34 years old, and outdated. It is not required, fair, relevant or workable.

Thank you for taking the time to hear my concerns.

Regards,

Warwick Calleia

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

Warwick Calleia
mybuilder@live.com

Halekulani 2262