
From: Niclas Thiele [niclas.thiele.nt@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, 23 February 2020 9:45 AM
To: DPE PSVC Central Coast Mailbox
Subject: 2020 03 09 Thiele, Niclas 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

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:

Before I commenced my flight lessons, I considered my options of where to learn how to fly. Bankstown was a consideration as we live in Sydney, however, the airport is too busy. The problem with larger airports is that you can spend a long time taxiing on the ground and then waiting on the ground for take-off clearance. Of course, this is all time NOT spent flying which nevertheless is paid for. One could thus make an argument that students at Warnervale end up being better pilots as they spend more time in the air than on the ground waiting for clearances. But it does not end there. Even in the air, there is less traffic to worry about, leading to a lower chance of an air traffic collision and more relaxed flying which are all very important for a student pilot. Hence I chose Warnervale Aerodrome. I loved it so much that I remained there until I got my Recreational Pilot's Licence. I plan on getting my Private Pilot's Licence here as well.

Limiting the movements to 88 per day would limit the number of exercise take-offs and landings we can do. The flight school would probably have to take on fewer students in

order not to exceed this cap. It would thus either make flying lessons more expensive or make the flying school commercially not viable.

The planes that we use at Warnervale are so small and relatively quiet that they do not interfere with the interests of surrounding residents at all. Especially, since the freeway is nearby with a constant stream of noise. I ask you to repeal the act.

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

Niclas Thiele

niclas.thiele.nt@gmail.com

Turrumurra 2074