
From: Brett Morton [brett_morton@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, 27 February 2020 6:03 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:

1. I am a private pilot and a member of the Royal Newcastle Aero Club. Warnervale is very important to me as I fly coastal between Newcastle and Sydney on a regular basis and rely on Warnervale airport as a safety airfield for any diversions that may arise. It is also important as it is the only landing area should I require fuel or have an emergency that may occur on these flights.

2. When I was first made aware of the council invoking the WAR Act I was shocked that such an Act could even be tabled in the NSW Parliament, let alone be passed. The Act is not necessary and creates an air of uncertainty to the general aviation community on our ability to land at the airfield. The current airport would never take jet operation as CASA would never approve it, they do not meet required runway length or standards for this approval, nor would it make economic sense to airlines given proximity to Newcastle, Sydney and Western Sydney Airports nearby. This airport provides relevant and accessible "General Aviation" resources to the aviation and wider community in particular accessible flight training and emergency transport or

staging.

3. I urge you to alter the act as a minimum to that suggested below in the appended comments, in particular clause 2, by removing the 88 movement limit for aircraft below 5,700kg. This restriction is not relevant to the incumbent flight training provider or any other small aircraft operator e.g RFS, Flying Doctor/Air Ambulance, Westpac Helicopters. Also the fact that pilots have to give 24 hours notice to land is absurd. Added to that the fact that the approach and take off to the north is a risk due to the trees.

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

Brett Morton

brett_morton@hotmail.com

Lambton 2299