

From: [Anthony Tavella](#) on behalf of [DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox](#)
To: [DPE PSVC Central Coast Mailbox](#)
Subject: DOC20/203977 2020 03 11 Munn, Chris Individual Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996 Review
Date: Friday, 28 February 2020 2:17:03 PM

From: noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au
<noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Friday, 28 February 2020 2:14 PM
To: [DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox <epanning.exhibitions@planning.nsw.gov.au>](mailto:epanning.exhibitions@planning.nsw.gov.au)
Subject: Webform submission from: Review of Warnervale Airport (Restrictions) Act 1996

Submitted on Fri, 28/02/2020 - 14:14

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type: I am submitting on behalf of my organisation

First Name: Chris

Last Name: Munn

Name Withheld: No

Email: heymun@gmail.com

Suburb/Town & Postcode: Kings Langley

Submission file: [webform_submission:values:submission_file]

Submission: The Sydney Recreational Flying Club (SRFC) is based at the Oaks SW of Sydney. It is imperative that small airports like Warnervale operate under sustainable conditions that allow them to both guarantee their existence and to thrive into the future. The current Restriction Act gravely jeopardises Warnervale's ability to do either. SRFC aircraft and members periodically utilise Warnervale for training and recreational purposes; it's location (being the only viable and usable piece of aviation infrastructure for Recreational Aircraft for nearly 200km, between the Oaks and Newcastle) is essential to provide a contingency for adverse weather and for emergencies. Some SRFC members also own and operate training establishments from Warnervale. The Act itself is a one off, unnecessary, with no comparison in Australia. It was put in place in response to a fear campaign in the 1990's that Warnervale may become a round the clock jet airport. This has not happened and is never likely to happen (please refer to the CCAC's position on the future of Warnervale-none of which involves the type of operations the Act was designed to curtail). Yet, due to the poor and ambiguous wording of the Act, it may be argued that Central Coast Council have triggered a clause in the Act which could limit operations to 88 movements a day. If so, This could see routine operations by the CCAC (Central Coast Aero Club) alone exhausting operational limits in as little as 2 hours of commencing operations for the day. Itinerant users of the airport and importantly, aeromedical flights, RFS and SRFC aircraft would effectively have no access to the airport with potentially tragic outcomes. Clubs like the CCAC and SRFC operate discretely and under a fly neighbourly policy, almost within the confines of the aerodrome boundary, the adjacent M1, unpopulated and industrial areas and are unlikely to genuinely be of a nuisance to residents. A wider view must also consider the continuing decline of the General Aviation (GA) industry and closure of associated aviation infrastructure. Much of this is due to over- and unnecessary regulation, of which the Act is a prime example. Consequently, there is an apparent and impending greater shortage of both pilots and aviation

related trade skills. Clubs like SRFC and the CCAC endeavour to provide these skills. The nationwide economic implications of restrictive Acts like this one are yet to felt fully, but a time is coming when they will be. Likewise, the removal of the Act will be a 'shot in the arm' for the local Central Coast community, encouraging tourism with the potential for Warnervale to compete to become a centre of excellence for the delivery of aviation related education and trade skills. Regards, SRFC Committee

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