

Mr G.P. Willans

HACKETT ACT 2602

2 May 2009

The Executive Chairman and Managing Director,
Canberra Airport

**RESPONSE TO THE CANBERRA AIRPORT PRELIMINARY DRAFT
MASTER PLAN (PDMP) DATED FEBRUARY 09**

References:

- A. Canberra Airport Preliminary Draft Master Plan of February 2009
- B. Canberra Airport Preliminary Draft Master Plan 2008
- C. Canberra Times Report of 20 January 2006 -- 'Runway upgrade aims to boost airport' by John Thistleton
- D. Statement of Reasons for the Minister's Rejection --
www.infrastructure.gov.au/aviation/airports/decisions.aspx
- E. Access Economics Review of Canberra Airport Preliminary Draft Master Plan and the 'High Noise Corridor' Concept dated 23 March 2009
- F. Access Economics Addendum dated 28 April 2009

Introduction

Following Ministerial rejection of the 2008 Draft Master Plan, Canberra Airport has released a revised Preliminary Draft Master Plan (PDMP) dated February 09 (reference A) and invited public comment on it.

I comment as an ex-military aviator who has flown jets and turbo-props from Canberra Airport, and as a neighbour of Canberra Airport flight paths, living 6.6 kilometres from the runway intersection to the NNW and within the Canberra Noise Abatement Area. I have also been referred to as '*the serial noise complainant from Hackett*' at Airport Noise Consultative Forums; I acknowledge that I have used the Airservices noise complaint system to make complaints.

Aircraft Traffic Affecting Me. The northern jet departure and arrival paths are about 2.3 kilometres to the east of my residence, and light aircraft and helicopters regularly and noisily overfly my home, or close to it, at low level tracking within and immediately adjacent to the NE boundary of the Canberra Noise Abatement Area. Jet circuit traffic also overflies my home.

Hackett Noise Monitor Terminal. A temporary noise monitor terminal (NMT) has been installed since 18 December 2008 in Hackett and it can be publicly monitored through WebTrak. It is located about 700m to my south-west in a location that is hill-shadowed from the jet departure and arrival flight paths and 600m further away, and lower than my location. This NMT is poorly sited for effective noise monitoring of jet and GA aircraft operating to the north and north-west of the Airport, particularly jets landing runway 17.

Neighbour from Hell. Canberra Airport is already a noisy, bad neighbour but the plans to significantly add to the aircraft noise burden with large, noisy jet flights in the sleeping hours will make it the neighbour from hell.

My response will generally, but not exclusively, focus on aircraft noise issues. Firstly though, I wish to discuss several, significant credibility issues in respect of the PDMP, then the Plan more generally.

**SIGNIFICANT CREDIBILITY CONCERNS
AFFECTING THE PDMP AND RESIDENTS' ABILITY
TO BE PROPERLY INFORMED**

There are several significant, credibility concerns where residents could be misinformed/misled. These concerns warrant immediate redress, review by BITRE and Airservices, correction of the PDMP, and its re-issue for the full public consultation period.

Chapter 5 – Passenger Aircraft Movement Projections

Table 5.6 – Inaccurate 07/08 Actual Movements. Paragraph 5.1.4 details 39,629 RPT movements in 07/08, but Table 5.6 states 36,629 movements, a difference of 3,000 movements. The 07/08 total movements of 88,576 are correct, suggesting that the correct RPT figure is 39,629 movements, not the 36,629 movements presented. This needs to be corrected.

Table 5.6 Incorrect Aircraft Movement Projections. Next, assuming a 07/08 basis of 39,629 actual RPT movements, the mid-range 2011/12 projection (Table 5.6) is based on 5.4% growth, not the claimed 3.4%. The 2011/12, 2016/17, 2021/22 and 2027/28 projections appear to have been copied from Table 5.7 in the rejected 2008 PDMP. However in that table, the mid-range figures are projected at 3.4% from a 05/06 base of 39,832 RPT movements. The mid-range domestic movement situation is summarised below:

Year	05/06 actual	07/08 actual	11/12	16/17	21/22	27/28	29/30
2008 PDMP Table 5.7	39,832	(42,587)	48,681	57,538	68,008	83,116	
	3.4% growth. The 07/08 projection would be 42,587 movements if 3.4% growth had occurred.						
2009 PDMP Table 5.6		36,629	48,681	57,538	68,008	83,116	88,864
	The 07/08 actual movements should be 39,629. The subsequent projections are wrong. The table should read significantly different:						
		39,629	45,300	53,542	63,285	77,343	82,692

International and Other Aircraft Movement Projections – Probably Incorrect. The projections for international and other movements appear to have been

developed similarly (although no growth projections were referenced but should be) and probably contain identical errors.

Implausible Mid-Range Domestic Aircraft Movement Growth Projection (3.4%). In 1998, the actual RPT movements were 39,032 (Table 4.1 1999 PDMP). The Airport states a 20-year growth rate of 3.3% to support its current RPT movement projection of 3.4%; however, there is no supporting evidence for the 3.3% claim. Projecting from the actual movements of 39,032 in 97/98 when the Airport was bought, the 07/08 movements should have been 54,529 at 3.4% growth. However, actual movements for 2007/08 were only 39,629, a significant difference. Growth in RPT movements is flat at best despite the boom economic conditions of this period, exemplified by the flat growth lines of Figure 5.7 of the 2009 PDMP. This finding is also explained by the 1998 passengers per movement ratio rising from 46.8 (1,827,707 divided by 39,032) to 71.9 (2,850,016 divided by 39,629) in 2008, a 53.6% increase paralleling the 55.9% rise in passenger numbers. In the case of the 2030 projections, the ratio would only increase to 83 (6,860,566 divided by 82,692) (15.4% increase). Compared to the ten years from 1998 to 2008, this is very flat growth in passengers per movement for a 22 year period over which the larger B787/A350 will replace the B737 if the passenger demand eventuates. This is another major inconsistency in the aircraft movement projections that needs to be resolved.

Domestic Aircraft Movement Projection. As passenger demand grows, the airlines will simply exercise their flexibility to use larger aircraft as they have over the past ten years. A long-term, domestic RPT aircraft movement projection of 3.4% growth is implausible on the history of the last ten years of the Airport's private ownership – 0.1% would be closer to the mark than any of the projections used by Canberra Airport over the past ten years.

The Prospect of Direct International Services by mid-2010 (paragraph 5.2). Past master plans have raised the prospect of international services beginning imminently. The still-operative 2005 master plan projected 265 international RPT movements in 07/08, but there was none despite the boom economic times. The only direct service that did begin in the past was the Air Pacific service to Fiji that quickly ceased in the midst of a Canberra winter because custom was insufficient to deliver paying load factors for a B737. The B737 and/or the A320 are the smallest aircraft that might be used for direct flights to Bali, Fiji or New Zealand and the potential passenger loads are insufficient to sustain a daily or regular service. Larger, longer-ranged aircraft such as the B767/787 and the A330/350 are required for direct flights to mainland South-East Asia, requiring very high load factors for paying flights, particularly for low-cost airlines. For 2029/30, the mid-range passengers per movement ratio is 153.4 (382,495 divided by 2493) which might suffice as a satisfactory load factor for a B737/A320, but would be unsatisfactory for a B787 or A350. When flights from Sydney to international destinations are being cut because of limited patronage in a global recession, there is little prospect of Canberra gaining regular, frequent, direct services to international ports by mid-2010 as stated (paragraph 5.2). At the same time, Brisbane Airport has deferred a significant expansion program including a parallel main runway because of falling passenger numbers.

Implications for the PUC ANEF. It appears that use of an implausible domestic RPT, long-term growth projection of 3.4% and the hyped-up prospects of international services to various overseas ports is being used to inflate aircraft movement projections to in turn bolster the long-challenged and unconvincing ANEF movement projections. Realistic, sustainable projections are required so that the ANEF is on a firm basis and the utilisation of land on the Airport approaches is not unnecessarily quarantined by inflated aircraft movement projections inappropriately bloating the ANEF.

Movement Projection Errors in Table 2.5 of the Preliminary Major Development Plan for the Western Terminal. The movement projection errors documented above are also replicated in this plan.

Summary. For residents to gain an accurate and informed appreciation of the 2009 PDMP and of the true aircraft noise position, accurate movement statistics and growth projections are fundamental. The data in the 2009 PDMP provides neither. The inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the aircraft movement projections misinform and mislead residents on a crucial, fundamental basis of the PDMP. Because the Airport is unable to deliver credible aircraft movement projections to the public, the PDMP should be withdrawn and BITRE and Airservices properly review the movement projections. For public confidence, this would need to be done transparently. Then, a new plan could be issued for the full public consultation period, allowing respondents to comment from a properly informed basis. The revised movement projections should also be developed further to inform a new ANEF. The inaccurate and incorrect movement projections at Table 5.6 are also replicated as Table 2.5 in the Preliminary Major Development Plan for the Western terminal released on 28 April.

Chapter 7 – General Aviation and Military Operations

Parallel Runway. Paragraph 7.1 states that *'Towards the end of the planning period of the Master Plan, a runway parallel to the main Runway 17/35 may be required to cater for growing General Aviation traffic alongside growing airline and other commercial traffic'*. Mr McCann, the Airport's Director of Planning, has stated that the requirement for a parallel runway has been included in the previous and current Plan, first at the Howard government's request and later the Rudd government. This differs with the statement in the current Plan. I also understand that the land required for the parallel runway is held by Defence who have advised an enduring requirement for this land, and also advised me that Canberra Airport had been so advised. These inconsistencies need to be resolved for informed comment on a significant issue affecting residential amenity.

Military Operations (paragraph 7.2). This paragraph states that:

'The basing of the RAAF 34 Squadron aircraft fleet at Canberra Airport, providing VIP transport operations for Government, provides positive impetus for increased military activity at Canberra Airport in the future. The current 34 Squadron fleet incorporates Boeing Business Jet (B737) aircraft and Challenger 604 corporate jets. It is possible that the Special Purpose Aircraft (SPA) fleet may be increased in size in the future to accommodate increased level of Government SPA operations, possibly

including a larger aircraft to transport Government officials to overseas destinations. Any such increase in the SPA fleet may require additional apron, hangar and office space to be constructed at Fairbairn.

Canberra Airport would actively support any increase in military aviation at the Airport, including but not limited to flight training, helicopter operations or other aircraft operations.

It is also noted that additional RAAF squadrons or other military aircraft capabilities may be located at Canberra Airport within the planning period of this Master Plan, though the level of any such expansion (if any) is unknown at this time.'

Defence has advised me that no decision has yet been made on a replacement for the existing SPA fleet which is leased until 2014, and that Defence has no plans to base additional aircraft or squadrons at Canberra Airport. Defence also advised that it was not consulted in respect to the statements made in Chapter 7. The statements at Chapter 7 regarding military operations would appear to be kite flying without any formal basis. These misleading statements should have been checked with Defence before they were made and demonstrate the inconsistent staffing of this PDMP. The formal Defence position needs to be ascertained and incorporated into the Plan for later, informed comment by residents.

Chapter 9 - Relocation of the Runway 35 Threshold (paragraph 9.6)

At page 109, the PDMP states:

'It is expected that the Runway 35 threshold will be moved south by 2010 to take advantage of this extra length for landing aircraft. The movement of the threshold, expected to be by up to 450m, will likely be associated with a replacement and upgrade by Airservices Australia of the Runway 35 Instrument Landing System (ILS), in June 2010.'

Previous Airport Commitments Regarding the Runway 35 Landing Threshold. The Airport General Manager, then Mr Milton, responded to a letter of mine on Mr Snow's behalf on 10 June 1999 (CIA:bm) stating *'this runway extension has been included as a planning option to provide additional range for departing aircraft. As such, the landing threshold of an extended runway would remain in its present position and the height of aircraft approaching from the south is not expected to change'*. Mr Byron, the current Managing Director, made a similar statement publicly in The Canberra Times of 20 January 2006 (reference C) in relation to the runway extension.

Expectation to Honour Commitments. At the public meeting at the Airport on 17 March to discuss the 2009 PDMP, I advised Mr McCann, Director of Planning, that past commitments had been given to retain the 35 landing threshold in its current location. Mr McCann denied any knowledge of these past commitments. The simple fact is that unconditional commitments have been given not to relocate the runway 35 threshold as part of and prior to the runway extension being built. The Executive Chairman and Managing Director of Canberra Airport need to honour their previous, unconditional and freely-given commitments. Then, the PDMP can be amended

appropriately and the ANEF constructed on the correct threshold for informed comment.

Chapter 14 – Aircraft Noise

'According to the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO), aircraft noise is the most significant cause of adverse community reaction to the operation and expansion of airports'. Aviation Green Paper Airport Planning: Aircraft Noise Management: Maunsell AECOM, August 2008.

Specific comment on noise aspects of the proposed freight operations is provided later; these comments are directed to aircraft noise generally.

Airport Claims/Assertions. The Airport claims/asserts that:

- it protects Canberra and Queanbeyan residents from 55-65 dBA of noise per jet overflight (p173);
- it would appear that the impact of night time aircraft noise is low and therefore a curfew is not necessary or desirable (p176);
- [North Canberra] is subjected to single noise event levels from jet aircraft well below 65 dBA level at which Commonwealth authorities state that noise begins to become intrusive (p183); and
- land use planning must reflect the reality of Canberra Airport being a 24-hour operating airport.' PDMP, p 176.

The wording of these claims or assertions seems to have been deliberately chosen. As a North Canberra resident subjected to both jet and prop noise well in excess of 65 dBA, why are the claims/assertions limited to jets? It seems that the Airport is endeavouring to make a special case for the night freighter operation to be approved on the basis that 65 dBA of jet noise is acceptable even at night.

Level of Noise Protection. The defined level of so-called noise protection is vague and imprecise – 65 dBA is double the noise level of 55 dBA. This is akin to the Airport saying there might be 10,000 night freighter movements or 20,000. A specific level of claim needs to be defined for informed comment.

Actual Aircraft Noise Levels Experienced. Examination of annex A shows that residents are regularly subjected to more than 65 dBA of jet noise at either end of the Airport.

Intrusive Noise Level. It is unclear whether the purported 65 dBA threshold for intrusive noise applies continuously or has a time limitation. Most people seem to accept 65 dBA as tolerable during daytime (7am to 7pm), but many people would regard 65 dBA in the evening and the sleeping hours between say 8pm and 7am as intrusive. External noise of 65 dBA reduces to 60 dBA indoors (windows and weather doors open, security door locked) which significantly exceeds the levels of 35-45 dBA at which World Health Organisation research indicates that sleep is disturbed with resulting health concerns. I contend that aircraft noise events at 65 dBA or louder in Canberra would most certainly be sleep disturbing, particularly when the external noise level during the sleeping hours is generally < 30 dBA. However, if aviation

authorities believe that jet noise at 65 dBA is acceptable for residents during the sleeping hours, I suggest they test their belief at Sydney Airport and relax the curfew. There, airline or jet freighter take-offs and landings could be trialled over residents of the suburbs to the north-west of Sydney Airport. These residents are also voters in the Minister for Infrastructure's electorate.

Jerrabomberra. The planning of Jerrabomberra was properly approved because the development of the suburb accorded with AS 2021, the then ANEF 20 contour only reaching as far as Tompsitt Drive, the current, main access into Jerrabomberra. Subsequently in 1995, the boundary lines of the Queanbeyan Noise Abatement Area were drawn in such a way as to leave residents of 600 or more homes under the runway 35 straight-in approach exposed to loud, repetitive aircraft noise, primarily between 6am and 11pm at the moment.

High Noise Corridor. The Airport uses the High Noise Corridor concept to discount the rights of these residents as irrelevant and proposes to subject them to loud aircraft noise in the 11pm to 6am period when they now have some respite. If the High Noise Corridor concept were utilised at Sydney Airport, hundreds of thousands of people would be significantly disadvantaged. The simple truth is that AS 2021 is the binding regulation affecting such development and the High Noise Corridor has no formal standing except in the Airport's eyes. Reference to it is used to mask the true situation and discount these residents. The High Noise Corridor needs to be totally withdrawn from the documentation.

Discounting of Jerrabomberra Residents. The way these Jerrabomberra residents have and are being discounted as irrelevant and their interests accorded no value because the Airport seeks to expand its operations is deeply troubling. They deserve equal consideration in the discussion over expanded flight operations, particularly during the sleeping hours.

Airport Planning – Change of Attitude. Airport planning needs to recognise that some residents already carry a potential 24-hour exposure to significant aircraft noise because of their location relative to the Airport. These residents cannot be ignored because it is inconvenient to the Airport's expansion plans. The Airport is named the Canberra Airport and it exists to serve the region's people, not Sydney's. The people of the region will determine the role of the Airport and just how much land will be reserved for the aviation function.

Summary. The Airport seems unaware, but should be aware that:

- residents to the north and south of the Airport are already subjected to noise events exceeding 65 dBA, contrary to its claims and
- the purported level of protection is already well breached.

Airport planning needs to recognise that it exists to serve Canberra and Queanbeyan residents largely, not Sydney's and that its functions will be determined by local residents. Additionally, the Department of Infrastructure and Airservices need to clarify whether subjecting residents to 65 dBA or more of aircraft noise is acceptable during the night hours, particularly the sleeping hours.

OTHER SHORTCOMINGS OF THE 2009 PDMP IN PROVIDING AN ADEQUATE OBJECTIVE BASIS FOR INFORMED PUBLIC CONSIDERATION AND COMMENT

The PDMP proposes to increase the number of scheduled movements between the 'normal' airline hours of 6 am to 11 pm and also operate large, noisy jet freighter flights in the sleeping hours between 11 pm and 6 am. In considering the PDMP from a resident's perspective, three broad issues prevail:

- ◆ the reasons for rejection of the previous iteration of the PDMP;
- ◆ the purported economic benefit to the community; and
- ◆ the noise and air quality costs of increased, continuous aircraft movements.

My detailed comments follow. Road traffic concerns from the increased volumes of traffic will be left to those holding special expertise on this aspect.

Ministerial Rejection of the Previous PDMP

Rejection of the Previous PDMP Version. The previous PDMP (reference B) was rejected. There is little mention of this or the reasons for the Minister's rejection (reference D). The detailed reasons for the Minister's rejection of the 2008 PDMP are crucial in providing context and background to facilitate informed consideration and comment on the current PDMP (reference A) by residents. The detailed reasons for the Minister's rejection of the previous plan need to be included and discussed at the start of the current PDMP.

Key Oversight. In my opinion, this key oversight makes it extremely difficult for uninformed or poorly informed residents to properly consider the PDMP, its potential affect on their residential amenity, and constitutes sufficient reason to reject the PDMP outright.

Chapter 2 of the PDMP – Economic Impact

While more than \$600M has been invested over the past 11 years, a significant amount appears to have been invested in non-aviation facilities which have taken jobs away from other areas of Canberra depriving the town centres of much-needed advancement. Most of the claimed 'new' jobs at the Airport have simply been transferred from the region, or Sydney in the case of Defence C130 maintenance.

Costing Aviation Projects. The essence of the PDMP lies in the proposal to introduce new flight services. For residents' appreciation of the cost/benefit of the aviation development, the costs of relevant aviation projects need to be detailed, and subsidies also identified. For example, around \$60M has been spent on two upgrades of the main runway but the Howard government subsidised this significantly with funding of \$37M (over 60% of cost). The runway upgrade would probably have founded if it had not been subsidised heavily, and the Airport had to recover costs through international passenger charges because the domestic aircraft passengers had no need of the runway upgrade and should therefore not have to pay for it.

The terminal and road upgrades are welcomed as essential and long-overdue developments.

The overall benefit of the proposed Airport development to the region's residents is difficult to determine but seems to be small. More flight opportunities between the preferred travel period of 6am to 11pm advantage the community. However, the freight hub and proposal to become the Second Sydney Airport primarily benefits Canberra Airport and will be of little community economic advantage.

Chapter 6 – Proposed Freight Operations

The proposal being put by Canberra Airport differs significantly with the position of Sydney Airport where the current airfreight activities are based. Sydney Airport envisages the freight operations continuing to be based there and allows for growth of 2% pa in freight aircraft movements. Sydney Airport is also conducting a master planning activity and the differing issues in the respective proposals need to be resolved by the Government.

Freight Aircraft Noise Signatures. Paragraph 6.2.3 foreshadows the ATR42, B757F and B767F aircraft being used as well as the B737-300F for initial freight operations and goes on to state that '*aircraft such as the B757F, whilst larger, have a similar noise profile or are indeed quieter than existing B737F freighter aircraft*'. I have not been able to locate the noise signature of the B737-300F but, using the B737-800 which routinely operates into Canberra Airport as a yardstick, the ATR42, B757 and B767 all have noise characteristics noisier than the B737-800 (ICAO, Annex 16, Chapter 3 certification).

B737-300F Noise Contour Map and Actual Readings. Figure 6.6 shows that I should receive about 50 dBA of jet noise from a B737-300F and the current Hackett noise monitor terminal about 45 dBA. Over many months, I have been taking noise readings around Canberra and attach some recent observations taken this year (annex A). Current jet aircraft subject the Hackett NMT to noise levels as high as 76 dBA for departures and up to 60 dBA for arrivals, the Hackett NMT being particularly poorly sited to 'hear' runway 17 approaches. For Jerrabomberra, an A320 on runway 35 approach at 2 am on 31 March subjected those residents to 74 dBA at the NMT. No matter what explanation is given, there is a significant difference between actual jet noise readings and those of the noise contour model. Additionally, background noise across most of Canberra and Queanbeyan is less than 30 dBA during the sleeping hours. Jet noise of 76 dBA is over 20 times louder than background and will easily suffice to waken residents.

The statement at paragraph 6.5.2 that '*These figures [6.6 and 6.7] demonstrate that no residents within the ACT, and only a few within Jerrabomberra, will be exposed at any time to noise over 65dBA as part of a freight hub*' does not correlate with the NMT noise readings nor those that I have taken. Moreover, the proposed freight aircraft would be noisier than the B737-800. As for the B747F, the ICAO Annex 16 Chapter 3 certification shows that it generates over double the noise of a B737-800 on take-off.

Omission of the Mode of Runway Operation. The mode of operation of runway 17/35 is not stipulated and this is crucial in determining who receives what noise and when for informed, resident' consideration of the PDMP. Will runway 17/35 be operated one way or two way? Current Airservices operational documents favour the use of runway 17 for landing and runway 35 for take-off (two-way) during the sleeping hours. This means that North Canberra and Gungahlin residents bear the brunt of the freight aircraft night noise – a situation that will be deeply disturbing for these residents. However, the freight aircraft are unlikely to have RNP approach capability and the requisite pilot training, so freight aircraft may prefer/have to land runway 35, particularly during inclement weather.

Sydney Relief Measures from Continuous Noise. Canberra Airport only has one runway for jet operations in contrast to Sydney's three. There will be no respite from continuous jet noise for residents living near the northern and southern approaches to the jet runway. Yet, Sydney Airport has a curfew and a rigorously-enforced system of changing the duty runway and dispersing departure paths to provide a measure of day and night relief from aircraft noise.

Use of Reverse Thrust. No mention has been made of the use of reverse thrust by freight aircraft landing in the sleeping hours. As evidenced by the A320 incident on 31 March at 2 am, reverse thrust at power can be heard in Hackett across the Majura-Ainslie ridgeline (annex A). Reverse thrust power needs to be limited to idle for all landings during the sleeping hours.

Power Supply for Freight Aircraft During Turnround. Freight aircraft normally take some time to turn round – typically about two hours for a B747F. During the turn-round, these aircraft will need power. It is unclear whether these aircraft will run noisy, aircraft auxiliary power or mobile ground power units to power the aircraft during the night, or whether they will be powered by in-apron, reticulated aircraft power. This issue is of potential importance for Pialligo, Campbell, Majura Valley, Oaks Estate and possibly Narrabundah residents who could be disturbed by the noise of several, concurrently running APUs. This oversight is another example of inadequate, prior information for residents to make an informed decision.

Summary. This chapter contains significant omissions, inaccuracies and inconsistencies making it unacceptable and indeed misleading for informed consideration and comment by respondents. Residents need to know exactly how many noise events they will receive during the sleeping hours and how loud, what reverse power will be used, and whether APUs will be run during the turnround. The PDMP fails residents badly on such key issues. It needs to be re-staffed properly and then re-circulated for public consideration.

Chapter 7 – General Aviation

General Aviation Operations (paragraph 7.1). The possible securing of a major flight training facility would be a matter of concern if training or transits to training areas will be conducted over residential areas. North Canberra and Gungahlin are subjected to considerable, noisy GA aircraft overflights now, as evidenced by annex A. The prospect of more GA overflights at low level would be opposed

strongly. If new flight training activity is to be established, then both the circuit and upper air training, and transits need to be distant from residential areas.

GA Aircraft Projections. The possibility of securing a major flight training facility also tests the GA aircraft movement projections. In the ANEF, GA movement projections dwindle to less than 3,000, contrary to the projections in Table 5.6. These contradictions need to be resolved.

CHAPTER 14 – AIRCRAFT NOISE

Reduced to the essence, the thirty or so pages of this chapter could be summarised as Canberra Airport believes that:

- the majority of Canberra and Queanbeyan residents are protected from aircraft noise of 55-65 dBA,
- such noise levels are acceptable allowing continuous operations, and
- that, if residents complain, noise sharing would be the most likely outcome.

I have already disputed the first two points leaving the matter of Tralee/noise sharing for comment. Firstly though, I will comment on the inaccurate homily about the past foresight of planners.

PDMP Homily Regarding the Foresight of Planners

'Thanks to the far-sighted vision of early planners and regulators, the overwhelming majority of communities that surround Canberra Airport are free from the adverse impacts of aircraft noise. By the simple act of ensuring that flight paths to the north and south of the Airport were maintained free from residential development, planners and regulators have been able to ensure protection for 99.5% of the region's residents.' PDMP, p 167

Past Jet Overflight of Residents. This historical assertion is false and misrepresents the situation although it might advantage Canberra Airport spin to promote the High Noise Corridor that lacks any formal acceptance. Since jet services were introduced in the 1960s until 1995, arriving and departing jets swept noisily across Hackett and the other North Canberra suburbs at low level (1,000 feet) day and night. At the southern end of the main runway, jets regularly overflew the Weston Creek and Woden suburbs equally noisily at low level. Only Queanbeyan was provided some respite from aircraft noise with jets from Sydney being requested in the early 70s to circumnavigate it, or being radar vectored accordingly. Prior to that, jets also overflew Queanbeyan at 1,000 feet. Effectively, residents were not protected from jet noise, and the PDMP-purported benefits of the planners and regulators foresight did not exist.

Sale of Airport. The only reason that these practices were changed was because the Keating government intended sale of Canberra Airport and it needed to complete a master plan to advantage the sale, holding the requisite public meeting for development of the master plan. The Keating government plans were disrupted by significant public complaint about aircraft noise at two meetings, sufficient for the Airport to be sold three years later in 1998 by the Howard government without an updated master plan. However, the jet arrival and departure procedures were upgraded

significantly to lessen residents' aircraft noise exposure, and the Noise Abatement Areas were established with arbitrary boundaries.

RPT Flightpath Changes Forced by Residents. These changes had nothing to do with far-sighted planners or regulators, just concerned, self-interested, vocal residents sick of being bathed in loud jet noise reacting to an opportunity presented through the intended sale of the Airport. Public pressure on the Federal Airports Corporation and the then Department of Transport delivered these changes.

Jerrabomberra Residents Merit Consideration. In the same period, the construction of Jerrabomberra was properly approved because the development of the suburb accorded with AS 2021, the then ANEF 20 contour only reaching as far as Tompsitt Drive, the current access into Jerrabomberra. The boundary lines of the Queanbeyan Noise Abatement Area were set, subsequent to the suburb being constructed, leaving residents of 600 or more homes under the runway 35 ILS approach, exposed. The way these people have been subsequently dismissed as irrelevant and accorded no consideration because the Airport seeks to expand operations sits most uncomfortably with me. They deserve equal consideration.

Nothing to Do with Far-Sighted Planners. Where were the far-sighted planners or regulators then? This misleading section needs to be completely rewritten from a factual basis, or withdrawn.

Tralee and Noise Sharing

'Further, if houses are permitted to be built in the High Noise Corridor, then it is possible that the Noise Abatement Areas could be abolished. This is because it would make no sense to continue to force the airlines to fly around the suburbs of Canberra and Queanbeyan at great cost (and increased greenhouse emissions) to protect the community from 55-65dBA of noise per jet overflight, especially when the NSW Government is seeking to develop new housing in the High Noise Corridor exposed to 65-75dBA of noise.' PDMP, p 173

The PDMP rails at length against the development of Tralee. The simple truth is that AS 2021 is the binding regulation, the High Noise Corridor has no formal standing except in the Airport's eyes, and development of Tralee accords with AS 2021 and the current, inflated ANEF. Another simple fact is that the Noise Abatement Areas do not protect residents to the north and south of the Airport from current aircraft noise up to 75 dBA (three times louder than normal conversation – see annex A). Airservices has a principle of minimising aircraft noise and is obliged to do so. Any relaxation of current aircraft noise restrictions would see the government punished at the ballot box and is quite unlikely to occur.

Firstly, Airport planning must recognise that current residents to the north and south of the Airport are already subjected to significant aircraft noise, and that the Airport exists to serve the needs of the Canberra region, not Sydney. After all, it is named the Canberra Airport. The community, not the Airport, comes first and will decide the role of the Airport and how much land will be allocated for Airport functionality.

The Airport's opposition to Tralee is rank scaremongering, lacking any shred of credibility. Figure 14.2 simply confirms that view.

Noise Abatement Areas

When the noise abatement areas were established in 1995, it was recognised that the Canberra north-eastern boundary did not encompass future Gungahlin suburbs, and that the noise abatement area would need to be extended at some point in the future.

The PDMP appears to bestow on the noise abatement areas the characteristics of the Great Wall of China or the Israeli Wall. The noise abatement areas are not effective in delivering satisfactory noise outcomes as is illustrated by annex A. Lateral jet noise, despite the noise abatement boundary, will bathe the suburb in sufficient noise to disrupt sleep.

Revised Departure Procedure Runway 35

Proposed Revised Departure Procedures for Runway 35 (14.4.5). In making this proposal, the Airport is recognising and conceding that aircraft noise will be a concern in North Canberra for freight hub departures during the sleeping hours. It is desperately trying to make the proposal more palatable. However, it seems to be unaware that jet departure noise reaches its maximum in the rear quarter, coming in rolling waves and that the right turn manoeuvre will be initiated abeam Hackett. This right turn procedure will still result in North Canberra residents being exposed to tailpipe noise levels sufficiently loud to waken/disturb sleeping residents. No matter how the Airport strives to find a compromise that might work, it simply exposes the fact that it is unaware of the true noise situation around Canberra and is grasping at straws.

Practical Ultimate Capacity Aircraft Noise Exposure Forecast (PUC ANEF)

The PUC ANEF is based on the movement projections contained in the Rehbein AOS Study dated 28 May 2007:

	Day	Night 7pm-7am	Total
RPT – international jet	10,760	14,346	25,106
RPT – domestic jet	98,555	57,351	155,906
RPT – regional non-jet	44,387	24,441	68,828
Freight – jet	606	20,574	21,180
Freight – non-jet		3,272	3,272
Military – jet and turbo-prop	1,888	888	2,776
Corporate	2,005	339	2,344
General aviation and training	<u>2,255</u>	<u>453</u>	<u>2,708</u>
Total fixed wing	160,456	121,664	282,120
Helicopters	<u>2,300</u>	<u>620</u>	<u>2,920</u>
Total all aircraft	<u>162,756</u>	<u>122,284</u>	<u>285,040</u>

Credibility of the ANEF Movement Projections. The credibility of the PUC ANEF movement projections can be simply tested by examination of the domestic RPT movements – jet and non-jet - which constitute 79% of the overall total movements. The ANEF projected 224,734 domestic movements being reached between 2050 and 2060. This contrasts sharply with the actual movements of about 39-40,000 pa over the past ten years, and the airlines' flexibility to tailor aircraft size to passenger demand resulting in minimal movement growth. On this test, the PUC ANEF movement projections lack credibility and appear grossly inflated.

PUC ANEF Night Movements. Night movements of all RPT, freight and military aircraft total 120,872 – i.e. a movement every 2.2 minutes between 7 pm and 7 am. Virtually all of these movements involving up to B747 aircraft will be on runway 17/35. There will be no respite from aircraft noise to the north and south of the Airport such as Sydney residents gain from the curfew. Noise will be continuous and likely to be challenged by affected residents. Construction of the PUC ANEF not only has to be determined by the maximum number of aircraft that can be operated; but also be determined by the noise affects on residents subjected to the resultant aircraft noise, and residents' tolerance.

PUC ANEF Aircraft Types. The ANEF for Canberra Airport is longer than that for the main runway at Sydney. This partially results from the selection of aircraft types. Many of the designated aircraft will not be in service by 2050 and the nomination of new aircraft types such as the B787, A350 and A380 with Chapter 4 aircraft noise signatures would be more appropriate for a 2050 and beyond ANEF. This would also minimise the unnecessary quarantining of land under AS 2021. This also suggests that if the PUC ANEF is to be continued, an intermediate ANEF for say year 2030 is required.

Location of the Runway 35 Threshold. The PUC ANEF is based on the runway 35 threshold being relocated 450m to the south of its present position. I have already pointed out that both the Executive Chairman and Managing Director of Canberra Airport have given unconditional assurances publicly and privately that the runway 35 threshold would not be repositioned from its current location. The PUC ANEF needs to be redrawn on the current position of the runway 35 threshold. This may reduce the maximum movement rate. A new EIS may also be required.

Canberra

Annex:

- A. Pot-Pourri of Noise Readings and Complaints made to Airservices 14 Jan 09 to 25 Apr 09

**POT-POURRI OF NOISE READINGS AND COMPLAINTS
MADE TO AIRSERVICES 14 JAN 09 to 25 APR 09**

Findings

- ◆ **North Canberra Departures & Arrivals.** Normal jet departures from runway 35 subject Hackett and other North Canberra and Gungahlin residents to noise levels up to **76 dBA**. Noise levels for B737s landing runway 17 are around
- ◆ **Sleep Disturbance.** From the aircraft noise events during the sleeping hours, sleep disturbance occurs around external noise level.
- ◆ **North Canberra Light Aircraft.** Light aircraft and helicopters overflying Hackett or transiting just outside the NE boundary of the Canberra Noise Abatement Area also subject residents to noise levels similar to the jet departures.
- ◆ **Jerrabomberra Arrivals.** Jerrabomberra residents are subjected to similar noise levels by jets and turbo-props landing runway 35. This is sharply illustrated by a Tiger Airways A320 landing at 2 am on 31 March (74 dBA Jerra NMT against a background noise of < 30 dBA). Note: each of the purported freight aircraft for the proposed freight hub has noise characteristics exceeding the A320 or B737, nor would the Tiger flight have been allowed into Sydney Airport.
- ◆ **Jerrabomberra Departures.** For runway 17 departures, Jerrabomberra residents are currently subjected to noise up to 70 dBA.

Conclusions Drawn from Noise Readings and Complaints

- ◆ The Airport Master Plan assertion that 99.5% of Canberra and Queanbeyan residents are protected from aircraft noise is false.
- ◆ The Airport Master Plan assertion that all Canberra residents and most of Queanbeyan will be protected from aircraft noise over 65 dBA from freight hub operations is false.
- ◆ Aircraft noise levels in the sleeping hours can be expected to waken residents of Canberra and Queanbeyan.
- ◆ To protect residents from sleep disturbance, either a curfew or community-set noise outcomes backed by a monitoring and stiff penalty system needs to be introduced.

Colour Coding of Noise Readings:

< 50 dBA (50 dBA - external noise level for sleep disturbance – 4 times background noise level across most of Canberra in the sleeping hours)

65 - < 70 dBA (louder than normal conversation)

70 - < 75 dBA (loud conversation)
75 and > dBA (what the hell was that!)

Date of Concern: 14-Jan-2009

Time of Concern: 6:32 AM

Comment: A noticeably noisy Qantas B737 delivered noise of **76 dBA NMT** on departure. The B737 single event noise contour tendered last year as part of the failed Canberra Airport Draft Master Plan suggests that I should receive of noise from a B737. Clearly, this contour map is seriously wrong. B737 noise at this level against a background night noise level of < 30 dBA will not only waken residents of North Canberra, it could waken occupants of the Gungahlin Cemetery. I ask that this complaint be brought to the attention of Airservices and Dept of Infrastructure representatives, and that I be provided an e-mail response.

Fri 16 Jan	7.43pm	Qantas B737	65 NMT
Sun 18 Jan	09.08am	VB E190	74 NMT
	5.14pm	Q 737	
	8.40pm	Q 737	65 NMT

Date of Concern: 19-Jan-2009

Time of Concern: 7:34 PM

Comment: A Qantas 737 delivered jet noise of 66 dBA NMT. Canberra Airport seeks to introduce night freight services. I point out that night noise levels are below 30 dBA and that jet noise of 66 dBA (over 12 times background noise) will disturb sleeping residents. This proposal should not be approved and a curfew should be introduced.

Thu 22 Jan	7.25pm	Q 737	
	7.44pm	Q 737	65 NMT
	8.38pm	VB E 190	75 NMT

Sat 24 Jan	5.11pm	Q B737	65 NMT
------------	--------	--------	--------

Date of Concern: 25-Jan-2009 Sun

Time of Concern: 8:09 PM

Comment: A jet(s) flew low over the suburb north to south making noise to **82 dBA NMT** level. This did not appear to involve a flypast.

Date of Concern: 26-Jan-2009 Australia Day

Time of Concern: 4:36 AM

Comment: A noisy prop-driven aircraft appeared to depart Canberra to the north.

Date of Concern: 3-Feb-2009

Time of Concern: 1:29 AM

Comment: Woken by aircraft movement near suburb.

Date of Concern: 9-Feb-2009

Time of Concern: 11:55 PM

Comment: I was woken by a jet movement further illustrating why future jet movements in the sleeping hours associated with a freight hub will disturb the sleep of thousands of residents.

Date of Concern: 12-Feb-2009
Time of Concern: 12:46 AM
Comment: Woken by aircraft movement.

Date of Concern: 12-Feb-2009
Time of Concern: 5:14 AM
Comment: Departing aircraft woke me - noise level 70 dBA. Night flights by jets are going to be much worse if they are approved.

Date of Concern: 12-Feb-2009
Time of Concern: 5:39 AM
Comment: Jet departure woke me. This aircraft was not visible on WebTrak so I assume that it was one of the invisible, but not unheard, military jets. Noise level 70 dBA. Another example of night jet noise issues and why the proposal by Canberra Airport should not go ahead and why the WebTrak policy of not showing military aircraft is wrong.

Date of Concern: 15-Feb-2009 Sun
Time of Concern: 8:53 AM
Comment: A Virgin jet overflew Queanbeyan apparently below the noise abatement area ceiling, infringing the NAA.

Date of Concern: 15-Feb-2009 Sun
Time of Concern: 10:21 AM
Comment: Noisy Qantas jet departure (estimated mid 60s dBA) to the north). Background noise 33 dBA. During the sleeping hours, this would have sufficed to waken many people leading to the conclusion that jet operations during the sleeping hours will result in much dissatisfaction.

Date of Concern: 16-Feb-2009
Time of Concern: 6:00 AM
Comment: Noisy aircraft (Qantas) departed Canberra to the north.

Date of Concern: 22-Feb-2009 Sun
Time of Concern: 5:54 AM
Comment: Prop-driven aircraft departed Canberra Airport to the north waking me. Jet aircraft in the sleeping hours will be noisier, drawing the conclusion that many residents will have their sleep disturbed if the proposed freight hub eventuates.

Date of Concern: 22-Feb-2009 Sun
Time of Concern: 11:12 PM **Note: over at Jerrabomberra**
Comment: A landing jet delivered 72 dBA NMT of noise - background noise was less than 30 dBA. Jet noise pollution was more than 16 times louder than background. Jet noise at these levels is quite unsatisfactory for the sleeping hours.

Date of Concern: 24-Feb-2009

Time of Concern: 6:36 AM

Comment: A particularly noisy prop-driven aircraft departed Canberra tracking over North Canberra delivering 70 dBA of noise. This type of aircraft regularly flies out of Canberra Airport and may well be the same aircraft. Such flights exemplify the ineffectiveness of the noise abatement areas and how they do not protect residents from aircraft noise. Aircraft with such noise characteristics should not be allowed to overfly the Canberra or Queanbeyan residential areas or should be subjected to a noise tax.

Date of Concern: 24-Feb-2009

Time of Concern: 10:36 AM

Comment: A prop-driven aircraft appeared to take-off on runway 30 and when first heard at Hackett was over Campbell at about 2,000 ft AGL tracking NWly and climbing. This aircraft, although about 3 kms away, still delivered noise of 65 dBA. For the residents of Campbell, the noise must have been extremely loud. This illustrates that the noise abatement area does not protect residents from significant aircraft noise events and that it is quite ineffective.

Date of Concern: 1-Mar-2009 Sun

Time of Concern: 5:51 AM

Comment: I was woken by a prop-driven aircraft departing Canberra to the north. This reinforces my contention that jet operations during the sleeping hours will disturb the sleep of thousands of residents.

Date of Concern: 1-Mar-2009 Sun

Time of Concern: 11:46 AM

Comment: A single-engined light aircraft delivered noise of **76 dBA** over Hackett. This is very intrusive at any time but is a bit much on a quiet Sunday. This complaint further illustrates that the Canberra Noise Abatement Area does not provide reasonable and tolerable noise outcomes for residents. This aircraft needs to circumnavigate suburban areas not overfly them.

Date of Concern: 4-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 10:27 PM

Comment: A prop-driven aircraft tracked east to west across the suburb - measured noise 66 dBA. I have just been reading the Airport Draft Master Plan's assertion that 99.5% of Canberra and Queanbeyan residents are protected from aircraft noise. The level of protection slipped badly in this case, just as it will if the jet freight services are allowed to start.

This aircraft appeared to have been engaged on a training flight

Date of Concern: 5-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 7:03 PM

Comment: A helicopter tracking NW to SE overflew the suburb delivering 70 dBA of measured noise. This is another example of the Noise Abatement Area failing to deliver a satisfactory outcome. Again, the people of Hackett must have been in the 0.5% of Canberra and Queanbeyan residents not protected from aircraft noise.

Date of Concern: 5-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 10:48 PM

Comment: Noisy jet departure to the north again illustrating that freighter aircraft in the sleeping hours will waken thousands of residents.

Date of Concern: 6-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 11:39 PM

Comment: Another aircraft departure in the sleeping hours waking me. Either a curfew is introduced, or required noise outcomes are set by the community, backed up by stiff penalties for breaches.

Date of Concern: 7-Mar-2009 Sat

Time of Concern: 11:44 AM

Comment: A light aircraft overflowed the suburb delivering 72.9 dBA (Hackett NMT 70 dBA). The difference in the noise readings can be explained because this aircraft overflowed my home but would have passed about 500m from the NMT. Background noise was 37 dBA. The first aircraft was followed by another light aircraft at 11.49 passing just to the east of me and even further from the NMT delivering 69.6 dBA. A third aircraft then overflowed the suburb at 11.59 delivering 67 dBA (NMT 69 dBA). This noise is at loud conversation levels and it is clear that Hackett, Watson and Gungahlin where they continued on towards must be part of the 0.5% of Canberra and Queanbeyan residents not protected from aircraft noise. Gee, that's a large 0.5%. The Noise Abatement Areas do not work.

Date of Concern: 7-Mar-2009 Sat

Time of Concern: 12:07 PM

Comment: A Qantas B737-400 departing to the north delivered noise of . If the freight hub were to proceed, the ATR-42, B757F, B767F and B747F all have noise characteristics louder than the B737 - the B767 is about 50% louder and the B747 double the noise level of a B737. The Airport in its master plan asserts that Canberra and Queanbeyan residents are protected to . It is palpably clear that residents are going to be subjected to aircraft noise at loud conversation levels and that will waken many people. The freight hub proposal will clearly deliver an unsatisfactory outcome for thousands of residents.

Date of Concern: 7-Mar-2009 Sat

Time of Concern: 2:28 PM

Comment: An ex-military trainer tracked NWly over the suburb delivering **75 dBA** of noise to the NMT. Another aircraft at 2.31 pm delivered 74 dBA of noise to me but only 65 to the Hackett NMT as it passed about 100m east of me but 7-800m away from the NMT. This further illustrates that the Noise Abatement Area is no magic solution, that it is quite ineffective in reducing noise and the Airport has no idea to what noise various suburbs are being subjected. This reflects in the Draft Master Plan (2009 version) where various assertions are made.

Date of Concern: 7-Mar-2009 Sat

Time of Concern: 5:41 PM

Comment: A light aircraft subjected the suburb to 65.2 dBA of noise (NMT reading 69 dBA) again demonstrating the ineffectiveness of the Noise Abatement Area and the Airport's lack of awareness of the noise situation.

Date of Concern: 8-Mar-2009 Sun

Time of Concern: 8:52 AM

Comment: A C182 subjected the suburb to 73 dBA of noise. Two single-engined light aircraft at 1040 and 1041 subjected the suburb to 74 and 73 dBA. The community needs to decide and set required noise outcomes for aircraft noise, whether jet or prop, and there needs to be stiff penalties (heavy fines and loss of points from pilot's licence) for breaches.

8 Mar (Sun)	7.11pm	Q 737-800	65 dBA NMT
	7.37pm	Q 737-800	66 dBA NMT

Date of Concern: 9-Mar-2009 Canberra Day

Time of Concern: 4:43 AM

Comment: A prop-driven aircraft departed to the north waking me. Examination of WebTrak reveals that this aircraft did not register on it. Freight jets will make more noise than this aircraft and also waken many more residents. Required noise outcomes need to be set by the community to protect its rights to undisturbed sleep.

9 Mar (PH)	10.30 am	Light twin engined a/c	68.8 dBA me, 72 dBA NMT
	10.47 am	ditto	71 dBA NMT

Date of Concern: 9-Mar-2009 Canberra Day

Time of Concern: 11:13 PM

Comment: A jet made a noisy, late night departure to the north further confirming the disruptive potential of the freight hub proposal

11 Mar	10.18 am	Q 737-800	66 NMT
	7.40 pm	Q 737-800	

12 Mar	9.03 am	Q 737-800	65 NMT
--------	---------	-----------	--------

Date of Concern: 13-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 5:34 AM

Comment: Woken by a prop-driven aircraft departing Canberra to the north followed by a second aircraft at 0536. Jets will be noisier and more intrusive during the sleeping hours.

Date of Concern: 13-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 11:20 AM

Comment: A large, heavy jet (B767 or equivalent) subjected me to 66 dBA of jet noise departing to the north. This contradicts the Airport assertion that no Canberra resident will receive noise over 65 dBA from a freight hub and is indicative of the noise problems that will eventuate if the freight hub goes ahead.

14 Mar (Sat)	1012	C182	68 dBA	65 dBA NMT
	1039	C206	70 dBA	64 dBA NMT
	Aircraft passed within 200m of me but 1km from NMT			
	1202	light aircraft		68 dBA NMT

Date of Concern: 15-Mar-2009 (Sun)

Time of Concern: 11:37 AM

Type of Call: Complaint

Comment: A red helicopter subjected residents to **76 dBA** of loud intrusive noise. Other flights at 1040, 1055, and 1116 subjected residents to 70-72 dBA. The Noise Abatement Area is quite ineffective in achieving acceptable noise outcomes. The Airport contention that 99.5% of Canberrans are protected from aircraft noise is a falsehood.

15 Mar (Sun)	1307	C182	68 dBA	66 dBA NMT
	1433	C182		68 dBA NMT
	1435	twin-engined at over 3000 ft AGL		NMT
	1718	Q B737-800		65 dBA NMT

16 Mar	1403	C441 (a/c about 5 kms from NMT)		63 dBA NMT
--------	------	---------------------------------	--	------------

17 Mar	1117	Twin-engined light aircraft	67 dBA	NMT
		a/c overflew me but was about 800m from the NMT		
	2232	jet departure to the north		
	2255	noisy prop-driven aircraft to the east of the suburb		

Date of Concern: 18-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 5:07 AM

Type of Call: Complaint

Comment: A prop-driven aircraft woke me; any chance of going back to sleep was overtaken by another noisier prop aircraft at 5.24 am. Last night, I attended an Airport presentation on its revised master plan where the Airport strove to imply that jet operations in the sleeping hours would not be a problem. Bull!

21 Mar (Sat)	1519	C206		71 dBA NMT
--------------	------	------	--	------------

Date of Concern: 21-Mar-2009 Sat

Time of Concern: 11:00 PM

Comment: Noisy Falcon 2000 departure to the north demonstrating that even noisier freighter aircraft will disturb thousands of residents in the early morning.

22 Mar (Sun)	1000	C182		68 dBA NMT
	1101	C206	72 dBA me, a/c 1.5 kms from NMT	63 dBA

Date of Concern: 23-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 7:28 AM

Comment: A twin-engined light aircraft subjected the suburb to 74 dBA of noise, flying within the Noise Abatement Area.

Date of Concern: 23-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 7:32 PM

Comment: A Qantas B737-800 subjected Hackett residents to **75 dBA** of jet noise. While this aircraft overflew the suburb, no weather was evident either on the weather radar or in the sky. The fact that weather was not an issue was confirmed by a Qantas jet 3 minutes later making a normal departure for Perth and not seeking to cut the corner overflying residences.

Date of Concern: 24-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 12:57 PM

Comment: A large, very noisy military jet tracked over the suburb at low level subjecting residents to an estimated **75 + dBA** of noise. This aircraft was reheard and reseen in the normal departure path to the north at 1.14 pm. Noise levels were less, probably around 70 dBA. This aircraft appears to have engaged in training but why air traffic controllers would route such a noisy aircraft through rather than round the Canberra Noise Abatement Area needs to be closely examined. This also illustrates why the policy of not showing military aircraft on WebTrak is wrong, particularly when there is a delay mechanism and routing need not be portrayed to maintain security.

Date of Concern: 24-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 7:38 PM

Comment: A very noisy jet, sounded like the C17 that was around at lunchtime, tracked across the suburb at low level within the Noise Abatement Area. Why was this aircraft routed over residences?

25 Mar 1955 B737

Date of Concern: 27-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 3:50 PM

Comment: A C152 delivered **75 dBA** of noise tracking NWly over the suburb. This reinforces my contention that the Noise Abatement Area and associated practices are quite ineffective.

Date of Concern: 28-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 10:11 AM

Comment: A Dash 8 on approach delivered **75 dBA** of noise at the Jerrabomberra Tennis Courts.

28 Mar (Sat)	0952	C206		67 dBA NMT
	1009	C182		65 dBA NMT
	1019	C150		67 dBA NMT
	1041	light a/c	65 dBA	
	1127	light a/c	67.9 dBA	65 dBA NMT
	1257	C182	71.0 dBA	65 dBA NMT
	1313	C206	71.2 dBA	
	1341	light a/c	72.9 dBA	68 dBA NMT
	1440	light a/c	73.9 dBA	

Date of Concern: 30-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 10:11 PM

Comment: A B737 landing runway 17 delivered _____ of jet noise. This typifies the through-the-night landing noise that could be expected if the freight hub proposal is approved.

Date of Concern: 30-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 10:12 PM

Comment: A helicopter about 3000 ft AGL tracking to the SW overflew the suburb delivering 74 dBA of noise.

Date of Concern: 31-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 2:02 AM

Type of Call: Complaint

Comment: I was woken by a jet reversing thrust on landing and, despite the intervening Mt Ainslie Ridge and my home being sited on the reverse slope 200 ft above the Airport, the reverse thrust noise sufficed to wake me. This illustrates the likely scenario if the freight hub is approved. A check of WebTrak showed a Tiger A320 tracking over the Jerrabomberra NMT at 0200 delivering 74 dBA of jet noise to Jerra residents. This also represents the likely situation if the freight hub proposal goes ahead.

Date of Concern: 31-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 5:50 AM

Comment: Noisy prop aircraft departure to the north waking me.

Date of Concern: 31-Mar-2009

Time of Concern: 11:07 AM

Comment: A jet over or near the suburb delivered 74 dBA of noise.

Date of Concern: 1-Apr-2009

Time of Concern: 1:26 AM

Comment: Woken by noisy prop-driven aircraft again demonstrating that freight jets in the sleeping hours will be even more disruptive.

Date of Concern: 2-Apr-2009

Time of Concern: 11:32 AM

Comment: A light, twin-prop aircraft tracked across the suburb at about 2000 ft AGL delivering noise of 73 dBA. This refutes the Airport's assertion that 99.5% of Canberra residents are protected from aircraft noise and illustrates the ineffectiveness of the noise abatement area.

2 Apr 1616 Virgin B737 on approach 35 at Jerra 73 dBA NMT

Date of Concern: 3-Apr-2009

Time of Concern: 1:15 PM

Comment: A large, noisy C-17 jet appeared to be engaged in pilot training, subjecting the suburb to an estimated 70 dBA of jet noise, and again at 1325. Canberra and Queanbeyan residents are already subjected to considerable aircraft noise from Canberra-based aircraft training activities without having to bear the jet noise of visiting aircraft. Moreover, the C-17 is based at Amberley and it is surprising that the Defence budget allows the conduct of pilot training 2 hours from home base and past other suitable military bases such as Williamstown and Richmond.

Date of Concern: 8-Apr-2009

Time of Concern: 5:33 AM

Comment: A jet departure to the north woke me. Later examination of WebTrak did not show any aircraft movement although the Hackett NMT was subjected to a

noise event to . Presumably, this was a VIP aircraft movement which is not shown by WebTrak. This policy is just flummery.

Date of Concern: 8-Apr-2009

Time of Concern: 1:59 PM

Type of Call: Complaint

Comment: A white helicopter flying at about 1000 ft made a series of overflights across the North Canberra suburbs to about 3.30 pm subjecting residents to noise up to **75 dBA**. This refutes the Airport assertion that the Noise Abatement Area delivers satisfactory noise outcomes. It also clearly refutes the Airport assertion that 99.5% of residents are protected from aircraft noise.

Date of Concern: 8-Apr-2009

Time of Concern: 7:48 PM

Comment: A Qantas B737-800 subjected residents to 68 dBA of jet noise. This again illustrates that residents are subjected to jet noise events exceeding 65 dBA. Bearing in mind that the prospective freight aircraft are noisier than the B737, residents will be subjected to significant jet noise sufficient to easily waken residents from sleep.

9 Apr 0930 B737

9 Apr 2248 A320 departure runway 35 – estimated

Date of Concern: 10-Apr-2009 Good Friday

Time of Concern: 12:40 AM

Comment: A helicopter movement to the east of the suburb woke me - estimated noise level equivalent to an airline jet departure.

12 Apr 0025 Helo inbound 67 dBA NMT

14 Apr 1040 B767 65 dBA NMT
2012 B737-800 65 dBA NMT

25 Apr 1154 Anzac day flypast **92 dBA NMT**
(for information purposes only)
E170 overflying Jerra NMT 73 dBA NMT

From: Geoffrey Willans [mailto:geoff.willans@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Saturday, 2 May 2009 12:29 PM
To: Info @ Canberra Airport
Subject: CANBERRA AIRPORT PRELIMINARY DRAFT MASTER PLAN DATED FEBRUARY 09

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your Plan. My comments are attached.

Kind regards, Geoff Willans

Enjoy a safer web experience. Upgrade to the new Internet Explorer 8 optimised for Yahoo!7. [Get it now.](#)