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Introduction

In early 2008, the Commonwealth Government released a National Aviation Policy Issues Paper that set out a range of airport planning and aviation issues for public comment. It received some 290 submissions, and subsequently made public some a total of 267 (see list at end of this report). In December 2008, the Government presented specific policy proposals to the public for comment in the Green Paper Flight Path to the Future. Over 220 submissions were made, and 210 of these were made publicly available.  

This report provides a summary review and analysis of the Green Paper submissions. The total of 210 Green Paper submissions available at May 2009 was analysed, using numerical and qualitative methods, to determine issues and cleavages surrounding airport planning and development.

The approach was broken into several stages. A preliminary review of submissions was undertaken primarily to determine the overall level of concern about airports, as distinct from broader or more specific aviation concerns. The Green Paper submissions were initially reviewed to gauge the distribution responses across the 10 major aviation topics nominated. The total of 181 Green Paper submissions that raised ‘airport infrastructure’ concerns was used in the next part of the study.

Airport-related content in these submissions was examined using a partly-prescriptive and partly-open content analysis. The ‘prescriptive’ part of the analysis involved counting mentions of particular topics derived from the Green Paper (e.g. in relation to Airport Planning Advisory Panels). The ‘open’ aspect of the analysis involved recording and counting mentions of other airport issues raised in submissions (e.g. the idea for an aviation industry ombudsman). At total of 16 key issues emerged from this process, ranging from non-aeronautical land uses at airports to the health impacts of noise.

The nature of the concern about the 16 issues was then examined through qualitative analysis. The qualitative analysis involved recording positions, arguments and/or proposals in relation to the key airport issues, as well as quotations showing submission emotional or rhetorical content. Each submission was also classified according to participant type, such as business, community group or Government, and according to the main airport discussed.

This process of content analysis and coding generated extensive working spread sheets which are not reproduced in this report which confines itself to an overall summary and discussion of selected issues.
1 The Commonwealth Way Forward on Airport Development

In its National Aviation Policy Green Paper, the Commonwealth presented proposals in relation to 10 broad issues:

- Aviation Safety
- Aviation Security
- International Aviation
- Domestic and Regional Aviation
- General Aviation
- Industry Skills and Productivity
- Consumer Protection
- Airport Infrastructure
- Aviation Emissions and Climate Change
- Noise Impacts.

Some proposals were connected to more than one issue, such as airport management of noise impacts. In relation to airport issues, the Commonwealth put forward proposals addressing matters that included airport governance, on-airport planning, off-airport planning and off-airport noise management.

In discussion of airport issues, the Commonwealth says it wants a balance between airport development needs, and the economic, social and environmental needs of the community. It said its planning proposals were guided by dual principles of encouraging investor certainty and community confidence as well as protecting airports and communities from land use-related risks.

In relation to governance, the Commonwealth flags its intention to retain final decision-making power over airport development, but wishes to work with State and Local Governments on more cooperative and integrated planning arrangements. It proposed the establishment of Airport Planning Advisory Panels (APAPs) for each major airport that would comprise planning and/or aviation experts from Government, industry and the community. The APAPs would advise the Minister on airport master plans and major development plans, and the impacts of airport projects on local infrastructure and planning.
Also proposed are community consultation groups for each major airport, incorporating an independent Chair and representatives of Governments, local communities, airport users and airport companies. These groups would 'have scope to address' airport planning and development issues, airport operations with significant impacts such as aircraft noise, and monitor the community complaints process.

In relation to on-airport planning, the Green Paper puts forward suggestions for reforming both airport master planning and development control. It proposes more detailed articulation of plans for the first 3-5 years of the master plan cycle, preparation of detailed precinct plans for non-aeronautical development proposals at airports, and ground transport plans assessing airport impacts on off-airport airport infrastructure. On future development control, the Commonwealth suggests a review of major development plan triggers to better capture developments with significant off-airport community impacts, a Ministerial call-in power for other airport developments that might affect the community, and a prohibition on certain 'incompatible' non-aeronautical developments at airports, with mention of child care centres and nursing homes. The Green Paper also foreshadows possible airport contributions to off-airport transport and community infrastructure.

In relation to off-airport planning and management, the Green Paper argued that future airport growth must be safeguarded from ‘inappropriate’ development in surrounding areas. These developments, it said, included tall buildings that interfered with flight paths, and new residential developments that created pressure for noise-related curfews. The Green Paper also says surrounding communities must be protected from safety risks from airport operations. The Commonwealth therefore proposes the establishment of a risk-based national airport safeguarding framework, involving national airspace protection legislation and a policy on public safety zones around airports, and ‘a national land-use planning regime’ to prevent noise-sensitive developments being located near airports and under flight paths. In relation to the proposed noise-risk planning and management however, the Green Paper indicated that the Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) system no longer provided an adequate information basis for noise prevention. It therefore foreshadowed the development of new noise information and noise mitigation measures, including maintaining the existing curfews at Sydney, Gold Coast, Adelaide and Essendon Airports to protect communities. A discussion paper on these matters was released in June 2009 producing a further round of responses to the ideas floated.iv

As noted above, issues raised in the Commonwealth’s Green Paper partly guided the content analysis of public submissions. Table 1 shows a categorisation and definition of responses clustered around 16 main issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport Investment and Growth:</strong></td>
<td>Including impacts on investment from global financial crisis, oil depletion, and proposed regulatory changes, significance of non-aeronautical revenues to investment, desirability of airport investment/growth &amp; alternatives to airport investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Sydney Airport and Sydney Airport Capacity:</strong></td>
<td>Including desirability of second Sydney airport, alternatives to a second Sydney airport and possible locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Responsibilities in Airport Planning:</strong></td>
<td>Including desirability of Commonwealth control over airport planning, jurisdiction over non-aeronautical development on airport land, intergovernmental coordination for airport-related development and Local Government control of smaller airports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Around Airports:</strong></td>
<td>Including risk-based planning of off-airport development to allow for airport operation &amp; growth, public safety zones around airports, planning under flight paths and to manage noise exposure, and planning of airport regions (does not include off-airport infrastructure planning).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-Airport Transport and Community Infrastructure:</strong></td>
<td>Including extent of airport impacts on surrounding infrastructure, infrastructure funding responsibilities and integrating planning of on- and off-airport infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Aeronautical Uses at Airports:</strong></td>
<td>Including potential impacts on aeronautical uses, desirability or need for non-aeronautical uses, and competition with similar uses outside airports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport Planning Advisory Panels:</strong></td>
<td>Including desirability of establishing panels, composition, roles and responsibilities, and funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport Community Consultation:</strong></td>
<td>Including desirability of establishing airport community consultation groups, compositions, roles and responsibilities, and procedural matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport Master Planning:</strong></td>
<td>Including accuracy and transparency of master plans, level of detail in master plans, and desirability of proposed changes to master planning including precinct plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport Development Control:</strong></td>
<td>Including review of major development plan triggers, call-in power for sensitive developments and prohibition of incompatible uses on airport land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport Pricing:</strong></td>
<td>Including desirability of more extensive price monitoring, price monitoring of airport car parking, and proposed ‘show cause’ process for pricing misbehaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Airports:</strong></td>
<td>Including significance of regional airports to regional development, international access to regional airports, desirability and cost of security measures, and funding programs for regional and remote airports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport-Related Noise Mitigation:</strong></td>
<td>Including desirability and operation of curfews, noise-insulation programs and industry funding for noise mitigation and compensation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport-Related Noise Information Tools:</strong></td>
<td>Including adequacy of Australian Noise Exposure Forecasts as planning information tools, web-based flight path information tools, the Transport Noise Information Package and providing noise exposure advice to home-buyers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport-Related Noise and Health Impacts:</strong></td>
<td>Including health impacts of aviation noise, studies of health impacts, and use of health risk assessment for airport developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Aviation at Airports:</strong></td>
<td>Including significance of and provision for GA at airports, noise from GA activities, location of GA airports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Airport Issues Raised in the Public Submissions to the Green Paper**
2 The Public Response to the Invitation to Comment

Figure 1 below shows the level of concern in Green Paper submissions about airport issues compared to other aviation issues. Note that when concerns overlapped more than one issue, for example international aviation and international flight access to regional airports, the submissions were coded and counted for more than one issue.

Of the 210 Green Paper submissions received to May 2009, 181 or 86% dealt with airport infrastructure (planning and development) issues. By way of contrast, this compares to 178 Issues Papers submissions that raised airport concerns (representing 67% of the total).

Figure 1: Concern About Airport Infrastructure and Other Issues in Green Paper Submissions
The greatest source of submissions was the business sector, which provided 73 or 40% of the total. These submissions came from tourism companies and organisations, airport companies and organisations, and airlines and aviation-related bodies. The property industry was represented by 6 bodies, including the Shopping Centre Council and the Urban Taskforce Australia. As shown in Table 2, most of the remaining submissions came from community and government sources. Community groups and individuals, primarily located near airports, accounted for 27% of the submissions. Governments, mostly Councils and Local Government associations, were responsible for 22% of the submissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Participant</th>
<th>Number of Submissions</th>
<th>% Total Submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/ Industry Associations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Politicians</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Party Groupings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/ Territory Government</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Associations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Sources of Airport-Related Green Paper Submissions

Table 3 overleaf shows the most frequently mentioned airport-related issues in the submissions. Regional airport concerns topped the list with 83 mentions, aided by a letter writing campaign organised by Tourism Tropical North Queensland that accounted for more than two dozen identical submissions from tourism businesses and groups. Regional airport concerns, also mentioned by local Councils responsible for managing regional airports, included the cost of security measures, means of increasing international flight access to regional airports, and recognition of the role the airports can play in regional development.
Table 3: Most Frequently Mentioned Airport Issues

Airport pricing was a less frequently mentioned issue. It was primarily a concern for the business sector, particularly airport companies, and the airlines that pay to use their facilities. Similarly, the health impact of airport-related noise was primarily raised by community groups and individuals. The issue was also mentioned by two State Governments, but not a single business or business organisation.
Figure 2 below shows the proportional contribution of business, community, Government and other sectors to expressed concern about airport-related issues.

Figure 2: Airport Issues Raised - % Contribution of Different Participants
3  Looking at specific issues

3.1  Views about On-Airport Planning

The airport company submissions expressed significant opposition to the Commonwealth’s on-airport planning reforms, arguing that the existing system was adequate. Submissions by the Australian Airports Association (AAA), Canberra, Sydney, Perth and Bankstown airports warned that the proposed changes, particularly the Ministerial call-in power, would seriously threaten airport investment and development. The AAA said that ‘the introduction of the call-in power would carry considerable risk that infrastructure investment will be deterred’. Canberra Airport also opposed the call-in power and argued ‘investors need to have certainty around the development approval process’. In relation to ground transport, Jandakot airport said infrastructure improvements should be made by State and Local Governments, and expressed concern about the ‘fair allocation’ of infrastructure costs. Several airports suggested the major development plan triggers should be relaxed to capture fewer developments. The AAA, Canberra, Perth and Moorabbin airports also opposed detailed, binding precinct plans for Ministerial approval. Many airports however were less opposed to providing detail of a non-binding nature in master plans, and measures to coordinate on-and off-transport ground infrastructure planning. Australia Pacific Airports in fact supported the requirement for ground transport plans and agreed some planning reform was needed for non-aeronautical developments. The airlines expressed a mixture of cautious concern and interest in the reforms.

The property industry, Government and community submissions generally agreed on the need for airport planning reforms and supported many of the Commonwealth proposals. Many of the submissions supported more detail, transparency and certainty in master plans. The City of Holdfast Bay, for example, argued ‘airport master plans should provide the community with a reasonable level of certainty regarding future land-uses’. The property industry and Governments strongly supported infrastructure contributions by airports. Queanbeyan City Council, similar to several other submissions, said there was ‘a strong argument on equity considerations’ for the proposed contributions. Government and property industry submissions also provided strong support for the review of MDP triggers, and more cautious support for the call-in power. Some community-related submissions however raised planning concerns about the health risks of airport developments to nearby residents, associated with aviation fuel emissions and other pollutants. Two politicians representing the constituents near Essendon airport, and the Midland FROGS group in Western Australia, called for health risk assessments to be a part of the airport planning process.
3.2 Views about Off-Airport Planning and Management

The airport and airlines submissions strongly supported the Commonwealth’s proposed national risk-based framework for planning around airports, including airspace protection measures, public safety zones, and measures to prevent residential development in noise affected areas. The submissions also provided strong but not unanimous support for new noise information tools, including a review of the Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) system. However, the airports and most airlines strongly opposed the use of curfews as a tool for managing noise around airports. Brisbane airport argued that any suggestion of a curfew at Brisbane would undermine investor ‘certainty’ and be arbitrary and ‘unfair’.

Governments and community submissions also generally supported land-use planning around airports to protect airspace and public safety. They also provided considerable in-principle support for planning to restrict new noise-sensitive developments under flight paths. However, several submissions cited practical difficulties, including the inadequacy of the ANEF system to accurately predict noise, and the potential for ANEFs provided by airport businesses to create development restrictions on large amounts of land around airports. The property industry was particularly concerned about the latter issue. The Victorian Government said, in relation to the use of ANEFs or alternatives in planning, that ‘these controls need to provide a high degree of certainty over time’. ‘Planning controls’, it said, ‘guide the way people make important life decisions about matters like the location of their house or where to invest in property development’.

In relation to other measures for managing noise exposure around airports, there was strong support from community and local Government submissions for curfews. To support their position, many of the community groups argued, like the WA Government, that noise in areas around airports was harmful and hazardous. Curfew 4 Canberra, for example, said ‘night time noise poses a major public health risk’ and called for a Canberra curfew. It added that a curfew ‘would provide certainty for residents and businesses alike’. Other Canberra residents said the lack of a curfew at the nearby airport was ‘unjust, unfair and inequitable’ compared to other cities.
3.3 Views about Airport Governance

The airport business submissions provided strong support for continued Commonwealth control over airport planning. Brisbane airport suggested the Commonwealth should *extend* its planning power, to cover off-airport proposals compromising airport safety and efficiency. The airports nonetheless provided some support for better intergovernmental coordination, particularly between Commonwealth and State Governments. The airlines also provided a degree of support for improved intergovernmental coordination. In relation to proposed APAPs, many of the airports opposed their establishment, on the grounds that the groups were unnecessary. Adelaide airport argued that introducing APAPs carried the ‘very real risk’ of conflict and confusion. Another said that they would foster ‘uncertainty’.

Other airports, such as Bankstown and Australian Pacific Airports, expressed concern about the detail of proposed APAPs. They indicated APAP members must be independent of Local and sometimes State Governments. Airport views on the community consultation proposals were mixed. Bankstown and Australian Pacific Airports suggested that the membership of the consultation groups should include Federal and State Government representatives, but neglected to mention nearby residents or community groups. The AAA argued there must be ‘safeguards’ against airport critics in the groups. Perth warned of the danger of the consultation groups being ‘hijacked’.

The property industry, Government and community submissions were strongly, but not unanimously, opposed to continued Commonwealth airport planning control, particularly in relation to commercial developments. The Shopping Centre Council argued ‘the most equitable approach’ was for non-aeronautical developments to comply with State and local planning laws. Some of the Government submissions, such as from NSW, indicated that if the planning approval role stayed with the Commonwealth, non-aeronautical developments should at least be tested against State and local laws for consistency. In relation to the proposed ‘national land-use planning regime’ for airport-related noise, the WA Government said it opposed any shifting of off-airport planning responsibility to the Commonwealth. Almost all of the property industry, Government and community submissions, however, supported the proposed APAPs. State Governments submissions generally said State representatives should be on the panels, while Local Government submissions proposed local Government membership. In relation to community consultation groups, State and Local Governments were supportive but sometimes warned of problems with existing airport groups. The community group submissions were even less enthusiastic. Most supported improved community consultation, but were highly critical of existing airport community consultation groups and processes, based on their previous experience.
3.4 Views about Other Airport Issues

Views expressed in public submissions about airport investment and growth, airport pricing, regional airports, second Sydney Airport and Sydney's airport capacity, and general aviation at airports are summarised in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Public Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport Investment and Growth</strong></td>
<td>Business, State Government and union submissions supported airport investment and growth. Many airport submissions stressed the importance of non-aeronautical developments to investment, and/or the risk to investments from the global financial crisis and airport planning changes. The Brisbane Airport Corporation said ‘investors require a level of certainty and confidence, underpinned by a supportive policy environment’. The ACTU wanted measures to ensure ‘a safe level of investment’ in aviation infrastructure. Community submissions, and several from Local Government in Sydney, questioned or opposed airport investment and growth, citing risks related to oil supplies, climate change, global financial crisis and/or noise. The Australians Against Aviation Academies Flying Over Communities said excessive aviation growth was ‘unsustainable, irresponsible and unethical’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport Pricing</strong></td>
<td>Airport businesses opposed or were concerned about any increase in airport price monitoring. The AAA said ACCC monitoring of car parking carried ‘a high risk’ of dissuading investment. Adelaide airport said show cause mechanisms could create ‘uncertainty’ amongst financiers over cash flows to airports. Airlines, aviation-related professional associations, unions and Governments generally expressed concern about airport prices and/or support for enhanced price monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Sydney Airport and Airport Capacity in Sydney</strong></td>
<td>There was general support, sometimes fairly noncommittal, amongst submissions for a process of identifying additional airport capacity for Sydney. Submissions from the community, some NSW Local Government associations, and Newcastle and Canberra airports favoured increasing airport capacity outside the Sydney basin. The NSW Government, a property-related professional association and Bankstown airport supported expanding capacity inside the Sydney basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Airports</strong></td>
<td>Tourism business submissions, organised through a letter-writing campaign, strongly supported Government measures to improve international access to regional airports to enhance regional development. Airport businesses, airlines, and Governments including Local Government airport owners, strongly supported Commonwealth assistance to regional airports, particularly in relation to security costs. Several submissions said regional airport assistance was an ‘equity’ issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Aviation at Airports</strong></td>
<td>Airport businesses, aviation-related business and professional associations, and State Governments strongly supported provision for general aviation at airports. Several of these submissions expressed concern about the economic viability of general aviation. Community submissions expressed strong concern about noise from general aviation, particularly pilot training operations, and the location of GA airports. Jon Anderson expressed concern about the health risks from pilot training, and said Government encouragement of the industry was ‘unjust’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Views in Green Paper Submissions about Selected Airport Issues
3.5 Views about Specific Airports

The classification of Green Paper submissions in relation to key airport mentioned facilitated an analysis of public concerns about specific places. Table 5 shows a summary of issues at selected major airports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Airport</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perth Airport</td>
<td>Issues include brickworks on airport land and impacts on bushland, air quality, and infrastructure; airport development impacts on Aboriginal sites; planning around the airport in noise-affected areas in City of Swan; international access to Perth Airport; traffic on the Great Eastern Highway and road infrastructure planning and funding; proposed curfew at Perth Airport and noise insulation; effectiveness of existing community consultation; and potential health impacts of airport-related noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jandakot Airport</td>
<td>Issues include planned commercial development and impacts on bushland, threatened species and future aeronautical development; planning around airport to link bushland areas and prevent noise exposure; road infrastructure planning around the airport; adequacy of Jandakot Airport master planning; general aviation at airport including significance and noise impacts; noise mitigation and monitoring at Jandakot; effectiveness of Jandakot community consultation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Airport</td>
<td>Issues include commercial development at Adelaide and competition with off-airport developments; certainty and detail in Adelaide Master Plan and development control; coordinated planning in and around the airport; airport impacts on traffic and roads; proposed public safety zone in West Torrens and compensation for property owners; noise mitigation including Adelaide curfew; effectiveness of existing airport community consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankstown Airport</td>
<td>Issues include proposed introduction of passenger services to contribute to Sydney airport capacity; planned commercial development and impact on future aeronautical uses; impacts on road infrastructure and funding; significance, noise and regulation of general aviation at airport; noise mitigation measures including proposed curfew; effectiveness of existing Bankstown community consultation group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essendon Airport</td>
<td>Issues include proposed relocation of Essendon airport; non-aeronautical developments such as Direct Factory Outlet; airport-related traffic and proposed road changes; quality of master planning; planning around airport by Moonee Valley City Council; general aviation noise and safety; proposed change to the Essendon curfew; noise information such as publication of Essendon curfew dispensations; representation on Essendon Airport Working Group; aviation fumes from airport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Stakeholder Views at Selected Major* Airports

* airports regulated under Part 12 of the Airports Act
At Perth airport, for example, where a brickworks and other non-aeronautical uses are located, the airport company warned in its submission that global economic decline may contribute to ‘uncertainty’ about future revenue and therefore jeopardise the ability of airports to deliver aeronautical infrastructure investments. It argued that on-airport planning and development had been sensible and appropriate, and that the Government’s proposed planning changes may ‘harm’ airport development. It said that in fact poor road planning had taken place in the vicinity of the airport by Local and State Governments.

By contrast, and indicative of the polarity evident in the wider debate, the Perth Airports Municipalities Group however said it was concerned that the non-aeronautical uses affected local infrastructure, but the airport developers paid no developer contributions. The Group said that there had been little consultation with them over airport commercial planning. The Alliance for a Clean Environment, a community group, said the brickworks and other airport non-aeronautical developers, may have an ‘unfair commercial advantage’ over local businesses. It also argued that airport developments should be required to conduct ‘health risk’ studies, and there was an ‘unfairness’ associated with the lack of compensation available for airport-related noise exposure.

Table 6 below shows a summary of issues at selected smaller airports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Airport</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyabb Airport, VIC:</td>
<td>Issues include noise and safety associated with general aviation at airport; proposed noise monitoring at nearby properties to assist in mitigation; effectiveness of existing community consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns Airport, QLD:</td>
<td>Issues include international access to Cairns airport; role of airport in regional tourism development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle Airport, NSW:</td>
<td>Issues include potential development as second Sydney airport; international access to Newcastle; security costs at airport; role in Hunter regional development; off-airport infrastructure including public transport; planning around airport and noise impacts at Raymond Terrace; constraints associated with adjacent defence airport RAAF Williamtown; noise information and complaints about defence aircraft; proposed alteration to existing curfew.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Field Airport, NSW:</td>
<td>Issues noise from general aviation; noise information including ANEFs for airport; need for an airport community consultation group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Stakeholder Views at Selected Smaller* Airports
* airports not regulated under Part 12
At another major airport, Moorabbin, where commercial development is soon to expand onto the local golf course and ‘green wedge’ land, the airport company argued in its submission that non-aeronautical uses and ‘certainty of planning requirements’ were vital to investment in aeronautical uses. It argued it should not be presumed that the current airport planning system was not operating effectively. Rather, it argued, the challenge at Moorabbin was off-airport planning in the surrounding area and the protection of prescribed airspace.

However, the City of Kingston Council however said that its experience at Moorabbin had been that disproportionate investment had occurred in non-aeronautical development with only limited investment in any strategic operational improvements. It said it was concerned about the threat to good retail planning from airport commercial developments, as well as the ‘community risk’ associated with pilot training at the airport. The Moorabbin Airport Residents Association argued that airport commercial developers should have to comply with local and State planning laws, and drew attention to the health risks associated with airport related noise. It said light aircraft at Moorabbin spread ‘its harmful effects’ over several nearby suburbs. Another environment-related community group said proposed development at Moorabbin ‘flies in the face of fair, orderly and sustainable planning’. Again, these views indicate a divergence in opinion among stakeholders that any new consultative and review processes initiated in the wake of the Green Paper will need to breach.
The Debate on Airport Planning in Australia

The Green Paper submissions indicate that there are two distinct discourses on airport planning.

The airport businesses generally believe that existing airport planning is effective. They want a regulatory framework that provides investor certainty, and support continued Commonwealth control. They are strongly opposed to unpredictable measures like the call-in power, but see some merit in better integration of on- and off-airport planning. They want State and Local Governments, however, to accept their fair share of responsibility for land-use and transport planning. Off-airport planning must be changed to ensure safe and efficient airport operations.

The property industry, State and Local Governments, and communities believe existing airport planning is inadequate. They want a regulatory regime that is fair and consistent with State and local planning laws. They can see some merit in better integration of off- and on-airport planning to increase safety for airports and nearby residents. However they want new airport planning and consultation measures to reduce the risks from airport developments and noise. They argue such measures are necessary to increase certainty for surrounding businesses and communities.

Although there is conflict between airport stakeholders, there is also a degree of consistency. The desire for economic certainty, social equity, and safety from environmental risks, runs through submissions from business, Government and community sectors alike. The scope of the proposed reforms – covering both airports and surrounding areas– provides both on- and off-airport stakeholders with a notional seat at the negotiating table. The challenge ahead for Australian aviation policy-makers, will be promoting constructive collaboration amongst all parties to plan sustainable airport regions.
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Park Regis Cairns Pty Ltd
Parke, Ms Melissa, MP
Parkes Shire Council
Paronella Park
Perth Airport
Perth Airports Municipalities Group (PAMG)
Peters, Ms Juliet
Petersham-Newtown Greens
Phillips, Stephen J - University of South Australia
Physical Disability Australia (PDA)
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Tyabb and District Ratepayers Group
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