

Lindsay J. Rudge

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Senate Inquiry on Aircraft Noise

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the senate inquiry into aircraft noise and the lack of consultation over recent flight path changes.

I submit the following comments in relation to the matters to be raised by the Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee.

1) An assessment of the effectiveness ... and protect the environment from the effects associated with the operation of aircraft for which is has legislative jurisdiction.

I submit that the environment of my home has been seriously disturbed as a result of the changed flight paths as described below.

Before flight path changes

- Very few noticeable flights over our neighbourhood.
- Planes at high altitude
- Minor interference to television reception.

After flight path changes

- Planes flying low, directly over my neighbourhood.
- Volume clearly audible over radio, television and even bathroom fan!
- Plane noise at the same volume as thunder.
- Plane noise at a similar volume to a motor bike passing directly by the house but lasting for longer.
- Arrivals and departures.
- All hours of the day and night.
- Frequency – varied depending on weather patterns but often ranges from frequent to continuous. E.g.
 - o Friday 13th November 2009 – 7 departing flights in 25 minutes, six at thunder volume between 6:30 and 6:55 am.
 - o Friday 13th November 2009 – approximately 12 flights from 9:00 - 10:30pm all at a similar volume to thunder.
 - o Thursday 12th November 2009 – continuous arriving flights (3-5 minute intervals) for approx. one hour between 6:30 and 7:30am. Planes screaming and roaring under heavy cloud cover.

In summary, a serious impact on our neighbourhood is being experienced. Prior to the flight changes I had planned to live at this address indefinitely. (I conducted a lengthy and thorough investigation of this area's traffic and likely urban growth prior to purchasing this property ten years ago; my primary aim being to live in a peaceful location.) Continuing to live under four major flight paths is not acceptable and I will be forced to relocate if changes are not made.

2) With regard to this responsibility, whether Airservices Australia:

a. has consulted an effective, open and informed public consultation strategy with communities affected by aircraft noise;

Prior to the flight path changes I received or became aware of **no** indication that my home was shortly to be bombarded with airtraffic or even impacted on in a minor fashion. I was not aware of any consultation process of any kind. As a regular reader of the Hills Gazette, Chidlow Chatter and the West Australian and an active member of the hills community and teacher at Glen Forrest Primary School, it is highly unlikely that I would have missed any discussion related to a matter as serious as changes in flight paths.

b. engages with industry and business stakeholders in an open, informed and reasonable way;

Unknown

c. has adequate triggers for public consultation under legislation and whether procedures used by Airservices Australia are compliant with these requirements;

Unknown but recent experiences suggest not!

d. is accountable, as a government-owned corporation, for the conduct of its noise management strategy;

Judging from the unwillingness of the minister or his representatives to discuss this matter with either the press or supposedly advisory bodies such as the PANMCC it appears highly unlikely.

On 14th November I wrote a second letter to Airservices Australia asking them what process of resolution around my experiences of unacceptable aircraft noise I could expect. I received a reply some weeks later saying that my letter has been referred to a specialist team for consideration and that I could expect a reply in due course. As at 21st January 2010 this is yet to eventuate suggesting that responding to public concerns on noise management is a low priority (and that they are not accountable for this).

e. has pursued and established equitable noise-sharing arrangements in meeting its responsibilities to provide air traffic services and to protect the environment from the effects associated with aircraft for which it is responsible.

My first perusal of the Webtrack facility confirmed my experience that four major incoming and outgoing flight paths had been located directly over my neighbourhood. It is impossible that there are no other options but to fly directly over my neighbourhood (what happened before the changes when we had no major traffic impact?). This is inequitable and shows absolutely no regard for the rights of those who chose to live in this area for its peace and tranquillity.

f. requires a binding Community Consultation Charter to assist it in consulting fully and openly with communities affected by aircraft noise.

I believe that Airservices Australia have demonstrated no capacity for dealing with the complex issues of flight paths equitably and with an appropriate level of consultation both in Western Australia and several other states. Therefore, a binding charter is clearly necessary to protect the rights of ordinary citizens.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to express my concerns and thank you for taking this very important matter to a senate inquiry!

As I wrote this letter aircraft continued to scream continuously overhead... I am hopeful of a very positive resolution.

Sincerely,

Lindsay Rudge
21st January 2010