

To: Committee Secretary  
Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport  
PO Box 6100  
Parliament House,  
Canberra ACT 2600  
Australia

Alan G. Rogers

29 January 2010

---

To Senate Committee Members,

Senate Submission – Airservices Australia management of Aircraft Noise

Introduction

There has been unprecedented growth in the amount of traffic both domestic and international, which can be directly attributed to the enormous growth in resource, mining and service industries throughout Western Australia, particularly the north and goldfields. This growth is expected to continue.

The cross runway 06 - 24 is now being used as a main runway and more often than not, as the preferred runway for landing and take-off, even though traffic management conditions do not require that the cross runway be used.

Airservices Australia are in default of their legislative responsibilities by not protecting the populace and environment in the areas effected by aircraft noise and frequent movements by the constant use of runway 06 – 24 as a main runway.

Further, I would contend that Airservices Australia is abrogating their responsibilities as listed within the Terms and Conditions as detailed in the considerations listed for Inquiry.

Background

I have been a resident at Greenmount for the past 28 years and am now subjected to more disruptive noise and aircraft movements than has ever been the case.

I am sure that Perth Airport planning and the "Master Plan" never intended that Runway 06 – 24 was to be used as a main runway. The runway is too short to be able to land the larger aircraft now in use, it is orientated over a greater urban area and it requires greater engine power and therefore, greater fuel consumption, during take-off when gaining safe altitude over the Perth hills.

Runway 06 – 24 *does* permit safe landing when cross-winds are too high for a safe landing using the designated main runway 03 -21.

RAAF Pearce does impinge on the available airspace for aircraft landing and departing Perth Airport but the restricted airspace does not preclude the use of the main N/S runway. There are many acceptable and safe alternatives, which are available before it would be considered necessary (for safety reasons only) to use runway 06 – 24.

Traffic Management on the ground at Perth Airport is now over-taxed due to the un-planned increase in aircraft movements, however, with the efficient use of the taxiways and aircraft schedules the N/S runway can be managed with resorting to the use of the cross runway.

Flight paths and the increase in traffic, both on the ground and in the air, have increased many times more than have been forecast.

Recent articles in WA newspapers as well as other media sources have highlighted the unexpected and unplanned for increase in aircraft movements and noise. E.g.

- The Reporter, Tues Oct 27 2009 – "...Noise"
- The Reporter, Tues. Nov 03 2009 – "....noise"
- West Australian, Thurs 31 Dec 2009 – "Million passengers a month"
- West Australian, Thurs 31 Dec 2009 – "second runway pressure grows"

(there are many more which your researchers can be add to the list of comment and complaint)

### Complaint

1. Movements:

Cross runway 06 – 24 is now being used as a main and preferred runway such that the residents of Greenmount, Swanview, Bellevue, Midvale, in particular, are, at times, being subject to aircraft movements as frequent as **EVERY 2 MINUTES**.

Aircraft are being scheduled to use cross runway 06-24 from:

- early morning such that I am woken at 0100
- kept awake from 0530 as the schedule enters peak hour

- disturbed and irritated during the day especially at approximately noon peak hour
  - disturbed and inconvenienced such that I am unable to dine outside
  - disturbed and irritated from 2000 until 2400.
  -
2. Runway 06 – 24 is now being used as a main and preferred runway such that the residents are being subjected to aircraft noise both from engines under-power as the aircraft gain altitude and for landing as the aircraft engines surge as they adjust approach speed over the escarpment.  
The noise may not reach the levels deemed to be in excess of measured levels of pollution however, the noise is still such that I have to close windows to be able to hear the television.
3. ref (a) "*effective, open and informed public consultation.....*".  
Up until the recent advise of runway works, there has been NO public consultation with respect to aircraft noise of movements. Airservices Australia have arbitrarily made decisions with scant regard to the effect on the surrounding populace. Households are not aware of changes or proposed changes until the effect of the change is being experienced.

Ref(b). No comment

Ref (c). No comment

Ref (d). Accountability is an essential fundamental requirement. Whether in business or public service, whether as an individual or a collective, there must be a clear auditable line of responsibility and accountability.

Ref (e). "*.....pursued and established equitable noise-sharing arrangements.....*" cannot be determined as there is no clear laid-down procedure nor is there any clear means of accounting for the actions of the airport management when scheduling preferred runways. Under the Noise Abatement Procedures (Airservices Australia PPHNAO1-101. 25 Nov 2004 - Perth), procedures are stated for actions when using the runways but there are no criteria to determine when a runway becomes a preferred runway.  
I would argue that this is an anomaly as the cross runway 06 – 24 should never be a preferred runway except for safety reasons.

Ref (f). YES. In consultation with the Community and interest groups, a Community Consultation Charter should be created.  
In doing so there would be far greater transparency of criteria, responsibility and actions for both Airservices Australia and the community.

Ref (g). *"any other related matter"*.

I would ask that the Senate Committee issue a directive to the Minister for Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport for him to compel Airservices Australia to cease the use of runway 06 – 24 other than for justifiable reasons of safety.

### Summary

The well-being, health, quality of life, happiness and comfort of an individual and family is being detrimentally effected by the frequency of aircraft movements and the noise from the many aircraft using runway 06 -24.

In our society we are dependent on the ability to be able to communicate. On an individual basis, the noise and frequency of aircraft using runway 06 - 24 stifles communication.

In the community and environment it is possible to provide much argument to demonstrate that Airservices Australia have demonstrated indifference when communicating and dealing with noise and its effect. Statistics are collected and compiled and reported but Airservices Australia does not consult, explain or act from the evidence resulting. This seems especially so for Perth airport and surrounds.

Airservices Australia does not meet their obligations and responsibilities associated with aircraft noise and movement management in and around airspace of Perth Airport.

### Conclusion

I thank the Committee for the opportunity to present a submission with respect to my current concerns on the lack of transparency and accountability with respect to Airservices Australia – particularly the designated use of Runway 06 – 24 at Perth Airport.

### **For Information:**

Although not specifically referenced I have accessed, searched and consulted with numerous web sites.

I have researched Airservices Australia quarterly reports, Noise abatement Procedures, Aircraft Noise Management Strategy Committee Information, Perth Master Plan 2004 and more.

I complain and will continue to complain onto the AA 'noise complaint line', sometimes three or four times per day, when the numbers and noise and frequency of aircraft becomes particularly onerous.