

AIRSERVICES COMMITMENT TO AIRCRAFT NOISE MANAGEMENT (2013)

RWAY 30 RNP-AR was implemented in November 2019 when "Airservices Commitment to Aircraft Noise Management (2013)" was in force. This document was superseded by the "Flight Path Design Principles" in 2020.

We must refer to the 2013 document to show Airservices Australia failed us miserably in 2019.

1. Substandard Community Engagement

- Commitment: ASA is committed to proactive community engagement, ensuring clear, timely, accessible communication and consultation on aircraft noise issues (Commitment-to-Aircraft-...).
- Failure: Our submission documents that ASA's engagement was inadequate and misleading. Most residents were unaware of impending flight path changes, and those informed were given inaccurate assurances about the distribution of flight arrivals. ASA's reliance on technical jargon and lack of genuine transparency exacerbated community frustration, contradicting their commitment to meaningful and inclusive engagement (CPF_FPOG_Submission_Sen...).

2. Transparency and Accountability

- Commitment: ASA pledged to ensure transparency in decision-making processes, including publicly available relevant information and clear explanations for decisions (Commitment-to-Aircraft-...).
- Failure: Our submission reveals that ASA's responses to community concerns have been dismissive and evasive. Complaints often go unanswered, and Freedom of Information (FOI) requests have yielded unsatisfactory responses, further undermining trust. ASA's lack of transparency, particularly in communicating with elected officials, contradicts their stated commitment to accountability (CPF_FPOG_Submission_Sen...).

3. Handling of Noise Complaints and Community Concerns

- Commitment: ASA promised to respond effectively and efficiently to complaints, inquiries, and suggestions, aiming for timely resolution of issues (Commitment-to-Aircraft-...).
- Failure: Our submission highlights that ASA has failed to adequately address community complaints. Despite overwhelming community feedback against the current flight path, ASA has been slow to implement recommended changes, such as the Noise Abatement Procedure (NAP), demonstrating a disregard for community concerns (CPF_FPOG_Submission_Sen...).

4. Environmental and Social Impact Assessments

- Commitment: ASA claimed it would prioritise reducing the environmental impact of aircraft noise, aligning with best practices, and ensuring thorough assessments (Commitment-to-Aircraft-...).

- Failure: Our submission criticises ASA's inadequate and poorly executed environmental impact assessments. ASA significantly underestimated the noise impact of the new flight path and failed to consult with relevant environmental authorities, overlooking critical local environmental and health factors. This lack of thorough assessment contradicts their commitment to environmental responsibility (CPF_FPOG_Submission_Sen...).

5. Collaboration with Stakeholders

- Commitment: ASA is committed to a collaborative approach, involving all relevant stakeholders, including communities, in decision-making processes (Commitment-to-Aircraft-...).
- Failure: Our submission illustrates that ASA's collaboration has been superficial. The decision to move the flight path over more densely populated areas without proper consultation or consideration of community input indicates a failure to genuinely collaborate with stakeholders. This approach conflicts with their commitment to working collaboratively for better outcomes (CPF_FPOG_Submission_Sen...).

6. Addressing Health and Well-Being Concerns

- Commitment: ASA recognised the importance of considering the well-being of communities affected by aircraft noise and committed to minimizing its impact where possible (Commitment-to-Aircraft-...).
- Failure: The significant mental and physical health impacts reported by your community, as documented in our submission, indicate that ASA has not adequately prioritised community well-being. Despite acknowledging these concerns in their assessments, their failure to act directly contradicts their stated commitment (CPF_FPOG_Submission_Sen...).