



Submission on

**Senate Standing Committee on Rural and  
Regional Affairs and Transport  
Inquiry into the effectiveness of Airservices  
Australia's management of aircraft noise**

**29 January 2010**

by:

**The Village Building Company Pty Limited**  
Argyle Corner, 7/92 Hoskins Street  
PO Box 178  
Mitchell ACT 2911  
Phone: (02) 6241 6844 Fax: (02) 6241 6677  
Web: [www.villagebuilding.com.au](http://www.villagebuilding.com.au)



## **Table of Contents**

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1.0 – RESPONSE TO THE TERMS OF REFERENCE</b> .....	<b>5</b>
1.1 HAS CONDUCTED AN EFFECTIVE, OPEN AND INFORMED PUBLIC CONSULTATION STRATEGY WITH COMMUNITIES AFFECTED BY AIRCRAFT NOISE.....	5
1.2 ENGAGES WITH INDUSTRY AND BUSINESS STAKEHOLDERS IN AN OPEN, INFORMED AND REASONABLE WAY.....	5
1.3 HAS ADEQUATE TRIGGERS FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION UNDER LEGISLATION AND WHETHER PROCEDURES USED BY AIRSERVICES AUSTRALIA ARE COMPLIANT WITH THESE REQUIREMENTS.....	7
1.4 IS ACCOUNTABLE, AS A GOVERNMENT-OWNED CORPORATION, FOR THE CONDUCT OF ITS NOISE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY .....	9
1.5 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.....	12
1.6 REQUIRES A BINDING COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CHARTER TO ASSIST IT IN CONSULTING FULLY AND OPENLY WITH COMMUNITIES AFFECTED BY AIRCRAFT NOISE.....	14
1.7 ANY OTHER RELATED MATTER .....	15
<b>SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1 – CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN VBC &amp; ASA AND VBC &amp; COMMONWEALTH OMBUDSMAN</b> .....	
<b>APPENDIX 2 – FEDERAL COURT RULING</b> .....	
<b>APPENDIX 3 – REPORTS FROM ACCESS ECONOMICS AND BIS SHRAPNEL</b> .....	
<b>APPENDIX 4 – WILKINSON MURRAY REPORT – PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS NEAR CANBERRA AIRPORT: ASSESSMENT OF AIRCRAFT NOISE IMPACTS</b> .....	
<b>APPENDIX 5 – WILKINSON MURRAY REPORT – RECENT SUB-DIVISIONS AROUND AUSTRALIAN AIRPORTS</b> .....	
<b>APPENDIX 6 – BRIEFING NOTE FROM DITRDLG TO MINISTER ALBANESE</b> .....	

## **Summary of Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1:**

*Legislation should be introduced to ensure AirServices Australia (ASA) has greater accountability to the Commonwealth Government to ensure consultation with all sections of the community, not only the aviation industry, in a fair, equitable and transparent manner.*

**Recommendation 2:**

*Section 10 of the Air Services Act 1995 should be revised to require that ASA liaise with all sections of the community impacted by its activities.*

**Recommendation 3:**

*A set of regulations should be made to detail the requirements of when and how ASA undertakes the consultation required by Section 10 of the Air Services Act 1995.*

**Recommendation 4:**

*The Air Services Act 1995 should be amended to require ASA to make public:*

- *all the submissions received during public consultation periods; and*
- *all determinations made, including any conditions imposed and the reasons for the decision.*

**Recommendation 5:**

*The legislative framework governing the federally leased airports should be amended to ensure that the assessment of environmental and social impacts is consistent with the requirements and procedures of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conversation Act 1999.*

**Recommendation 6:**

*Regulations should be made that detail the process for the assessment of ANEFs including a rigorous, independent assessment of the underlying operational and financial assumptions that form the basis of the input data.*

**Recommendation 7:**

*The power to approve ANEFs should be transferred from ASA to an appropriate independent body that is able to objectively assess the broader community interest and not just one that seeks to promote aviation interests.*

**Recommendation 8:**

*The decision making process for noise-sharing arrangements and public statements regarding noise sharing should be consistent with AirServices' own policy guidelines..*

**Recommendation 9:**

*The Senate Standing Committee investigates options that would result in the process for determining the application of noise sharing arrangements being enshrined in legislation.*

Recommendation 10:

*Either the existing policy document or the new legislation relating to noise sharing arrangements specify that a public consultation period must be undertaken prior to any amendments to existing flight paths being approved. The consultation is to include all groups, bodies and individuals impacted by the potential change.*

Recommendation 11:

*The Senate Standing Committee should make a clear statement to ASA and DITRDLG that all public statement must be in accordance and consistent with Government policy.*

Recommendation 12:

*That ASA has a legally binding Community Consultation Charter.*

Recommendation 13:

*That the Aviation Branch of DITRDLG has a legally binding Community Consultation Charter.*

## **1.0 – Response to the Terms of Reference**

### ***1.1 has conducted an effective, open and informed public consultation strategy with communities affected by aircraft noise***

AirServices Australia (ASA) has conducted its public consultation with a high degree of emphasis on aviation industry inputs and a high degree of disregard for inputs from other industry and the broader community.

Further comments on this term of reference are given throughout this submission.

### ***1.2 engages with industry and business stakeholders in an open, informed and reasonable way***

The Village Building Company (“VBC”) has had reason to engage with Airservices Australia (“ASA”) as a result of being the proponent of a residential development in New South Wales, some 10 kilometres south of the Canberra Airport,.

VBC is a development company with a primary focus on the provision of affordable residential properties in Canberra/Queanbeyan, Wollongong, Coffs Harbour Brisbane and Sydney. VBC has been operating for 21 years and in this period produced over 16,000 dwellings and/or dwelling sites.

In response to an emerging land shortage in 2001 in the southern ACT region, VBC evaluated Government policies to determine if there were clear signposts for future development. The overriding document was the 1998 ACT & Sub-Region Planning Strategy, signed by the Commonwealth, ACT & NSW Governments and the relevant local councils. This document stated its purpose is to give certainty to the community, Government agencies and industry as the directions for future growth. It nominated Lower Jerrabomberra, including Tralee as the area for the future urban growth of the southern ACT Region subject to the requirements of Australian Standard AS2021 and the ANEF system. The attached working papers clearly showed the "urban" area to be predominantly for residential use. The Sydney/Canberra Corridor Strategy supported this cross border agreement as did Queanbeyan City Council's Strategy Plan. Being responsible developers, we then purchased the site at public tender, following the signposts set by Government in its planning framework at each level of Government. All relevant current planning strategies still identify Tralee for residential development.

.During the due diligence process for its tender bid for Tralee, VBC held discussions with a range of federal, state and local government authorities. Discussions were held with ASA in May 2002, when ASA informed VBC that AS 2021 and the ANEF contours were the relevant planning controls in relation to aircraft noise.

Subsequent to VBC's purchase of the controlling interest in Tralee and options over adjacent land the lessees of Canberra Airport, The Capital Airport Group (CAG) have undertaken an aggressive campaign to block the proposed development. CAG is a development company and a competitor of VBC. The aviation bureaucracy including ASA and the Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Local Government (DITRD LG) have supported CAG despite Tralee's compliance with Commonwealth legislation and policy. In August 2002 ASA issued a press release stating that although Tralee complied with AS2021 ASA believed it was unacceptable for residential development

Comments on Tralee by ASA and DITRD LG have been similar to the views and written comments expressed by the Capital Airport Group and contrary to the following written Commonwealth Government policies:

- *Airports Act 1996 and Air Services Act 1995*, particularly in respect of references to ANEF and AS2021
- *National Aviation Policy White Paper*

- *The ANEF System and Associated Land Use Compatibility Advice in the Vicinity of Airports*, Airservices Australia, 2001
- *Environmental Principles and Procedures for Minimising the Impact of Aircraft Noise*, Airservices Australia, 2002
- *Expanding Ways to Describe and Assess Aircraft Noise Discussion Paper*, Department of Transport and Regional Services, 2000
- 1998 ACT and Sub Region Planning Strategy

The changed attitude of ASA referenced above, coincided with the initiation of the Canberra Airport's campaign. For this reason VBC holds the belief that ASA and Canberra Airport colluded on this matter. ASA has not engaged with VBC in an open or reasonable way.

In 2008, ASA endorsed the Canberra Airport Practical Ultimate Capacity despite acknowledging that it had not checked the forecasts behind the ANEF (see further comments under 1.4) VBC submitted a detailed request for information and explanation of ASA's decision as it relates to the Ministerial Directive for the Endorsement of Australian Noise Exposure Forecasts. ASA's response to our request was dismissive and provided no answers to the detailed questions posed.

As a consequence, VBC lodged a formal complaint with the Commonwealth Ombudsman requesting that he conduct an investigation into the handling of this matter by ASA. As a result of our complaint, the Commonwealth Ombudsman undertook an investigation and requested that ASA provide a proper response to VBC's original correspondence.

A copy of the chain of correspondence as evidence of ASA's dismissiveness is included in **Appendix 1**.

VBC is not involved in the aviation industry; however VBC does have a controlling interest in proposed residential lands that are 10 km from Canberra Airport. VBC is therefore a stakeholder that ASA should deal with in an open, honest and reasonable manner. ASA has not conducted itself in such a manner in its past dealings with VBC but rather has simply acted as an advocate for Canberra Airport.

**Recommendation 1:**

**Legislation should be introduced to ensure ASA has greater accountability to the Commonwealth Government to ensure consultation with all sections of the community not only the aviation industry, in a fair, equitable and transparent manner.**

### **1.3 *has adequate triggers for public consultation under legislation and whether procedures used by Airservices Australia are compliant with these requirements***

The legislative requirements for ASA to undertake consultation are detailed in Section 10 of the *Air Services Act 1995*. This section of the *Act* is quite brief and only provides a very limited list of bodies that ASA is required to liaise with when performing its function, and most of the groups listed are directly involved in the aviation industry. The provisions of the Section 10 do not specify consultation with the public; affected land owners; or other affected parties. It appears that ASA is currently interpreting the reference to “industry” in Section 10 relating only to the aviation industry.

Furthermore, the wording of Section 10 is ambiguous in relation to the detailing of what constitutes consultation and when consultation is required. The legislation currently includes the wording “where appropriate”, however it does not specify who determines when such consultation is required and what is deemed to be appropriate.

To the detriment of the general public, no regulations have been enacted to provide additional details or guidance around the consultation requirements of ASA.

**Recommendation 2:**

**Section 10 of the *Air Services Act 1995* should be revised to require that ASA liaise with all sections of the community impacted by its activities.**

**Recommendation 3:**

**A set of regulations should be made to detail the requirements of when and how ASA undertakes the consultation required by Section 10 of the *Air Services Act 1995*.**

ASA is not currently undertaking an appropriate level of consultation in the performance of at least one of its functions. The Commonwealth Government, through a Direction issued by Minister John Anderson on 3<sup>rd</sup> May 1999, gave ASA the responsibility to “*make available data for the development of aircraft noise exposure analyses and prediction and be responsible for endorsing Australian Noise Exposure Indices/Forecasts for all Australian airports.*” (Item (x) of Direction)

In the case of the endorsement of the Practical Ultimate Capacity (“PUC”) ANEF for the Canberra Airport in 2008, ASA undertook no independent consultation with the public, nor did it publish the basis for its decision. In the preparation of the PUC ANEF, the privately owned CAG undertook its own public consultation, however the submissions received were not published, nor did CAG publicly release any information to indicate that the submissions were seriously considered or acted upon.

When Canberra Airport’s Practical Ultimate Capacity ANEF was publicly exhibited, VBC engaged leading aviation, acoustics and economic experts to review the documentation and provide detailed analysis. These reports raised serious questions regarding the assumptions used in the PUC ANEF relating to traffic volumes and aircraft types and these were included in our submission to CAG. Prior to the approval by ASA, there was no formal response to our submission from either CAG or ASA.

The processes adopted by ASA, and the entire aviation bureaucracy (in particular the Aviation Branch of DITRDLG) are at odds with the processes adopted by other Commonwealth Government Departments when assessing major developments that are likely to have significant impacts on the wider community. For example, the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (“DEWHA”) under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conversation Act 1999* (“EPBC Act”), requires the preparation of detailed assessment of the existing environment, potential risks of the proposed development, assessment of alternatives and the preparation of management plans to minimise and manage the identified risks. Furthermore, this legislation requires that the DEWHA approve the documentation prior to public consultation and that the proponent considers all the comments received prior to submission to the Department and ultimately the Minister for approval. The Ministerial approval, along with the reasons for approval and any conditions are all made available to the public.

There is an inconsistency in the Commonwealth’s legislative processes in relation to the protection of the environment for the aviation industry, through the aviation legislation, and all other development proposals, through the EPBC Act. The legislative framework for the aviation industry has not kept pace with the broader environmental protection legislation. Moreover, subsequent to the privatisation of airports, the legislation governing the aviation industry has not been adequately amended to ensure that the Government is able to regulate and manage the impacts from these sites.

**Recommendation 4:**

The *Air Services Act 1995* should be amended to require ASA to make public:

- all the submissions received during public consultation periods; and
- all determinations made, including any conditions imposed and the reasons for the decision.

**Recommendation 5:**

The legislative framework governing the federally leased airports should be amended to ensure that the assessment of environmental and social impacts is consistent with the requirement of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conversation Act 1999*.



## **1.4 is accountable, as a government-owned corporation, for the conduct of its noise management strategy**

ASA's noise management strategy is not clearly defined, however from information on ASA's website it appears to include the noise and flight path monitoring system, aircraft noise certification, wake turbulence issues, the Webtrak software along with the endorsement of ANEF contours.

In regards to the ANEF, the Commonwealth Government Direction on the 3<sup>rd</sup> May 1999 gave ASA the responsibility for the provision of data for the development of aircraft noise forecasts and the endorsement of the resultant ANEF contours for all Australian airports.

ASA's expertise in relation to aircraft noise is mainly focussed around the provision of noise certification and noise data for individual aircraft types and the ability to assess whether data has been correctly entered in to the ANEF prediction software rather than the ability to assess the adequacy of flight projections and aircraft types.

A critical part of the assessment of ANEF contours developed by an airport lessee for the major Commonwealth airports (all of which are privately owned) is an evaluation of underlying assumptions in relation to aircraft movement growth rates, terminal capacity and runway capacity, etc. ASA is not an expert in any of these areas; therefore ASA is not the appropriate arm of government to be endorsing such predictions.

In legal action in the Federal Court initiated by VBC against ASA over the endorsement of CAG's Practical Ultimate Capacity ("PUC") ANEF for Canberra Airport, a senior bureaucrat in ASA gave evidence stating that ASA's assessment of a proposed ANEF consisted of only a "technical accuracy" check.

In his Federal Court ruling Justice Rares said "*para 40 Kenneth Owen, the senior environment specialist of Airservices' Environment Branch, has responsibility for overseeing and undertaking the review of ANEFs for technical accuracy. ... para 41 ... He said that in performing this function, his practice of determining whether an ANEF may be endorsed under the s 16 direction is not to assess any of the data in a qualitative way or to seek to determine the likelihood of the assumptions behind the relevant data actually occurring. Nor does he undertake an audit of the business plan of the airport operator which stands behind the assumptions used in a draft ANEF application.*" (Federal Court Ruling – 15 August 2007 copy provided in **Appendix 2**)

As a result of such an endorsement process, the ANEF for Canberra Airport was approved by ASA based on unachievably high flight numbers flown by older, noisier planes, far exceeding any realistic expectation of development at Canberra Airport. Since privatisation, the ANEF contours at Canberra Airport have increased dramatically while the ANEF contours at other airports have remained stable or contracted. the intention of the expansion of this ANEF seems to be to deny future residential development.

ASA has not assessed the resultant impacts to the community at large. Recent economic analysis conducted by Access Economics and BIS Shrapnel (**Appendix 3**) have quantified the costs to Canberra and the surrounding region if the South Jerrabomberra area was sterilised as proposed by CAG's extension of the ANEF of Canberra Airport.

Further evidence of a failure of ASA scrutiny is that Canberra Airport, CAG indicated that the practical ultimate capacity would be reached between the years 2050 to 2060, however a number of aircraft types used in the calculation of the PUC ANEF have been identified as coming to the end of their operational life well prior to 2050.

These examples clearly indicate the refusal of ASA to undertake a rigorous, thorough or even a logical check of the validity of ANEF contours that it approves. The current system is a de facto “self certification” process for airport lessees. The function of endorsement of ANEFs should therefore be removed from ASA.

The National Aviation Policy White Paper released in December 2009 identified that greater independence and scrutiny of ANEFs was required, however it provided no details of how this should be achieved. In the assessment of the ANEFs for major airports, there needs to be a detailed review of the underlying assumptions that inform the aircraft movement information fed into the noise modelling software. Furthermore, there should also be a detailed assessment of the impacts of such aircraft movements on the surrounding community. This is particularly relevant to Canberra Airport’s intention to land 747 freighters throughout the night.

The aviation industry should not be treated any differently to any other major contributor to the economic growth of Australia such as the expansion of mining activities or the construction of major freeways. The long term growth projections, demand for the services provided and potential impacts on the community and environment should all be independently assessed and subject to rigorous public consultation and review. Otherwise individual airports have the capacity to unnecessarily ban residential development for hundreds of square kilometres around the airport i.e. cities will be planned around the needs of airports, distorting efficient, sustainable and affordable urban forms rather than airports planning to meet the needs of cities

The current regulatory environment has allowed Canberra Airport to propose an unachievable four-fold growth in aircraft movements (to a level in excess of Sydney Airport, currently the busiest Australian airport), over a forty year timeframe. Such a proposal is not presently subjected to any form of independent feasibility assessment; environmental impact assessment or social impact assessment by a government body that is not directly related to the support of airport operations. However, if the same airport was proposing to build a new runway, then under the requirements of the *Airports Act 1996* and the *EPBC Act 1999*, it would be required to prepare an environment impact statement and be granted approval by the Environment Minister. This represents an inconsistency in both the legislation and the application of the environmental protection principles by the various government departments.

The assessment process of the Aviation Branch of DITRDLG used in the approval of Airport Master Plans, prepared under the *Airports Act 1996* suffers from similar faults to the endorsement process used by ASA. The Aviation Branch of DITRDLG does not critically assess the assumptions or information underpinning the draft Master Plans submitted by Airports for approval under the Act.

In the case of the Canberra Airport, CAG submitted a draft Master Plan in 2008 for approval. Minister Albanese rejected this plan and issued a detailed statement of reasons. In 2009, CAG prepared, exhibited and submitted a new version of the draft Master Plan. VBC had this plan reviewed by numerous leading experts in the areas of aviation, economics and acoustics. Detailed consultants reports by The Ambidji Group, Wilkinson Murray, Access Economics, Bis Shrapnel and other experts, identified serious errors and inconsistencies in the draft Master Plan.

The 2009 draft failed to address the concerns raised in the Minister’s reasons of rejection of the 2008 draft. A significant number of other submissions made on the draft Master Plan, including the submission of the ACT Government, also identified errors in the draft Master Plan and highlighted that it did not address the original concerns of the Minister. Despite all these submissions and the detailed evidence that clearly suggested that the draft Master Plan should again be rejected, the Aviation Branch of DITRDLG recommended that the Minister approve the Plan.

The independence of the assessments undertaken by the Aviation Branch of DITRDLG should also be investigated by the Senate Standing Committee to ensure that the interests of the entire community are considered as well as the commercial interests of airport lessees.

**Recommendation 6:**

Regulations should be made that detail the process for the assessment of ANEFs including that a rigorous, independent assessment of the underlying operational and financial assumptions that form the basis of the input data.

**Recommendation 7:**

The power to approve ANEFs is transferred from ASA to an appropriate independent body that is able to objectively assess the broader community interest and not just one that seeks to promote aviation interests..

### ***1.5 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***

The formal policy position of the Commonwealth Government in regard to noise sharing is contained in the document “Environmental Principles and Procedures for Minimising the Impact of Aircraft Noise” released by ASA in 1997 and revised in 2002.

This policy document outlines a set of “fundamental principles ... to be used in environmental assessments ... for changes to existing arrangement and as a basis for selecting preferred noise abatement procedures.”<sup>1</sup> As such these principles must be considered prior to the amendment of flight paths or the redistribution of aircraft noise over residential areas.

The proposed residential development at South Tralee exceeds all local, State and Commonwealth Government policies in relation to managing the potential impacts of aircraft noise that may result from Canberra Airport operating at its practical ultimate capacity. ASA has made public comments in the Canberra media stating that noise sharing would result if this development was to go ahead, despite the fact that this would be contrary to their own policy document.

DITRDLG has made similar public statements contrary to the written Government policies.

VBC sought advice from Dr Rob Bullen a principal in the leading acoustics consultancy, Wilkinson Murray, and a member of the Australian Standard AS 2021 Review Committee. Dr Bullen indicates that there is no basis under the “Fundamental Principles” contained in the “Environmental Principles and Procedures for Minimising the Impact of Aircraft Noise” that would allow for the application of noise sharing flight paths at the Canberra Airport (Refer to **Appendix 4**). There is therefore no justification for ASA to introduce noise sharing at Canberra Airport, as a result of the proposed residential development 10 kilometres south of the end of the runway.

A Wilkinson Murray Report (**Appendix 5**) has identified that new residential developments have recently been approved at every Australian airport in areas with more noise than Tralee. Neither the Aviation Branch of DITRDLG nor ASA have objected to these developments or expressed any concerns regarding the possible implementation of noise sharing at these airports. It appears that comments by ASA and the Aviation Branch of DITRDLG suggesting that noise sharing could be introduced as a result of residential development at Tralee are made in support of the Canberra Airport lessee’s opposition to developments undertaken by competing developers in the region. This is not administration “without fear of favour” and amounts to entrapment and abuse of administrative power.

This current policy of ASA does not include any information or requirement for consultation to be undertaken by ASA prior to modifications to existing flight paths.

The recent activities of the aviation bureaucracies in relation to the proposed development south of Canberra Airport indicate a willingness to abandon written policy in one specific instance at the behest of an airport.

Consequently, it is recommended that the processes for amending air routes for the purpose of noise sharing over metropolitan areas be enshrined in legislation. Such legislation should include a detailed requirement for consultation with all members of the community affected by any modifications, including

---

<sup>1</sup> Airservices Australia, “Environmental Principles and Procedures for Minimising the Impact of Aircraft Noise”, page 2

the aviation industry, community groups, businesses and individual residents. Moreover, having noise sharing policies in law would mean that any decision regarding the movement of aircraft over metropolitan areas surrounding airports are made by Parliament, rather than bureaucrats that can be unduly influenced by airport operators or aircraft operators.

Noise sharing legislation would also provide the wider community in all major cities throughout Australia with greater certainty. If a person buys a property near an existing or proposed flight path, then that person should be aware of this and accept the implications; alternatively if a person buys a property away from an existing or proposed flight path, they can be confident that the flight path will not be moved over their property to provide respite to others.

**Recommendation 8:**

The decision making process for noise-sharing should be consistent with AirServices own policy guidelines.

**Recommendation 9:**

The Senate Standing Committee investigates options that would result in the process for determining the application of noise sharing arrangements being enshrined in legislation.

**Recommendation 10:**

Either the existing policy document or the new legislation relating to noise sharing arrangements specify that a public consultation period must be undertaken prior to any amendments to existing flight paths being approved. The consultation is to include all groups, bodies and individuals impacted by the potential change.

**Recommendation 11:**

The Senate Standing Committee should make a clear statement to the bureaucracy of ASA and DITRDLG that all public statements must be in accordance and consistent with Government policy.

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

VBC believes that ASA should be subject to a legally binding Community Consultation Charter to ensure that the non-aviation related sector of the community impacted by the operations of the aviation industry is provided with the same opportunity to comment and be afforded the same level of respect.

VBC has had dealings with ASA since the purchase of land and options over eight years ago. It has been the experience of VBC over this period that despite being a government owned corporation, ASA very much favours the interests of the aviation industry, particularly airport lessees over the interests of the broader community. Furthermore, ASA does not take seriously submissions contrary to the interests of key players within the aviation industry.

VBC has experienced a similar attitude from the Aviation Branch of DITRDLG. This section of the Department has shown a similar close relationship with aviation industry players, to the detriment to the broader community. This does not represent an open and honest consultation strategy. As a result, it is suggested that DITRDLG should also have a binding Community Consultation Charter in respect to its dealings with communities affected by aviation operations.

Throughout the eight years that VBC has been trying to work with the federal aviation bureaucracy responsible for the oversight of the aviation industry, they have been found to be exclusively focussed on the needs of the aviation industry, without giving consideration to a balanced approach towards the entire community. Further, there is evidence that the Aviation Branch of DITRDLG reacts strongly to pressure from the key aviation industry players, without taking into account impacts on the community at large. (See a recently misinformed briefing note provided to the Minister of Transport from the Aviation Branch obtained under FOI in **Appendix 6**)

The federal aviation bureaucracy is inconsistent and ad-hoc in its application of processes and responsibility, particularly in relation to airport lessees' proposals. For example, when the Aviation Branch of DITRDLG was assessing the Sydney Airport's 2009 draft Master Plan, they engaged independent consultants, Access Economics and The Ambidji Group to peer review the assumptions and information contained within this Plan. However, only several months later, when the same section was assessing the Canberra Airport's 2009 draft Master Plan, they did not undertake any peer review. This was despite a submission from VBC that included reports from the same consultants, Access Economics and The Ambidji Group and other leading consultants that highlighted significant errors and flaws in the assumptions, growth rates and projections present in the preliminary draft Master Plan. There is no evidence that the Aviation Branch of DITRDLG considered this expert advice.

**Recommendation 12:**

**That ASA has a legally binding Community Consultation Charter.**

**Recommendation 13:**

**That the Aviation Branch of DITRDLG has a legally binding Community Consultation Charter.**

## **1.7 *any other related matter***

At the core of the problem with ASA and DITRDLG is a culture of promoting the interests of airports without proper consideration of broader community interests. There is an assumption that if something is perceived to be in the interests of an airport that it will automatically be in the interests of the broader community. This will not always be the case. The consequences of this assumption are compounded by an attitude of locking out proper dialogue with other industry sectors and the community at large

## **Supporting Documentation**

VBC submits the following reports as part of this submission:

1. Correspondence between VBC and ASA and between VBC and the Commonwealth Ombudsman
2. Federal Court Ruling 15 August 2007
3. Access Economics report, *An Evaluation of the Proposed Residential Development at South Jerrabomberra*, December 2009 and BIS Shrapnel report, *Economic Impact of Residential Development in South Jerrabomberra*, November 2009.
4. Wilkinson Murray report, *Proposed Residential Developments near Canberra Airport: Assessment of Aircraft Noise Impacts*, June 2006
5. Wilkinson Murray report, *Recent Sub-divisions around Australian Airports*, November 2004
6. Briefing Note from DITRDLG to Minister Albanese

### **Appendix 1 – Correspondence between VBC & ASA and VBC & Commonwealth Ombudsman**

### **Appendix 2 – Federal Court Ruling**

### **Appendix 3 – Reports from Access Economics and BIS Shrapnel**

### **Appendix 4 – Wilkinson Murray Report – Proposed Residential Developments near Canberra Airport: Assessment of Aircraft Noise Impacts**

### **Appendix 5 – Wilkinson Murray Report – Recent Sub-divisions around Australian Airports**

### **Appendix 6 – Briefing Note from DITRDLG to Minister Albanese**