

JOHN DALE ARCHITECT
Registered in N. S. W.

Committee Secretary
Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600
Australia
Phone: +61 2 6277 3511
Fax: +61 2 6277 5811
Email:

Submission to the Committee's 29/01/2010
'Inquiry into the effectiveness of Air services Australia's management of aircraft noise'

As I advised Lawrence in my call to her on the 27/01/2010 I became involved in Working Group 1 as a community representative in the Noise Management Plan instigated by Roz Kelly's DASSET document after the 1990 response to the HORSCAN report 1985.

I have monitored maintained community representative roll to the present date. After the NMP the Community Advisory Committee continued to monitor, present submissions and reports to affected community groups and government. In 1994 I did further post graduate study at Sydney University under Fergus Fricke on the subject of Community Noise assessment. This included acoustic theory and a year logging and measuring noise in the field.

I have been a community representative in the Australian Standards committee EV 11 since 1993. ASA was sufficiently concerned about the output of the committee as to have Lee Kenna chair the committee for years.

Since privatization of the Australian Standards Association there has been a dynamic change in interests in that committee. There has been no further development with the community from the committee since the production of the AS 2021 amended standard version 2000.

As president, I report that the CAC made submissions to :

1995 Select Committee on Aircraft Noise in Sydney

A state inquiry into the noise pollution

A presentation to the Hearing on the introduction of Precision radar Monitoring

And other Federal Government events labeled as consultation with the affected communities on noise and air pollution generated by aircraft.

I submit that there is increasing ongoing noise and air pollution associated with Australian airports. That Government and agencies have not delivered a responsible and

equitable level of care for all particularly in respect of the communities around those airports.

The record of events since the 1990 response to the HORSCAN report 1985 demonstrate that there has been any thing but equitable care for affected communities. Instead there has been spin, evasion of responsibility, circumvention of process and now questionable statements about a second airport.

With Federal Government announcing perfunctory approval of the recent master plan for KSA and then making a statement about a another study for a second airport to be run in conjunction with the state of NSW's government beggars belief.

This clearly reflects that the past practices are ongoing and that ASA and the minister present a serious threat by way of increasing operations and the consequent higher doses of noise pollution. The affected communities are owed a duty of care by Government for equity and abatement of health impacts from aircraft noise emissions at point of impact described in detail by qualified sources such as Kryter , WHO consultants 1995and AS 2021

I will present a summary of events and practices now on record as demonstrating that the past to present performance by the ASA agency under a series of ministers has not been equitable. Has not been consultative but a monitoring processes to push airport development and privatization forward with out due care to protect communities affected by increasing operations.

The public perception of politicians, executive government and their agents is demeaned by their disregard for community with these inequitable noise impacts and monitoring processes. I submit that it is a constructive criticism that should be presented to the committee to remind government of the extent and increasing pollution and for it to be adequately assessed and abated.

As a starter, I would like to use Sydney as a model of what is happening with noise impacts. If the central authority is doing it once it is doing it all over and that is adversely effecting a lot of people.

The present level of impacts with increased frequency of 747's 767 and 737 operations is heading toward equivalent damaging impacts that occurred in 1994 with the opening of 3rD runway. The peak levels metric of noise emissions at point of impact may be lowered by the introduction of Chapter 3-4 certified & A380 air craft but the dosage of unwanted sound (noise) is at least equivalent because the frequency has increased and will continue to increase. The A380 may be quieter with higher low frequency component but not quite in single event or the cumulative noise dose senses.

So sharing was an event of relief for the federal government and ASA as a way of appearing to diminish pollution. According to AS 2021 1985 housing development above contour 25 ANEF around air ports was unacceptable.

With the introduction of new aircraft paths for a mix of Ch 3- 4 certified & other aircraft the sharing is seen as a furphy. It is spreading noise by effecting new corridors that will have increasing emissions impacts.

Affected communities in Sydney opposed the introduction of PRM operations. Since they were introduced increasing noise incidence has been boosted by aircraft having to power up to stay in the air and or a greater incidence of dirty landings . This was clearly presented to the government hearing but ignored.

For these type of operations at a minimum of 6.6 Km from the air port with 737's and particularly 747's and & 767's the noise impact is such that you cannot decipher speech 2 meters apart and depending on the spectrum of the event you experience a tension in your body as a result of the noise dose as a regular conditioned response. It is reasonable to assume that there are a great number of people more adversely affected within a radius of 6.6Km during extended periods of peak operations.

This regressive situation by ASA and the air port owners has not been addressed by ASA or the minister. Operation abatement procedures seem to have been swapped for free market operations and if controllers are diminished for more aircraft to air craft computer safety and separation there could be lesser abatement unless government does not provide more preparation and protection.

There is no current good neighbor mentality being demonstrated by the airport owners in Australia or the authority, Air Services Australia for affected communities around airports. Just more of the same and an increasing incidence of noise.

This is all that I can afford to present at the moment and as accepted by Lawrence who I spoke to by phone I have an extension to next Friday to send additional material.

John Dale as community representative