

From: Keith Maroon  
Subject: Submission towards a National Aviation Policy Statement  
To: aviationstatement@infrastructure.gov.au  
Date: Wednesday, June 25, 2008, 4:10 PM

Dear Aviation Policy Submission Considerers,

On behalf of all people who's homes are trashed by unnecessary overflights I wish to offer this submission to hopefully restore public health and home amenity as an immediate priority, restoring some balance.

I trust you realise that for most of human existence, life plodded on just fine without aviation, but now its here to stay, and like the automobile, becoming a dirty dangerous unhealthy problem because of the lack of considerate regulation favouring greed, and of course bankers.

It appears to me that many airport problems are due to:

- Poor planning with regard to planning/developing Airfields;
- Government lobbied by very strong inconsiderate groups promoting their own interests disregarding public health;
- Lack of effective will to remedy the above;
- A media generally supportive of 'paying' Airport stakeholders downplaying the severity of airport noise pollution.
- Allowing urban developments approach airfields:
- Stakeholders ignoring true social impact to maximise profits
- Not developing new airfields in appropriate locations;
- Appalling decisions like continuous 'development' West Beach Adelaide, and allowing half a million aircraft movements at Parafield, located in the middle of an urban, largely residential area.

I'm very concerned how perceptions of essentialness about aviation growth are created. It all seems to come from the aviation/transport industry promoting itself. It's crazy enough as it is, where we are buying consumables freighted all over the world where most can be made/grown locally.

One can see how the Aviation Industry (like most industries that have considerable influence in deregulating Government policymaking) create complexity to maintain the current status quo where nobody seems responsible for the damage their pollution incurs. Like most contemporary global Corporations, they strategically wish to enhance National dependence securing their operations. Aviation is essential for national security, but much of its commercial 'growth' is merely attributed to the almost zero interest rates offered by financial markets early 2000, where surplus leveraged money enables the sale & purchase of many aircraft, funded by cheap fare cash flow, and they want us to hastily organise the infrastructure for them. Short-termism at its finest, greatly benefiting a minority while trashing vast areas of urban Australia , where most inhabitants live. It would be only a matter of time when the west & north east of Adelaide would be totally ruined by aircraft noise, because this country is virtually 'noise illiterate'.

I also wish submit material on the following links:

<http://stopparafieldairnoise.blogspot.com/2008/05/parafield-endless-flight-training-noise.html>

[http://docs.google.com/Doc?id=dgg4nzb\\_1f78t2wcd](http://docs.google.com/Doc?id=dgg4nzb_1f78t2wcd)

[http://docs.google.com/Doc?id=dgg4nzb\\_10f2v7rrdc](http://docs.google.com/Doc?id=dgg4nzb_10f2v7rrdc)

I hope you find differing views useful for discussion

Thank You,  
K Maroon.

**Pertaining to some general 'Issues Paper' points, I also relate to 'General Aviation' as Parafield is a 'Secondary Airport'**

## ***International services***

*Do Australia's international air services policies serve Australia's national interest and balance the need to have an Australian based industry with robust competition from international competitors?*

Does this include foreign flight training? The current mass flying schools that destroy residential amenity in Australia are all foreign owned. There is nothing to be proud of covering up their polluting flight operations, to avoid compensation, for them to remain inappropriately based where they currently are, and where they propose to expand to. My home amenity has become almost non-existent. My blood pressure is high, although I keep physically very fit. My concentration is crippled for about 5minutes every time I hear a drone of aircraft, and I can no longer perform highly developed work skills at home. I am not submitting this as a whinge, but as an example of only one out of hundreds of local people that are damaged by flight training noise. Is this what you wish to encourage? I would like to know who the inconsiderate lunatics that initially propose such developments are.

Since mass flight training was permitted in Parafield there is now approximately a \$50,000 differential between my home and an equivalent home not under their training operations. Add this up with relocating costs, then multiply it by ~20,000 adversely affected homes & see how economic it all has been. There is also ~\$15,000 State stamp duty tax to repurchase a home elsewhere. A bonus to the State for sanctioning and remaining, 'legally ignorant', by not measuring, or wanting to know the true extent of flight training noise over our homes: In spite of well over one hundred letters printed in our local paper by frustrated residents having to 'put up' with it; In spite of over 2000 registered signatories in a petition opposing it.

*How might the Australian Government continue to develop improved competition and access to services while maintaining appropriate levels of aviation safety and security?*

Don't allow the argument of airports needing to operate over residential areas (i.e. near our 'lifestyle' amenities) to be competitive. Ensure all their accidents and near

misses are reported and transparently available for our scrutiny. This seems not to be the case at Parafield for mass flight training operations.

About security, allowing thousands of foreign nationals to fly so close to our military facilities, as in Parafield's case with Edinburgh nearby, seems stupid. Also, there are quarantine issues with deadly virulent airborne viral infection risks associated with hundreds of youngsters churning through Parafield from infected countries. It only takes one flu infected mass-night-clubber to spread it across our entire city.

*Priorities and approach be in the future?*

I hope you are not bent on tourism, once again it benefits a few, ruining a place while destroying the planet. Never-ending planeloads of tourists, doing the Australian circuit Adelaide stopover does not do much for Joe Citizen living between Highbury and Richmond . Imagine when the massive populations North becomes affluent enough to spend a week or two off on a fly to Oz. Let people come if they want to, good places don't require promotion, but more nice spaces should be developed where people live instead. Transport policy used to be focussed on essential quality efficient services, now its running amuck.

*How might the Australian Government best ensure all international airlines flying into Australia maintain the highest of safety standards? How might the Australian Government most effectively monitor and enforce safety standards of airlines that lease aircraft rather than operating their own aircraft?*

This is a challenge that we should not compromise on. Then again, you seem happy to allow large parts of our capitals to be polluted at any transport industries' beckon because a belief is created that they are so important. You do realise that Australia is amongst the most urbanised countries and we have the space to pollute non urban areas, and in my opinion life was so much better when we travelled by sea. With air safety there ought to be guaranteed compliance with stringent International safety standards matching our own, or no entry - keep it simple, whatever the cost.

Most flight training done at Parafield is for China , yet unfortunately they have a poor aviation safety record. Possibly that may be due to hastily pushing their rapid aviation growth with 'fast-tracked' courses done here with insufficient time to properly develop language & communication skills. It's all rapid and 'fast-tracked' so the likes as BAE can flog aircraft ASAP. Were there different standards for qualifying licences granted here in the past? I believe there was, but they are commercial pilots today. We also don't seem to have effective/disciplinary jurisdiction of foreign cadets/instructors 'play' flying over homes here.

## **Land Use:**

*Are the planning and development mechanisms under the Airports Act working effectively?*

No, especially when 'consulting' residents. They consider running self promoting business articles and 'hijacked' broadcasts as 'consultation'. The public have never informed of the full adverse impacts of any airport proposal.

*How can we improve consultation with State and local authorities and with the community?*

Give home owners the respect they deserve. The average person sacrifices a lot of life to establish their own home. Ask people if they really want more pollution & compensate fairly if they don't. Then you'll see the real cost. We can live quite well

without rampant aviation. Get all relevant studies done by independent public health orientated bodies.

*Could the regulatory regime better facilitate genuine long-term co-operation between airport operator companies and state and local governments on land use planning?*

Yes, especially if the 'regulatory regime' is completely independent from aviation promoters, and genuinely conscious of public health & amenity, holding that as priority. Governments are the only body capable of properly representing the people afflicted by industry pollution, yet in this country that is grossly inadequate. Transport is crucial, dealing with the constantly touted 'tyranny of distance' in rural areas. In urban cities transport policy seems about flogging cars and encouraging their dependence growing foreign investment while destroying amenity - like growing urban airfields. We have no rights when it comes to our residential conditions being protected, let alone maintained. Here in Salisbury thousands of good private homes are unhealthy to live in caused by transport policy made by an inconsiderate elite. Here the public is continuously misled, promises broken, plans changed, but what is consistent is that residential amenity continuously is degraded without compensation. Then one form of Government blames the other, nobody seems responsible, innocent taxpayers lose out and suffer..

*How can we better integrate investment on airports with the funding and construction of improved road and rail links to and from our airports?*

Spend the money, charge the aviation industry, which will pass it onto their consumers to move their pollution far away from where people live, and are ever likely to live in future – like it used to be. Allowing full of self-importance airfields to entrench themselves is akin to theft, trashing a town's amenity benefitting a minority.

Do your job and invest in good planning, irrespective of the politics. Selfish political parties contracting inconsiderate consultants with their 'public relations' regimens whose only concern is what's 'technically legal' have buggered our family homes up. The same culture exists amongst in the 'Corporate Executives' club.

*What mechanisms might be used to ensure an effective ongoing dialogue between airport operators and their local communities?*

Experiencing first hand what happens at Parafield, only a independent authorities mechanism will give the local community any resemblance of influence. Residents driven mad have been effectively ignored by Parafield Airport since 1993. Get rid of Airservices 'public relations game'. Encourage people to complain, but unfortunately here most have given up, too sick/disheartened or moved. Appoint an Aviation Ombudsman with laws prioritising public health. Otherwise it is all a waste of time.

*How should guidance be formulated for airport operators and others about public safety zones for locations at significant risk of on-the-ground fatalities from aircraft operations?*

Dangerous zones should not be permitted in public places – when will you realise that the aviation industry is well organised to grow itself for profit, most flights are unessential anyway, airports should move to appropriate places. Otherwise offer generous compensation, and make it a crime for reckless development to be approved. The nation has the wealth – remember Telstra losing ~\$7Billion, while an airfield is built offshore in Japan for a little more. That is an example inspiring national infrastructure.

*How can the mechanisms for guiding development around airports be improved to ensure potential issues from aircraft noise are fully addressed in planning?*

Regulate airports to comply with acceptable community health standards and get them to pay for all the adverse consequences they promoted for their own expedient gains. Then it may make more economic to relocate if they want to grow rampant like in the less regulated US. You must realise large areas of our capital cities will be sacrificed for a minority. This typically happens when the haves & have nots continue to separate. What happened to our once proud egalitarian nature? Wealth concentration has become obscene as we develop an undemocratic nature.

*How can we better ensure off-airport developments subject to state and local government planning regimes, such as tall buildings, do not compromise the safe and effective use of aviation infrastructure?*

Good planning prevents this in the first place. I hope you can fix what was left from previous 'leadership'.

## Future Airport Needs

*How can future airport needs best be addressed, recognising the importance of airports as an element of the national economic infrastructure?*

Now that aircraft are becoming huge, requiring runway improvements, take the opportunity to improve transport infrastructure and move problem airports.

*What are the current and future pressure points in relation to airport capacity?*

I hope it's a general increase in public awareness about public health, amenity and environment. Tax aircraft (and automotive) fuel, plan and fund proper environmentally adequate infrastructure. Most of the public would prefer a pleasant healthy place to live, for everybody, instead of rampant consumerist growth. Hopefully some sanity will return to our cities.

*How can the protection of the communities around airports from undue aircraft noise best be addressed as demand for services continues to grow?*

People should have priority over industry, most aircraft services are not as essential as they claim. They are creating their own public perception of importance and so called essential growth. Question the true importance of commercial aviation. Consider the overall true cost, including social & environmental factors. Most of the population don't fly that much. Most flyers do only because it is cheap, as the true cost is not built in the fare. The automobile also seems to enjoy a similar phenomenon of ignorance. Both have become environmentally reckless overly-polluting enterprises. Overall true costs to remedy adverse aviation impacts should be built in the fares.

## Pricing of airport services

### *Aircraft noise*

*What airport strategies and government policies could be implemented to reduce the impact of aircraft noise on communities?*

Charge them to compensate for their pollution and have it measured by an independent public health orientated body. Fine them for every complaint. Make it easy for adversely affected people to obtain compensation.

*Could the ANEF system be improved or be supplemented by other planning tools to better explain the impact of aircraft noise? Should State and local governments play a greater role in aircraft noise management? What should be the responsibilities of airports?*

Yes it should be independently reviewed and improved. Have noise measured as noise dosage, it need not be expensive, and combine aviation noise to any other background noise - because that is what people are exposed to. Currently airports diffuse their noise pollution referencing background noise from trains, trucks etc. Here people are 'living' under flight training paths, on filthy highways, and noisy train lines, e.g. helicopter training is flown *along* the Salisbury Highway, how does the ANEF system measure that environment? Absolutely disgusting and apparently legal, again complaints are effectively ignored.

*Should emphasis be given to airport/community partnership approaches, for example, based on locally negotiated agreements rather than generic legislative approaches?*

Experiencing so called 'fly friendly' concepts with Flight Training Adelaide, definitely not, because it is a complete imbalance of power/influence, does not protect future generations enabling the status quo to continue to worsen, benefiting airports. That has happened since 1993, the evidence is in our local papers.

*Can techniques for sharing information on aircraft noise impact be further developed to improve the supply of information to potential property purchasers and other affected parties?*

We cannot obtain accurate noise plots from General Aviation Airports like Parafield now. What you get is what's in the glossed up Master Plan, where noise over residential areas is fudged to whatever ANEF number is deemed acceptable. At Parafield we have endured obscene amounts of flight training noise (up to 14 hours continuous, even on public holidays). I'm yet to know anybody getting the DOTARS transparent 'TNIP' system working properly, then again even Airservices conservatively estimated movements at Parafield, enabling airport 'environmental consultants' contracted out the noise modelling biased in the airports favour. Publishing the true noise dose in parts of Salisbury will render our homes only fit for the hearing impaired. Will we be compensated for this?

*Which airports in Australia need to remain curfew free and under what conditions? Can operations at airports be better managed to ensure the community is protected while at the same time providing for night time access?*

Airports 20 miles away from any residential, or future areas linked to efficient terrestrial transport hubs would be a good candidate for no curfew. You must realise that ensuring undisturbed sleep is considered essential in the civil parts of the world. This would not be possible where there is no curfew. Another thing to consider is other polluting activities near airports. For example, the opening up of the Adelaide-Darwin rail, with an unfortunate daytime train accident at Salisbury, has ensured nobody near that railway line will have a guaranteed undisturbed sleep. The Ghan now rumbles through Adelaide's Northern suburbs at ~ 2AM or ~ 5AM. That rail noise can wake me, and I live ~1km from the line. That may never diminish, at least they are considering re-routing the line away from residential areas, while the Parafield Airport fraternity is giggling in to stay and grow, trying to bring freight in during the night and merely maintain a voluntary 11PM curfew. Airport complainants have been 'harassed' by flight training aircraft practicing stalls over their units even after 11:30PM.

*How effective are the current noise enquiry and noise complaint services? Are there more effective ways to deal with people's complaints and requests for information? Can the services be better provided?*

Airservices is the public's only point of contact, the complaint number is not well known, and from my experience they're ineffective. Recently they apparently now log all complaints from people that eventually find their number, but for many years they did not. Reports are sent to airports, they appear 3-6months later, then (at Parafield) the Airservices representative helps airport management play down the complaints. Eventually the complaints are effectively ignored. I have heard of innocent home telephone lines being monitored by the Federal Police, instigated by Airservices operators while registering complaints, after complainants express their frustration by years of inaction.

*Are current complaint and compliance mechanisms effective?*

No, Airservices are stooges for the Aviation Industry (like BAE), and have little effect after merely logging a complaint. They make excuses defending airport operators, gather personal data for airports, limit their response to questions, offer residents no sense of hope encouraging them to consider moving. What compliance mechanism is there? Need an Airport Ombudsman.

*Compensation arrangements in the event of an accident*

*Are the minimum insurance standards appropriate? Should the system be extended to require insurance for third party surface damage? Does the aviation industry face any difficulties in accessing appropriate levels of insurance to cover their potential liabilities?*

Of course there should be insurance, it should not be voluntary. Cover for road carnage is compulsory, so it should be for the aviation industry. Nobody asks or wants aircraft flying over them. Full compensation should be easily available for aviation's adverse consequences. Keep it simple, then true costs will become apparent and hopefully better decisions are made.

*Aviation security*

*Is enough being done to enhance security in the aviation sector?*

The health experts are concerned by a pandemic rapidly spread by the aviation industry. This threat is very real, multiplied by millions enticed to fly around on cheap fares, encouraging 'growth' and pollution, while Flu, TB & thrombosis are played down by the aviation industry. More attention should be paid to our biological security and discourage unnecessary air transport.