

For Public Submission

Dear Colleague,

I would like to make the following submission to the review of the Aviation Statement.

I have in addition received the brochure on Runway Safety Enhancement posted to my home in Dulwich Hill, NSW 2203.

This house is located under the point of the northbound flight path where aircraft increasingly apply full thrust to get up to cruising altitude. This means about four to five times a day windows rattle and television or radio can be inaudible inside a room, even with closed, decent aluminum framed windows. In the daytime, children cannot be heard by teachers when in the playground of nearby Wilkins School which my children attend.

To announce casually that more of this noise burden was to be borne – even for so laudable an aim as increased safety - more of the time, by an increasingly smaller part of the residential areas of Sydney is inequitable, and the distribution of burden unjust. Why should state and commonwealth government most disproportionately tax me and my family by sound which other people do not have to bear? Why do you not extend subsidy for double glazing and other sound proofing to this area? I have examined the online maps which indicate the corridors within which sound-proofing support can be claimed and which appear to be very narrowly drawn. I cannot believe that these are adequate to the inhabitants of the zones adjacent to them, and there are many occasions when houses outside that zone are subject to very high noise levels, as I can indeed attest as above.

The noise in this area has increased way beyond the level at the time of purchase in 2000, as has the airborne pollution from jet engines, as witnessed by the increasing amount of small particle black dust inside the house. I am unaware if this is systematically monitored at the moment, like sound. If not pollution should be so monitored, since it falls under basic state and commonwealth responsibility to maintain a healthy environment, and not harmful one.

At minimum, Sydney airports and its users should either pay up for noise and air pollution or demand on our behalf a levy from commonwealth and state governments to allow proper insulation and air filtering of affected households.

As a matter of general operational policy and governance, I would also like to draw your attention to the discrepancies between supposed noise sharing and the operation of the airport by Air Services. There are several operating plans in application from which choice is made for 'operational reasons' by the airport and airlines to which there would appear to be no or little effective recourse. Frequently there are take-offs to the North West when there is no operational need to do so – i.e. when there is no wind from the Northwest, a bright day, a Sunday morning and afternoon.

It should be axiomatic in Sydney that there should be no take-offs to the North when this is not required for safety or to obtain sufficient lift by on-coming wind at take-off. I can frequently testify that take-off patterns appear to be set by volume and clock rotation and that there are often take-offs towards the North when no wind is coming from that direction.

Could the Minister please order that all take-offs should be towards the sea unless otherwise required, and that the zone for compensatory support towards residential and educational sound insulation be properly widened.

Yours sincerely,

Dr John Clark