

Hackett ACT 2602

24 June 2008

To whom it may concern,

I wish to register my family's objection to the proposed expansion of Canberra's airport operations. I understand that the plan is to have no night time curfew to allow the maximum number of plane movements for freight and passengers. My family live in Hackett and stand to be severely affected by such a proposal.

We moved to Canberra from Sydney *because* of the plane noise we were subjected to whilst living in Sydney's inner west. We know first hand how detrimental such noise and disturbance is to family life and peace of mind. In Sydney there was a curfew between 11pm-6am so I am bewildered how it can even be seriously considered to have no curfew here, where there are residences so close to the plane flight paths. I cannot understand why Canberra residents are not to be given the same rights as Sydney residents, particularly when it appears that the majority of the benefits of increased flights will benefit Sydney as it will serve as Sydney's 2nd airport .

I fail to understand why the financial gain of a small sector of the Canberra community (particularly one influential family in Canberra who stand to make substantial financial gains from the proposal) is considered more important than the majority's rights to peace and quiet. When there are so many articles flooding the media on the importance of sleep for health and wellbeing, why is the government proposing an arrangement that will detract from any possibility of a good night's sleep for thousands of the local community?

It seems obvious that there should be an independent study conducted on the extent of noise impact on residents, to confirm that proposed noise levels will be within acceptable limits. Given I have lived under noise levels that were considered "acceptable" in Sydney, I am very dubious that extensions to the operations of the Canberra airport so close to residential areas could be found to be acceptable. Likewise, given the current oil crisis, I find an expansion to airport operations both morally offensive and economically unsound to gear infrastructure expansion to an unsustainable means of travel.

I would appreciate a response to this email and to be advised of any consultation processes that may be proposed with the community so that I can attend and inform myself on this issue (out of work hours so residents other than stay at home mums and pensioners can participate please).

Yours faithfully,

Harriet Spring
Angus Watson
Freya Watson