

**To:** Aviation Statement

**Subject:** Comment on the Aviation Strategy White Paper

To the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government.

Dear Mr Albanese,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the "Towards a National Aviation Policy Statement" white paper.

I offer the following comments and observations.

It would have been easier for us to comment if you had numbered the questions that you post in the document.

My interest lies in Chapter 4 – customer and community protection.

In relation to the first question, "what practical steps..." I find it surprising that you continue to predict a 5% growth in air travel despite the rising cost of energy. The airline industry is going to reduce its greenhouse emissions by reducing flight numbers and seeking enormous efficiency improvements in response to a steeply rising oil price. Passing on the cost of fuel to consumers will immediately cut demand for discretionary flights. Serendipitously this will reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

In relation to the third question, "given the international nature..." I think that an agreement should be reached that the emissions from any flight are assumed to occur at the take off point. This would be a reasonably fair way to pin the emissions to a locality and allow them to be counted in a carbon trading scheme. I think that a carbon trading scheme should include all forms of transport – from private cars to aeroplanes, otherwise it will leave large loopholes and skew the market terribly.

Question 4 "Could the ANEF...". The ANEF system seems to be fundamentally sensible and a good start to guide planning around airports. It does however seem to be open to some manipulation in its current form, and the airports do not seem to be held responsible for their predictions. As a resident of Canberra, I am aware that the Canberra Airport ANEF contours are based on very optimistic flight number predictions, that also seem to assume that we will still be flying noisy dash-8's in the year 2050. This needs some reality checking. I would suggest the following: An independent body (perhaps Air Services Australia) should be required to verify that the future traffic predictions are sensible. Also, the assumption should be made that future aircraft will be quieter than current models – reducing the noise emissions in the future (perhaps only by a couple of percent). And finally – if an airport proposes to expand the ANEF contours beyond those previously approved, affecting land that was not previously subject to development constraints, then the Airport should be liable to pay compensation to the landowner for the reduced development rights or property value. This requirement for compensation (or even compulsory acquisition) is applied to other nationally important but locally disruptive industries such as mining.

Question 7 "Which Airports in Australia..." given that the Sydney, Adelaide, Essendon and Gold Coast airports can successfully serve their communities while adhering to a curfew, then I think that the Canberra Airport could service the current and likely future population of Canberra while operating under a curfew. I would support a curfew being imposed on Canberra Airport.

Overall, I think that your white paper should consider the strong prospect that the recent growth in the aviation industry is not sustainable and that it is highly likely to take a sharp negative turn in the next couple of years. The growth has largely been a result of technology improvements and very cheap fares making it easy for people to hop between cities. I think that much of this travel will prove to be discretionary and very price sensitive. Increases in oil prices and the introduction of carbon trading will end the era of cheap flights, and stop the growth at least until a viable fuel alternative is identified.

I thank you for your time.

Kip Tanner  
Narrabundah, Canberra.