

OFFICIAL: Sensitive

MS23-000152



Australian Government

Department of Infrastructure, Transport,
Regional Development, Communications and the Arts

To: The Hon Catherine King MP, Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government (for decision)

Subject: Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Critical Date: Decision required by 9 March 2023. No decision by this date will result in a deemed approval in accordance with section 81 of the *Airports Act 1996*.

Recommendations:

1. That you **approve** under section 81(2) of the *Airports Act 1996* (the Act) the Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022 at **Attachment A**.

Approved / Not Approved

2. That you **sign** the letters to Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd and other relevant stakeholders advising of your decision at **Attachment B**.

Signed / Not Signed

The Hon Catherine King MP

Date:

6.03.23

Comments:

Key Points:

1. On 19 December 2022, Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd (HIAPL) submitted the Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022 (dMP) for your consideration. A decision on the dMP, having regard to the requirements of the Act, is required by 9 March 2023.
2. The Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts has assessed the dMP and considers it meets the requirements of the Act and recommends approval. We also consider the dMP and Supplementary Report have adequately demonstrated HIAPL's due regard to public comments received during the formal consultation period. The supplementary report detailing the consultation and how HIAPL has responded is at **Attachment A**.
3. The department's assessment is at **Attachment C** and includes the matters to which you must have regard. Major components are summarised to follow.

OFFICIAL: Sensitive

OFFICIAL: Sensitive

MS23-000152

4. *Land-Use Plan and Development Plans:* Developments across the planning period include expansion of the existing terminal, as well as current and proposed airfield development to support forecast passenger growth. A land use plan and permissible future uses have been outlined for each precinct to enable future major airport developments to achieve consistency with the dMP, a requirement under the Act. The breakdown of the two landside 'mixed-use' precincts also includes proposals for non-aviation development opportunities, primarily for visitor accommodation, tourism and entertainment facilities, retail, commercial development.
5. *Environmental assessment:* The dMP identifies environmentally significant sites on the airport and details potential causes of environmental impacts from activities undertaken on site and systems in place to respond to those issues. The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water advised that the dMP's environmental management framework and associated strategy reflects legislative and regulatory requirements.
 - a. In your comments on the Melbourne Airport draft Master Plan 2022 (Melbourne dMP) which you approved on 14 November 2022 (MS22-001773 refers), you expressed your expectation that airports should outline the impacts of the airport itself on emissions and provide a plan to address this in the future.
 - b. There are no provisions in the Act or the Airports Regulations 1997 pertaining to carbon emissions on-airport, or in the development of a Master Plan. However, in the dMP, HIAPL has noted that it has developed an Integrated Carbon Management Plan that aligns with the Airport Carbon Accreditation program (ACA).
 - c. The airport currently holds ACA accreditation level 2 ('reduction'; where the airport must provide evidence of effective carbon management procedures) and has set a goal of achieving ACA accreditation level 4 ('neutrality'; where the airport must offset emissions over which the airport has control) in the long-term (3-5 years). HIAPL has committed to continue to engage with stakeholders annually to reduce emissions.
6. *Economic assessment:* Prior to COVID-19, Hobart Airport generated 639 direct full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs (employed by the airport, airlines and tenants) and 487 indirect jobs. The dMP states that in 2042, it is expected that Hobart Airport will generate 3,500 direct and indirect FTE jobs. The dMP estimates that in 2042, Hobart Airport will contribute \$412 million directly to the economy, comprised of \$71.4 million from the airport operator and \$340.5 million from the airport tenants. The proposed airfield developments are intended to facilitate larger aircraft to operate from Hobart Airport, enabling a direct route for passenger flights to Singapore and open up Tasmania to key Asian markets, an increase in Hobart's capabilities as the gateway to the Antarctic to support and an improvement in international freight capacity.
7. *Aeronautical development:* The dMP forecasts two key aeronautical developments across the airport site over the initial eight-year planning period to support forecast growth of aircraft and passenger movements. The first development is the expansion of the existing terminal, which will include expanded domestic departures, international processing facilities for Code C and Code E aircraft, expanded baggage handling services and enhanced security to support domestic passenger forecasts. To complement these works, the dMP has outlined current and proposed airfield development to support passenger forecast growth, including taxiway extension, airfield strengthening for Code E Aircraft, additional parking bays and expansion of the freight apron.
8. *Non-aeronautical development:* HIAPL has not proposed any specific non-aeronautical developments in the landside areas of the airport, noting that the scope of these opportunities have not yet been defined, however, the dMP outlines areas that have been zoned for non-aeronautical development that aligns with permissible land uses.

OFFICIAL: Sensitive

OFFICIAL: Sensitive

MS23-000152

9. *Impact on aviation operations:* The dMP forecasts an increase in aircraft movements from 2.7 million annual passengers in 2018-19 to almost 5.5 million annual passengers in 2041-42. Freight handling is expected to increase from 660 air transport movements per annum in 2018-19 to 960 air transport movements per annum in 2041-42. These forecasts support HIAPL's views on the future economic contribution of freight and their vision of the airport as Australia's gateway to Antarctica. The dMP also includes an updated Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF), which has been endorsed by Airservices Australia (Airservices). The ANEF is the primary noise metric in Australia to guide land use planning around airports.
10. *Ground Transport Plan:* The dMP provides a Ground Transport Plan to meet the transport needs for the initial eight-year period and into the future, including works intended to improve the quality of the ground transport system for both the internal and external road network to meet the demands of freight and passenger access. This includes a joint-Commonwealth funded external road project to create dual-lanes along the Tasman Highway.
- In your comments on the Melbourne Airport draft Master Plan 2022 (Melbourne dMP) you also expressed your expectation that airports should engage in plans regarding disability and accessibility on-airport.
 - There are no provisions in the Act pertaining to disability or accessibility requirements on-airport, or in the development of a Master Plan, however, the dMP does outline the airport's consideration of accessibility requirements. This includes a 2019 investment in five Avi-ramps to offer more accessible boarding to passengers. The Avi-ramps provide step-free access directly from the ground to the aircraft door and are used on the majority of Hobart flights for all passengers to board and disembark planes.
 - Within the Hobart Airport terminal car park, customers with a valid disability permit or seniors' card are entitled to 30 minutes free parking to allow safe and timely access to the terminal. Additionally, if customers have a disabled parking permit, they are entitled to utilise one of the dedicated disabled car spaces in the Premium or Terminal Car Park located close to the terminal for improved access.
 - Hobart Airport has committed to continuing to progressively improve and upgrade all publicly accessible areas as part of the future development at the airport.
 - The Airport Building Controller has noted that it is unclear whether the airport has achieved full compliance with the Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2002 by the target date of 31 December 2022. Should you decide to approve the dMP, the department suggests that you request HIAPL to confirm its progress on this matter before publishing the final Master Plan.
11. *Aircraft noise and airport safeguarding strategy:* the dMP reflects implemented airspace changes to flight paths around Hobart Airport that were introduced in 2017 and were subsequently amended and finalised in 2019. These changes have resulted in interest from the community, particularly in relation to aircraft noise impacts on areas surrounding the airport. The department notes that this is a matter for Airservices as the agency responsible for managing airspace and flight paths and is being addressed through the Airservices Post Implementation Review (PIR) of Hobart flight path changes. The PIR was completed in 2022, identified a number of alternative flight path options suggested by the community and industry, some of which were found to be viable for further investigation and detailed assessment.
12. *Public consultation:* The public exhibition period was held for 60 business days as required under the Act, from 11 August 2022 to 2 November 2022. Only three public submissions were received through the exhibition of the Preliminary Draft Master Plan; one from a local business group and two from individual community members.

OFFICIAL: Sensitive

OFFICIAL: Sensitive

MS23-000152

- a. Issues raised in submissions primarily related to concerns with the level of consultation with neighbouring property owners regarding proposed developments, and environmental management on-airport.

Financial impacts: N/A

Legal/Legislative impacts: N/A

Stakeholder Implications:

13. Neither Airservices Australia (Airservices) or the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) raised any significant issues regarding the dMP.
14. The dMP has been prepared following two one-year extensions to the date for submission, from December 2020 to December 2022. Both extensions were sought due to COVID-19 and were approved by then-Infrastructure Minister under s 71(6)(b) of the Act. In addition, on 28 September 2018, the Airports Amendment Act 2018 was legislated. This changed Hobart Airport's Master Plan cycle from five to eight years.
15. It is anticipated the approval of the Master Plan will have minimal impacts for industry and the community as it is a strategic document that outlines HIAPL's vision and plans for the airport site for the 20-year planning horizon.

Media Opportunities:

16. A media release can be prepared if you wish to announce your decision about the dMP.

Consultation:

Internal: Domestic Aviation and Reform Division, Infrastructure Investment Division, Surface Transport Emissions and Policy Division, Bureau of Infrastructure and Transport Research Economics

External: Airservices Australia, Australian Border Force, Australian Federal Police, Civil Aviation Safety Authority, Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water

Attachments:

Attachment A: Hobart Airport dMP 2022 and Supplementary Report (2 documents)

Attachment B: Letters to HIAPL and other relevant stakeholders (10 letters)

Attachment C: Departmental assessment of the dMP under ss 71 and 81 of the Act (2 documents)

Cleared By: Phil McClure
Position: Assistant Secretary
Division: Airports Branch
Ph: 02 6274 s22(1)(a)(ii)
Mob: s22(1)(a)(ii)
Date: 1 February 2023

Contact Officer: s22(1)(a)(ii)
Section: Airports Branch
Ph: 02 6274 s22(1)(a)(ii)
Mob: s22(1)(a)(ii)

Instructions for MPS: Send contact officer copies of signed package, including letters

Responsible Adviser: s22(1)(a)(ii)

PDMS Distribution List: Jim Betts, Marisa Purvis-Smith, Stephanie Werner

OFFICIAL: Sensitive

The Hon Catherine King MP

**Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government
Member for Ballarat**

Ref: MC23-000152

Mr Norris Carter
Chief Executive Officer
Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd
6 Hinkler Road
CAMBRIDGE TAS 7170

~~Dear Mr Carter~~ *Norris*

Thank you for submitting the Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022 (the Master Plan) for my consideration. I write to advise you that I have approved the Master Plan in accordance with section 81 of the *Airports Act 1996* (the Act).

In making my decision, I have noted the due regard Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd (HIAPL) has given to comments received during the public consultation period that relate to the Master Plan. I have also considered the views of Airservices Australia (Airservices), the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) and the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW), who did not raise any significant safety, operational, or environmental issues in relation to the Master Plan.

I commend HIAPL for its ongoing engagement with the three agencies on the Master Plan. I expect HIAPL to continue to engage with these agencies, and all other relevant government, industry and community stakeholders, in respect of all the developments foreshadowed in the Master Plan.

Ongoing regulatory compliance will be essential to Hobart Airport's development over the Master Plan period and this cannot happen without HIAPL working closely with the Airport Environment Officer (AEO) and the Airport Building Controller (ABC), as well as the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts (my department) itself on regulatory compliance matters relating to the Master Plan. This includes providing any sub-plans or strategies related to environmental management requirements and providing regular updates on the program of works.

While it is not a consideration under the Act, I appreciate your inclusion of Hobart Airport's efforts to improve accessibility for all airport users. I would however welcome a more specific inclusion in your final Master Plan of whether your efforts will meet the requirements of the the Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2002 by the target date of 31 December 2022.

Under section 86 of the Act, publication of the final Master Plan is required within 50 business days of my approval. I ask that a copy of the final Master Plan be provided to my department for review prior to its publication. Prior to the publication of the Master Plan, I also ask that you include further details of Hobart Airport's full compliance with the Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2002 up to the target date of 31 December 2022.

The relevant contact officer in the department is Mr Phil McClure, Assistant Secretary, Airports Branch, Domestic Aviation and Reform Division, who can be contacted at Phil.McClure@infrastructure.gov.au or on (02) 6274 6289.

In accordance with section 242 of the Act, and subject to the *Administrative Appeals Tribunal Act 1975*, application may be made to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal for review of my decision.

I wish you and your team all the best in implementing the initiatives within this Master Plan and continuing to ensure Hobart Airport meets the needs of users at the airport into the future.

Yours sincerely



Catherine King MP

6 /03 /2023



The Hon Catherine King MP

Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government
Member for Ballarat

Ref: MC23-000152

The Hon Guy Barnett MP
Minister for State Development, Construction and Housing
Level 5, 4 Salamanca Place
HOBART TAS 7000

Dear Minister

807

I am writing to advise I have approved the Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022 (the Master Plan), in accordance with section 81 of the *Airports Act 1996*.

In making my decision, I have given regard to the comments received throughout the statutory referral and consultation process, including any views provided by the Tasmanian Government.

I believe the 20-year strategic vision for Hobart Airport set out in the Master Plan will strengthen Hobart Airport's key role as a domestic and international aviation gateway to the city of Hobart and Tasmania.

The final Master Plan is required to be published within 50 business days of my approval.

Yours sincerely

Catherine King MP

6 / 3 / 2023



The Hon Catherine King MP

Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government
Member for Ballarat

Ref: MC23-000152

The Hon Michael Ferguson MP
Deputy Premier
Treasurer
Minister for Infrastructure and Transport
Minister for Planning
Level 5, 4 Salamanca Place
HOBART TAS 7000

Dear Deputy Premier

I am writing to advise I have approved the Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022 (the Master Plan), in accordance with section 81 of the *Airports Act 1996*.

In making my decision, I have given regard to the comments received throughout the statutory referral and consultation process, including any views provided by the Tasmanian Government.

I believe the 20-year strategic vision for Hobart Airport set out in the Master Plan will strengthen Hobart Airport's key role as a domestic and international aviation gateway to the city of Hobart and Tasmania.

The final Master Plan is required to be published within 50 business days of my approval.

Yours sincerely

Catherine King MP

6 / 3 / 2023



The Hon Catherine King MP

Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government
Member for Ballarat

Ref: MC23-000152

Mr Kim Evans
Secretary
Department of State Growth
GPO Box 536
HOBART TAS 7001

Dear Secretary

I am writing to advise I have approved the Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022 (the Master Plan), in accordance with section 81 of the *Airports Act 1996*.

In making my decision, I have given regard to the comments received throughout the statutory referral and consultation process, including any views provided by the Tasmanian Government.

I believe the 20-year strategic vision for Hobart Airport set out in the Master Plan will strengthen Hobart Airport's key role as a domestic and international aviation gateway to the city of Hobart and Tasmania.

The final Master Plan is required to be published within 50 business days of my approval.

Yours sincerely

Catherine King MP

6 / 3 /2023



The Hon Catherine King MP

Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government
Member for Ballarat

Ref: MC23-000152

Mr Ian Nelson
General Manager
Clarence City Council
PO Box 96
ROSNY PARK TAS 7018

Dear Mr Nelson

Ian,

I am writing to advise I have approved the Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022 (the Master Plan), in accordance with section 81 of the *Airports Act 1996* (the Act).

In making my decision, I have given regard to the comments received throughout the statutory referral and consultation process, including any views provided by Clarence City Council.

The approved Master Plan is required to be published within 50 business days of my approval.

Yours sincerely

Catherine King MP

6 / 3 / 2023



The Hon Catherine King MP

Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government
Member for Ballarat

Ref: MC23-000152

Cr Kerry Vincent
Mayor
Sorell City Council
PO Box 126
SORELL TAS 7172

~~Dear Mayor~~ *Kerry,*

I am writing to advise I have approved the Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022 (the Master Plan), in accordance with section 81 of the *Airports Act 1996* (the Act).

In making my decision, I have given regard to the comments received throughout the statutory referral and consultation process, including any views provided by Sorell City Council.

The approved Master Plan is required to be published within 50 business days of my approval.

Yours sincerely

Catherine King MP

6 / 3 /2023



The Hon Catherine King MP

**Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government
Member for Ballarat**

Ref: MC23-000152

Ms Kelly Grigsby
Chief Executive Officer
City of Hobart
GPO Box 503
HOBART TAS 7001

Dear Ms Grigsby

Kelly

I am writing to advise I have approved the Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022 (the Master Plan), in accordance with section 81 of the *Airports Act 1996* (the Act).

In making my decision, I have given regard to the comments received throughout the statutory referral and consultation process, including any views provided by the City of Hobart.

The approved Master Plan is required to be published within 50 business days of my approval.

Yours sincerely

Catherine King MP

6 / 3 / 2023



The Hon Catherine King MP

Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government
Member for Ballarat

Ref: MC23-000152

Mr Jason Harfield
Chief Executive Officer
Airservices Australia
GPO Box 267
CANBERRA ACT 2601


Dear Mr Harfield

I am writing to advise I have approved the Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022 (the Master Plan), in accordance with section 81 of the *Airports Act 1996* (the Act).

In making my decision, I have given regard to the views of Airservices Australia (Airservices), as required by section 81(3)(d) of the Act. I note Airservices' assessment of the Master Plan has not identified any significant safety or operational issues.

I have informed Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd (HIAPL) that I expect ongoing engagement with Airservices on the developments foreshadowed in the Master Plan.

A copy of my letter to HIAPL approving the Master Plan is enclosed for your information.

Yours sincerely

Catherine King MP

6 / 3 / 2023



The Hon Catherine King MP

Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government
Member for Ballarat

Ref: MC23-000152

Ms Pip Spence PSM
Chief Executive Officer and
Director of Aviation Safety
Civil Aviation Safety Authority
GPO Box 2005
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dear Ms Spence *P.P.*

I am writing to advise I have approved the Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022 (the Master Plan), in accordance with section 81 of the *Airports Act 1996* (the Act).

In making my decision, I have given regard to the views of the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA), as required by section 81(3)(d) of the Act. I note CASA's assessment of the Master Plan has not identified any significant issues impacting on safety.

I have informed Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd (HIAPL) that I expect ongoing engagement with CASA on the developments foreshadowed in the Master Plan.

A copy of my letter to HIAPL approving the Master Plan is enclosed for your information.

Yours sincerely

Catherine King MP

6 / 3 /2023



The Hon Catherine King MP

Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government
Member for Ballarat

Ref: MC23-000152

The Hon Tanya Plibersek MP
Minister for the Environment and Water
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Minister

Tanya

I am writing to advise I have approved the Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022 (the Master Plan), in accordance with section 81 of the *Airports Act 1996*.

In making my decision, I have given regard to the views of the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW). I note DCCEEW's consideration of the Master Plan has not identified any significant environmental issues.

My department will seek commitments from Hobart Airport relating to the prevention and management of known contamination, and to continue to work with DCCEEW for future developments that may be referred for your advice under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*.

The approved Master Plan is required to be published within 50 business days of my approval.

Yours sincerely

Catherine King MP

6 / 3 /2023

Hobart Airport 2022 Master Plan

Supplementary Report

Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd

Reference: P505274

Revision: 0

16 December 2022



Pages 2 – 20 deleted

Outside scope of request

Section 22(1)(a)(ii)

Appendix B

Copy of written submissions during public comment period

Feedback on Preliminary Draft Hobart Airport Masterplan 2022

s47F

31 October 2022

Notes:

- This critique follows the structure of the Draft Masterplan and the points are thus not in order of significance.
- This draft Masterplan suffers greatly from the lack of an Executive Summary, making it very hard to critique and to navigate. A lot of detail is quite hard to find and is not well cross-referenced. Many supporting references are absent altogether. These all need to be addressed, and links to references provided.
- I have not corrected typos. Quotes from the Draft Masterplan are in italics.

Section 1. Introduction

P 10. As an immediate neighbour and member of CACG I am pleased to read the final statement that HIAPL *"will continue to work closely with the community to ensure aircraft operations are carefully managed with consideration to nearby land uses."*

However, I believe that should be extended to include all operations, not just aircraft operations, ie including business operations.

P 11. *"in the region"* – HIAPL supports employment and economic prosperity across Tasmania (certainly, all of Southern Tasmania) and I think this should be explicitly stated.

It is a *"key driver"* of more than *"Tourism, freight and local business sectors"* – it impacts on other sectors such as education, health, scientific and other research and much more, including non-business operations.

The fundamental importance to the Tasmanian economy and society of getting this right needs to be more strongly emphasised and resonate through the document, in my opinion.

8 year plan for businesses along Tasman Hwy – is the time for planning access to these now, while the Tasman Hwy widening plans are still a work-in-progress?

Will your business entry come off Pittwater Rd? As drainage off the proposed widened highway into and flowing along Pittwater Rd is a significant unresolved issue, and some of this stormwater will flow into Airport land, it might be a good idea to start planning for this now. Or would access be better to come off the proposed new signalled interchange? (These are not covered in S 6 or 7)

Exactly how long a period this draft Masterplan is supposed to be covering is not clearly stated up front. Yes it is mentioned in the Foreword but it needs be explicitly stated in this section. Readers should not have to go looking for it.

Section 2. Economic Benefits

P 18 2.1 The "*study to quantify the benefits associated with direct impacts and indirect benefits of the Airport to the Tasmanian economy*" is not listed in the References. Why not? Who conducted this study, is it internal or external, when was it conducted, and is it publicly available?

Non-inclusion of this reference is a significant oversight as it is important data/justification.

Table 2.1 The indirect value-added contribution is only just over ½ the direct contribution. Typically it would be expected that a multiplier/indirect benefit ratio of 4 or 5 times that of direct benefits would apply, not half. I question whether this is correct, but without the reference, cannot say.

Tourism – where are all the extra tourists to Tasmania proposed to stay? How will this impact on Tasmania's existing housing/homelessness crisis? I realise this is outside your scope but who plans all this? DSG? If so, is HIAPL represented on the Tasmanian Development/DSG Board? You need to be permanently represented there if not already. Opening the tourism floodgates without the requisite backup facilities and infrastructure is not good planning, for anyone. It is not sufficient to view this "not our problem". At minimum a Govt plan to accommodate and cater for all these extra tourists should be referenced. Collaborative, open, long-term and overarching planning involving all parties is required.

P 19 Antarctic/Southern Oceans Research. Is a research base also planned for HIAPL, as well as the aviation operations? If so, where is this on the plans?

Other benefits – also likely understated.

2.3 Future economic contribution from "*planned development of the landside commercial and industrial precincts*". As one immediate neighbour, and having had prior discussions with HIAPL about creating a "5 Mile Beach sub-regional tourism attraction area" (for want of a better description at this point) I believe there needs to be more consultation with your immediate neighbours about this, so we can also plan, and aim towards creating something great and synergistic, and not replicate (or adversely impact on) what each other is doing, or for planning to occur in a piecemeal fashion.

This includes Mr Greg Casimaty and his team's proposals for development of his land on your western side. A strategic alliance would be a win-win-win for us all. It would not be financially beneficial for anyone to end up eg in a competitive war for tenants, duplication of consumer/business offerings or other lacks of synergies. This would also have environmental costs that would conflict with your environmental objectives in Section 11.

For example, as you already know I am creating eco-tourism facilities that include Milford Forest on your NE boundary, which would hardly be enhanced by, for example, a multi-storey DFO immediately opposite on Pittwater Rd (as a hypothetical example

affecting me, and the Milford Forest environment with its Critically Endangered and Endangered species and listed habitat).

Section 3. National Policy and Regulatory Framework

p. 23 Table 3.1

The EPBC Act 1999 also applies to your freehold land, not just to Commonwealth land, and this needs to be rectified in your Table.

3.1 Commonwealth Framework

P 24 Airports Act 1996 (d) *"Reduce potential conflicts between uses of the Airport site, and to ensure that uses of the Airport site are compatible with the areas surrounding the Airport"*.

To me this statement is very important. As one of your two principal immediate neighbours, I do not believe there is or has been adequate/meaningful consultation with us about your proposed developments (despite CACG, of which I have been a member or over 5 years – that is the wrong forum, especially for commercial-in-confidence, more localised and business-oriented discussions).

As above, I believe that it is in everyone's joint interests that our developments are complementary and enhance the overall 5 Mile Beach/Eastern Cambridge mini-region, as far as possible do not replicate or conflict with each other, and create something that is greater than a sum of its parts, which then can become an exciting and attractive destination to Tasmanians and to tourists, in itself. This is in fact a very significant opportunity for Clarence and Southern Tasmania as a whole.

This is also important environmentally (eg to reduce wastage, increase sustainability, including financial sustainability) and is also of benefit to Clarence Council and ratepayers. HIAPL has the significant development advantage of not being subject to local planning constraints etc on Commonwealth land, but in my opinion, this does not confer a 'right' to outcompete other local businesses, which pay rates and thus contribute significant finances to Clarence Municipality coffers. That to me is not being a good community citizen, as espoused in your objectives.

I would therefore like to see regular (eg quarterly) consultation with your immediate neighbours on proposed developments/planning commence mandated and be included as part of this Plan, with a view to working together cooperatively for better outcomes for all, including other stakeholders and the wider Tasmanian community.

After all, your new Mission Statement on p 11 is *"to connect communities"* and what better place to start than with your own neighbours/local community? Aim 1 (p 11) is to *"enhance (y)our role in the community"*, ditto. Be the catalyst for better local planning and cooperation too, please (which will lead to and accelerate local growth).

This also fits under purpose (a) of the S 70 of the Airports Act quoted on p 24, which is to *"establish the strategic development for efficient and economic development of the Airport over the planning period..."* (my underlining). Duplication is not efficient, for use of resources, money, planning time and headspace, or return on investment.

P 25 Where is the proposed incoming high voltage from Pittwater Road proposed to be? Will there be a new high voltage line installed down Pittwater Rd to supply this? This will potentially have environmental implications for the adjacent Milford Forest, which as you are aware contains 2 Federally listed Critically Endangered species, other Endangered Species, and the habitat is listed as Threatened at State level. It may need to be sited underground.

P 25 Environmental assessment. I would strongly suggest that you consider employing Van Diemen Consulting Pty Ltd, Envirodynamix, or another consultancy firm for future work in this area, to maintain a high standard of integrity and independence, including that of public perception.

Is the current MNES Report by North Barker publicly available? It is also not referenced in S 14, another significant oversight in this document. There are many members of the public interested in preserving the environment, and this should be handled openly in my opinion. As we know from previous experiences relating to flight paths, leaving public consultation until after decisions have been made is costly, counterproductive, is destructive to community goodwill and wastes a lot of time and energy.

3.2 State and Local Framework.

This section is admittedly just a statement of the State and Local government legal environment in which HIA operates. However, it could be much more.

Para 2 states that *"This Masterplan must demonstrate consistency with (State and local planning) provisions in accordance with S 71 of the Airports Act (and) if it is not consistent, there must be justification for such inconsistencies"*

In my experience the State LUPA Act fails to achieve its first stated objective as quoted in this Masterplan: *"to provide sound strategic planning and co-ordinated action by State and local governments"* (p 26). These are worthy aims but as we know the reality falls far short, as we have recently and are currently still observing right at the doorstep of Hobart Airport, with the planning and construction of the Hobart Airport Interchange and more recently with DSG's proposal to widen the Tasman Highway to the Airport's east (which will also impact on Pittwater Rd).

Insofar as this LUPAA objective affects Hobart Airport and this Masterplan, sadly I do not believe you can take either of these (sound planning or coordination) as givens, and it is thus poor risk management for HIA to assume so.

I therefore consider HIA needs to take a much more proactive approach to both planning and co-ordination, and demonstrate leadership and exhibit the highest level of transparency and accountability (especially to the public). You can still be consistent with the aim, but operate at a far more efficient and effective level. This is a big opportunity for Hobart Airport to excel and help improve the local planning climate by good leadership and example. Be proactive, and as mentioned on p1, if HIA is not represented on TD/DSG's Board as a first step, I believe you should be.

The third LUPAA objective quoted, concerning the environment, is almost totally meaningless: (to) *"ensure that the effects on the environment are considerate of social and economic effects when decisions are made about the use and development of the land"*. In the famous words of Pauline Hanson: "Please explain"? I sincerely hope that this statement is not guiding HIA's environmental policy, as it is a licence to overrule any

environmental impacts with social or economic considerations. Perhaps this needs to be made clear in this section of the Masterplan, and refer the reader to Section 11 on Environmental Strategy here.

Ditto the mention of the EMPC Act 1994 and the State Coastal Policy on p 26 – refer to the relevant parts of Section 11 that (hopefully) covers these.

Southern Tasmania Industrial Land Strategy – here is dated 2013, in the references 2011. Which is correct? This is relevant because in Oct 2012 a Draft for Consultation on this Strategy was published which included on p 5 an Addendum concerning 2 extra blocks of land adjacent to the Airport to the east and south which HIA presumably intends to utilise viz:

"Addendum A potential future industrial site that was only recently identified involves land at the Hobart International Airport. This land falls under the Clarence Planning Scheme, unlike most of the current uses of the airport which are on Commonwealth land. Currently these blocks are not in use, however, Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd (HIAPL) has identified that opportunities exist to utilise these blocks for aeronautical purposes in the future. These uses include: - Antarctic services; - Aircraft maintenance and hangars; - General Aviation; and - Freight and logistics.*

The land needs to be considered as part of the final industrial land strategy. likely be considered as Industrial or Particular Purpose Zone" (see [https://stors.tas.gov.au/au-7-0073-00197\\$stream](https://stors.tas.gov.au/au-7-0073-00197$stream))

This would appear to be in addition to the 105 ha of land quoted (p 26) to cater for significant industrial growth in Clarence. Such inconsistencies need to be rectified if this document is meant to inform 8 and 20 year planning.

(* it is my understanding that at least part of the eastern block is leased out, including to Monmouth Pony Club. How long are these lease(s) in place?)

P 27 – there is a map Fig 3.1 depicting the "Safeguarding Airports Overlay" but no reference to what this actually means. It would help the reader to refer to the relevant sections of this draft Masterplan that (hopefully) discusses this, eg Section 10, and any others.

P 28 Hobart City Deal 2019 <https://www.hobartcitydeal.com.au/home>

Given the broad-ranging but unspecified objectives of this City Deal quoted on p 28, again I sincerely hope that HIA is represented in this decision making and planning, particularly with regard to the increasing tourist numbers and the pressure this is putting on housing supply and affordability, as one example already mentioned that directly affects the local/Tasmanian community. It would also give HIA the opportunity to lead with proactive vision and implement tangible, meaningful outcomes.

There are also many synergies with your immediate neighbours that flow from this, which can perhaps best be explored through subsequent regular (eg quarterly) consultation.

Section 4 Land Use Plan.

P 31-32 Overview and Managing Land Use

Whatever land use internal zoning gets locked in in the final 20-year Masterplan is going to be locked in for the next 100 years, if not in perpetuity, especially when the light industrial and aviation support precincts are developed. I question whether a sufficiently long viewpoint is being taken now. The legislation may not require it, but sound planning does.

Looking at the air traffic modelling for Badgery's Creek, Hobart Airport is a long way off needing a second runway; however, it may happen, and the only place to locate it appears to me to be in a SSW to NNE direction, starting in your SW proposed light industrial precinct and ending in Milford. This raises the question of the potential need to acquire parcels of surrounding land now/within the next 20 years (ie as part of this plan) while it is still possible to do so. Once they are developed, or locked up in some way, this will be near impossible or hugely expensive.

To my knowledge almost every airport in Australia is currently trying to acquire adjacent land, often at developed rates per m2, not \$ per hectare. This future proofing could potentially be funded by the Commonwealth should existing owners regard it as too long-term an investment. The perception is that money is tight (or we might be getting airbridges?) but that is the whole point of this document – to plan ahead. If it is not explicitly stated in this plan, even as a potential objective to analyse further, then it won't happen.

4.2 and 4.3 Aeronautical development and opportunities

As your report states on p 33, "*Aeronautical development at Hobart Airport is closely linked to the economic growth of Tasmania*". While we are coming off a low base, Tasmania's economy is developing rapidly. Antarctic services will only increase too. At minimum some overt planning and risk analysis should be made explicit on this, plus some modelling of the potential benefits to GDP etc. It may 'never' happen, but not planning for it may create significant future issues.

4.4 Non-aeronautical development

I have already commented on the need to consult regularly with your immediate neighbours to the east and west (in particular myself and the Casimaty-led group, also neighbouring golf clubs) to develop synergies, create a genuine and exciting business and consumer destination, avoid duplication, wastage etc so, I won't comment further on 4.4: Tourism and Mixed-use precincts 1 and 2, and Light Industrial Precincts, except to say that I hope an effort will be made to achieve carbon neutrality in their development? (I don't see this mentioned at all, even in Section 11 on the Environment).

Are more detailed plans available for these precincts?

Also note your proposed Tourism Precinct 2 is located on a Threatened Native Vegetation Communities Zone (TNVC 2020), which I realise is degraded but should be noted. It is also immediately opposite the same Zoning in Milford Forest, species in which are also Federally listed, so potential impact on these should be taken into account now. We are currently seeing the significant and avoidable holdups caused by a planning failure with

the proposed Tasman Highway widening, now in its third year. Lost time costs money, at least to the private sector.

On your proposed Environmental Precinct to the east (p 37) the purpose of this precinct is stated *"to provide for the management, protection, and continues improvement of areas that are identified as having environmentally significant biodiversity and cultural values"*.

The wetlands to the south have environmental values and this habitat is also Federally listed. However much of this zone to the north is (to my knowledge) currently of low biodiversity and degraded, so is it planned to somehow improve this? There are no details in this document.

Again, working in conjunction with, instead of in isolation from Milford/myself would add significant value here, as Milford Forest immediately opposite this Precinct to the north is the most biodiverse parcel of land in Clarence, and probably in Southern Tasmania, and working together to eg jointly conserve this area would add significant value to both parties plus potentially free up more of your own land for revenue-generating activities (permitted under zoning rules, where applicable) whilst also achieving better conservation outcomes in the sub-region, and generating good PR. This should at least be in the plan as a topic to explore.

This section also needs to refer to Flooding under 8.2.

4.5 Non-Aeronautical development opportunities.

This section is devoid of any detail. I would expect that the short-term plans (up to 8 years) should already be underway? The next draft should include these. It's difficult to comment on generalised statements.

Section 5 Air Traffic Forecasts

I note the forecasts in 5.3 (Passenger and aircraft) and 5.4 (Busy hour forecasts) and the impact of COVID on reducing the growth rate from a previous 5.6% to a predicted 3.5% from 2023. Had modelling been done on a higher growth scenario? (eg once the extended runway is built and direct flights from Asia and NZ commence?)

As these underpin much of the rest of this Masterplan, they are extremely important. I believe this needs a lot more work.

Sections 6 Aviation Plan

6.1-6.4 Out of my area of expertise, looks ok though.

6.5 Other aviation uses.

This appears to be the first mention of helicopters. *"To meet the forecast demand, provision for helicopter operations and parking is expected to be expanded in the short term (up to 8 years)."*

However, the report does not say where. This is a significant oversight, especially given the noise pollution problems caused locally by helicopters. Are they to be relocated to the aviation support precinct to the east? Or stay where they are?

What are the projected growth rates on helicopter traffic? More information is required.

In Fig 6.5 Hobart Airport 2042 development plan (p 52) there are only 2 entrances shown into Hobart Airport. This is obviously incorrect. The Tourism/Mixed use precinct to the NE will need an entrance (presumably off Pittwater Rd?) as will the Light Industrial and Aviation Support Precincts to the south (and the Environmental Precinct, if this is to be used for recreation etc). Refer to Section 7.1

Also a second entrance off the Tasman Highway is shown via Back Road. Inspection of the current roadworks indicated that this will be cut off to eastbound traffic (ie coming from Hobart). It appears that DSG will only allow a LH entrance/exit here (ie catering for inbound traffic from the Sorell direction). This effectively leave only 1 entrance to the entire Airport area.

This is a potentially major error/oversight in this Masterplan, and in planning in general. I question if one entrance is sufficient, especially give the design (tight turning radius, poor visibility to the right when eastbound to airport etc) and thus the questionable safety and carrying capacity of the new 'dogbone' roundabout. One major accident on this new 'dogbone' roundabout, and the Airport may be effectively isolated for hours. This question of alternative access (and exit) needs looking at in your 20 year Masterplan in my opinion.

Section 7 Ground Transport Plan.

P 55 Objectives. These look fine. Meeting them however is going to be a major challenge in my opinion. Refer back to my statement about the need for HIA representation on the Board of Tas Development/State Growth (or some other high-level forum that can influence DSG's decision making in a positive way, which is not easy or fast to change). HIA is a major 'client'/stakeholder of State Roads in SE Tas, and indeed of the State Government as a whole, and the need for DSG to be functionally aware of this and working proactively with HIA is fundamental and critical.

A key statement (p 55) is "*Traffic levels... are also increasing given the growth ... and the eastern townships of Sorell and Midway Point*" (plus expected significant growth in the Southern Beaches area, not mentioned in the Masterplan). These are now all commuter suburbs and peak hour traffic at the interchange will still need to be managed relative to flight arrival and departure times, at least for the next 5+ years until DSG hopefully complete widening the Causeways and the section between HIA and the start of Causeway 1 (which I see in Section 13 is not expected until after Year 8). Traffic backing up, potentially again to the west of the HIA interchange, will likely continue for at least 3 years and possibly longer.

7.1 Existing ground transport network

External network (p 57) This mentions accesses off Pittwater Rd. They should be on the map in Fig 6.4. As no doubt you are aware, Pittwater Rd is a Clarence Council road and currently has significant lack-of-proper-drainage issues, with water pooling beside and

sometimes over the road, and flowing along the road, during and after heavy rain. (DSG claim this will not worsen after the new Pittwater Rd interchange is built, but in any case they have handballed this issue to Council.) Significant advance consultation with Council and probably DSG will be required before you construct new entrances to the precincts on this side, or before starting planning to utilise them for significant levels of traffic.

7.2 Traffic demand. A massive increase in the number of vehicles movements from current to 2030 (7 fold) and 2042 (nearly double again) is forecast. Much of this is stated to be from future commercial development, especially from 2026.

I question the assertion in 7.3 Future ground transport network that "*the planned future development of Hobart Airport is expected not to exceed the 2042 external road network*". Pittwater Rd capacity will be exceeded well before that. To and from Hobart, relying on dedicated bus lanes etc still keeps the transport problem on the roads, and funnels it towards the Tasman Bridge bottleneck, which will only worsen with the suburban development of Droughty Point etc. There is also no mention of a road from Cambridge to Brighton, especially for commuting workers and freight etc.

The concepts discussed are traffic solutions, not 'transport' solutions. Transport is more than just cars. Light rail also needs to be considered. Admittedly this is not your responsibility, but planning for an alternative to more cars (or even more buses) needs to start now.

7.5 Public and active transport. This refers to the Sorell to Hobart Corridor Plan, which is not listed in the References App 14. It needs to be, this can't be analysed properly without it.

If there are to be more frequent buses along a new bus corridor, where is the Airport bus depot/pickup/dropoff to be located? It is not shown on the Ground Transport Plans Fig 7.5 (2030) or 7.6 (2042) or listed in 7.6 Ground Transport Initiatives.

Whose responsibility is planning and funding that? I suggest that you need a person in DSG dedicated to planning HIA's future transport needs, such is the forecast increased demand (for freight transport also) and the already existing significant constraints, and the vital importance of HIA to the Tasmanian economy.

Section 8. Utilities and Services Infrastructure

8.1 Stormwater and flooding. P 65 This also drains into and impacts on the Threatened saltmarsh on Milford to the east, not just into Lower Pittwater.

Sewerage. There is an urgent and immediate need to deal with this as it is already flooding and being discharged into Sinclair Creek and thus into Lower Pittwater after major rain events, and which will only worsen as more infrastructure etc is built, both on the Airport precinct and locally.

This can't continue to be ignored (largely by TasWater) or left to after Year 8, as it also impacts on the local oyster industry, and the environment. Presumably as tenants, they

have a tenancy agreement with HIA to adhere to, which (I hope) specifies limits to discharge etc? If not this needs looking at urgently, ie Year 1.

8.2 Planned utilities and services infrastructure.

Electricity. As discussed upgrades along Pittwater Rd may need to go underground, at least at the northern end near Milford Forest.

Flooding (p 66) Given not only the potential for a sea level rise in the next 40 years, but also a rise in the water table, and potential flooding from increasing heavy rainfall events, I suggest that investigating this should happen early on in the first 8 years of this plan. Ditto sewerage, as above.

Section 9. Aircraft Noise.

I am sure you will get a lot of feedback on this so I won't add to it, except to say that as an immediate neighbour, and not under the flight path, current fixed wing aircraft noise is not a significant issue for me personally or my current businesses.

However what is an issue for me is helicopter noise. We have in the past negotiated an informal 'no fly zone' over the Milford farm and business buildings, and also 'no low flying' over Milford Forest due to the presence there of 3 semi-resident wedge-tailed eagles, but this is routinely ignored, even sometimes eg at 11 pm. If I complained every time a helicopter went over my house at low altitude, I would be your most frequent complainer. It had been agreed that instead, helicopters flew about 200 m offshore from Milford, especially when doing training circuits, but this seems to have been forgotten or is routinely ignored. I would greatly appreciate this being reinstated and formalised in this plan, please. (Obviously emergency services helicopters are exempt).

This also affects livestock, including horses, especially low-flying helicopters at night. Racehorses in particular are easily frightened and can injure themselves if they bolt and run into fences etc. Night flying helicopters should not be allowed over the neighbouring rural areas. (See 11.11 below)

It also needs to be made a lot easier for affected people to lodge noise complaints, with a link on the home page of your website. Currently it is very difficult and hard to find.

Section 10 Airport safeguarding strategy

P 79 NASG Principle 2: local Councils also need to be involved in "*sharing responsibility to ensure that airport planning is integrated with local and regional planning*".

Guideline C: Managing the Risk of Wildlife Strikes

Given the presence of 3 wedge-tailed eagles plus several pairs of white-bellied sea eagles in the immediate vicinity to HIA, could artificial intelligence be employed to monitor them, as it now being done at GoldWind wind farm at Tarraleah? Visual observation and alerts are now proving to be very inadequate by comparison.

Black cockatoos in large numbers I presume are also posing a problem, given the size of these birds, but I'm not sure what you can do about them other than remove some of the old pine trees in the south of the HIA land (their preferred food) and replace them with native vegetation.

Not sure if this also covers terrestrial wildlife eg echidnas etc on landing? Im happy to have these relocated to Milford if required.

Fog 10.2. What do these 'wildlife buffer zones' actually mean?

Guideline H: Protecting Strategically Important Helicopter Landing Sites. Where are these? They are not shown. Impossible to comment meaningfully without this information.

Guideline I: Managing Public Safety at the Ends of Runway. As much as it is lovely to have a walking and cycle path at the southern end of the runway at 7 Mile Beach, to me this area is a significant potential risk. I believe at minimum you need to install monitored security cameras there. Anyone with a rifle could easily go there and simply shoot at a plane, fly a drone or point a laser into one, if so inclined. There is no protection whatsoever, currently, and as there are 2 entrances, escape would be relatively easy.

Section 11. Environmental Strategy

Firstly, I would like to commend HIA for work done and positive outcomes already achieved in this area. I agree with the statement on p 85 that you are "*demonstrating environmental leadership*" and congratulate you on your 11.3 *Key Achievements 2015-21* on p 86.

However, 11.2 Stakeholder consultation should have included DPIPW/DNRE. DSG is not the State Government's environmental authority or source of environmental expertise.

Also the not-insignificant matter of overflow sewerage (and grey water?) in the recent and increasingly frequent significant rain events is not mentioned, and as I have already raised, needs to be addressed urgently or a lot of this hard-won credibility will evaporate when the public finds out and out the pollution that is resulting, and the impacts of that (eg algal blooms, eutrophication in Lower Pittwater, potential seabird and fish/shellfish deaths etc) Does your tenant TasWater have a CEMP? Is this monitored, and if so, by whom? Enforced? Are there penalties for breach? Imposed by whom?

11.4 Environmental management. I agree with the aim but the objectives also need to be achieved by better planning, not just eg regulation and enforcement. (eg reduction of duplication of proposed developments, already raised)

Training. This should be extended to cover basic botany, zoology, ecology and the importance of habitats. Many environmental problems could be totally avoided if more people (especially engineers, planners and field workers) had this basic understanding. This also includes in resource prioritisation on p 88.

Indigenous cultural awareness training should also be undertaken for key personnel. There are courses available.

Management systems and processes. The BA 365 system referred to is not referenced in Appendix 14 and I doubt many readers would know what this means. Ditto the Environmental Risk Register. It may well be that making the latter especially a public document would achieve better outcomes, as you could then draw on free specialist input.

Monitoring and research. There is a summary of Monitoring in Table 11.2 but no research, and none in the references. What research specifically?

As we know from recent experience, risk registers and procedures need tightening up.

Table 11.2 Overview of environmental monitoring.

There is mention of weeds, and 'fauna' under biodiversity, but none of feral animals, including cats, roosters and rabbits. Is HIA's myxomatosis/calicivirus program on permanent hold? This was very useful as it helped rabbit population control in the whole area, including Acton, and I and others in the Acton community would like to see this reinstated urgently.

Also what is being done about feral cats and roosters on HIA? It is difficult to control them on Milford if they can simply walk over Pittwater Rd from airport land to replace ones I remove. These are not in the plan either. Roosters are also a traffic hazard both on the Tasman Highway and Pittwater Rd.

11.5 Biodiversity.

I am encouraged to read "*our operations are conscious of the adjacent environmental land values*" however I question if this is being put into place especially with the immediately adjacent Milford Forest, the most biodiverse parcel of land in all Clarence. I thank HIA for your repeated commitment in endeavouring to persuade DSG to reinstate an access gate and fire/access trail to protect both this Forest and your/their assets, especially in the event of a wildfire, but I would like to see more consultation about what can be done proactively to assist. Cool burning can no longer be used as a management tool in Milford Forest due in part to the risk of smoke drift over HIA runway. Can HIA therefore assist with alternative management measures (which also help reduce wildfire risk)? At least some discussion on this would be welcome.

Note that development on HIA land immediately opposite this area will likely be subject to Commonwealth EPBC Act assessment, so better to be proactive now.

Table 11.3 To my knowledge there is no Tasmania White Gum Wet Forest on HIA land or in the near vicinity, it is DVC (dry forest).

11.4 Fauna species identified at Hobart Airport Significant omissions from this list are the Endangered wedge-tailed eagle, masked owl and white bellied sea eagle. They need to be listed here and plans need to reference them too.

11.5 Black cockatoos and grey currawongs need to be included in the Moderate risk species list.

P 91 Key potential impact

"Construction and operational activities that have the potential to impact on adjacent RAMSAR-listed wetland values". This needs to be extended to those that impact on Lower Pittwater (which is a shark and ray marine reserve) and the EPBC listed wetlands on Milford.

It also needs to include activities undertaken by your tenants (including but not limited to TasWater, as already mentioned).

P 92. The *Hobart Airport Weed Management Plan 2020-25* is not in the references and should be. How can we comment on something that is referred to but not available? For example, do you have a freesia weed problem? (which is occurring down Pittwater Rd and spreading rapidly into the important habitat of Milford Forest). Is so, can we collaborate to try to eradicate them? Pine tree weeds are another issue.

Ditto HIA's *Wildlife Hazard Management Plan* (which should be 'Hazard and Conservation' Management). Wildlife are not just hazards. They need protection too.

Table 11.6 *Condition assessment of the Commonwealth listed Saltmarsh community east of the runway* – should be conducted in the next 8 years, before planning for the development of that eastern area begins.

11.6 Land mentions *"and surrounding"* but I do not consider that I am adequately consulted as an immediate neighbour with a significant environmental land areas immediately adjacent.

Table 11.7 Strategic land actions. What do the annual tenant audits on TasWater (or others affected by excess polluted water discharge) show? (I see these are mentioned in 11.7 and Table 11.8 on p 95)

As well as monitoring PFAS in Sinclair Creek and Pittwater, you need to be monitoring nutrients, bacteria/viruses and other contaminants. Also, how are complaints treated?

Management actions: groundwater assessment. As groundwater affects me and your other immediate neighbours, this information should be shared.

11.8 Climate change

The Climate Change Adaptation Plan 2020 is not listed in the references, and there is no hotlink to view it. This is another significant oversight. I can only assume much of this is drawn from that plan, but there is no way of telling.

I would be particularly interested to see the sections on bushfires, and projected sea level and water table increases, especially if/when it affects HIA drainage into Sinclair Creek.

P 96 Reducing our carbon footprint

Ditto the Carbon Management Plan 2019, which is to *"align with the priority areas of Tasmania's Climate Change Action Plan (also not referenced nor with a link provided), and the government's agenda for action on climate change"*. I presume the latter means the State Govt, and if so, this section needs more detail, as tbh there is little current evidence that one exists, or if it does, then it is being followed.

A major deficiency in the section is offsets, especially for emissions caused by aircraft. Almost everything on-ground pales into insignificance in comparison with this. I understand it is a much broader national and international issue, but we need to start somewhere, and leadership begins right here in this plan.

I am heartened to see in Table 11.9 Strategic climate change actions *"Investigate Airport-led passenger offset program options... via QR codes.."* As part of this I would suggest looking at an incentivisation program eg with airlines, or State govt etc – even something as simple as "offset your flight and go in the draw to win a flight or Tasmanian accommodation voucher" or etc. It need not be costly but would potentially increase uptake and awareness, and be good PR. Most people won't do this unless there is something in it for them.

In my opinion, local offsets should also be considered (eg on Milford) and these would be tangible for passengers etc, not just something hypothetical that they can't see/visit. I welcome further discussion on this in the 1st phase implementation of this plan.

"Investigate actions to guide and influence airport tenants in achieving carbon reduction from their business operations" I believe the aim for new tenants, particularly for construction, should be carbon neutrality. They may not achieve it, but they should try, and HIA is in a position to demonstrate significant leadership on this.

11.9 Waste.

Again your waste reduction measures are to be commended. 'Waste miles' needs to be considered in its disposal however – how far is waste being transported? This adds to the environmental problem. Are there better alternatives? With the presumably significant quantities of waste being generated per week, could a small, clean waste-combustion electricity generator (as used eg in Denmark) be considered as part of your plan? Or alternative measures?

11.10 Cultural heritage

Table 11.11 Again working with your immediate neighbours on this (as well as Govt) needs to be undertaken, including but not limited to cultural burns. (This could be discussed at regular quarterly meetings if/when set up).

11.11. Local air quality.

"This airport is located in an urbanised area surrounded by a mix of residential, commercial, industrial and recreational areas".

This statement is incorrect, it omits rural areas (both 'rural resource' and 'rural living' zones) and needs to be corrected. This is relevant not only because one of your immediate neighbours (Milford) is a working farm, it has viticultural and horticultural activities which need to be considered in discussions on local air quality. Two neighbours are involved in sheep meat production, and several have racehorses. (Also see sections on Noise and ground water above.) Any contaminants are a potential issue.

11.12 Ground-based noise.

It should be easier for people to lodge noise complaints (also for aircraft noise, as above). Noise is not currently an issue except perhaps early morning rabbit shooting on the runway, but this needs to be monitored. No doubt noise will increase as the site develops.

11.13 Hazardous substances

Management actions. Who conducts the HIAPL environmental audits? Are these independent? Publicly available? Not specified.

They also need to be extended to cover TasWater emissions if they are not already. What contaminants are in there waste/overflow water going into Sinclair Creek/Lower Pittwater?

Section 12. Consultation Strategy

It is commendable that this process has improved since eg the previous lack of community consultation re the altered flight paths. This saves a lot of time, money and angst. However:

P 106 Additional consultation

All your significant immediate neighbours need to be consulted, not just those invited to HACAG.

P 106 Submission to the Minister. *"the Preliminary Draft Masterplan is amended accordingly"*.

I believe this process needs to be better explained and be more transparent and rigorous. Eg Who does this and decides what to incorporate or not? Will feedback such

as this be included? Is there another round of public comment, or a period to read it? (can be shorter). How are issues raised and considered valid to then be dealt with?

Section 13. Implementation Plan.

It is disconcerting to me that what is essentially the 'guts' of this Draft Masterplan starts on p 109, where I imagine a lot of people might not even find it. An Executive Summary would help this, and also referencing these tables and the actions in the preceding sections. The Actions should also be numbered for ease of reference.

Most of my comments on this section I have already covered, but I would add that I am starting to hear discontent from members of the public about:

- the piecemeal approach to the terminal upgrades, parking etc over the past few years, and the hope that this might improve;
- the lack of air bridges; and
- very recently, about the lack of consideration apparently given to the needs of long-haul aircraft when the recent works to strengthen the ends of the runway were undertaken.

Such comments are indicative of limited advance planning, and I hope this Masterplan will assist in redressing that, and take a longer-term, wider view, and at minimum recommend performing a risk analysis of the omission of analyses of post-20-year needs (eg potential second runway, more comprehensive transport solutions, meaningful, tangible passenger carbon offsets, implications of climate change, risk of terrorism/security issues etc). Expect – and plan for – the unexpected.

Overall however I consider this Preliminary Draft Masterplan to be a lot better than many others I have seen in the past (ie from other authorities). I don't see any major short-term omissions, deliberate or otherwise. It is relatively open and transparent, and community and environment as well as business focussed.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide feedback.

s47F



s47F



SUBMISSION RE HOBART AIRPORT MASTERPLAN 2022:

s47F

Personal Background:

I read with interest and with extreme apprehension your Masterplan 2022 for the next 20 years. Extreme apprehension because I currently reside under Runway 30 Flight Path and the noise and sight intrusion, along with total loss of privacy in both my front and back yards, has impacted negatively 100 % my once quiet, peaceful, country life style. Along with these stated negative impacts the value of my property has been greatly reduced due to the sky highways above my home. Not only am I directly affected by Runway 30 arrivals but also by departures and by planes tracking across my land to Dunalley. These 3 flight paths track directly to waypoint BAVUW which is directly behind my home.

The expansion you are predicting in both passenger numbers, flight numbers with increases in freight flights, Antarctic flights, international flights will drastically increase the negative impacts on my neighbours, myself, the residents of Primrose Sands, Carlton, Dodges Ferry and Forcett. Approximately **8000** residents are currently negatively affected and it appears the situation will **drastically deteriorate as Hobart Airport expands.**

INACCURATE STATEMENTS IN YOUR MASTERPLAN 2022:

Firstly I would like to state that trying to locate and read the page numbers in your Plan is a trial in itself.

I refer to the following pages:

Page 78 states:

“final design and associated airspace was completed in 2019

on the same page:

{current flight paths were designed} ***“in consultation with local communities so that they limit the noise impact to the maximum extent possible.”***

Page 77 states:

“current flight paths are in affect until 2028”

and while this last following statement on page 71 is not inaccurate, as far as I am aware, it does nothing to encourage support from the community currently affected by the unacceptable flight paths. The statement is:

“Hobart airport has not been required to develop any plans for the management of aircraft noise intrusion over existing residences.”

With Airport management issuing these statements how can you hope to obtain the support of the now negatively impacted communities? You have **thrown us to the wolves**. We are of the belief that Air Services are currently reviewing Runway 30 arrivals and yet Airport management has made the above statements. The current situation has **left the current affected communities in no man's land**. The word **coercion** comes to the foreground and it is the local communities who are suffering.

GROUND NOISE:

I am not against any form of advancing tourism and growth of a sustainable nature for Tasmania but **ground noise** is a major unacceptable consequence of this growth. There are many vacant safe corridors that Runway 30 can be transferred to so perhaps I could suggest that Airport Management unite with the community to discuss alternatives with Air Services in the hope of finding an acceptable solution for both Airport advancement and a happy community.

We are approximately **8000** residents who prior to 2017 were never overflowed and now are overflowed for **18 hours a day and longer when planes are delayed**. We have a legitimate major problem. If the current problem is not addressed your Masterplan has not mentioned the word **CURFEW**. This may, in fact, be the only solution for the community.

ADDRESS TO FORWARD SUBMISSIONS:

Nowhere in your Masterplan Preliminary Draft did I find either a postal address or an email address to forward submissions to. Maybe you were hoping this emission would deter persons, particularly current aggrieved community members, from forwarding a submission?

I would appreciate acknowledgement of receipt of this submission.

s47F

With airport management issuing these statements how can you hope to obtain the support of the now negatively impacted communities? You have thrown us to the wolves. We are of the belief that Air Services are currently reviewing Runway 30 arrivals and yet airport management states the current flight paths are finalised and in affect until 2028.

In your plan you have not mentioned the magical word "**CURFEW.**"

,

Pages 41 – 68 deleted

Outside scope of request

Section 22(1)(a)(ii)

s22(1)(a)(ii)

From: Matt Cocker s47F
Sent: Wednesday, 26 October 2022 4:36 PM
To: Erin McGoldrick; Hannah Nolan
Subject: Fwd: Congratulations

Matt Cocker

Chief Operating Officer

P: 04 s47F **E:** s47F

6 Hinkler Rd | Cambridge, Tas | 7170 www.hobartairport.com.au



Connecting Communities

Begin forwarded message:

From: Norris Carter s47F
Date: 26 October 2022 at 14:39:36 AEDT
To: Matt Cocker s47F
Subject: FW: Congratulations

Feedback on the Master Plan from TSBC

Norris Carter

Chief Executive Officer

P: 04 s47F **E:** s47F

6 Hinkler Rd | Cambridge, Tas | 7170 www.hobartairport.com.au



Connecting Communities

From: Robert Mallett s47F
Sent: Wednesday, 26 October 2022 2:00 PM
To: Norris Carter s47F
Cc: s47F



s47F

Subject: Congratulations

****External****

Attn Norris Carter
CEO Hobart Airport

Dear Norris

Congratulations on the confirmation in last night's budget announcement of the \$60 Million to complete the upgrade of the Hobart Airport runway to enable wide bodied jets. It just makes so much sense for Tasmania to have this facility.

In addition, congratulations on an exciting master plan which was presented at the Woolstore a few weeks ago. I thoroughly enjoyed the presentation and the opportunities it will bring to the small and medium business sector throughout the state.

Whilst there are plenty of detractors when it comes to the lack of airbridges, your perfect explanation of customers needing to choose affordable airfares or an expensive couple of airbridges makes perfect sense. Personally, there is nothing better than coming home and standing on the top of the stairs and taking a deep breath of pure Tassie air. In addition, we have the second lowest rainfall of any capital city in the country and so I am not sure what facility an airbridge would provide?

Once again, thank you for a masterplan that, when complete, will make every Tasmanian proud of our southern 'front door'. The TSBC looks forward to being involved in its realisation.

Regards

Robert

Robert Mallett
CEO
TSBC
GPO Box 224
Hobart Tas 7001
Ph. 03 s47F
Mob. 04 s47F
Skype: The_Front_Man



Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022
Airports Act 1996 - sections 81(2), 81(3), 81(4), 81(5)

Matters to be considered by the Minister when deciding whether to approve the Master Plan	
Acronyms	
ABC	Airport Building Controller
AES	Airport Environment Strategy
AEO	Airport Environment Officer
Airservices	Airservices Australia
ATMs	Air Traffic Movements
ANEF	Australian Noise Exposure Forecast
BITRE	Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics
CASA	Civil Aviation Safety Authority
DCCEEW	Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water
dMP	draft Master Plan
FTEs	Full-time Employment
HIAPL	Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd
MDP	Major Development Plan
Non-RPT	Non-regular Passenger Transport – includes freight, royal flying doctor service, general aviation and Antarctic flights
OLS	Obstacle Limitation Surface
PANS-OPS	Procedures for Air Navigation Services – Operations Surfaces
pdMP	preliminary draft Master Plan
the Act	<i>Airports Act 1996</i>
the department	the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts
the Minister	the Hon Catherine King MP, Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government
the Regulations	Airports Regulations 1997

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022
Airports Act 1996 - sections 81(2), 81(3), 81(4), 81(5)

Airports Act 1996 - approval of draft by Minister

81(2) The Minister must:

- (a) Approve the plan; or
- (b) Refuse to approve the plan.

NOTED

The department recommends the Minister approve the dMP.

81(3)(a) In deciding whether to approve the plan, the Minister must have regard to the following matters:

(aa) the extent to which the plan achieves the purposes of a final master plan (see subsection 70(2));

CRITERION SATISFIED

The department considers the Hobart Airport dMP achieves the purpose of a final Master Plan as set out in Section 70(2) of the *Airports Act 1996* (the Act), including to:

- establish the strategic direction for efficient and economic development over the planning period;
- provide for the development of additional uses of the Airport site;
- indicate to the public the intended uses of the Airport site;
- reduce potential conflicts between uses of the Airport site, and to ensure uses are compatible with areas surrounding the Airport;
- ensure all operations at the Airport are undertaken in accordance with relevant environmental legislation and standards;
- establish a framework for assessing compliance at the Airport with relevant environmental legislation and standards; and
- promote the continual improvement of environmental management at the Airport.

The dMP identifies current and proposed aeronautical development intentions for the planning period. The dMP adequately explains the correlation between the operational and planning objectives of the Airport and the local and state planning authorities. The dMP promotes consultation with Local and State Government on a range of matters relating to planning, environment, ground transport and collaborative approach to each of these matters.

The department considers the dMP fully achieves the purpose of a final Master Plan.

(a) the extent to which carrying out the plan would meet present and future requirements of civil aviation users of the airport, and other users of the airport, for services and facilities relating to the airport concerned;

CRITERION SATISFIED

The department considers that in implementing the dMP, the airport will meet both short-term (8 years) and future requirements (20 years) of civil aviation users and other users of the airport, for services and facilities relating to the airport.

HIAPL's assessment in the dMP of future needs of airport users is based on both the short and long term forecast growth for the airport. As identified in the table below, the number of passengers, movement of freight and other non-regular passenger transport (non-RPT) air traffic movements (ATMs) and vehicle movements is expected to nearly double by 2042.

Forecasts	FY 2015-19 (pre Covid)	20-year forecast (2042)
Passenger numbers per annum	2.7 million	5.5 million
Aircraft movements per annum	19,095	
Non-RPT ATM (Freight) per annum	660	960
Non-RPT ATM (Total) per annum	1200	3290
Employees at the Airport	1125	3500

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022
Airports Act 1996 - sections 81(2), 81(3), 81(4), 81(5)

The forecast data provided in the dMP has been used as a basis for the development of the aviation and non-aviation development plans. BITRE has confirmed the statistics presented in the dMP are close to the data it collects, and acknowledge that COVID-19 does impact the accuracy of some statistics. These forecasts demonstrate the need for additional infrastructure to meet demand and the dMP outlines the likely developments over the planning period to meet the increase in aviation demand.

Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the dMP specify HIAPL's assessment of future needs of civil aviation users of the airport, and other users of the airport, for services and facilities relating to the airport. Chapter 4 also outlines the land use plan and proposed airport development opportunities, including specific development objectives for each precinct, across the term of the Master Plan.

- **Chapter 5** provides forecasts for growth in passenger, aircraft and freight movements, and the consequent growth in traffic to and from the airport. Since the 2015 Master Plan, annual growth had an increase of 5.6% and exceeded passenger forecasts in the 2015 Master Plan.
- **Chapter 6** outlines future airside developments planned for the airport to ensure runway and associated taxiway capacity can accommodate forecast growth, including:
 - expanding the passenger terminal, improving customer experience and supporting growth of expanded domestic departures and international flights,
 - strengthening of the runway, which will ensure Code E aircraft are able to use the runway on a regular timetabled basis, and
 - expanding the taxiways and strengthening pavements to accommodate larger and more frequent aircraft movements.
- **Chapter 7** describes the ground transport initiatives needed to cater for increased travel to the Airport by passengers, employees and freight vehicles.
- **Chapter 8** outlines planned utilities and services infrastructure upgrades over the term of the Master Plan.

Chapter 2 details employment statistics currently on the airport and forecast employment numbers as a result of implementing the Master Plan.

The current employment of 1,125 full-time employees on the airport is expected to increase to 3,500 full-time employment opportunities by 2042. The airport and the airport precinct generated \$145 million to the Tasmanian economy in 2018. This is expected to increase to \$412 million in 2042. HIAPL also note that their planned aeronautical development on the runway will generate an employment of \$122 million and 1,261 FTEs over the operating life of the project.

The department notes that the dMP would benefit from inclusion of projected aircraft movements in FY2042.

The department considers the dMP adequately addresses the needs of Airport users.

- (b) the effect that carrying out the plan would be likely to have on use of land:**
- i. within the airport site concerned; and
 - ii. in areas surrounding the airport.

CRITERION SATISFIED

The department considers **Chapter 4** (Airport Land Use Plan), **Chapter 6** (Terminals and Aviation Development Plan), **Chapter 7** (Ground Transport Plan), **Chapter 8** (Utilities Infrastructure Development Plan) sufficiently outline HIAPL's plans and projections for the airport site for the planning period.

Further, land uses outlined in the dMP are consistent with off-airport land uses and with local planning policy as outlined in **Chapter 4**.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022
Airports Act 1996 - sections 81(2), 81(3), 81(4), 81(5)

The dMP sufficiently details precinct plans for the airport site and ensures land will be safeguarded for future aviation development to meet forecast demand, as well as upgrades to both the internal and external road networks. There are currently no proposed plans for non-aviation development, however HIAPL note that any developments must be consistent with State Planning regimes, and that the “Land Use Plan is consistent with the light industrial zoning adjacent to the Airport and utilises the available infrastructure.”

The Airport Environment Strategy as outlined in Chapter 11 identifies the relevant environmental aspects to be implemented, with each aspect including a group of general environmental management considerations used to manage the airport’s environmental impacts.

The department notes that, as indicated in Figures 11.2, development in Tourism/mixed use precinct 2 may impact Tasmanian white gum (*Eucalyptus viminalis*) coastal forest community and woodland, which is a vulnerable species of Flora (*Nature Conservation Act 2002*). Section 4.4 acknowledges that this precinct is located within an environmentally significant area (ESA).

Chapter 10 (Airport Safeguarding Strategy) provides HIAPL’s assessment of its interaction with the National Airport Safeguarding Framework (NASF). The department considers the assessment provided in the dMP demonstrates HIAPL’s consideration of the framework. Under Chapter 10.1, HIAPL note that under the Airports Act and Airport (Protection of Airspace) Regulations (APARs), prescribed airspace ensure that aircraft departing and arriving are not affected by high terrain, natural obstacles, or building of structures or other land use activities both on- and off-airport. Local councils which fall within Hobart Airport’s Prescribed Airspace are required to review all building and planning applications for any potential infringements on Prescribed Airspace. Under the APARs, local councils are required to refer potential ‘controlled activities’ (an intrusion into Prescribed Airspace) to Hobart Airport for assessment, which allows HIAPL the opportunity to assess proposed developments, both on-airport and off-airport to ensure there is no impacts on safe airport operations and ensure consistency with the Safeguarding of Airports Overlay under the Tasmanian Planning Scheme, and consideration to the Airports Act, APARs and NASF Guidelines.

As required by the Act, the dMP includes an Airservices Australia endorsed Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) at Appendix C.

For areas surrounding the airport, Section 10.2 outlines the flight path changes undertaken as part of a review in 2017 and implemented in 2019. In 2022, Airservices Australia outlined considerations for further improvements to noise abatement procedures and will explore these opportunities in 2023.

The department considers the dMP adequately addresses the effect carrying out the Master Plan will have on land use.

(c) the consultations undertaken in preparing the plan (including the outcome of the consultations);

CRITERION SATISFIED

Chapter 3 of the Supplementary Report contains categories of the themes raised in the comments. For each theme, HIAPL has detailed its position and what regard was had to the comment in preparing the dMP. These comments are located at section 3.3.1 ‘Consideration of Matters Raised.’ HIAPL has worked through the issues by summarising the issue, identifying where in the Master Plan it had been discussed, explaining HIAPL’s position and response to the issue, and indicating what changes, if any, were made to the dMP.

Only three public submissions were received throughout the exhibition of the pdMP; one from a local business group and two from individual community members.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022
Airports Act 1996 - sections 81(2), 81(3), 81(4), 81(5)

Consultation undertaken

As discussed in the Supplementary Report, HIAPL undertook a public consultation program to provide community and other stakeholders with information on the contents of the Master Plan.

The public exhibition period was held for 60 business days as required under the Act, from 11 August 2022 to 2 November 2022.

Consultation undertaken on the Master Plan included:

- Announcement of the pdMP at the Tourism Tasmania Business Breakfast and a presentation at the Tourism Industry Event;
- Four public information sessions with a presentation and questions & answer session, held at Hobart, Dunalley and Sorell as well as one-on-one meetings with members of the community and key stakeholders;
- Meetings with AusTrade and the Department of State Growth (Tas) to provide a briefing on and discussion of the Master Plan;
- Newspaper advertisements including the Mercury, Eastern Shore, Hobart Observer, Tasman and Sorell Newspapers;
- Informal consultation including posters at Dunalley petrol stations in response to community request; printed media, television and radio coverage;
- Distribution of the pdMP to other key stakeholders including Cambridge Aerodrome, Airlines, Hobart Airport Tenants and Tourism Tasmania as well as to local, state and federal offices; and
- Existing channels such as the airport's website, social media, as well as Hobart Airport's Community Aviation Consultation Group and Planning Coordination Forum.

Themes and issues

Whilst only three submissions were received, HIAPL addressed the issues based on chapters in the Master Plan, as comments were received with regard to **Chapters 1 to 13**.

HIAPL's responses to themes and issues

Section 2 of the Supplementary Report discusses the consultation undertaken and **Section 3** outlines the outcomes of the consultation. In subsection 3.3.1, HIAPL first addressed general comments that related to the Master Plan as a whole, and then broke down the issues in relation to each chapter.

HIAPL justified its position and response to each issue raised. This includes sound, respectful explanations where HIAPL disagreed with views expressed in the submissions. The position includes appropriate supporting information, further clarification or justification for changing or keeping sections of the draft Master Plan the same.

HIAPL provided a comment on each issue as to if/how the Master Plan has changed as a result of community feedback and where the inclusion of additional information has been added. Where reasonable, HIAPL offered solutions to the issues raised, such as a commitment to continue with engagement and consultation with adjacent landowners.

The department considers the dMP adequately articulates the consultations undertaken in the preparation of the Master Plan and the outcome of the consultations on the pdMP.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022
Airports Act 1996 - sections 81(2), 81(3), 81(4), 81(5)

(d) the views of the Civil Aviation Safety Authority and Airservices Australia, in so far as they relate to safety aspects and operational aspects of the plan.

CRITERION SATISFIED

Civil Aviation and Safety Authority (CASA)

In correspondence dated 18 January 2023, CASA notes that some of their suggestions raised during the edMP have been addressed such as the addition of a new chapter. CASA states that the runway and taxiway infrastructure are adequate for safe aircraft operation and notes that the proposed transport depot and distribution facilities will no longer be located within the airfield precinct.

Airservices

In correspondence dated 19 January 2023, Airservices acknowledged the engagement undertaken by HIAPL in the development of the dMP and noted that their previous comments on the edMP had been addressed. Airservices did not identify any significant safety or operational issues relevant to their responsibilities.

The department considers the views of CASA and Airservices do not raise any issues of significance with regard to the dMP and that the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

81(4) Subsection (3) does not, by implication, limit the matters to which the Minister may have regard.

NOTED

The department notes the views of the other federal agencies, including specialist areas within the department, indicate that the dMP is of high quality and can be recommended for approval. These views are summarised below.

Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW)

In correspondence dated 20 January 2023, DCCEEW advised that the dMP's environmental management framework and associated strategy reflects legislative and regulatory requirements. DCCEEW noted they would like to see specific PFAS commitments and an updated strategy in line with their PFAS National Environmental Management Plan. The department will work with HIAPL to implement this in the final Master Plan.

Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics (BITRE)

In correspondence dated 23 December 2022, BITRE noted only minor discrepancies between their aviation statistics and those provided by HIAPL in the dMP. The dMP recognised that forecast economic and growth forecasts may not be entirely accurate due to the impacts of COVID-19 and BITRE did not raise any concerns with the content of the dMP.

Airport Building Controller (ABC)

In correspondence dated 16 January 2023, the ABCs acknowledge that generally their comments have been addressed in the dMP. One example of this is in the edMP, the ABCs noted that HIAPLs intent for additional carparking spaces may also require additional accessible carparking facilities. HIAPL have committed in the dMP that any proposed design should be reviewed by the Hobart Airport Accessibility Working Group.

The ABCs have noted that it is unclear whether full compliance with the Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2002 has been achieved at the Hobart Airport by the target date of 31 December 2022. Should the Minister approve the Master Plan, the department suggests that the Minister requests HIAPL to acknowledge their progress on this matter before publishing their final Master Plan.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022
Airports Act 1996 - sections 81(2), 81(3), 81(4), 81(5)

Airport Environment Officer (AEO)

In correspondence dated 17 January 2023, the AEO has acknowledged that her requested amendments have largely been actioned, but that the dMP requires some minor editorial amendments and clarifications prior to being published.

Airspace Protection and Safeguarding Section (the department)

The National Airports Safeguarding Framework (NASF) has been referenced in several Sections (specifically in Chapter 3.1, Chapter 9 and Chapter 10). The aim of the NASF has specifically been mentioned in Chapter 9.2 and Guideline A and the importance of land-use planning to manage the impacts of aircraft noise.

In correspondence dated 16 January 2023, the department's Airspace Protection and Safeguarding team noted that following recent consultation with the airport, they had no further comments regarding the Airspace and NASF content of the Master Plan.

Infrastructure Investment Division (the department)

In correspondence dated 17 January 2023, Infrastructure Investment Division confirmed they had no comments on the dMP.

Surface Transport Policy Division (the department)

In correspondence dated 11 January 2023, the department's Surface Transport Policy Division noted the dMP demonstrates a comprehensive review of the Airport's relationship with freight movements both within the airport itself and its surrounds. It was also noted the dMP appropriately considered the Airport's changing infrastructure needs in areas such as traffic, roads, environment, utilities and services.

Airport Branch's Noise Section (the department)

In correspondence dated 6 January 2023, the Airport Branch's Noise Section noted that draft Master Plan meets the content requirements in relation to noise management under the Act.

Australian Federal Police (AFP) and the Australian Border Force (ABF)

The Australian Border Force had no comments on the dMP but suggested some editorial changes for consistency. The AFP noted that there is nothing which would cause any issues to AFP operations at Hobart Airport.

The department considers the views of agencies do not raise any issues of significance with regard to the dMP and do not prevent its approval.

81(5) If the Minister neither approves, nor refuses to approve, the plan before the end of:

- (a) The period of 50 business days after the day on which the Minister received the draft plan; or**
 - (b) A longer period (of no more than an extra 10 business days) that the Minister specifies in a written notice to the airport-lessee company;**
- the Minister is taken, at the end of that period, to have approved the plan under subsection (2).**

NOTED

The Minister has until Thursday 9 March 2023 to decide to approve or refuse to approve the dMP. If the Minister has not made a decision by this date, the dMP is deemed to be approved.

The department recommends the dMP be approved.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

Matters considered by the Airport-Lessee Company when developing their Master Plan**Acronyms**

AEPRs	Airports (Environment Protection) Regulations 1997 (Cth)
AES	Airport Environment Strategy
Airservices	Airservices Australia
ANEF	Australian Noise Exposure Forecast
BITRE	Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics
CASA	Civil Aviation Safety Authority
DCCEEW	Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water
dMP	draft Master Plan
HIAPL	Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd
MDP	Major Development Plan
OLS	Obstacle Limitation Surface
PANS-OPS	Procedures for Air Navigation Services – Operations Surfaces
pdMP	preliminary draft Master Plan
the Act	<i>Airports Act 1996</i>
the department	the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts
the Minister	the Hon Catherine King MP, Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government
the Regulations	Airports Regulations 1997

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

Airports Act 1996 - contents of draft or final master plan**71(2) In the case of an airport other than a joint-user airport, a draft or final master plan must specify:****(a) the airport-lessee company's development objectives for the airport; and****CRITERION SATISFIED**

The dMP states HIAPL's objective for the next 20 years in section 1.1 is to guide future development and "to connect communities, provide a uniquely Tasmanian experience for its visitors and continue to grow as an economic hub." HIAPL's vision is to continue to be a key driver of "tourism, freight and local business sectors as well as the increasingly important Antarctic research sector."

HIAPL also outlines here their significant development objectives over the life of the Master Plan. Table 1.1 outlines the objectives, which are to:

- enhance their role in the community,
- sustainably grow air connectivity,
- facilitate Antarctic and cargo services,
- enhance customer experience, and
- diversify property business.

These objectives are detailed further in the respective chapters and development concept plans.

The department considers HIAPL has adequately stated and addressed its development objectives for the airport.

(b) the airport-lessee company's assessment of future needs of civil aviation users of the airport, and other users of the airport, for services and facilities relating to the airport; and**CRITERION SATISFIED**

Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the dMP specify HIAPL's assessment of future needs of civil aviation users of the airport, and other users of the airport, for services and facilities relating to the airport. Chapter 4 also outlines the land use plan and proposed airport development opportunities, including specific development objectives for each precinct, across the term of the Master Plan.

- Chapter 5 provides forecasts for growth in passenger, aircraft and freight movements, and the consequent growth in traffic to and from the airport. Since the 2015 Master Plan, the number of airport passengers increased by 5.6%, which exceeded passenger forecasts in the 2015 Master Plan by approximately 100,000 passengers. Both pre and post covid-19 (covid) forecasts are provided for annual passenger movements at Figure 5.1 (pre-covid) and Figure 5.4 (post-covid). Only post-covid forecasts have been provided for freight movements (Figure 5.5).
 - BITRE note that some growth forecasts in Chapter 5 may be inaccurate for a few years due to the effects of covid with regard to statistics. It is noted that inaccuracies identified between HIAPL's forecasts and BITRE data are minimal.
- Chapter 6 outlines future airside developments planned for the airport to ensure runway and associated taxiway capacity can accommodate forecast growth, including:
 - expanding the passenger terminal, improving customer experience and supporting growth of expanded domestic departures and international flights,
 - strengthening of the runway, which will ensure Code E aircraft are able to use the runway on a regular timetabled basis, and
 - expanding the taxiways and strengthening pavements to accommodate larger and more frequent aircraft movements.
- Chapter 7 describes the ground transport initiatives needed to cater for increased travel to the airport by passengers, employees and freight vehicles. This is inclusive of a joint-Commonwealth funded external road project to create dual-lanes along the Tasman Highway as well as improvements and upgrades to existing internal roads across the longer-term of the Master Plan.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

- **Chapter 8** outlines planned utilities and services infrastructure upgrades over the term of the Master Plan, including providing upgraded/new provisional water supplies and sewer mains to precincts to accommodate developments.

The Master Plan's role is to present a high-level vision of the development of aviation infrastructure over the 8- and 20-year planning horizon, as well as for the long-term. The forecasts provided in the dMP demonstrate the need for additional infrastructure to meet demand, which HIAPL has responded to with current and proposed developments over the planning period.

The department considers the dMP adequately addresses the future needs of civil aviation and other users of the airport.

- (c) the airport-lessee company's intentions for land use and related development of the airport site, where the uses and developments embrace airside, landside, surface access and land planning/zoning aspects; and**

CRITERION SATISFIED

HIAPL articulates its development objectives and intentions for the development of the airport site across airside, landside and surface access in chapters 4, 6 and 7 of the dMP.

The information included provides a sufficient level of certainty to aviation and commercial customers about the land-use plans for aviation and non-aviation facilities in chapter 4, and aviation and ground transport development plans in chapters 6 and 7. All of these chapters outline the intentions of the airport for current and future development. This will enable future major airport developments to achieve consistency with the dMP, which is a requirement for Major Development Plans under the Act.

The abovementioned chapters are summarised below:

- **Chapter 4** sets out land use plans for Hobart Airport, and provides an overview of HIAPL's development opportunities for the 8- and 20- year planning periods at Table 4.1 (aeronautical development) and Table 4.2 (non-aeronautical development).
 - This includes a breakdown of the two landside 'mixed-use' precincts and proposals for non-aviation development, primarily for commercial developments such as visitor accommodation, tourism and entertainment facilities, retail, commercial and business development.
- **Chapter 4** includes a breakdown of each precinct and describes their uses and roles within the airport site. Permissible future uses for the precincts are outlined in Appendix D.
 - **Chapter 4** overview acknowledges the airport's adoption of the Tasmanian planning scheme where appropriate.
- **Chapter 6** outlines the airport's terminal and aviation development plans. This section outlines plans for expansion of the existing terminal, including expanded domestic departures, international processing facilities for Code C and Code E aircraft, expanded baggage handling services and enhanced security to support domestic passenger forecasts.
 - It is noted that a Major Development Plan to expand the existing terminal was submitted and approved in 2019 and is under review for potential design changes due to covid impacts on airport operations.
 - **Section 6.4** discusses airfield development to support passenger forecast growth, including taxiway extension, airfield strengthening for Code E Aircraft, additional parking bays and expansion of the freight apron.
- **Chapter 7** details the ground transport plan for the airport site. This section contains detailed analysis of current and future usage and HIAPL's plans to manage peak-period traffic congestion. This will include strengthening the internal road network and improving efficient access to the airport from external road networks.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

- **Section 7.3** provides an assessment of the external and internal road networks and plans to address identified issues and improve the network. **Table 7.1** outlines short- and long-term transport initiatives to the road network while **Figures 7.5** and **7.6** demonstrate the 8- and 20- year network plans.

The department considers the dMP adequately articulates the airport's intentions for land-use on the airport site.

(d) an Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (in accordance with regulations, if any, made for the purpose of this paragraph) for the areas surrounding the airport; and

CRITERION SATISFIED

Chapter 9 of the dMP focuses on Aircraft Noise. **Section 9.1** defines the noise systems used in the dMP, namely the ANEI, ANEC and ANEF, and also mentions AS2021-2015 for compatible land uses near airports.

Section 9.2 details the NASF principles (specifically NASF Guideline A – Managing the Impacts of Aircraft Noise) along with N-Contours.

For the purposes of 71(2)(d), the dMP specifies a long-term scenario (20-year period) Ultimate Capacity ANEF. International aircraft movements have also been considered as part of the ANEF scenario. An endorsed ANEF is provided at **Figure 9.5** on page 74 of the dMP.

While stating that a comparison of the existing 2015 ANEF and the 2022 ANEF is at **Figure 9.6**, this appears to be the N60 day corridor map.

The dMP states that the key differences between the existing and new ANEF are changes in flight paths and forecasts along with changes to modelling software used by Airservices Australia.

The department considers the ANEF made for the purposes of this paragraph meets the requirements of this criterion.

(da) flight paths (in accordance with regulations, if any, made for the purpose of this paragraph) at the airport; and

CRITERION SATISFIED

The dMP provides flight tracks for departures and arrivals for fixed wing aircraft on pages 72 and 73.

Section 10.2 outlines the flight path changes undertaken as part of a review in 2017 and implemented in 2019. In 2022 Airservices Australia outlined considerations for further improvements to noise abatement procedures and will explore these opportunities in 2023. The opportunities to further develop and improve flight paths and instrument procedures following local community feedback includes:

- moving the Runway 30 Required Navigation Performance Authorisation Required procedure 2-3km to the east,
- moving the Runway 30 arrivals over the east coast (over water), and
- implementing improved departures and arrival procedures for the New Zealand route.

Section 10.3 outlines the advances to flight path efficiency due to Performance Based Navigation (PBN). PBN can reduce carbon emissions by allowing the most efficient landing and take-off approaches. Required Navigation Performance to both Runway 12 and 30 allows for route design that reduces noise, reduces carbon emissions and allows for more reliable landings. Standard Instrument Arrivals and Standard Instrument Departures were designed in consultation with local communities to limit the impact of noise to the maximum extent possible.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

The department considers the dMP adequately addresses the requirements of this criterion.

- (e) the airport-lessee company's plans, developed following consultations with airlines that use the airport and local government bodies in the vicinity of the airport, for managing aircraft noise intrusion in areas forecast to be subject to exposure above the significant ANEF levels; and

CRITERION SATISFIED

Section 10 of the dMP references the use of airport safeguarding strategies for land use planning decisions to minimise noise-sensitive developments near the airport and improve aircraft noise disclosure mechanisms. There is reference to the *Australian standard 2021-2015 Acoustics: Aircraft Noise Intrusion – Building Siting and Construction* and Guideline A: Measures for Managing Impacts of Aircraft Noise in Sections 9.1 and 9.2 (page 70).

The *Building Acceptability* table outlining what is 'acceptable', 'conditionally acceptable' and 'unacceptable' for ANEF contours was included on page 123.

Due to the location of residential zoning around the airport, there are no residential areas subject to or planned for, with exposure above significant ANEF levels.

Section 12 of the dMP lists the bodies that HIAPL has consulted with through the 2022 Master Plan process. This includes airlines and local government bodies in the vicinity of the airport.

HIAPL continues to advocate for the community with Airservices to find viable alternate flight path options.

The department considers the dMP adequately addresses the ALC's plans for the management of aircraft noise intrusion.

- (f) the airport-lessee company's assessment of environmental issues that might reasonably be expected to be associated with implementation of the plan; and

CRITERION SATISFIED

Chapter 11 of the dMP specifies HIAPL's assessment of environmental issues that might reasonably be expected to be associated with implementation of the plan. Corresponding management actions are listed against risk of impacts. Further potential issues that might arise during development are discussed in Section 4.4.

Section 4.4 states that the tourism and mixed-use precinct 2 is located within an environmentally significant area (ESA). According to HIAPL's ESA mapping at Figure 11.2, development in precinct 2 may impact Tasmanian white gum (*Eucalyptus viminalis*) coastal forest community and woodland, which is a vulnerable species of Flora (*Nature Conservation Act 2002*).

Overall, the 2022 draft Airport Environment Strategy (dAES) identifies the relevant environmental aspects to be implemented with each aspect including a group of general environmental management considerations used to manage the airport's environmental impacts.

The department considers the dMP adequately addresses the requirement to assess environmental issues that might reasonably be expected to be associated with implementation of the plan.

- (g) the airport-lessee company's plans for dealing with the environmental issues mentioned in paragraph (f) (including plans for ameliorating or preventing environmental impacts); and

CRITERION SATISFIED

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

Section 4.4 states that

- The tourism and mixed-use precinct 2 is located within an environmentally significant area. Any proposed development will be considered on a case-by-case basis and must demonstrate consistency with management actions that will minimise impacts on the land.

The AEO views that the draft AES relies heavily on subplans and strategies which have not been detailed or provided in the dAES. HIAPL's position is that these are internal documents. Nonetheless, these subplans and strategies are tools that underpin the management of the airport environment and HIAPL must clarify deadlines and measurable targets to illustrate compliance.

While the department supports the level of detail HIAPL has provided in the dMP, it expects close cooperation with the AEO on the development and implementation of, and compliance with, the AES. The department will engage with HIAPL to ensure the appropriate plans are drafted and accepted by the AEO and DCCEEW as appropriate.

The department considers the dMP addresses the requirements of this criterion.

(ga) in relation to the initial period (see subsection (3A)) of the master plan – a plan for a ground transport system on the landside of the airport that details:

- a road network plan; and
- the facilities for moving people (employees, passengers and other airport users) and freight at the airport; and
- the linkages between those facilities, the road network and public transport system at the airport and the road network and public transport system outside the airport; and
- the arrangements for working with the State or local authorities or other bodies responsible for the road network and the public transport system; and
- the capacity of the ground transport system at the airport to support operations and other activities at the airport; and
- the likely effect of the proposed developments in the master plan on the ground transport system and traffic flows at, and surrounding, the airport; and

CRITERION SATISFIED

HIAPL states in Chapter 7 that the objectives of the airport's 8-year Ground Transport Plan are to:

- improve ground transport access for all modes of transport,
- integrate the ground transport network with future changes to the land use precincts,
- improve safety, sustainability and prevent congestion,
- provide a range of ground transport modes and equitable access for airport users, and
- provide a network capable of meeting forecast growth in all modes of transport.

Section 7.1 specifies HIAPL's existing ground transport network, with the external network and internal networks illustrated at Figures 7.1 and 7.2. HIAPL state that, aside from temporary congestion, there are no capacity issues within their internal network and planned developments currently underway are unlikely to increase traffic capacity.

Section 7.3 specifies a plan to improve the ground transport system for both the internal and external road network. A summary of the key network changes in the short- and long- term are also provided at Table 7.1, and illustrated at Figures 7.5 and 7.6.

HIAPL states that the Tasman Highway provides primary access to the airport, however is subject to congestion and is expected to experience further traffic demand. Hobart Airport, along with the Department of State Growth (TAS) have developed the 'Tasman Highway – Sorell to Hobart Corridor Plan' which identifies solutions to improve road safety and transport needs. Part of this solution is the planned building of new interchanges between Hobart

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

and the airport to increase the efficiency of the highway. These upgrades will also include transit lanes in both directions to enable priority access for buses and improve public transport frequency.

Whilst HIAPL indicate that no currently planned airport development will increase the traffic affecting the external road network, it will continue to engage with the Department of State Growth for high priority, medium priority and long-term solutions for improving transport systems surrounding the airport.

The Master Plan demonstrates a comprehensive review of the airport's relationship with freight movements both within the airport itself, and in its surrounds. The future economic contribution of freight and the need for greater international freight capacity is evident, particularly given the anticipated commencement of direct international flights. The Master Plan considers the internal and external road demands of freight and passenger access, and outlines how these tasks can be met cooperatively. The consideration for the new freight precinct off Gruber Avenue demonstrates further consideration of the freight task and the necessary developments to support the 20-year growth horizon.

In addition, the Master Plan outlines both short- and long-term considerations for freight activities including: 'construction of a new freight apron to support freight...' and 'further establishment of the freight and logistics area'.

The Master Plan appropriately considers the airport's changing infrastructure needs and the relationships with freight in areas including: traffic, roads, environment, utilities and services.

The department considers the dMP adequately addresses the ground transport plan requirements.

(gb) in relation to the initial period (see subsection (3A)) of the master plan – detailed information on the proposed developments in the master plan that are to be used for:

- i. commercial, community, office or retail purposes; or
- ii. for any other purpose that is not related to airport services; and

CRITERION SATISFIED

HIAPL do not have any proposed developments that meet the above criteria; both current developments are aeronautical in nature (Terminal Expansion and Runway strengthening).

HIAPL do note in Section 4.1 areas zoned for non-aeronautical developments, where opportunities for development are discussed in Sections 4.4 and 4.5, with permissible land uses are also located at Appendix D, however there are no specified developments currently proposed.

Section 4.4 describes HIAPL's consideration of non-aeronautical development at Hobart Airport, where it is noted that 'future development will reflect the continued growth of Hobart Airport as well as the wider Tasmanian economy. While non-aeronautical development may capitalise on the strategic location of being close to the airport, it also leverages proximity to agricultural regions, transport routes and residential populations. A range of activities and enterprises are supported in the non-aeronautical development precincts, including business, retail, food services, professional services, community, recreation, entertainment, tourism operations and visitor accommodation.'

While no specific developments are accounted for, HIAPL has provided detail in the Master Plan that accounts for "short term" (8-year Master Plan term) and "long term" (20-year planning horizon) that presents a broad categorisation of the uses of the three non-aeronautical precincts. The department is aware that HIAPL, as a business, regularly seeks out opportunities in the market and converges on them as they arise. HIAPL is responsible for ensuring the success for potential tenants on the airport site, and its short- and long-term plans provide for a broad category of businesses to seek opportunities to be explored in more detail through other building approval processes, including through the ABC and MDP processes.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion to outline non-aviation development on the airport site at a high level.

(gc) in relation to the initial period (see subsection (3A)) of the master plan – the likely effect of the proposed developments in the master plan on:

- i. employment levels at the airport; and
- ii. the local and regional economy and community, including an analysis of how the proposed developments fit within the planning schemes for commercial and retail development in the area that is adjacent to the airport; and

CRITERION SATISFIED

As noted in the assessment of 71(2)(gb), HIAPL has not proposed any specific non-aeronautical developments, however have identified permissible land uses for each development precinct to cater for future development.

Although there are no specific developments to assess the 71(2)(gc) criteria against, the department considers these points for the relevant assessment criteria as follows:

- i. HIAPL states in Section 1.1, Hobart Airport and its tenants generated 639 direct full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs and 487 indirect jobs. By 2042, it is expected jobs on the airport precinct will increase to 3,500 direct and indirect FTE jobs.
 - a. Table 2.1 outlines economic contribution and employment at Hobart Airport prior to covid (FY2018).
 - b. Figure 2.2 shows estimated employment creation to FY2040.
 - c. BITRE note that some growth forecasts in Chapter 2 may be inaccurate for a few years due to the effects of covid with regard to statistics. It is noted that inaccuracies identified are minimal.
- ii. HIAPL states in Sections 2.2 and 3.2:
 - In 2018, Hobart Airport contributed \$145 million to the Tasmanian economy. This is expected to increase to \$412 million by 2042.
 - There are no proposed developments at this stage that will impact State planning schemes, however HIAPL note that the Master Plan considers and is consistent with the Tasmanian Planning Scheme, inclusive of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, the *Greater Hobart Act 2019*, the *Hobart City Deal (2019)*, *Tasmanian Planning Scheme (2021)* and the *Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy (2010-2035)*.
 - The Hobart City Deal shares a vision between the Commonwealth, Hobart Airport and Local Governments (Clarence, Glenorchy, Hobart and Kinsborough) about the opportunity to enhance Hobart Airport as an international gateway, particularly for the Antarctic.

The department considers the dMP adequately addresses the requirements for employment figures and how the land uses fit within the planning schemes of the areas adjacent to the airport.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

(h) in relation to the initial period (see subsection (3A)) of the master plan--an environment strategy that details:

- i. the airport-lessee company's objectives for the environmental management of the airport; and

Regulation 5.02B(2) of the Airports Regulations 1997 (the Regulations) states that in specifying its objectives for the airport under subparagraph 71(2)(h)(i) of the Act, an airport -lessee company, must address its policies and targets for:

- (a) continuous improvement in the environmental consequences of activities at the airport; and
- (b) progressive reduction in extant pollution at the airport; and
- (c) development and adoption of a comprehensive environmental management system for the airport that maintains consistency with relevant Australian and international standards; and
- (d) identification, and conservation, by the airport-lessee company and other operators of undertakings at the airport, of objects and matters at the airport that have natural, indigenous or heritage value; and
- (e) involvement of the local community and airport users in development of any future strategy; and
- (f) dissemination of the strategy to sub-lessees, licensees, other airport users and the local community.

CRITERIA SATISFIED

The department, supported by the AEO, views that the criteria under this subregulation have been broadly addressed. This view is also informed by the level of changes HIAPL have made since the AEO submitted their comments on the edMP and during a pre-draft submission meeting, which are not a legislated process.

However, should the Minister decide to approve the dMP, the department will engage with the airport to encourage them to work closely with the AEO on the finalisation and delivery of the environment strategy.

Specific feedback from the AEO included the following in relation to addressing the requirements of Airports Regulations 5.02B:

- The AEO is satisfied that the draft AES objectives were properly articulated.
- The AEO commends HIAPL on the integration of their feedback. Improvements have been made since the provision of the edMP/AES and the pre-dMP/AES. Specific examples include:
 - Text has been updated throughout the dMP as requested; timeframes have been more clearly defined (short term is identified as 1-2 years, long term is identified as 3-5 years);
 - Table 11.7 now includes the target to "Develop site management plans for the retired landfill sites to incorporate findings from the Preliminary Site Investigation to guide ongoing monitoring and site security".

Recommendations from the AEO to be expected of HIAPL include:

- Minor editorial amendments throughout the Master Plan.
- Amendment to 11.3 to ensure consistency with AEPR Regulation 1.06.
- Additional clarification in Tables 11.9 and 11.10 to demonstrate outcomes.
- Additional text included under incident management and environmental reporting on at Chapter 11.3 to clarify incident reporting triggers in accordance with AEPR 6.04 and 6.05.

DCCEEW state that a number of Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) protected under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (the EPBC Act) have been identified as potentially occurring at or nearby Hobart Airport, creating potential impacts on MNES.

Both the AEO and DCCEEW expect to be provided with the various strategies and management plans to ensure compliance with the AES, relevant national standards and EPBC Act commitments.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

The department considers these issues to be resolved through the iterative and ongoing work between the AEO and HIAPL.

The department considers that the dMP satisfies the requirements of these criteria.

- ii. the areas (if any) within the airport site which the airport-lessee company, in consultation with State and Federal conservation bodies, identifies as environmentally significant; and
- Regulation 5.02B(3) of the Regulations states that in specifying under subparagraph 71(2)(h)(ii) of the Act, the areas within the airport site it identifies as environmentally significant an airport-lessee company must address:
- (a) any relevant recommendation of the Australian Heritage Council; and
 - (b) any relevant recommendation of the Department of Environment regarding biota, habitat, heritage or similar matters; and
 - (c) any relevant recommendation of a body established in the State in which the airport is located, having responsibilities in relation to conservation of biota, habitat, heritage or similar matters.

CRITERIA SATISFIED

The department notes that in section 11.2 and 11.9, HIAPL have commenced engagement with Reconciliation Tasmania and developed their 'Reflect Reconciliation Action Plan,' alongside their Cultural Heritage Management and Action Plan.

No changes have been made to the management and/or extent of the ESAs since the 2015 Hobart Airport Master Plan and are shown at Figure 11.4. HIAPL note that it has identified flora and vegetation communities that have high biodiversity and/or conservation values, identified in consultation with Tasmanian and Commonwealth conservation bodies.

On climate change, HIAPL note that it has developed a Carbon Management Plan (2019) to align with the Tasmanian Government's Climate Change Action Plan. This was expanded in 2022 to the Integrated Carbon Management Plan and aligns with the Airports Council International and the Airport Carbon Accreditation program (ACA), for which Hobart Airport achieved accreditation level 2 in 2019. HIAPL have a targeted goal of accreditation level 4 in the long-term (3-5 years). This requires ongoing engagement with stakeholders to reduce emissions and engagement will be conducted (at minimum) annually (see Table 11.9).

On PFAS, the department notes that HIAPL's engagement with federal and state agencies regarding PFAS management is an ongoing and collaborative piece of work. The nature of this work is ongoing and is a main focus for federal and state environment agencies. The department notes that this will continue through the life of this Master Plan.

DCCEEW noted in its assessment that the dMP addresses a number of matters raised during the edMP process. Specific matters yet to be addressed in the dMP include:

- noting the potential impacts for MNES that may occur during construction, operation and management activities at the airport,
- making a clear commitment to meeting obligations under the EPBC Act, including referral and permit requirements,
- ongoing engagement with DCCEEW to ensure that the EPBC Act processes are followed regarding the critically endangered Tasmanian Forests and Woodlands dominated by Black Gum or Brookers Gum,
- committing to conduct investigations of contamination and
- including a specific commitment to minimising or preventing stormwater and wastewater that is contaminated above guideline values from being discharged from the airport into sensitive receiving environments such as Barilla Bay and Pitt Water.

The department notes that DCCEEW's advice includes some editorial amendments, which the department will work with HIAPL to implement in the final Master Plan.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

The department considers the abovementioned environmental issues will be resolved through ongoing work between DCCEEW, relevant state agencies and HIAPL.

The department considers that the dMP satisfies the requirements of these criteria.

iii. the sources of environmental impact associated with airport operations; and

Regulation 5.02B(4) of the Regulations states that in specifying the sources of environmental impact under subparagraph 71(2)(h)(iii) of the Act, an airport-lessee company must address:

- (a) the quality of air at the airport site, and in so much of the regional airshed as is reasonably likely to be affected by airport activities; and
- (b) water quality, including potentially affected groundwater, estuarine waters and marine waters; and
- (c) soil quality, including that of land known to be already contaminated; and
- (d) release, into the air, of substances that deplete stratospheric ozone; and
- (e) generation, and handling, of hazardous waste and any other kind of waste; and
- (f) usage of natural resources (whether renewable or non-renewable); and
- (g) usage of energy the production of which generates emissions of gases known as 'greenhouse gases'; and
- (h) generation of noise.

CRITERIA SATISFIED

Chapter 11 identifies one of HIAPL's goals is to 'minimise our environmental impact.' While no specific development opportunities are proposed; Section 4.4 states that the tourism and mixed-use precinct 2 is located within an environmentally significant area (ESA). According to HIAPL's ESA mapping at Figure 11.2, development in precinct 2 may impact Tasmanian white gum (*Eucalyptus viminalis*) coastal forest community and woodland, which is a vulnerable species of Flora (*Nature Conservation Act 2002*).

With regard to specific subsections:

- Section 11.10 specifies that HIAPL have regard to the *Airport (Environmental Protection) Regulations 1997* for air quality within the airport boundary, and the *Tasmanian Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994* with respect to air quality outside of the airport boundary. Airport activities with the potential to impact air quality are listed and air quality targets to avoid and reduce these impacts are shown at Table 11.2
- Section 11.6 outlines that surface water quality monitoring is undertaken twice-yearly and ground-water is tested annually. Known areas of contamination are shown at Figure 11.3.
- PFAS testing is undertaken at key groundwater and surface water monitoring sites.
- Tier 1 tenants with the potential to impact water quality are required to undertake regular ground and surface water sampling. Collection of samples are provided for analysis to an accredited laboratory where necessary. Tenants are supported by HIAPL to ensure compliance with regulations.
- Section 11.5 discusses land, with known areas of contamination are shown at Figure 11.3, including known PFAS and landfill sites. In the short-term (1-2 years), HIAPL have identified that it is proposing to undertake investigations to identify, revise and improve management of contaminated areas, including development of site management plans.
- Refrigerants and air conditioning are the only identified ozone depleting airport activities outlined to have a potential impact on air quality, however ozone-depleting substances are also monitored annually as part of Hobart Airport's air quality monitoring.
- Section 11.8 discusses waste management at the airport, whilst section 11.12 discusses management of Hazardous Materials.
 - In Section 11.8, HIAPL note that majority of its waste comes from the terminal building, including quarantine waste, and is buried in landfill in accordance with Tasmanian requirements. Since 2017, Hobart Airport have successfully diverted 25% of waste from landfill to raise awareness of best practice waste management through the Tasmanian Governments' 'Rethink Waste' initiative. In the

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

short-term (1-2 years) HIAPL intend to engage with contractors and tenants to identify opportunities to reduce land and water waste, such as the implementation of a waste tracking register.

- Storage for PFAS waste materials is discussed in section 11.12 and will be assessed on a case-by-case basis, dependent on factors such as contamination concentration, type and length of storage and quantity in accordance with the relevant regulations and legislation in Figure 11.1.
- Section 11.7 shows HIAPLs consideration of natural resources. In Table 11.39, HIAPL identify that it will “develop an Energy Strategy in the short-term (1 - 2 years) that will describe existing capacity, existing demand (including EV) as well as options, costs and benefits of expansion into renewables such as solar, and LV network upgrades.”
- This section also outlines their approach to greenhouse gases, which are reported in line with the International Greenhouse Gas protocol accounting standards. An inventory of greenhouse gases is maintained by the airport annually.
- Section 11.11 discusses ground-based noise from a number of sources on the airport, including road traffic, tenant activity, maintenance activity and ground running of aircraft. HIAPL have committed to annual noise quality assessments and to monitor complaints about ground-based noise levels, while noting that most noise issues relate to aircraft in the air.

The department considers these issues to be resolved through the iterative and ongoing work between the AEO and HIAPL.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of these criteria.

- iv. the studies, reviews and monitoring to be carried out by the airport-lessee company in connection with the environmental impact associated with airport operations; and

Regulation 5.02B(5) of the Regulations states that in specifying under subparagraph 71(2)(h)(iv) of the Act, the studies, reviews and monitoring that it plans to carry out, an airport-lessee company must address:

- (a) the matters mentioned in subregulation 5.02A(2) [any areas identified as sites of indigenous significance] and subregulation 5.02B(3) [any areas identified as environmentally significant] and 5.02B(4) [the sources of environmental impact]; and
- (b) the scope, identified by the airport-lessee company, for conservation of objects and matters at the airport that have natural, indigenous or heritage value; and
- (c) the approaches and measures identified by airport-lessee company as its preferred conservation approaches and measures; and
- (d) the professional qualifications that must be held by a person engaged in carrying out the monitoring; and
- (e) the proposed systems of testing, measuring and sampling to be carried out for possible, or suspected, pollution or excessive noise; and
- (f) the proposed frequency of routine reporting of monitoring results to the airport environment officer (if any) for the airport, or to the Secretary.

CRITERIA SATISFIED

The department notes the dMP sets out the requirements of these subregulations as follows:

- a) Environmentally significant areas are outlined in sections 4.4, 11.4, 11.5, 11.9 and Figure 11.4. The airport has two recognised historical sites shown at Figure 11.5. Chapter 11.9 states that the airside land contains a number of Indigenous heritage sites, artefacts and artefact scatters. Cultural heritage values are managed in accordance with relevant Commonwealth and Tasmanian legislation listed in Figure 11.1 as well as Hobart Airport Management Plans.
 - a. All relevant studies, reviews, ongoing monitoring and management plans for ESAs (biodiversity and cultural heritage) are appropriately identified in these sections and are a continuation from the 2015 AES.
- b) HIAPL continue to engage with Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania, prior to any development work in areas of previously recorded heritage value. Any works proposed to be undertaken on an ESA or threatened

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

ecological community must first undergo an assessment of potential impacts as required by the AEPRs. The scope for conservation objects and matters is appropriate.

- c) The approaches and measures identified by HIAPL as its preferred conservation approaches and measures are appropriate and recommendations to explain measures identified have been considered by HIAPL.
 - a. For example, Chapter 11.10 now identifies that “Implementation of measures to reduce our carbon footprint demonstrated through adherence to Hobart Airport’s Integrated Carbon Management Plan.”
- d) Qualifications are discussed in Chapter 11.3, with responsibilities and training further shown at Table 11.1. The AEO notes that this section provides for ‘project specific training’ only, and generally omits professional qualifications held by personnel undertaking monitoring.
- e) Sections 11.5, 11.6 and Table 11.2 identify that monitoring will be carried out and reference the AEPR broadly, with monitoring for various aspects to be carried out (annually or ongoing). Sampling is mentioned in relation to section 11.6 with respect to Tenant Water monitoring.
- a) Table 11.2 identifies routine reporting as required under the AEPRs. Section 11.3 further states “Under the AEPR, HIAPL as the airport-lessee company is required to prepare and submit an Annual Environment Report (AER) to the Commonwealth via the Airport Environment Officer. The AER reports on the environmental performance of the airport on an annual basis.”

The department considers that the dMP addresses the requirements of these criteria.

- b) the time frames for completion of those studies and reviews and for reporting on that monitoring; and

CRITERION SATISFIED

Table 11.2 outline HIAPL’s ongoing environmental monitoring program undertaken in accordance with the Environment Strategy, which details the environmental aspect, monitoring type and frequency of monitoring.

The AEO acknowledges improvements in timeframes, which have been more clearly defined (short term is identified as 1-2 years, long term is identified as 3-5 years). A number of timeframes were identified as “ongoing”. While these specifically measurable timeframes for reporting would provide extra clarity, they are largely regulatory in nature.

The AEO has recommended improvements to clarify outcomes, particularly in Tables 11.9 and 11.10.

The department considers that the dMP addresses the requirements of this criterion.

- c) the specific measures to be carried out by the airport-lessee company for the purposes of preventing, controlling or reducing the environmental impact associated with airport operations; and

Regulation 5.02B(6) of the Regulations states that in specifying under subparagraph 71(2)(h)(vi) of the Act, the measures that it plans to carry out for the purposes of preventing, controlling or reducing environmental impact, an airport-lessee company must address:

- (a) the matters mentioned in sub-regulations 5.02B(2) to (4); and
- (b) the means by which it proposes to achieve the cooperation of other operators of undertakings at the airport in carrying out those plans.

CRITERIA SATISFIED

Chapter 11 details the action plans for achieving the targets under identified environmental aspects.

- Table 11.6 for biodiversity and conservation management and targets
- Table 11.7 for land targets and ongoing management
- Table 11.8 for Water targets and ongoing management

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

- Table 11.9 for Climate Change targets and ongoing management
- Table 11.10 for Waste targets and ongoing management
- Table 11.11 for Cultural Heritage targets and ongoing management
- Table 11.12 for Air Quality targets and ongoing management
- Table 11.13 for Ground-based noise targets and ongoing management
- Table 11.14 for Hazardous materials targets and ongoing management

The department considers that the dMP satisfies the requirements of these criteria.

d) the time frames for completion of those specific measures; and

CRITERION SATISFIED

Timeframes have been clearly defined (short term is identified as 1-2 years, long term is identified as 3-5 years).

Each action plan contains timeframes for which the action will be conducted/completed. The department notes that the time frames are appropriately high level for a Master Plan and allow flexibility to use further subplans and strategies to add further detail. Nonetheless, the department anticipates HIAPL and the AEO will continue to work together closely on developing and embedding timeframes.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

e) details of the consultations undertaken in preparing the strategy (including the outcome of the consultations); and

CRITERION SATISFIED

Table 12.2 outlines consultation activities undertaken with key stakeholders in the development of the Environment Strategy. These stakeholders included Commonwealth, State and local government level officials.

Chapter 11.5 demonstrates the outcomes of consultation with Tasmanian and Commonwealth conservation bodies, with ESA's mapped at Figure 11.4, and flora and vegetation communities identified at Tables 11.4 and 11.5.

The department considers that the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

f) Any other matters that are prescribed in the regulations; and

Regulation 5.02A(2) states the environment strategy must specify any areas within the airport site to which the strategy applies that the airport-lessee company for the airport has identified as being a site of indigenous significance, following consultation with:

- (a) any relevant indigenous communities and organisations; and
- (b) any relevant Commonwealth or State body; and

Regulation 5.02A(3) states the environment strategy must specify the airport lessee company's strategy for environmental management of areas of the airport site that are, or could be, used for a purpose that is not connected with airport operations; and

Regulation 5.02A(4) states the environment strategy must specify:

- (a) the training necessary for appropriate environment management by persons, or classes of persons, employed on the airport site by the airport-lessee company or by other major employers; and
- (b) the training programs, of which the airport-lessee company is aware, that it considers would meet the training needs of a person mentioned in paragraph (a); and

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

Regulation 5.02B(7) states an airport-lessee company, in specifying the company's strategy for environmental management under subregulation 5.02A(3), must address the matters in subregulations 5.02B(2) - (6).

CRITERIA SATISFIED

With relation to the criteria under regulation 5.02A(2), Table 12.2 prov provides a summary of the communities, organisations and government agencies consulted on the draft AES. Specific outcomes of the consultation with indigenous communities and organisations or with relevant Commonwealth or State bodies are demonstrated in section 11.9, where HIAPL, in conjunction with consultation with Reconciliation Tasmania, includes the development of their 'Reflect Reconciliation Action Plan.'

Chapter 11.9, specifically Figures 11.4 and 11.5 identify areas of environmental and cultural heritage.

With relation to regulation 5.02A(3), Chapter 11.3 and Table 11.2 provide HIAPL's approach to environmental management overall. This section identifies the management systems and processes, including reporting of water quality, air and noise monitoring; septic and fuel tank locations and inspections; Aboriginal and European heritage site locations; flora and fauna assessments; groundwater monitoring; and contaminated land assessments.

The AEO recommends that the actions associated with targets for Decommissioning and removal of remaining underground storage tanks in Section 11.5 and Table 11.7 be more clearly linked to the AEPR requirements (Reg 6.07) for assessment of soil associated with potential for contamination resulting from faulty or removal of USTs and hydrocarbon legacy contamination.

With relation to regulation 5.02A(4) Chapter 11.3 outlines the environmental awareness and training programs across Hobart Airport. In this section, HIAPL states that it delivers project-specific training in relation to the environment, such as :

- Asbestos Awareness
- Wildlife Management
- Waste Segregation
- Noise Exposure
- Chemical Contaminants
- Weed Management

The department considers that the dMP satisfies the requirements of these criteria.

(j) Such other matters (if any) as are specified in the regulations.

Paragraphs (a) and (h) do not, by implication, limit paragraph (j).

Regulation 5.02(1) following matters are specified:

- a) any change to the OLS or PANS-OPS surfaces that is likely to result, if development proceeds in accordance with the master plan;
- b) for an area of an airport where a change of use of a kind described in subregulation 6.07(2) of the Airports (Environment Protection) Regulations 1997 is proposed:
 - i. the contents of the report of any examination of the area carried out under regulation 6.09 of those Regulations; and
 - ii. the airport-lessee company's plans for dealing with any soil pollution referred to in the report.

CRITERION SATISFIED

In relation to regulation 5.02(1)(a), there are no changes to the OLS and PANS-OPS proposed. CASA notes that the proposed transport depot and distribution facilities will no longer be located within the airfield precinct.

In relation to regulation 5.02(1)(b), Table 13.1 identifies an 8-year implementation plan for the relocation of vehicle rental to a new development precinct. The AEO notes that there is potential for legacy soil pollution associated with the operation of these facilities which has not been addressed in the dMP.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

71 (4) The regulations may provide that the objectives, assessments, proposals, forecasts and other matters covered by subsection (2) or (3) may relate to one or more of the following:

- (a) the whole of the planning period of the plan;
- (b) one or more specified periods that are included in the planning period of the plan;
- (c) subject to any specified conditions, a specified period that is no longer than the planning period of the plan.

NOTED

71 (5) The regulations may provide that, in specifying a particular objective, assessment, proposal, forecast or other matter covered by subsection (2) or (3), a draft or final master plan must address such things as are specified in the regulations.

Regulation 5.02(3) states a draft or final Master Plan must:

- a) address any obligation that has passed to the relevant airport-lessee company under subsection 22(2) of the Act or subsection 26(2) of the Transitional Act; and
- b) address any interest to which the relevant airport lease is subject under subsection 22(3) of the Act or subsection 26(3) of the Transitional Act.

CRITERION SATISFIED

Section 3.1 identifies several leases in existence prior to the lease dated 11 June 1998 that are still valid and operating; those being Airservices Facilities and Bureau of Meteorology.

HIAPL has advised the Bureau that in the future, development may affect operational equipment, however, adequate time will be provided to re-establish instruments in a new location for continuation of climatic records and will not impact aircraft operations.

Currently there are no conflicts or inconsistencies between any interests or proposals contained in the dMP.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

71(6) In specifying a particular objective or proposal covered by paragraph (2)(a), (c), (ga), (gb) or (gc), a draft or final master plan must address:

- (a) the extent (if any) of consistency with planning schemes in force under a law of the State in which the airport is located; and

CRITERION SATISFIED

HIAPL states in Section 3.2 and Chapter 4 that the "Master Plan considers and is consistent with the Tasmanian Planning Scheme which consists of State Planning Provisions and a Local Provisions Schedule."

Chapter 4 further notes that "While the Master Plan proposes non-aeronautical development to occur on land not required for aviation-related uses, there is no development proposed that is likely to conflict with surrounding land uses or the planning intent of the adjacent areas."

There are currently no proposed development projects, however permissible land uses are located at **Appendix D**. Future development in the light industrial precinct (see **Figure 4.1**) will require consistency with Clarence City Council and the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

HIAPL demonstrate due regard to these planning schemes, particularly in relation to the Terminal Expansion project (Project Mercury) and their ongoing engagement with Australian Border Services to support planned international flights and upgrades to customs, security and immigration at Hobart Airport. This ongoing engagement is further noted at Section 6.2.

Ground Transport Strategies were also identified by the City of Clarence in order to meet existing needs and future improvement. HIAPL indicate that the 2021-2031 Strategic Plan for safer and accessible pedestrian and bicycle networks are applicable to Hobart Airport and promote further discussion in Section 7.5 for future ground transport planning.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

(b) if the draft or final master plan is not consistent with those planning schemes – the justification for the inconsistencies.

NOTED

There are no noted inconsistencies.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

71(7) Subsection (6) does not, by implication, limit subsection (5).

NOTED

71(8) In developing plans referred to in paragraph (2)(e), an airport-lessee company must have regard to Australian Standard AS2021 – 2015 (“Acoustics – Aircraft noise intrusion – Building siting and construction”) as in force or existing at the time.

CRITERION SATISFIED

Sections 9.1 and 9.2 refer to the *Australian standard 2021-2015 Acoustics: Aircraft Noise Intrusion – Building Siting and Construction* and Guideline A: Measures for Managing Impacts of Aircraft Noise (page 70).

The *Building Acceptability* table outlining what is ‘acceptable’, ‘conditionally acceptable’ and ‘unacceptable’ for ANEF contours was included on page 123.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

Draft or final master plan must identify proposed sensitive developments

71A(1) A draft or final master plan must identify any proposed sensitive development in the plan.

NOTED

There are no sensitive developments planned for Hobart Airport.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

71A(2) A sensitive development is the development of, or a redevelopment that increases the capacity of, any of the following:

- (a) a residential dwelling;
- (b) a community care facility;
- (c) a pre-school;

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

- (d) a primary, secondary, tertiary or other educational institution;
- (e) a hospital.

NOTED

71A(2A) A *sensitive development* does not include the following:

- (a) an aviation educational facility;
- (b) accommodation for students studying at an aviation educational facility at the airport;
- (c) a facility with the primary purpose of providing emergency medical treatment and which does not have in-patient facilities;
- (d) a facility with the primary purpose of providing in-house training to staff of an organisation conducting operations at the airport.

NOTED

71A(3) In this section:

aviation education facility means any of the following:

- (a) a flying training school;
- (b) an aircraft maintenance training school;
- (c) a facility that provides training in relation to air traffic control;
- (d) a facility that provides training for cabin crew;
- (e) any other facility with the primary purpose of providing training in relation to aviation related activities.

Community care facility includes the following:

- (a) a facility that provides aged care within the meaning given by the *Aged Care Act 1997*
- (b) a retirement village within the meaning given by the *Social Security Act 1991*;
- (c) a facility that provides respite care within the meaning given by the *Aged Care Act 1997*.

NOTED

Planning period

72 A draft or final master plan must relate to a period of 20 years. This period is called the *planning period*.

CRITERION SATISFIED

HIAPL has provided a DMP that relates to a planning period of 20 years. This is supported in the introduction at Section 1.1 “the Master Plan presents the plan for growth to guide future development at Hobart Airport for the next 20 years,” and Section 3.1 outlines a Master Plan cycle of 8-years for Hobart Airport.

8-year and 20-year development plans are also located throughout the Master Plan at Sections 4.3, 4.5 and 7.7.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

New draft master plan to be submitted before expiry of old plan

76(1) If a final master plan (the original plan) is in force for an airport, the airport-lessee company must give the Minister, in writing, a draft master plan for the airport:

- (a) no later than:
 - i. in the case of Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport, Sydney West Airport, Melbourne (Tullamarine) Airport, Brisbane Airport or Perth Airport—5 years after the original plan came into force; or
 - ii. in the case of any other airport—8 years after the original plan came into force; or
- (b) within a longer period that the Minister specifies in a written notice to the airport-lessee company.

The planning period for the draft master plan must begin immediately after the expiry of the original plan

CRITERION SATISFIED

The dMP was submitted to the Minister on 19 December 2022.

The current Master Plan in force was approved by the then-Minister Truss on 18 December 2015.

Originally, Hobart's dMP was due to the then-Minister McCormack in December 2020; however due to complications of covid, a one-year extension was sought to submit the dMP to the Minister in December 2021.

In May 2021, HIAPL sought a further one-year extension to December 2022.

Both extensions were approved by then-Minister McCormack under s 71(6)(b).

On 28 September 2018, the *Airports Amendment Act 2018* was legislated. This changed Hobart Airport's Master Plan cycle from 5 to 8 years.

The dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

Public comment and advice to State etc.

79(1A) Before giving the Minister a draft master plan for an airport under section 75, 76 or 78, the airport-lessee company for the airport must advise, in writing, the following persons of its intention to give the Minister the draft master plan:

- (a) the Minister, of the State in which the airport is situated, with responsibility for town planning or use of land;

CRITERION SATISFIED

Appendix C to the Supplementary Report contains a copy of the notice, notifying of the release on 11 August 2022 of the pdMP for public comment and HIAPL's intention to submit a draft Master Plan to the Minister.

The ALC Written Certificate accompanying the Supplementary Report lists identifies that the notice was sent to the Hon Guy Barnett MP, Tasmanian Minister for State Development, Construction and Housing and the Hon Michael Ferguson MP, Tasmanian Minister for Planning.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

- (b) the authority of that State with responsibility for town planning or use of land;

CRITERION SATISFIED

The ALC Written Certificate accompanying the Supplementary Report lists identifies that the notice was sent to:

- Mr Kim Evans, Secretary, Department of State Growth, Tasmania

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

notifying them of the release on 11 August 2022 of the pdMP for public comment and HIAPL's intention to submit a draft Master Plan to the Minister.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

(c) each local government body with responsibility for an area surrounding the airport.

CRITERION SATISFIED

The ALC Written Certificate accompanying the Supplementary Report lists identifies that the notice was sent to:

- Mr Ian Nelson, Clarence City Council, General Manager
- Mr Kerry Vincent, Sorell City Council, Mayor of Sorell
- Ms Jacqui Allen, City of Hobart, Director, Connected City

notifying them of the release on 11 August 2022 of the pdMP for public comment and HIAPL's intention to submit a draft Master Plan to the Minister.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

79(1B) The draft plan submitted to the Minister must be accompanied by:

(a) a copy of the advice given under section (1A); and

CRITERION SATISFIED

Appendix C to the Supplementary Report contains a copy of the notice required under this paragraph.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

(b) a written certificate signed on behalf of the company listing the names of those to whom the advice was given.

CRITERION SATISFIED

A Written Certificate accompanying the Supplementary Report contains the certificate of compliance pursuant to section 79(1B) stating that the names of those to whom advice was given.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

79(1) After giving the advice under subsection (1A), but before giving the Minister the draft master plan, the company must also:

- (a) cause to be published in a newspaper circulating generally in the State in which the airport is situated, and on the airport's website, a notice:
- (i) stating that the company has prepared a preliminary version of the draft plan; and
 - (ii) stating that copies of the preliminary version will be available for inspection and purchase by members of the public during normal office hours throughout the period of 60 business days after the publication of the notice; and
 - (iii) specifying the place or places where the copies will be available for inspection and purchase; and
 - (iiia) in the case of a notice published in a newspaper—stating that copies of the preliminary version will be available free of charge to members of the public on the airport's website throughout the period of 60 business days after the publication of the notice; and
 - (iiib) in the case of a notice published in a newspaper—specifying the address of the airport's website; and
 - (iv) in any case—inviting members of the public to give written comments about the preliminary version to the company within 60 business days after the publication of the notice; and

CRITERION SATISFIED

Public notice was made in The Mercury newspaper on Wednesday 10 August 2022 and Saturday 20 August 2022 pursuant to section 79(1)(a). A copy of the notices were not provided as part of the Supplementary Report, however were provided as an addition.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

- (b) make copies of the preliminary version available for inspection and purchase by members of the public in accordance with the notice; and

CRITERION SATISFIED

Section 2.3 of the Supplementary Report notes that hard copies of the pdMP were made available for inspection at the offices of HIAPL at 6 Hinkler Road, Cambridge and Chambers and Local libraries of Clarence City, Sorell and City of Hobart.

A free electronic copy of the pdMP was and continues to be available on the airport's website at <https://hobartairport.com.au/corporate/development/master-plan/>.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

- (c) make copies of the preliminary version available free of charge to members of the public on the airport's website:
- i. in a readily accessible format that is acceptable to the Minister; and
 - ii. in accordance with the notice.

CRITERION SATISFIED

Section 2.3 of the Supplementary Report notes that an electronic copy of the pdMP was and continues to be made available on the airport's website at <https://hobartairport.com.au/corporate/development/master-plan/>. This is consistent with the newspaper notices provided.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

79(2) If members of the public (including persons covered by subsection (1A)) have given written comments about the preliminary version in accordance with the notice, the draft plan submitted to the Minister must be accompanied by:

- (a) copies of those comments; and**

CRITERION SATISFIED

Copies of the comments made by the members of the public are at **Appendix B** of the Supplementary Report.

The Department notes that HIAPL received 3 comments during public exhibition, however one of these responses has been omitted from the Supplementary report; however, the first comment under Table 3.1 'general comments' refers.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

- (b) a written certificate signed on behalf of the company:**

- i. listing the names of those members of the public; and
- ii. summarising those comments; and
- iii. demonstrating that the company has had due regard to those comments in preparing the draft plan; and
- iv. setting out such other information (if any) about those comments as is specified in the regulations.

CRITERION SATISFIED

The ALC Written Certificate accompanying the Supplementary Report notes that the requirements of this certificate are found in the Supplementary Report.

Appendix A contains the submitter details and their responses are contained at **Appendix B**. It is noted that one of these responses has been omitted from the Supplementary report; however, the first comment summarised under Table 3.1 'general comments' refers.

Chapter 3 of the Supplementary Report contains categories of the themes raised in the comments. For each theme, HIAPL has detailed its position and what regard was had to the comment in preparing the dMP. These comments are located at section 3.3.1 'Consideration of Matters Raised.'

An example of the due regard under sub-subparagraph (iii) can be found in the Supplementary Report at **Table 3.13**, where HIAPL notes that it has updated the Master Plan to reflect submitters comment 'section 12.1 has been updated to refer to section 79 of the *Airports Act* and that outlines the formal consultation activities that are required and how HIAPL has considered comments received.' Further amendments were made to the References at **Chapter 14** and at **Appendix E** – glossary of terms.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

79(3) Subsection (2) does not, by implication, limit the matters to which the company may have regard.

NOTED

Consultations

80(1) This section applies if:

- (a) an airport-lessee company gives the Minister a draft master plan under section 75, 76 or 78; and**

NOTED

Assessment – Hobart Airport draft Master Plan 2022

Airports Act 1996 - sections 71(2), 71(4), 71(5) 71(6), 71(7), 71A, 72, 76(1), 79, 80(1), 80(2)

- (b) Before the publication under section 79 of a notice about the plan, the company consulted (other than by giving an advice under subsection 79(1A)) a person covered by any of the following paragraphs:
- i. a State government;
 - ii. an authority of a State;
 - iii. a local government body;
 - iv. an airline or other user of the airport concerned;
 - v. any other person.

NOTED

80(2) The draft plan submitted to the Minister must be accompanied by a written statement signed on behalf of the company:

- (a) listing the names of the persons consulted; and
- (b) summarising the views expressed by the persons consulted.

CRITERION SATISFIED

The 'Hobart Airport 2022 Master Plan ALC Written Certificate' was provided as an accompanying document to the Supplementary Report and contains the written certificate pursuant to section 80(2) of the Act. Officials notified and consulted with are located in a table within the certificate.

Further requirements of this certificate are found in Section 3.3 of the Supplementary Report and a table summarising the communications with the public are listed at Table 2.2 and Appendix A.

The department considers the dMP satisfies the requirements of this criterion.