

---

**From:** Sharon Fotheringham [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 2 March 2023 3:25 PM  
**To:** Aviation White Paper  
**Subject:** [SPAM] Submission by community member Sharon Fotheringham

Prior to September 2017 when new flight paths were forced on my community and myself without any prior notice or community consultation I have become very aware of how extremely vulnerable the community is and how this same community is held in such low regard by departments such as AirServices Australia, airports in general and even CASA.

To quote a section from your white paper "work closely with community to support complimentary goals."

In regard to the above statement my comment is that communities **MUST BE GIVEN** more consideration when changes are made to flight paths that will have drastic negative effects such as noise and sight invasion, sleep deprivation and drastic effects on mental health of residents directly under flight paths. Also greater restrictions should be placed on AirServices limiting the number of flight paths individual community members are subjected to.

Prior to September 2017 and despite the totally irrational and unacceptable definition of **NEVER PREVIOUSLY OVERFLOWN** defined by AirServices, which if challenged in a Court of Law would be overturned, and which was challenged by the Air Noise Ombudsman on behalf of the community and was ignored, I was **NEVER** overflown by a sky highway and when I purchased my property 35 years ago, and indeed up to 12 months prior to September 2017, there was no indication that my property would be overflown by a sky highway. It should be emphasised here that I am desperately trying to cope with **THREE FLIGHT PATHS** that cross directly over my home or across my property. AirService flight path principles which came into force in 2018 were not applied to Hobart flight paths and if had been applied communities would not be suffering from the indiscriminate paths we have now been forced to cope with and questionably accept.

For 18 hours a day I am trying to cope with dB readings continually above 70 and 80dB and planes invading my space from 5.30am to 10pm and as planes are usually running late up to 12midnight and later. I generally have to cope with aircraft noise for 18 hours a day.

A means of "considering the community" and achieving "complimentary goals" would be to provide the Air Noise Ombudsman with a more updated community friendly, more positive and effective **CHARTER** where some powers are granted to that office to achieve "complimentary goals" between communities and autocratic departments such as AirServices. Currently I, and I believe, all negatively affected communities by AirServices Australia wide, are of the opinion, and can prove, that the Air Noise Ombudsman is what is known as a "toothless tiger." The Government via the white paper needs to address this.

The other means of achieving all round positive results would be to provide an **ADVOCATE** to the community experienced in all matters relating to flight paths to assist the community in all the technical aspects of flight paths and their negative impacts on communities and how the negative impacts may be avoided in the future through careful planning and consideration.

In Tasmania if AirServices had done their homework with so many vacant, safe and acceptable corridors to place a flight path the flight path directly over me and the largest populated area of the Tasman Peninsula, Primrose Sands, would have been avoided. The Tasman community has been in conflict with AirServices for 6 1/2 years. This sequence is occuring Australia wide and is not creating "complimentary goals." The current policy is causing **ALIENATION**.

In future if Airport runways are upgraded or extended there needs to be extensive consultation as to the effects these changes will have on the local community. Hobart airport does not currently have a **CURFEW** and any other Australian airports in the same position should seriously consider the impact any proposed late night flights/very

early morning flights would have on the community and how these would be addressed by the community. I understand

CURFEW from an airport perspective is a rude word while from the community perspective is considered a form of PROTECTION and a means of obtaining some sort of normality.

I hope this white paper review will consider the enormous impact flight paths have on the community and the extremely negative relationship that exists Australia wide between communities and AirService Australia and how any form of future community consideration would contribute greatly to "complimentary goals."

I apologise if parts of my submission do not come within the guidelines of the paper.

Best wishes.

Sharon Fotheringham







management view point is a very dirty word while the community considers it PROTECTION that provides some sort of normality and relief from intolerable aircraft noise.

I hope my submission falls within the realms of your White Paper but if I have over stepped the boundaries then I hold the opinion that these are all facts you needed to be aware of.

Best wishes.

Sharon Fotheringham

