

Aviation White Paper Branch
Domestic Aviation & Reform Division
Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts
GPO Box 594
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dear Sir/Madam,

My submission addresses the following term of reference for the Aviation White Paper:

“airport development planning processes and consultation mechanisms that consider the impact and changing nature of aircraft noise and related expectations on the role of noise sharing and noise mitigation.”

My submission refers to existing Australian airports, airport expansion projects, ‘share the noise’ community consultation and Western Sydney Airport. My suggested provisions for the Aviation White Paper, as well as explanations for several of them, follow. (My suggested provisions are typed in **bold**. I have included 17 suggested provisions in total.)

1. Every take-off and landing must take place over water when an Australian airport is located on the coast. Sydney Airport, Hobart Airport, Brisbane Airport, Sunshine Coast Airport, Adelaide Airport, Darwin Airport and Broome Airport are examples of coastal airports. There must be no take-offs and landings over residential areas at these airports. There must be no landlocked international airport in Sydney such as Western Sydney Airport. In addition, there must be no freight airport in Western Sydney. Every take-off and landing would take place over Western Sydney and the Blue Mountains Heritage Area on a 24/7 basis, if Western Sydney Airport is permitted to begin operating in future. Hundreds of thousands of Western Sydney residents would be impacted by unacceptable levels of aircraft noise and pollution. Western Sydney Airport is completely unnecessary. It is simply an exercise of transferring aircraft noise and pollution from the eastern suburbs, the North Shore and inner-west suburbs such as Leichhardt and Marrickville to the Western Suburbs. In addition, Western Sydney Airport, together with the Western Sydney Aerotropolis, are providing an opportunity for greedy developers to make billions of dollars.

My first suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **Every take-off and landing should take place over water at Australian airports, which are located on the coast such as Sydney Airport. There should be no take-offs and landings over residential areas at these airports. There must be no landlocked international airport in Sydney such as Western Sydney Airport. In addition, there must be no freight airports in Western Sydney.**

2. We should be attempting to fly less as a nation due to concerns about the impact of jet exhaust and aircraft noise upon human health and the environment. Modern technology in the form of digital platforms such as ‘Skype’ and ‘Zoom,’ etc., can help us to achieve this. The adoption of digital platforms for communication for business and private use would mean fewer international and domestic flights. Fewer people would be impacted by aircraft noise and pollution, if we flew less.

My second suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **Federal Government policy should outline strategies to fly less as a nation.**

3. Air Services Australia is responsible for responding to aircraft noise complaints. Despite the fact Airservices Australia is a Federal body, it is funded by the airlines for services. Communities, which are impacted by aircraft noise have complained for decades that Airservices Australia is profoundly lacking in regard to its responses to aircraft noise complaints. There is a valid concern that Airservices Australia is beholden to the airlines, and not to communities, which are impacted by aircraft noise. In my opinion, a conflict of interest exists in relation to Airservices Australia, and the way in which it is funded.

Air Services Australia was the subject of a Senate Inquiry in 2013. See quote and link below from Hansard.

https://www.aph.gov.au/binaries/senate/committee/rrat_ctte/aircraft_noise/report/c05.pdf

“Chapter 5 Independence, governance and accountability

5.3 However, the committee heard evidence and received submissions which suggested that Airservices Australia has a partnership approach with the aviation industry. The committee was told that this partnership approach has led to the prioritisation of aviation industry requirements above those of local communities and also to a loss of community confidence in the organisation's ability to perform its functions with impartiality: ... the organisation has proved itself too beholden to the industry at the expense of the public interest in minimizing aircraft noise. A separation of powers is essential. ASA's regulatory failure on Noise Management has been so complete leading to an absolute loss of faith in the organization by its public “customers”.

“5.7 The committee heard that the funding arrangement might predispose Airservices Australia to a conflict of interest. The Sydney Airport Community Forum Inc questioned Airservices Australia's ability to effectively balance the needs of the aviation industry and local communities: ... industry has a particularly intimate, ongoing relationship with Airservices Australia which the “community” does not possess...but when the communities interests may differ from those of industry, it can put the community at a disadvantage...”

My third suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **Airservices Australia should be completely reformed, and the community should have input regarding the reforms. Furthermore, this body should be funded by the taxpayer, and not by the airline industry.**

4. A Greens Lower House Member of Federal Parliament presented an Airservices Amendment Bill to the Lower House in 2018. A Greens Upper House Member also presented the same Airservices Amendment Bill to the Upper House in the same year. The Bill sought to provide greater protections for communities, which are impacted by aircraft noise, because they are located under imposed flightpaths. It advocated an independent Aircraft Noise Ombudsman (ANO) and an independent community aviation advocate. The Coalition and Labor did not support the Bill. Thus, it remains in limbo.

A section of the summary of the Bill is quoted below:

The Bill seeks to “provide that the functions of Airservices Australia (AA) include undertaking activities to protect the human and natural environment, community amenity and residential areas from the effects of the operation and use of aircraft, and associated effects; introduce new consultation arrangements for AA and persons affected by aircraft noise...”

My fourth suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **An Airservices Amendment Bill should be passed by Federal Parliament as soon as possible. Community consultation should take place, and public hearings should be held. The Bill should give communities, which are located under imposed flight paths, complete protection from the impact of aircraft noise and pollution.**

5. The Aircraft Noise Ombudsman (ANO) currently comes under the auspices of Airservices Australia. Thus their status is not independent. Change must be sought as soon as possible. An independent community advocate must also be appointed.

My fifth suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **An independent Aircraft Noise Ombudsman should be appointed, who is fully qualified in the field. They should be independent from State and Federal Governments and political manipulation. They should not be co-employed by the aviation industry while in office. An independent community advocate should also be appointed. The community should have input regarding the appointment of both positions.**

6. My sixth suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **Every international Australian airport should have a curfew and flight cap like Sydney Airport has.**
7. The Federal Government’s ‘share the noise’ policy in relation to airports must be abolished. ‘Share the noise’ is purely a policy for ‘spreading the noise’ to additional communities. It is a destructive policy and a failure. It serves only to impose more aircraft noise misery over a greater area, and upon thousands of more people. (See paragraphs below regarding the Hills Shire and Sydney Airport.)

Several Western Sydney Local Government Areas are impacted by devastating levels of aircraft noise due to the Federal Government’s ‘share the noise’ policy, i.e. Long Term Operating Plan (LTOP). The Hills Shire, Blacktown and the Blue Mountains are examples. Flight paths were imposed over Western Sydney in the 1990’s as a consequence of the opening of the third runway at Sydney Airport in 1994. Thousands of residents, who lived in proximity to Sydney Airport, took to the streets and protested against unpredicted levels of aircraft noise when the third runway began operations. They demanded flight restrictions at Sydney Airport in the form of a curfew and flight cap. They also demanded a ‘share a noise’ policy and a second airport in Western Sydney. Every one of their demands has been granted by the Federal Parliament. Sydney Airport’s curfew was imposed in 1995. The flight

cap was imposed in 1997, and the policy of Western Sydney Airport was announced by the Coalition Government in 2013.

The Hills Shire is 32 kilometres north-west of Sydney Airport. The Coalition Government ramped up the 'share the noise' policy over the Hills Shire after it won Government in 2013. Aircraft, which take-off and land at Sydney Airport fly over the Hills Shire. Several locations in the Hills Shire are impacted. They have experienced more than 100 flyovers at low altitude a day. Altitudes are as low as 1,000 feet. The noise is devastating, and exceeds 70 dBA. Flight paths were imposed over the Hills Shire in 1997, and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was not undertaken at the time. (An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has never been undertaken.)

My seventh suggestion for the Aviation White Paper follows: **The Federal Government should abolish 'the share the noise' policy at Sydney Airport and other airports.**

8. Federal Parliament legislation has favoured the aviation - airline industry for decades, as well as associated industries like the tourism industry, over communities, which suffer the impact of aircraft noise and pollution. Federal Parliament approves policies and passes legislation, which favour the aviation – airline industry.

My eighth suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **Federal Parliament should cease approving policies and passing legislation, which favour the aviation – airline industry over the well-being and welfare of communities, which are located under imposed flight paths.**

9. Despite the fact, Federal Parliament has legislated profoundly flawed aircraft noise management policies over the decades, our political representatives have approved airport expansion projects in different States over the last ten to fifteen years. Federal Parliament has also approved the new 24/7 Western Sydney Airport.

Thousands of residents, who live in 169 suburbs in Brisbane are currently devastated by the impact of unpredicted levels of aircraft noise after the opening of the new parallel runway at Brisbane Airport in 2020. Recent newspaper articles reveal that some Brisbane residents are selling their homes unable to bear the onslaught of 24/7 aircraft noise, and that the problem still hasn't been solved 3 years later in 2023 after the opening. Furthermore, the imposition of 24/7 aircraft noise and pollution upon Western Sydney via the new Western Sydney Airport is completely unacceptable! Western Sydney residents are asking themselves, if Western Sydney Airport and its 24/7 operations will emulate the aircraft noise debacle that is currently associated with the new runway in Brisbane.

Like the new parallel runway at Brisbane Airport, the new runway at Sunshine Coast Airport is another example of a recent airport expansion project. Like Brisbane residents, Sunshine Coast residents are complaining about the impact of aircraft noise. Community protest groups have been formed on the Sunshine Coast and in Brisbane. A third runway at Melbourne Airport and a new runway at Perth Airport are in the pipeline. Gold Coast

Airport has an additional flight path (ILS) and a community protest group has been formed as a consequence of the impact of aircraft noise. (It should be noted a Western Australian Liberal Lower House MP presented an Airservices Amendment Bill to the Lower House in 2010 due to community concern about the impact of aircraft noise, which affects several Perth Electorates. Like the 2018 Airservices Amendment Bill, the 2010 Bill failed to pass through Federal Parliament.)

My ninth suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **The Federal Government should not approve the expansion of Australian airports until Federal Parliament solves the aircraft noise and pollution problem, which affects impacted communities nationally.**

10. A justified concern exists that current methods of determining the impact of aircraft noise upon communities in relation to planes flying to and from proposed runways and airports are profoundly flawed. The same applies to proposed flight paths. These methods are often referred to as 'noise metrics'. The aircraft noise assessments of 'noise metrics' are 'computer generated', and based upon averages. The 'real' noise that people hear and experience is the 'maximum' noise a 'real' plane makes as it flies overhead in 'real time'. This is known as L_{Amax}. Average noise assessments are always lower than maximum ones.

My tenth suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **Aircraft noise assessments in Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) should always be stated in terms of L_{Amax}.** (See next section on Dr Eric Ancich.)

11. Some procedures, which relate to the approval of new airport projects require investigation. In my opinion, Western Sydney Airport is one such project. Investigations into procedures, which relate to airport projects must be truly independent. It is a profound concern that the identification of the 'true' impact of aircraft noise in relation to Western Sydney Airport and its 24/7 operations is being systematically hidden/ obscured throughout the processes, which relate to the 2015/16 Environmental Impact Statements and community consultation. There is a fear that the same systematic processes will hide the true aircraft noise impact when the final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and flight paths are released later this year.

The Senate Finance and Public Administration Committees conducted an Inquiry into Western Sydney Airport in 2021. The Committee published its Report on "the planning, construction and management of the Western Sydney Airport project," on its website on the 30th of June 2022.

Dr Eric Ancich is a trained acoustical engineer, who qualified at university. He has many years' experience in the field. He lodged a submission with the Senate Committee. (See his submission on the Committee's website.) The Senate Committee's Report does not refer to the contents of Dr Ancich's submission, although he is listed as a submitter. Furthermore, two hearings were conducted in 2021, and Dr Ancich was not invited to speak.

Dr Ancich wrote the independent noise study for Western Sydney Airport. His study focuses upon the aircraft noise assessments, which were published in the 2016 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Western Sydney Airport. (See pdf, Figure 10-2-Indicative sound levels for B747 and A320 aircraft – departures and arrivals.)

Dr Ancich's study is entitled, "Assessment Of Measured Aircraft Noise Levels Under The Existing Flight Paths of Sydney Kingsford Smith Airport With Reference To Western Sydney Airport." This document challenges the noise assessments, which were published in the 2016 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Western Sydney Airport. His study suggests that aircraft noise levels would be 3 to 4 times louder over Blacktown and Blaxland respectively than the noise assessments, which are 'indicated' in the 2016 EIS, with implications for other locations in Western Sydney. **(It must be noted the Federal Government approved Western Sydney Airport and its 24/7 operations based upon the 2016 EIS).** (Dr Ancich's noise study can be found on the Blue Mountains Council website.)

Dr Ancich's independent noise study for Western Sydney Airport has profound relevance for every Australian airport. He was referred to extensively, as well as quoted in an article, which was published by the Melbourne Age on the 25th of June 2022 regarding the proposed third runway at Melbourne Airport. The article is entitled, "Melbourne Airport runway could be noisier than residents told." (Please see attachment and [LINK](#).)

Dr Ancich's submission, which he lodged with the Senate Committee, is detailed and technical. It focuses on the aircraft noise assessments in the 2016 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as well as related information, which was obtained through Freedom of Information (FOI) requests.

Dr Ancich's submission was critical to the Senate Committee's Inquiry into Western Sydney Airport. It is deeply concerning that the Senate Committee did not address the justified fear that the aircraft noise assessments in the 2016 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) are significantly understated.

Dr Ancich published his independent noise study for Western Sydney Airport in early 2019. Three documents, which have been obtained through Freedom of Information (FOI), reveal the company, which provided the aircraft noise assessments for the 2016 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Western Sydney Airport 'reviewed' Dr Ancich's study. This is common procedure. One document is dated August 2019, and two of them are dated the 31st of December 2019. The August 2019 document is entitled, "Review of the report 'Assessment of Measured Aircraft Noise Levels under the Existing Flight Paths of Sydney Kingsford Smith Airport with Reference to Western Sydney Airport', Report No. 9173 –R1, Eric, J. Ancich."

The company, which is referred to in the Paragraph above, listed several points, which criticised Dr Ancich's noise study. A fourth document, which was obtained through Freedom of Information (FOI), reveals that the company's review of Dr Ancich's study was also forwarded to the Department of Infrastructure and Air Services Australia for appraisal. It appears the Department of Infrastructure and Airservices Australia accepted the company's negative assessment of Dr Ancich's independent noise study. As noted above, Air Services Australia is a Federal body. Therefore, it is not independent. Neither is the Department of Infrastructure.

The fourth document refers to “FOWSA meeting 10 (6 December 2019).” Quotes from the document follow:

“Table of Departmental Engagement with Ancich – Carter.”

“1 May (name of company)...provided their draft response to the Ancich Report on 1 May (circulated across to the department to Airservices for review.)”

Evidence has not been found to date that an independent investigation has been conducted to assess Dr Ancich’s independent noise study as well as the company’s aircraft noise assessments, which were published in the 2016 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). In my opinion, the assessment process was flawed and unethical, if this was the case. In my view, it is unacceptable that the ‘reviews’ of the Department of Infrastructure, Airservices Australia, and the company, which provided the aircraft noise assessments for Western Sydney Airport prevailed without conducting an independent investigation.

Dr Ancich’s independent noise study for Western Sydney Airport must be assessed by a truly independent expert and panel, who are fully qualified in the field. Western Sydney residents should also have an input into the investigation. The aircraft noise assessments, which were provided by the company for the 2016 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must also undergo an independent assessment. This must be done, if it hasn’t already been undertaken.

It must be noted that the aircraft noise ‘assessments’, which are provided in the 2016 EIS are computer generated. Dr Ancich recorded his aircraft noise ‘readings’ for his independent noise study by monitoring ‘real’ planes ‘in real time’ as they flew to and from Sydney Airport. (See Paragraph above on ‘noise metrics’.)

My eleventh suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **A truly independent expert and panel, who are fully qualified in the field should conduct an investigation into procedures, which relate to a new airport project, when one is warranted. The community should have input into the investigation.** (An independent investigation should be conducted into Western Sydney Airport regarding aircraft noise assessments, which are contained in the 2016 Environmental Impact Statement and Dr Ancich’s independent noise study.)

12. As noted above, Western Sydney Airport was approved by the Federal Government in 2016. It is now 2023, and the final flight paths have still not been released. This is unacceptable. In addition, the flight paths for Western Sydney Airport are ineptly labelled ‘indicative’. (See Figure ES 9 – “Indicative flight paths for the 23 operating mode Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement” – Volume 1 Page 21.) This is also unacceptable. Approximately two and a half million Western Sydney residents still do not know if they are destined to live under Western Sydney Airport’s flight paths. They do not know if they will be impacted by 24/7 aircraft noise and pollution. One could be forgiven for having the opinion, the flight paths have not been released after all these years due to fear of a political backlash in Western Sydney State and Federal Electorates.

My twelfth suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **The final flight paths should be published in an Environmental Impact Statement(EIS) for a new runway, airport or flight path, which the Federal Government approves. The community should be**

consulted on the final flight paths before the Federal Government approves the EIS. (This process should have taken place in the case of Western Sydney Airport.)

13. The myth has circulated for decades that the Federal Government is solely responsible for airports, their expansion, modifying flight paths, instituting new ones and the impact of aircraft noise. However, State and Local Government are also responsible for what occurs at airports.

The Queensland State Government had a 12.4% shareholding in Brisbane Airport for \$289.4 million. The shareholding was sold in 2008. Maroochy Shire Council funded the construction of the first sealed runway for what is now known as Sunshine Coast Airport in 1961. The Council funded the construction of a terminal building in 1979. On the 9th of February 2017, Sunshine Coast Council, (formerly Maroochy Shire Council), leased the airport for 99 years to a private company. The Sunshine Coast Council delivered the Sunshine Coast Airport Expansion Project, which was completed in 2020.

The NSW State Government supports Western Sydney Airport and legislates for the Western Sydney Aerotropolis. A former Premier of NSW signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the air freight company, FedEx Express in 2020 with the aim of supporting trade and export of local products through Western Sydney Airport. Local Western Sydney Councils have declared their approval for Western Sydney Airport as well as the Western Sydney Aerotropolis, and are actively supporting them. Liverpool Council, Parramatta Council and the Hills Shire Council are examples.

My thirteenth suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **The three levels of Government, Federal, State and Local, should be legally responsible for the impact of aircraft noise upon communities, as well as its management. Laws should be introduced, which ensure the three levels of Government are legally bound to compensate aircraft noise impacted communities when warranted. A special court or tribunal should be set up, which makes it easier and cheaper for aircraft noise impacted individuals and communities to sue the three levels of Government.**

14. The aviation/airline industry in Australia and globally is a perpetuator of untruths/fallacies/propaganda with full government support. These fallacies are disseminated by the aviation industry and government at the expense of communities, which are located under imposed flight paths, in order to gain advantage.

A major fallacy, which is perpetuated by the aviation industry, is the claim that ‘aircraft noise only impacts communities, which are located ten kilometres from an airport.’ Western Sydney Airport and its 24/7 operations are predicated on this untruth. Media reports reveal residents who live 30 kilometres from Brisbane Airport are complaining about the impact of aircraft noise after the opening of the new parallel runway. As noted above, the Hills Shire is 32 kilometres from Sydney Airport. Its residential areas are impacted by aircraft flying at low altitude to and from the airport. The noise, which is generated by their engines is ‘excruciating’! People who live up to 80 kilometres from an airport can be impacted by aircraft noise.

A second major fallacy is the aviation industry’s claim that modern planes are much quieter. Western Sydney Airport is also predicated on this untruth. The London aircraft noise protest

group, HACAN, published an article about this fallacious claim in 2019. It was found a specific plane may be up to 3 decibels quieter, but this makes no difference to the impact of noise upon people on the ground. A quote from Hacan's 2019 press release is below:

PRESS RELEASE

26/8/19 for immediate use

LONDON CITY'S CLAIMS ABOUT QUIETER PLANES UNDERMINED BY ITS OWN FIGURES

The report (1), which has been obtained by campaign group HACAN East, was compiled by consultants Bickerdike Allen Partners for London City Airport. They measured the noise of different types of aircraft approaching the airport under the SE London concentrated arrivals path in level flight at 2000 ft over a property in Lambeth in South London.

They found that the only new generation plane currently in service – the Airbus A220-100 – was at best only 3 decibels quieter than the older planes of equivalent size still using the airport.

HACAN East chair John Stewart said, "London City's own results show that the much-vaunted new generation of aircraft are only marginally quieter than the existing aircraft. The difference is so small that it will be hardly perceptible to people on the ground."

Tim Walker, a resident of Lewisham who lives close to the arrivals flight path, said " These measurements are truly alarming for Londoners. We now know that even with new generation aircraft, if London City doubles the number of flights the noise impact under this flight path will pretty much double with them. "

My fourteenth suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **The Australian aviation/airline industry should cease making fallacious claims about aircraft noise and its impact. Government should cease supporting these fallacious claims.**

15. As noted above, Brisbane residents are outraged by the level of aircraft noise, which is generated by aircraft flying to and from Brisbane Airport after the new parallel runway began 24/7 operations in 2020. Media reports reveal that the noise was 'unanticipated', and many more suburbs have been impacted than were predicted. (One hundred and sixty-nine suburbs have been impacted.) Media reports also reveal that many Brisbane residents feel their lives will never be the same, and some of them are selling their homes.

My fifteenth suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **The operations of a new airport project should be closed down immediately when the impact of aircraft noise greatly exceeds aircraft noise assessments, which are provided in an approved EIS. New airport projects include expansion projects such as new runways and flight paths, as well as the construction of new airports. An independent investigation should be undertaken, which includes members of the impacted community. Independent investigators should be experts, who are qualified in the field. Airservices Australia, Government Departments,**

corporations, companies and individuals should be held to account, if they are found to be responsible, and the impacted community should be compensated. Stiff fines should be imposed. Additional penalties should be imposed in the case of negligence or incompetence. Companies should be deregistered, if they are found to be grossly negligent or incompetent. The operations of an airport project, where the impact of aircraft noise greatly exceeds predictions, may only recommence when the aircraft noise problem has been completely solved.

16. The Forum on Western Sydney Airport (FOWSA) makes the following statement on its website. “The Forum on Western Sydney Airport (FOWSA) links the community, the Government and WSA Co during planning and construction of Western Sydney Airport and provides a consultative forum for the exchange of information and ideas.”

FOWSA also plays a critical role in designing the flight paths for Western Sydney Airport. Its website states,

“FOWSA and the Expert Steering Group will work collaboratively to deliver an informed and community-consulted airspace and flight path design for Western Sydney International.”

FOWSA has been the subject of intense criticism since its inception in 2017. Calls have been made for its reform. FOWSA has held meetings since 2017. It generally meets 3 times a year, and only two of its meetings have been open to the public. Members of the public were not permitted to speak at the open meetings. It publishes minutes of its meetings weeks and months after they have been held.

In my opinion, like the Western Sydney Airport project, FOWSA must be terminated.

My sixteenth suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **Every process, which relates to the approval of airport expansion projects and new airports like Western Sydney Airport should be transparent, open and honest. This includes the process of community consultation.**

CONCLUSION:

My submission has addressed the term of reference below for the Aviation White Paper, and provided suggested provisions for it.

“airport development planning processes and consultation mechanisms that consider the impact and changing nature of aircraft noise and related expectations on the role of noise sharing and noise mitigation.”

Everyone in Australia has the right to enjoy the amenity of their own home. They have the right to enjoy peace and tranquillity on their own property. The aviation/airline industry does not have the right to transform residential areas throughout Australia into industrial zones, as a consequence of aircraft noise and pollution, which are generated by the engines of planes as they fly overhead.

The aftermath of the Federal Election last May delivered the stunning news that the Coalition and Labor lost three seats between them in Electorates in Brisbane where the impact of aircraft noise is

a major issue after the opening of the new parallel runway in Brisbane in 2020. I anticipate that the two major Parties will lose many more seats in future Federal and State Elections if they do not remedy the aircraft noise problem, which is affecting an increasing number of communities in every State of Australia. The political backlash will also be felt at Local Government level. Furthermore, I anticipate that the two major Parties will experience a dramatic political backlash in Western Sydney at future Elections, if they insist on permitting Western Sydney Airport to commence its 24/7 operations, and they do not abandon their 'share the noise' policy over Western Sydney.

The Aviation White Paper 2023 must be a worthwhile process, which is undertaken by the Federal Government. The process must not be an exercise 'in just going through the motions'. As far as the management of the impact of aircraft noise upon communities is concerned, The Aviation White Paper can only be a worthwhile process, if the Federal Government heeds the suggested provisions and strategies, which I have outlined in my submission, as well as the strategies of other submitters, who share my concerns about the impact of aircraft noise and pollution.

My final suggested provision for the Aviation White Paper follows: **Every Australian airport should be nationalised. They should not be owned by private enterprise.**

Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to lodge my submission regarding the Aviation White Paper 2023.

Yours Sincerely,

Yvonne Reynolds

09 – 03 - 2023

Note: I have not represented Dr Anich's opinions as to whether Western Sydney Airport is a desirable project or not in my submission. The opinions, which I have expressed about Western Sydney Airport are my own.