
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 9 March 2023 5:30 PM
To: Aviation White Paper
Subject: Feedback for White Paper

1. Hello

Question : What are you hoping to achieve with this White Paper?

Absolutely NOTHING was done with the 2009 version!!!!

Look at the mess that has been created by Airservices with the diabolic mess created with Brisbane's flight paths. Zero external and international consultants used for flight path design and they think they can have another go at fixing it in maybe 3-5 years time. BAC should have never been given approval in the first place to build a second parallel runway facing directly at the most populated suburbs in Queensland. An environmental disaster that should never be repeated but unfortunately will be with Western Sydney 24/7.

Location of our home: [REDACTED]

Flight paths affecting residence: G, H1 and H2

Altitude of planes: Arriving 1250 to 1400ft, departing 1500 to 3300ft

Destinations: All destinations except Sydney, Melbourne, Hobart, Nescastle, parts of Regional NSW, NZ, LA, Vancouver, select Pacific Islands

Elevation of Residence: 35m

Types of offending aircraft: A380s,777s,747s,350s,320s,turboprops and single engines

Construction of residence: Queenslander, tin roof timber walls

Age of home: 110years

Time owned residence: 40years

Steps taken to reduce aircraft noise inside home: Sound deadening batts front verandah ceiling, built in side verandah batts in ceiling void, 10mm thick full glass windows and sliding doors for side verandah, sound deadening batts in total ceiling void total house, sound boards reverse side of garage doors

Cost of soundproofing: Total cost of building upgrade \$130,000 proportioned amount for soundproofing plus labour - approx \$30,000

BAC contribution for impact on lifestyle: ZERO

Lifestyle: Retired spending 90% of time at home

Steps taken for aircraft noise reprieve: Runaway from home to areas not affected by aircraft noise

Health repercussions: increased blood pressure, sleep deprivation, increased sleep medication, personal GPs notified of situation and recorded on health records for myself and wife for future potential litigation or class action

Affect on Homelife: We now live with all doors and windows closed for 100% of the time with air-conditioning activated including nighttime for grey noise, home entertaining for visitors severely reduced

Outdoors lifestyle is now limited and have resorted to wearing a noise cancelling headset

Exposure to aircraft noise prior to opening of New Runway: Limited to viewing aircraft arriving in the distance over the Gateway Bridge at approx 2kms - limited intrusion of noise. Limited aircraft arrivals and impacts on the Breakfast Creek Brisbane River route.

Ambient Noise levels: Low with distant noise from traffic on Lytton road 500m away and limited local suburban traffic.

Since the opening of the new runway on 12 July 2020 our home has been subjected to both arriving and departing aircrafts (jets and turboprops). We have experienced little reduction during Covid on flight numbers because all the flights over our house were mainly intrastate, regional centres and minesite FIFOs.

Below is a list of the number of flights over inner suburbs close to the airport from opening to the beginning of November 2022. Balmoral is far exceeding all other suburbs for noise pollution flight numbers. This is totally unfair and needs to be rectified urgently.

TOTAL FLIGHTS SINCE OPENING OF NPR TO FEBRUART 2023

Balmoral: 78875

Morningside: 39,195

Tingalpa: 52,184

Nundah: 14,963

To state that we are upset by the new flight paths and their impacts on our lives is an understatement - we are absolutely furious. How could approval possibly been given for arriving and departing planes over the same beautiful Brisbane riverside suburbs? This is purely inconsiderate and un-Australian behaviour. Whoever designed these flight paths needs to be shown the exit door at ASA along with the CEO. We were led to believe that the impact would be minimal and most of the planes would be over the Bay after the new runway was built. My wife and I personally visited BAC's "Benny" the travelling caravan at Bulimba Community Centre a few months before the opening of NPR where we were categorically told by Jessica Shannon (BAC Public Affairs Manager at the time) that there would be minimal impact. Our home is aligned smack bang underneath the new runway. If an engine or part of a plane were to fall off it would land in the middle of our lounge room. We agree as a last resort after maximising use of SODPROPS 24/7 and other noise mitigation factors that noise sharing should be instigated. We alone do not want to be subjected to this narrow band of noise pollution sewer alone otherwise our once beautiful suburb on top of Balmoral hill will be virtually unliveable. We have noticed the occasionally turboprop fly the old Brisbane River route that cuts across the point of Bulimba. How about this be used considerably more often? Agree that a 13deg from centreline departure/arrival be instigated from NPR to spread the noise. It is insidious that we receive landing aircraft when the wind is from the north and as soon as it changes to southerly we receive the departing planes over exactly the same pathway - TOTALLY WRONG!

We backup the submission by BFPCA.

1. The need for **legislative and regulatory overhaul** of the *Air Services Act* 1995 to achieve true regulatory independence, eliminate actual, possible or perceived **regulatory / state capture**, a broader scope for consideration of contemporary factors (e.g., climate change, social licence to operate) that will affect future airport and flight path design and operations, rather than the current limited focus on safety, efficiency and private industry profits.
2. The need for **standard criteria** across all capital and regional airports regarding the specification and adoption of curfews, flight movement caps, and airport capacity declarations as provided for under the *Airports Act* 1996, Section 195.
3. **International best practice** and genuine community engagement processes and impact reporting by qualified, independent experts across all jurisdictions regarding planned and ongoing airport operations.
4. Stronger and **evidence-based** consideration of all issues of the impacts of aircraft noise and other pollution on mental and physical health, and the role of strong regulation to achieve net aircraft noise pollution reductions.

ASA should not be given a second chance at fixing the flight path debacle as I simply don't think that it has the internal technical expertise or technical software to tackle the problem. Ditto for Trax - after their initial draft report I thought they may have been an option then the second visit and watered down final report I think their independent thinking was severely compromised and being directed how to produce the report. How about you now engage an international company that actually has a positive reputation to design the new flight paths?

Regards

[REDACTED]