

Over 20 years ago we bought our property in the [REDACTED] and built our house after confirming that it did NOT lie under the main flight paths into Brisbane airport.

A bureaucrat in a government department which is unregulated and uncontrolled has altered that without any care or concern over the wellbeing and health of those whose lives it has altered.

My family rely on rainwater harvesting and all my potable water supply is from tank water, I grow fruit, vegetables and herbs in my gardens for human consumption and the emissions from aircraft now overflying me has put the quality and safety of these at risk. I have observed local fauna troubled by the noise of the aircraft and I am concerned that the emissions will also affect local flora.

AirServices Australia (ASA) downplay the impact of noise and pollution through various outdated studies while completely ignoring the fact that previously there was no pollution and where there is now pollution the effects of that pollution will become manifest. Large numbers of residents in the valley rely on rain water harvesting for potable water. Any pollution whatsoever will result in that water supply being compromised.

We would hear perhaps 10 aircraft per year in the almost 20 years we have lived in the valley prior to the opening of the second runway. These were occasional joy flights during the Samford show and military aircraft practising prior to Brisbane Riverfire. That number is now exceeded by 07:30 each morning at a noise and pollution level that far exceeds the prior experience.

The mere alignment changes wrought by having the second runway less than 2km from the legacy runway does not require a lateral displacement realignment some 20+km from the airport of tens of km which places the convergence point of North and West air routes over [REDACTED]. ASA contend that the air traffic routes were altered as a result of the opening of the new runway, this is at best misinformation and more correctly lies. [REDACTED] is more than 20km from the airport and the local effects of a second runway do not translate into a wholesale concentration of aircraft in this area.

I am aware that ASA and Brisbane Airport Corporation (BAC) are happy to state that the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was always in an air traffic corridor and the response to that is that the corridor they refer to then was tens of kilometres wide and not the very narrow 2 or 3 km wide corridor that is currently being used. Seemingly centred over my house. Spreading the route was one of the things that could be implemented as stated by ASA in one of their community meetings last year yet this was not done when the previous trials were undertaken.

ASA not only moved the air routes further than was warranted by any displacement between the runways they have concentrated the routes so that the corridor is now very narrow. I reiterate we had NO routine air traffic noise or pollution over the last 20 years prior to the second runway opening.

I understand that the routes are weather dependent and that affects the ability of over the bay operations to be used to mitigate air traffic impacts on the residents of Brisbane and surrounds however air traffic is virtually non-stop now that a defined narrow corridor is being used. The NS and EW corridors more or less intersect over my property or near enough such that there is no hour of the day when there is no noise from multiple aircraft passing overhead. The noise from individual aircraft has increased compared to the previous months which I might add was already an impost from a change made without consideration or concern for those who might be impacted by noise and atmospheric pollution. I note that the overhead noise in the suburbs of Indooroopilly and Taringa from aircraft is less than over my property in [REDACTED] where the aircraft are supposedly flying higher.

Since the changed routes we not only have non-stop commercial traffic we have loud and slow and low altitude Archerfield traffic as well as helicopters at any hour of the day. Despite the assurance that traffic would be routed over the bay we still get aircraft overhead up to and past midnight and a check of the BOM site shows wind speeds that would not preclude bay operations. Either BAC or ASA or both are doing very little and have shown no interest in minimising the impact of their changes. As I have previously mentioned both BAC and ASA were aware that CASA would reduce the acceptable tail wind for bay operations and yet both espoused the lie that over bay operations would increase. ASA belatedly applied to CASA for an increase in the allowable tailwind for approaching aircraft fully in the knowledge of what conditions were applied around the world, this was a sop to try and show some form of empathy to those who lives adversely impacted.

To give you some idea of the noise generated by aircraft it is enough to drown out the sound of neighbours mowing.

The most recent report and action to date by ASA and BAC fails to address three key issues:

1. Failure of ASA and BAC to comply with the EIS. Exclusion of the EIS from discussions to date only highlights the failure to comply. The EIS was a document that was condition precedent for the second runway construction and operation and failing to comply with the provisions of the EIS renders the approval null and void and the decision to operate the second runway and current flight paths CANNOT be made under law. Any private sector failing to comply with an approved EIS would have their operations terminated and fines issued.
2. The noise monitoring and assessment by ASA and BAC is not in compliance with current AS/NS requirements and as such is meaningless. The methodology averages aircraft noise as the aircraft approaches and departs over a distance of approximately 2km and does not focus on the peak sound pressure level being experienced. In addition, further averaging takes place with aircraft on similar flight paths regardless of altitude. All up this means instead of a peak noise level per aircraft there is a blurring of the impact of all aircraft to the point where the data is a nonsense.
3. ASA and BAC have failed in their duty of care to individuals and businesses impacted by the new air traffic corridors.

None of these three issues are in compliance with the relevant Australian Standards and legislation.

It has taken 2 years to get to this point and still we have more aircraft overhead in an hour than we heard in the 20 years prior to the opening of the second runway. Any changes implemented by ASA and BAC have had NO impact on the noise or pollution that we are experiencing.

ASA themselves said they could spread the traffic to minimise the impacts yet they have concentrated the aircraft over a narrower corridor. How is that reasonable?

For almost 2 years we have complained and asked questions and now ASA won't even respond to my emails because they consider that they have responded and I have to learn to live with the noise which in their view is acceptable.

The noise surveys promoted were so poorly conducted and inaccurate that not a single survey was even remotely representative of the actual impact of the changed routes and elevations. ASA didn't even bother with surveys for areas such as the [REDACTED] that to be badly impacted by direct routes.

The ombudsman for aircraft noise has no power to make any changes and at best can write a rebuke over the process but cannot redress the gross abuse of power that has been effected. This is poor and does not reflect the authority of the position of ombudsman in any other area of government.

It beggars belief that one government department has the power to make such changes to people's way of life with no governance, no control, no recourse and no ability to enter into discourse about the impact of the changes wrought.

The most recent implementation of a trial on routes has only succeeded in directing more aircraft in our vicinity, I am not sure who ASA are trying to improve the noise for but it most certainly not residents in the [REDACTED].

There is clear 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. ASA needs to be accountable and residents in affected areas must be allowed a voice to discuss issues and problems.

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. Brisbane is now going through what has occurred in other cities over past years and a standard approach is needed.

International best practice and genuine community engagement processes and impact reporting by qualified, independent experts across all jurisdictions regarding planned and ongoing airport operations.

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

Thank you.