

Submission on Aviation Green Paper

I have made numerous submissions, attended numerous consultation sessions conducted by Air Services and BAC, and sent numerous emails to all and sundry, since the opening of the NPR in Brisbane in 2020.

It all seems to be a complete waste of time, with the whole consultation process clearly just an exercise in ticking the boxes, to give the impression of consultation, when priority is quite clearly given to airports, planes and profits, over the rights of people living under or near flight paths in Brisbane. This same approach appears to be taken with the Green Paper, which is not surprising when Minister King has dismissed noise complaints, refused to meet with us and refused to consider meaningful options.

The Green Paper says that the Australian Government is not considering imposing any additional constraints on airports such as curfews or movement caps (p83). Why is this already decided? Why aren't those options open if people want to propose them? Why do other airports have those things, but Brisbane is not even allowed to comment on them as reasonable options? How is it fair or reasonable that a privately owned airport can build a new runway aimed directly at a large city, and be allowed to send planes over suburbs many kilometres away from the airport, at all hours of the day and night? And misrepresent the position constantly (eg what percentage of flights actually go over the bay. Taking off over water and then immediately turning in a loop to go over land should not be counted as over the bay).

The Green Paper does not even identify mental health and well-being as matters that should be considered. It has already been decided that planes are more important. Most of us who object to what is happening at the moment do not oppose planes or air travel, but any changes should take into account the pre-existing rights of people affected by noise and emissions. How is it fair to wake up thousands of people every night, on multiple (and increasing) occasions by large jets flying low over our houses? Why are they allowed to fly over so low? Why are the flight paths sent across so many Brisbane suburbs and out to places like Upper Brookfield and Samford? Why should a privately owned airport have the right to set up a system where people who live nowhere near the airport are hammered by plane noise at all hours of the day and night? There is an increasing body of evidence which establishes that there will be a significant public health cost from all of this but government refuses to take those things into account. The Green Paper completely ignores these issues.

The Green Paper says that the best tool to manage aircraft noise is through effective land-use planning. Unfortunately, the NPR was approved and built on the basis of a completely flawed land-use planning process. No consideration was given to our outdoor lifestyle or our types of housing, which make the current flight paths completely unsuitable. If it had been properly done, we would not have the current noise debacle in Brisbane, so we have absolutely no confidence that any process will be "effective". If improvements can be made, why hasn't that happened already?

Even if it was being offered, which it isn't (despite it being on the table for Western Sydney – why is there a difference between them and us?) noise insulation is unlikely to make a significant improvement. There would have to be an enormous number of property acquisitions across many suburbs of Brisbane, which of course isn't viable. To make Brisbane 'liveable' again, the old cross runway should be reinstated. The original promise to send most flights over the bay should be immediately applied. Noting the responses about safety and CASA restrictions, we get back to caps and curfew. The Green Paper says that 'all three levels of government to play in mitigating the impact of aircraft noise'. Well, at the moment none of the three levels are doing anything that is even close to adequate, and Brisbane City Council and the State Government repeatedly say it's a federal issue and

nothing to do with them (despite contributing significant funds and other support). The statement that 'The Australian, state and local governments can ensure appropriate land-use planning occurs around airports to minimise residential and sensitive development close to them' is a complete joke and just a blatant disregard for what is actually happening in Brisbane.

The Green Paper says that "For aviation to continue to grow, airports, airlines and Airservices Australia must actively foster the social licence for airport and aviation activity, which will always need to be the subject of an ongoing conversation, otherwise there may be restrictions on aviation activity and growth". When there is clearly a problem NOW with BAC's social licence to operate on the existing flight paths, why aren't restrictions on aviation activity and growth being considered now? The paper acknowledges that that would be the appropriate outcome but refuses to even identify those things as options. Air Services and BAC have been found to have conducted a flawed process for the NPR, there are significant numbers of complaints about flight noise in Brisbane (despite Air Services manipulating the way in which complaints are counted, to make it appear less than there actually are), and there are serious deficiencies with the whole EIS process for the NPR. Surely those issues are worthy of mention.

The Green Paper contains questions about how to 'better manage noise'. Why are the same questions being asked in the paper that have been the subject of 3 long years of a process conducted by Air Services that has achieved NO improvements in that time? If there were ways to better manage aircraft noise or improve flight path design principles, why hasn't it been done? The answer is that BAC is only interested in as many flights and as much money as possible (which is entirely understandable) and that Air Services does not have any intention of taking any steps that might limit that in any way, despite the growing numbers of concerns raised about noise and pollution. The Green Paper should clearly identify the most realistic options of improvements are through a curfew and caps, and then a complete redesign of the NPR and flight paths by someone with the necessary expertise (ie not BAC or Airservices).

The Green Paper is a biased and preconceived document, that just reinforces the ongoing intention of government at all levels to favour and enable aviation activity and growth over the right of residents of Brisbane to peacefully enjoy their homes. This is not consultation, it is just going through the motions and ignoring the damage caused by aviation to people and the environment.