

Published name

DAVID EDEN

Short comment

The Green Paper should aim higher than business as usual, face up to the urgent climate change problems we face so it can be more inspirational to people shaping the aviation industry in Australia.

AVIATION GREEN PAPER SUBMISSION

The Green Paper is unambitious. A target of net zero emissions by 2050 is gutless, reluctantly agreed to by the Australian Parliament. Without sustainability, the aviation industry will continue to limp along instead of effectively fighting climate change.

The Green Paper does not even contemplate sufficient action to prevent the overwhelming consequences of climate change.

The Green Paper could have set an inspiring agenda. It could have encouraged a movement to reduce fossil fuel consumption in aviation. For example, people demanding aircraft engines quieter than those used in Boeing 707 jets lead to the development of high bypass ratio jets used nowadays. A Green Paper should (in my opinion) have realistically appreciated the global urgency of doing whatever it takes to tackle climate change and been inspirational enough to allow Australia to lead the world fighting against climate change and for sustainability. Examples of different thinking follow in the submissions below. These paragraphs are directed against the proposed operation of Western Sydney International Airport.

The Western Sydney International airport at Badgery's Creek can not be operated sustainably. It should never have been built. Our Australian and NSW Governments have wasted \$5.5 billion dollars of taxpayers money. Apart from using LED lighting and lower embodied energy and emissions concrete than conventional concrete, its design and construction have been unapologetically unsustainable. The project is a fantasy of planners dreaming of unsustainable growth. Now the same planners are asking us for feedback on aircraft noise, sleep disturbance and planning restrictions on building under flightpaths.

This is why the Western Sydney unnecessary airport should never operate -

1. Aircraft emit greenhouse gasses adding to climate change.
 2. Aircraft noise will be loud and objectionable where we live.
 3. Nighttime aircraft operations will disturb our sleep to a greater extent than estimated in supporting documentation because people living in rural areas near WSIA generally enjoy a nighttime background environmental noise level much quieter than the 8 dB(A) difference between the rural 42 dB(A) and city 50 dB(A) assigned in the National Aviation Safeguarding Framework Guideline A.
 4. The disturbance of aircraft flying at night will destroy the peaceful nature of our environment.
 5. Aircraft flying over National Parks and the Greater Blue Mountains World Heritage Area will make it even harder to enjoy a natural environment close to Sydney.
 6. Aircraft noise will disrupt our enjoyment where we live.
 7. Noise from aircraft at night will be unacceptably louder and more frequent than aircraft noise now.
- Aircraft taking off and landing at the proposed WSIA will add atmospheric carbon dioxide CO₂, making climate change even worse than it already is..

Growth in Sydney's population will not continue. People living in Sydney now have already lowered our birthrate. Politicians and planners will realise increasing our population is not sustainable. Operating another unsustainable international airport will make WSIA uneconomic from the first day it operates.

The arguments against using Western Sydney International Airport (WSIA) are

- A. Its use is unsustainable as operating WSIA will increase GreenHouse Gas (GHG) emission.
- B. Using the WSIA burns Australia's rapidly decreasing (or I argue already non-existent) carbon budget. We must not add to global warming before climate change is irreversible.

If we the taxpayers have already paid for WSIA construction [\$5.5 billion], can we get some value out of its already sunk cost? - No. We should not use WSIA because its use makes climate change worse. We did not support wasting money on unsustainable infrastructure spending. Politicians who do not yet understand the seriousness of climate change can learn from the WSIA. It was as a mistake. We should learn from mistakes - not add to them.

The WSIA may be used when, and only when, each aircraft operation (takeoff or landing) is carbon neutral. Whether a person's sleep is disturbed or not depends to an important extent on the difference in noise level before an event (the background noise) and the noise level of the intrusive event.

The measures used in Australia to assess whether people will be woken or disturbed by noise from an aircraft flyover, takeoff or landing have been derived from populations already habituated to aircraft noise. The significant difference when assessing WSIA is nearly all of the existing population to be impacted is naive to the noise of planes flying at night.

The area impacted by WSIA was, to an extent, selected because it has a low population density, is rural, is part of the Greater Blue Mountains World

Heritage Area and is largely in a natural state. It may also have been selected for political reasons because the human population is less well educated, not as wealthy, more widely distributed and less well organised than other communities (such as the Galston environment which decisively rejected the airport proposed there in 1973) considered as airport sites. The rural environment means background noise levels are quieter than in suburban areas.

Quieter background noise levels means a new noise at a given level is more likely to be disturbing. An example is this is how a country person can be woken by the (very quiet) sound of water dripping into house guttering from cloud condensing on a bedroom roof.

People have selected the area in which they live because they value quieter background noise levels, freedom from intrusive industrial noise, privacy from transport servicing industry and aircraft flying overhead.

It will be a mistake (leading to political instability) for government to approve an unsustainable project that will never be economic and will cease to be used once we reduce our carbon emissions to sustainable levels.

In the case of WSIA, we should not disrupt the existing population affected by aircraft flying overhead if they only fly overhead for a few years before politicians realise we really do have to act on climate change.

I submit the Green Paper should aim higher than business as usual, face up to the urgent real problems we face and be more inspirational to people shaping the aviation industry in Australia.

DAVID EDEN