

Hon C. F. King MP Member for Ballarat PO Box 6022 Parliament House CANBERRA ACT 2600

DATE - 4 DEC 207

30/11/2023

Senator the Hon Catherine King Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Dear Minister,

In the current proposed green paper it suggests (p81) "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"

I am writing to ask that you provide just one example that you would consider would constitute a breach of the 'social licence' for aviation activity. This is a reasonable question as currently:

- 1) Air Services actions (corporatised by the government) act as our regulator when they are also funded by the airline industry. Given they are not independent is this obvious lack of impartiality (unethical bias) the 'social licence' you deem is acceptable?
- 2) Brisbane Airport Corporation have entirely removed any mention of SODPROPS from day-time operations at Brisbane Airport when the ministerial approval of the New Parallel Runway and associated flight paths by the Australian Government in 2007 was based on the 2006 Brisbane Airport MDP/EIS, which stipulates that SODPROPS (over water operations) are to be, "the preferred mode as it offers the greatest noise abatement."? Is this deceitful change by Airservices, the 'social licence' that you deem is acceptable?
- 3) Airservices have published their online, interactive baseline model online which suggests for my address (24 Lloyd St Camp Hill) and for 2022 Southerly Winds Night-Time, I will receive an average (24hr) of 3.9 flights at an average altitude of 1241 meters. This is **totally** incorrect (see evidence below). Is lying to the public with totally false information the 'social licence' that you deem is acceptable?
- 4) I know this is a lie because I suffer what can only be described as physical abuse regularly. For example, on the evening of Monday 27 and morning of 28th November I have evidenced each flight and elevation by capturing them as they kept me awake from 10:00pm until 2:46am (see appendix A) All flights well below 600m). My home has become unliveable.

To help you understand, if I drove my car, blaring my horn, down your street over 20 times from 10:00pm to 3:00am I think someone might call the police? Why, because of the offensive noise keeping families awake. You however, allow aircraft over my home with 'horns blaring' throughout the night. It is no different. I had 2 hours sleep and had to withdraw (again) from work the following day due to excessive fatigue. Is this physical abuse to Brisbane residents the 'social licence' that you deem is acceptable?

You however, are the **only person** that can solve this 24/7 assault on Brisbane by legislating a curfew, so I am interested to see what you would actually consider behaviour that would incur a breach of 'social licence' by Airservices. Knowing currently that 'lack of impartiality', 'deceitful changes', 'false information' and 'physical abuse' are currently acceptable 'social licence' by Airservices Australia I think I have a right to clarity as to what isn't acceptable.

I am simply asking for **one example** that you would consider a breach of the 'social licence' for aviation activity that would actually trigger restrictions on aviation activity and growth?

Yours Faithfully

Rob Symon











