

Drs Frances Miao and Ken Micklethwaite
Hunters Hill NSW 2110

The Commissioners
Airport Regulation Inquiry
Productivity Report

March 24th, 2019

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Economic Regulation of Airports – Draft

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the above-mentioned document. Having read through the draft, we are aware of the goals and scope of the inquiry. However, we are disappointed the discussion around options and solutions for these issues have been narrow, short sighted and without a true assessment of the benefits for the community. The report seems to have made an assessment predominantly from the point of view of the current Airport stakeholders.

We would like to see the Commission include a robust and detailed review of the following:

1. True, long-term vision regarding the future of aviation travel in Australia. Having an airport in the metropolitan area is an outdated notion. Increasingly, airports all over the world are moving them to an area separated from dense population with advanced ground transport options. This would bring Australia on par with international airports.
2. The report states that the cost of parking at the airport is related to the location and demand for convenience rather than the operators gouging the public. This is a very simplistic assessment. The cost for an individual to use public transport to the airport may be moderate, but for a family, the cost matches or exceeds the use of a taxi (or parking) and decreases in convenience. A family of 4 travelling from my home needs to walk 500m, catch a bus, then two trains and pay \$20 per person to get to the airport. It costs \$90 for a taxi to take us directly from home to the terminal in half the time. For rural and regional families, the cost of exorbitant. If the commission is to provide honest and useful recommendations, then a robust review of ground transportation needs to be included. This must include Very Fast Train technology.
3. Whilst not openly admitting to planned changes to curfew (for Sydney), the report implies that the curfew is currently not efficient (for Airport stakeholders) and therefore needs to be reviewed. We find this to be egregiously narrow. **The efficiency of the public who live under the flight paths has been completely ignored.** We are both medical professionals who already suffer interrupted sleep due to our need to be on call for our patients. Dr Frances Miao is a shift worker who needs to sleep during the day. There are many, many shift workers out there who already know the perils of interrupted and poor sleep. It affects health, concentration and productivity.

Any change to the curfew, will result in hundreds of thousands of workers and students having interrupted sleep. Research indicates that being tired is equivalent to being intoxicated with alcohol. Millions of dollars have been spent on educating the public about tiredness and driving. It seems baffling to us that the commission would ignore such a risk to productivity for the whole society by considering a change to curfews.

4. One of the purposes of the report is to review opportunities to improve efficiencies. Recommendations need to include the broader investment into technology that will result in improved efficiencies in aviation into the future.

We have read other submissions made online by a variety of the public. Many of them include suggestions and requests for the Commission that could significantly add depth and meaning to the review process. We hope the commission takes these submissions under advisement and makes real changes to the future of aviation in our country.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr Frances Miao and Dr Ken Micklethwaite