

ECONOMIC REGULATION OF AIRPORTS

Dear Sir Sir/Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 'Productivity Commission Draft Report in the Economic Regulation of Airports.'

The value of Kingsford Smith Airport to the residents of Sydney, global and domestic business and tourism is incredibly important and significantly defines the view of Sydney as a world city.

As a frequent user of the airport and resident living under and impacted by one of the primary flight paths leading to the airport, I have the following comments:

1. NOISE SHARING

The impact of aircraft noise is still very significant at long distances from the airport. We live in Boronia Park, and the noise is so loud during flight days we still need to halt conversations, wake up earlier than intended, or close windows on summer evenings to manage. We have many days where we bear the brunt of air traffic with almost constant aircraft noise. If there are modifications to be made to the hourly cap, then these changes also need to review the greater sharing of flight paths into the airport.

2. FLIGHT CAPACITY CAP

In general, we support the need for a more common-sense approach to managing the rolling hour cap on aircraft movements, particularly when the airport is recovering from weather events. This flexibility will need to be monitored to ensure there isn't institutionalised abuse of the flexibility i.e. modifications to schedules that result in constantly needing to exceed the cap. The efficiency of airport operations is one matter, but in the end, this is an issue of helping people get to their destination with minimal delays and frustration.

3. CURFEW

The curfew should remain intact. The 11:00 pm till 6:00 am curfew (with limited exceptions) does balance the liveability of Sydney with the productivity of Sydney. However, the criteria for breaching curfew should be further reviewed. The impact of delayed flights being redirected due to not meeting the curfew by 5 minutes can be significant and far-reaching. I have personally been impacted by this and have been redirected to Melbourne and not arrived in Sydney until the middle of the next day. If a more robust consideration of landing paths, landing profiles (deceleration etc) and weather conditions allowed for the occasional slightly outside of curfew landing, this would be a more common-sense approach.

This is primarily an issue for not meeting the 11:00 pm curfew cut off and **not** the early landing scenario described in the report. Personal experience on many occasions with flights anticipating an early landing into Sydney has resulted in either slowing the speed of the aircraft mid-flight; adopting a high-level holding pattern over the ocean; or a delayed departure - all of which do not inconvenience the passenger or the citizens of Sydney with noise.

4. NOISE PROFILES

I agree with the proposition to consider noise on a performance and monitoring basis, and not based on specific aircraft models. I would go further and perhaps be even more stringent to encourage airlines for both passenger and freight movement to use more efficient and newer aircraft for landing in Sydney. For example, up until recently (about 2 years ago) you could almost always tell when a United Airlines 747 or FedEx DC-10 was coming into land.

United was using very old planes and due to the market fundamentals and pricing on the Pacific route to the USA, did not seem motivated to retire the aircraft until they absolutely needed to. Since United has retired the old 747's and started using modern Dreamliner aircraft the noise difference is enormous. If United had been forced to meet more stringent noise targets, they might have acted earlier to protect their access to the Sydney market.

5. FUEL SUPPLY

Fuel supply, security and infrastructure need to be more thoroughly reviewed and redefined with the building of the new Nancy Bird Airport. The current infrastructure is located in parts of Sydney which will ultimately be a significant constraint for the orderly development and protection of parts of Sydney, particularly Camelia and the port facilities in Sydney Harbour. The opportunity exists right now to redefine where fuel facilities are located and how the existing and new airports are serviced, rather than what appears to be the current plan to merely tweak existing redundant and poorly located facilities that require vulnerable pipelines under residential communities and sterilise more vibrant opportunities at Camelia.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Yours sincerely,

Julian Heath