

MELBOURNE AIRPORT COMMUNITY AVIATION CONSULTATION GROUP

Minutes, Open Meeting—Tuesday 16 August 2016, 7pm–8.30pm

Gladstone Park Senior Citizens Centre, corner Carrick Drive and Elmhurst Street, Gladstone Park

Present

(CACG members):

Darrell Treloar	Independent Chair
David O'Connor	Community
Susan Jennison OAM	Community
Frank Rivoli	Community
Michael Sharp	Australian Mayoral Aviation Council
Adem Atmaca	Australian Mayoral Aviation Council
Jane Homewood	Victorian Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning
Liz Beattie	Victorian Trades Hall Council (proxy for Luke Hilakari)
Henry Bezuidenhout	Local government officer (Moonee Valley)

(Organisational / agency representatives)

Michael Jarvis	Melbourne Airport
Anna Gillett	Melbourne Airport
Alby Goodsell	Airservices Australia
Neil Hall	Airservices Australia
Marcelo Alves	Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development
Joshua Ireland	Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development

(Supporting subject matter experts / support staff):

Kerr Forbes	Melbourne Airport
Trent Kneebush	Melbourne Airport
Tim Gill	Melbourne Airport / To70 Aviation
Renee Atkinson	Melbourne Airport
David Farrell	Melbourne Airport
Kris Perkovic	Melbourne Airport
Kristi High	Melbourne Airport
Helen Love	Melbourne Airport

Apologies:

Mateja Rautner	Community
Leanne Deans	Noise Abatement Committee
Paul D'Elia	Pilot, Virgin Australia
Bob Baggio	Local government officer (Melton)
Carly Dixon	Melbourne Airport

Number of public in attendance: 38

1. Welcome and introductions—Darrell Treloar, Independent Chair

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Jane Homewood, the Executive Director, Statutory Planning Services, Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP), who attended her first meeting as the DELWP CACG representative to the group.

The Chair noted the presence of key agency representatives and those attending in a support role, in particular:

- Michael Jarvis, attending his second meeting of the CACG but his first as the direct replacement to Sarah Renner as Melbourne Airport's representative to the CACG.
- Alby Goodsell from Airservices Australia, as the new Airservices representative to the CACG.
- Joshua Ireland, of the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development (DIRD).

The Chair advised that meetings of the CACG are recorded for the purpose of assisting with the preparation of draft minutes. The recordings are deleted once the minutes have been endorsed by this committee at the next quarterly meeting.

2. Apologies

The Chair noted the members that had provided apologies (as above).

3. Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting held 17 May 2015

The Chair referred to the minutes from the CACG meeting held on Tuesday 17 May 2016 from 7pm to 8.30pm at the Ultima Function Centre, corner Keilor Park Drive and Ely Court, Keilor.

It was **AGREED** that minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 17 May 2016 be confirmed as an accurate representation of the meeting.

4. Reports

4.1 CACG Pre-meeting, Summary Report—Darrell Treloar, independent Chair

Darrell Treloar provided a summary report on the key items of discussion from the pre-meeting of CACG members held from 4pm to 6pm. (Refer to CACG pre-meeting minutes for more information.)

This report was **NOTED**.

4.2 Melbourne Airport Report—Michael Jarvis, Melbourne Airport

Michael Jarvis presented the Melbourne Airport Report, which now incorporates the Planning Coordination Forum and Runway Development Program updates. Key items included the following:

- International and domestic passenger growth numbers.
- Commencement of work on the 2018 Master Plan.
- Environment update.
- Runway Development Program update.

This report was **NOTED**.

4.3 Annual Report— Darrell Treloar, Independent Chair

The draft CACG Annual Report was presented for approval.

It was **AGREED** that the draft Annual Report be approved.

5. Submissions / Questions from the public

Dennis Ruggiero

1. *If the proposed third runway goes ahead, once completed, will the existing east-west runway be closed for renovation/extension work thus creating a channelled air traffic situation on the third runway, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week? This will potentially expose residents to continuous air traffic noise with no breaks for the period of time it takes for the extension to be completed. What measures will the airport be taking to ensure this is not the situation?*

Michael Jarvis, Melbourne Airport:

As the Runway Development Program entails construction of a third runway and the extension of the current east-west runway, we are still working through the detail of how the construction will be staged. Construction staging is complex and will consider several criteria, including impacts to the community, safety and operations.

Dennis Ruggiero

2. *Are you going to close the existing east west runway?*

Michael Jarvis, Melbourne Airport:

It's too early to say how the construction will be staged. When a decision is made, it will be communicated to the CACG and the community.

Dennis Ruggiero

3. *If the east-west runway is closed, won't the proposed third runway be open 24 hours a day, 7 days per week?*

Michael Jarvis, Melbourne Airport:

The construction staging is currently being worked on by the Runway Development Project team and we are also working with Airservices regarding the flight paths.

Elizabeth McKinnon

The following question was received in writing with the request that it be brought to the attention of the CACG. The question was read out at the CACG meeting—with the resident then contacted after the meeting.

- 4. We have lived on our 5 acre property in Sunbury for over 44 years. In all that time we have never been so troubled with aircraft flying over or near us as we are now. When Tullamarine Airport was built the rules of engagement were that no aircraft was permitted to fly over Sunbury or its environs unless there was a major emergency of massive weather event. (I confirmed this with a senior retired flight captain last week). Two big housing developments are happening very near to us in Racecourse Road—Villawood and Sunbury Fields, so all of these homes are going to be affected so negatively as well. Our lives are so diminished by this aircraft noise and pollution.*

Maureen Bextream

- 5. Why is Melbourne Airport objecting to a housing development in Diggers Rest where the planes will be flying at maximum altitude? Yet Melbourne Airport has no problem having a third runway directly in line and within close proximity to a highly populated residential area, where the planes will be flying much lower, the noise will be much louder and the fumes will be more noxious?*

Michael Jarvis, Melbourne Airport:

In terms of the third runway, we will consider updating the flight paths and noise contours when making any assessment of the noise impacts for communities surrounding the airport. Our policy is to oppose developments we consider will create noise issues for likely future residents, particularly those developments near established or proposed flight paths.

Keith and Vicki Munday

- 6. Why was the east–west more community invasive third runway option chosen over the less invasive north/south option?*

Michael Jarvis, Melbourne Airport:

This has been covered at a number of previous CACGs and the information is readily available. The main factors in choosing east–west are that it provides the best safety, community, capacity, operational and environmental outcomes.

Keith and Vicki Munday

- 7. In 1990, the preferred option then was north-south? What's happened to that?*

Michael Jarvis, Melbourne Airport:

Both options have been in the Master Plan. The decision to choose east –west was made after a rigorous assessment of the options.

Keith and Vicki Munday

- 8. If the proposed east–west third runway goes ahead can you tell us what the separating distance will be from the highest point in Gladstone Park to the plane's lowest line of approach point over Gladstone Park?*

Neil Hall, Airservices:

Departing aircraft are generally higher than arriving aircraft. The standard glide path for arriving aircraft is three degrees from the threshold of the runway. As an example, an arriving aircraft at three nautical miles from the runway threshold equates to an altitude of 900 feet. On departure, at three nautical miles, aircraft might be at 2,500 feet.

Keith and Vicki Munday

9. *What about altitude at 2km?*

Neil Hall, Airservices: At 2km, aircraft will be about 500–600 feet on an arrival flight path to the threshold of the runway. On departure, that would be higher.

Rodney Watt

10. *I would like the Chair to give a guarantee that the CACG meeting is not run by the owners of the airport or people representing them and that the chair is not being paid by the owners of the airport to conduct the meeting on their behalf. If he cannot provide that guarantee then in order to prevent further conflict of interest I ask that he step down and be replaced by someone with no vested interest in the airport or its development plans*

Darrell Treloar, Independent Chair:

The CACG is independent of Melbourne Airport. It is not run by the airport nor is Melbourne Airport a member of the CACG, although airport staff provide secretarial support to the CACG and attend meetings. The CACG forms its own views and can refer issues to Melbourne Airport and other stakeholders such as Airservices and the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development.

Regarding my role as chair, I am paid by Melbourne Airport. It is a federal government requirement that CACG chairs be remunerated by airport operators for the time they put in to the CACG. I see myself as independent and have an equal responsibility to stakeholders and the community. I do not intend to step down. If Melbourne Airport and others decide to change the chair, then that is entirely up to them.

Sam Cetrola

11. *Can Melbourne Airport bring us up to date on where the impact studies are at? What has been done and what still needs to be done? When is the health impact study expected to be started and completed? Will the residents have an opportunity to raise concerns to the people carrying out the health impact study before it's completed?*

Michael Jarvis, Melbourne Airport:

All but a few of the studies have commenced. The health study has commenced and the consultant undertaking that work will attend the next meeting of CACG members to present on the project scope.

John Jennison

12. *Statement: Request for the Chairman to provide a review, at next meeting, on how CACG has over the past years contributed to the wellbeing and betterment of community members south of the airport. Some of the issues to be addressed include: relationships and acceptability of parties with each other, communications, credibility of airport in proposals given, consideration of community needs and requests, noise levels and noise abatement, less options to register a noise complaint, increase in aircraft movements particularly at night, bigger aircraft only using the longer n/s runway, stricter planning laws for nearby properties, simpler technical standards for community to understand, health effects of noise and kerosene, increased truck traffic in surrounding areas, and so on.*

Darrell Treloar, Independent Chair:

Thank you to John for the statement and suggestion on how to improve the CACG— your written feedback is much appreciated.

The CACG this year is trialling a new meeting process, changing from a single two-hour meeting to a separate closed meeting of CACG members and then a public meeting, which has included one hour of public question time.

This change has allowed the CACG in the closed meeting of members to delve more deeply into issues of interest, with presentations from expert speakers. The CACG has a work program, and this year has considered issues such as the Runway Development Program and noise abatement and next year will look at curfews, noise sharing, ground transport and airport safeguarding.

We will assess this year's meeting process at our November CACG meeting and consider what has worked well and where else improvements might be made. I am not certain if we will have the opportunity to consider your request in November but I would be pleased to take it on board and look at it next year.

Steve Ducie

13. *Last CACG meeting, I was concerned at comments made by yourself regarding the inability of the CACG to deal with community concerns. I have looked at the CACG Terms of Reference and believe that the community is not being properly consulted. Would you tender your resignation so we could have a new chairperson who is going to give us the opportunity to express our concerns?*

Darrell Treloar, Independent Chair:

This issue regarding comments I had made was first raised by a member of the CACG after the last meeting. I have gone back and listened to the recording and can say that comments thought to have been made by myself were not made.

I did make comments following an interjection as Melbourne Airport was attempting to answer a question from a member of the public. My comments sought to emphasise that the CACG does not have the power to change policy—that is not its role. The CACG is an information forum where questions can be asked, issues are discussed, and where possible, referred to the appropriate agency for consideration.

As mentioned, the CACG has a work program of issues—we are progressively working through that program and will report on the outcomes. It might be that the CACG makes a recommendation to Melbourne Airport or Airservices—or it might be that the CACG is not in a position to make a recommendation. But at all times, the CACG will do its best to provide answers to questions from the community. Sometimes, it can be frustrating as information is not always available, especially as has been highlighted with the RDP studies.

Regarding my resignation—I will not be stepping down. I'm not even sure what sort of change this might produce. I will continue to be even-handed and work to achieving better outcomes for stakeholders and the community.

Helen Franks

14. *Statement: Last August, I wrote to the Minister for Planning regarding noise issues / curfews. I received a return letter saying the government did not support a curfew. I would like to invite any member of CACG to come to my house—I can tell you that from 5.50pm to 2am, I am woken to the noise of my house shaking. It is not acceptable that we have no curfew at the airport. It seems to me that it's all about the dollars with little regard for residents, which is disgusting. I invite anyone to put a noise monitor at my home, to experience the noise I am experiencing.*

Neil Hall, Airservices Australia:

Regarding noise monitoring, Airservices is responsible for the positioning of noise monitors. Permanent noise monitors allow us to obtain the best possible data, which is used to establish a baseline of aircraft noise. We also on occasion use temporary noise monitors and in locations without a noise monitor, we utilise integrated noise modelling. This is a worldwide model used to determine what noise a particular aircraft makes at a particular height and is very accurate. Regarding your location, I would be happy to discuss your particular situation.

Robin Taylor

15. *What have been the findings of the risk assessments undertaken by Airservices taking into account that on the same runway an aircraft lands every two minutes and an aircraft takes off every two minutes. So, one minute an aircraft lands on the runway then aircraft takes off from virtually the same spot a minute later or so. I am especially interested in the findings relating to the safety of the community and passengers*

Neil Hall, Airservices Australia:

Air traffic control has mandatory safety standards. There are minimum distances for departing aircraft and minimum standards for arriving aircraft. At all times, safety is our number one priority and we are constantly assessing the risk in everything we do.

Steve Ducie

16. *What impact will the third runway have on property prices in the local area? What compensation will be provided to residents that will be severely impacted by the proposed east west runway?*

Michael Jarvis, Melbourne Airport:

Property values will be considered as part of the Runway Development Program Economic Impact Assessment. As for compensation, Melbourne Airport is not considering any compensation or noise insulation scheme at present. There was previously a noise insulation program at Sydney and Adelaide airports, which was administered by the federal government. Properties had to be within the 30 ANEF contour to be eligible for a grant.

Dianne Buttigieg

17. *I have been living in my home since 1999 and the noise factor commenced five years ago. Why, what has happened, what has changed? It has become progressively louder—why?*

Neil Hall, Airservices Australia:

It may be there are more aircraft, including larger international aircraft, and more of them are using Runway 16. The flight paths themselves would not have changed.

Dianne Buttigieg

18. *300 metres west of my home is an industrial area and sporting complex—that should be used as a flight path. Why not?*

Neil Hall, Airservices Australia:

Airservices does get asked by the community on occasion to consider changing flight paths. It is more difficult than it seems. Often what we find is that if we move a flight path, even a small amount, it's either not aligned with the runway or might over-fly another area and impact other people. I would be pleased to look into your situation. Bear in mind, it is not easy to change flight paths and might not be possible.

Dianne Buttigieg

19. *Why can't we have a curfew over the heavy, populated areas at night?*

Darrell Treloar, Independent Chair:

A curfew has been raised many times before and it has been acknowledged as an issue for the CACG and will be addressed as part of our work program for next year.

There have been some residents in Keilor pressing for a curfew but it must be noted that it is the policy of both the federal and state governments to not have a curfew and of course, Melbourne Airport does not support a curfew.

Dennis Ruggiero

20. *Why has the independent chair of CACG not instructed the CACG to liaise with the Melbourne Airport re: ongoing noise issues/concerns that the community raises at every meeting? Should the airport not be providing the community with a response re their ongoing noise issues/concerns?*

Darrell Treloar, Independent Chair:

The CACG is well aware of the noise issue and noise abatement has been the focus for this year, both at the May and August meetings and again in November. When noise abatement has been fully considered, the CACG as a group will determine a position and that position will be put to Airservices, Melbourne Airport and other stakeholders and the outcome reported afterwards.

Dennis Ruggiero

21. *At a recent meeting at the Greenvale Residents Association, a question was raised re take offs to the east and the answer given was to take off on the proposed third runway and turn south. My question is why would you take off over a residential area on the proposed third runway when you have a green wedge with no residents underneath on an existing runway and a majority of air traffic needing to turn north anyway?*

Neil Hall, Airservices Australia:

Melbourne Airport's Master Plan has indicative flight paths for both arrivals and departures. As these are only indicative, the final flight paths are still to be determined.

Meeting closed at 8.30pm.

Next meeting: to be held on Tuesday 15 November 2016, 7pm–8.30pm at the Jack McKenzie Community Centre, Green Street, Bulla.