

From: [REDACTED]
To: ChairSACF
Sent: Wed 23/10/2013 6:26 PM
Subject: Who pays the economic cost of aircraft noise?

Dear Mr Fitzgerald,

There are a number of "costs" incurred by those living beneath the Sydney Airport flightpath: Social, health and economic.

You will be very aware of the social and health costs residents bear (most recently this research published in the SMH on Oct 11: "Research links aircraft noise to higher rates of heart disease. Read more: <http://www.smh.com.au/national/health/research-links-aircraft-noise-to-higher-rates-of-heart-disease-20131010-2vbir.html#ixzz2hfivhBOW>). There have been many such studies published in recent years.

The economic costs are another matter. Aside from the obvious economic cost of lowering housing prices, and reducing productivity of workers, residents are required to comply with strict building regulations that add thousands of dollars to home renovation costs. Residents are forced to pay a significant financial cost when renovating their homes (in our experience over 10% of total renovation costs/ \$25,000).

It does not seem just that residents are required to remedy the environmental pollution/ impact of Sydney airport and the airlines (which are all commercial, profit-driven enterprises). In all other instances of pollution it is the polluter that is required to remedy the problem and pay all financial costs. Why would aircraft noise be any different from other forms of pollution?

Given this, I would suggest that Sydney Airport and Airlines should be financially responsible for all costs incurred by residents under the imposed building regulations. Why is this not the case?

I would appreciate an insight as to why this is the case.

thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]