

SYDNEY AIRPORT COMMUNITY FORUM



Sydney Airport Master Plan Meeting

Conference Room B, 8th Floor
70 Phillip Street, Sydney

Tuesday, 20 May 2003
9am

DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD

Agenda Item 1: Opening Remarks

Senator Payne opened the meeting at 9.05am.

Senator Payne acknowledged the attendance of those members able to attend this meeting given their prior commitments. Attachment A details the attendees at this meeting.

Apologies were received from

Cr Vince Badalati, Mayor of Hurstville

Cr Phil Blight, Mayor of Sutherland Shire

Mr John Clarke, representative for the Upper North Shore

Cr Fiona Sinclair King, Representative for the Wentworth Community

Dr David Niven, proxy for Cr Mark Bonanno, Mayor of Ashfield

Ms Sandra Nori, State Member for Port Jackson

Mr Anthony Roberts, State Member for Lane Cove

Senator Payne welcomed Mr Warren Bennett from BARA to his first meeting of the Forum.



Agenda Item 2: Adoption of Provisional Agenda

Members adopted the agenda for this meeting.

Agenda Item 3: Introduction by Sydney Airport Corporation Ltd (SACL)

a. Outstanding Items

Lisa Smith (SACL) advised the meeting that the outstanding issues from the previous discussion on the Master Plan on 31 March 2003 had been addressed. These were:

- ◆ presentations from the last meeting had been loaded onto the Airport's website
- ◆ Mr Hill had received the predictions concerning freight movements over the Kurnell Community.
- ◆ Mr Clarke had received the predictions concerning passenger growth.

b. Master Plan Progress

Mr Stuart (SACL) advised that they had conducted 25 consultations sessions and they had stressed that there would be no changes to the LTOP, movement cap or the curfew. He indicated that they were still working on airfield modelling and that the towing strategy was effective. They were happy with the strategy which was to ensure that congestion did not occur. On the domestic side there has been some slight revision to the parking layout and there would be some integration of the road system and the car park.

Overall, they were fulfilling the requirements of effective community consultation.

Max Hardy from Twyford Consulting gave a presentation titled *Community Panel Process for Masterplanning Directions*. Attachment B is a copy of the presentation slides.

This presentation was to provide more background information on the Community Panel as a consultation method for the Sydney Airport Master Plan.

Ms Smith advised Members that the term - *Community Panel* - was developed by them. The proposal of a community panel was similar to "*Citizen's Jury*" – a term used in the United States of America. In Germany, the concept is known as "*Planning Cells*" Members were advised that different names could be used for this concept.

The purpose of the *Community Panel* was to engage the broader community who often are not involved in corporate planning processes. It allows them to think about the issues concerned. The concept was an additional method for community input. The concept had been around for 30 years. This method is used in social planning processes in order to develop priorities.



There are various websites worldwide that provide information on Citizen's Jury and the methodology used in the process. Twyford Consulting's website at www.twyford.com.au provides additional information on consultation and participation.

Members were advised that there are a variety of methods from which to tackle community consultation and that there is no single right way for consultation. Members were informed that communities can be easily influenced, are often apathetic and often do not know the relevant issues. Therefore, effective consultation is important to overcome negative influences. Having the right methodology is important to ensure good thinking and good decisions.

An important consideration for the Community Panel is that its composition is made of a random group from the community. It was stressed that consensus was not absolutely necessary for the group's effectiveness.

Members were advised of the key features of the Community Panel (or Citizen's Jury) [refer Attachment B] but it was pointed out that there is not much time to consider in depth the issues facing the community. The Community Panel would have sufficient authority to produce a report on its findings in an advisory capacity.

Members were advised that different methods will produce different levels of value [refer Attachment B]. Twyford's Consulting indicated that the Citizens Jury provides a good method.

The Community Panel (or Citizens Jury) can use different criteria to value community input. Its composition should be considered as a microcosm of the broader community and should support other methods that are used. Other benefits include that individuals change their thinking from an individual perspective to a more community minded thinking.

Members were advised that the Panel would comprise a mix of people from the community who would take the process forward when they developed more focussed questions on issues peculiar to Sydney Airport.

SACF members were advised that SACL were proposing to start this process on 13 June 2003 [Refer Attachment B].

The Chairperson indicated that there were three areas for consideration

1. recruitment of the community panel
2. dates this panel will meet
3. SACF input to the Master Plan

The Chairperson asked Members to indicate the issues that they would like included in the submission on the Master Plan.

The issues that Members raised covered the following:

- ◆ Members indicated a preference for the term Community Panel be used as Citizen's Jury had legal connotations

The Chairperson indicated that the term Community Panel would be used for the process.



- ◆ Members expressed concern that the selection of the community panel was seen as a completely random process and that sufficient time would be allowed for the panel to address the issues given that people may not be familiar with the jargon and technical issues

Members were advised that the panel would have to meet certain criteria and that the names would be selected from say the White Pages. SACL outlined the steps involved and advised that the panel members would be paid a fee for their involvement.

Twyford Consulting highlighted that transparency was important and that SACF could witness the process to ensure that no bias was involved. The panel will only have merit if it is selected at random.

Maria Patrinos from CRAAN indicated that she would sit in on the community panel selection process.

SACL advised that the important component is to obtain community views with people having their say and to avoid the typical workshops or “town hall” style meetings. The emphasis should be on seeking community views not a general polling exercise.

Members were advised that there need only to be enough presenters to cover a range of views and that they aim would be to avoid jargon and excessively technical issues. SACL acknowledged that people do not like change and that the Master Plan would be based on that idea.

Members were advised that witnesses and presenters would make up the range of groups giving information to the panel. Concern was expressed that the panel members may be only interested in the money or time off work.

Members were advised that it was imperative that the community panel be completely independent and it was necessary to be mindful of the dangers if this was not the case.

- ◆ The time frame was not considered sufficient time to fully explore the LTOP [Long Term Operating Plan] modes of operation and that there should be the proposition of no change ie to maintain the status quo.
- ◆ The issue was raised concerning the success rate of these Community Panels overseas.

Members were advised that there were a number of websites such as the Jefferson-Center website which provided good information on this concept. The address is <http://www.jefferson-center.org/>

- ◆ There were some reservations expressed about this community panel concept as it could be snowed with presentations on one particular viewpoint. What was important was that community consultation should be seen as an ongoing process not a one off process.



- ◆ A primary concern requiring addressing is that a defence mechanism needs to be put into place to handle the different viewpoints likely to be submitted.
- ◆ There needs to be more consultation with the normal community and that the community panel should not be considered the sole source of comment from the community.
- ◆ Concern was expressed that community groups were thrown off guard due to the recent advertisement in the paper concerning the master plan and that the process was too controlled

The members were advised that the consultation process could be multi layered and that SACF can give consideration to the views of the various community groups by engaging in a community consultation process. SACF will be making presentation to the master planning process. An important issue is that there is a balanced view put forward.

SACL indicated that community groups were being advised of the master planning process and that they could give presentations to the community panel.

The Chairperson noted that there was time in the process for public consultation.

SACL indicated that there would be no changes and that the status quo stays. There will be a review of the master plan in five years which can address many of the issues raised since then.

- ◆ The question was raised on the origin of the statistical information that is being used to make the prediction that pre 11 September 2001 movements will only return in ten years time and that the worst case scenario needs to be presented.

Members were advised that the statistical data comes from a variety of published sources such as tourism figures, historical data and SACL forecasts.

Members were also advised that SACF can be presented with a brief on these passenger number forecasts for future meetings.

- ◆ Members expressed concern that there could be more than one panel considering issues of concern to the community and what happens to the opinions expressed throughout the consultation.

Members were advised that only one input would be put forward and that there is a period of public consultation period to allow the public to raise its issues.

- ◆ Members raised the issue that the community panel could address wider issues and not just aircraft noise which is the focus of the Forum. Why was SACF considered as the panel for community consultation?

The meeting was advised that the community panel will address a wide range of issues and not just aircraft noise. SACF's Terms of Reference is focussed towards aircraft noise abatement.



Mr Hayes indicated that the Community Panel could receive a status beyond its purpose thus carrying more weight and authority than it should. It was also highlighted that there could be a clash between SACF and the community panel. SACF could give a higher level statement on the issues of concern. A concern for the community panel is that they could get snowed because they may not realise the full implications of what they are involved in.

Mr Hayes indicated that he considered the selection of the members on the panel should be more determined and not a random selection. There are inherent dangers in the process of selecting or picking people out of a list.

SACL emphasis is on presenting a range of views and not allowing the Panel to be the sole decider on the master plan.

Overall SACL Member did indicate that the intention of the Community Panel was to provide community views and not to provide input on operational requirements. However, that does not mean that the report should be too simplistic. It was pointed out this Master Plan could not address specific detail but the next master plan could consider more detail on specific issues.

Twyford Consulting indicated that SACF could assist the process by providing a range of views and that it has the necessary expertise to draw upon. There is an opportunity for the people to present their views through the public consultation phase. Facilitators are obliged to follow professional standards and can add value to the process. They would welcome SACF's view on how to ensure they are accountable.

The consultants have an interest in ensuring that the consultation phase puts forward strong viewpoints.

- ◆ The question was raised whether there is opportunity to obtain quantitative and qualitative analysis of the issues?

Twyford Consulting advised that pilot tests could be undertaken to overcome problems associated with the selection of the panel members. This would be a useful way to ensure that the method overcomes bias.

The Chair pointed out that to convene another meeting may not be possible and that communication could be carried out by email.

Actions concerning general issues from master planning meeting

Agenda Item 4 Action MP1/1 DOTARS to prepare advice for SACF on publicly released travel forecasts for use by SACF in its submission to Sydney Airport Corporation Ltd's (SACL) Community Panel.

Agenda Item 4 Action MP1/2 SACF write to relevant Tourism Organisations for data on tourism forecasts.

Agenda Item 4 Action MP1/3 DOTARS in consultation with SACL [Sydney Airport Corporation Ltd] to circulate an information paper on the master planning process.



Agenda Item 4 Action MPI/4 SACL [Sydney Airport Corporation Ltd] to arrange for interested SACF members to sit in on the community panel as observers.

Agenda Item 4 Action MPI/5 Secretariat to forward outcomes of the meeting to SACF members not able to attend this 20 May meeting.

The consensus at the meeting was that SACF's submission take the following format – Background, Principles and Issues.

The Chairperson indicated that SACF members would have the opportunity to monitor the process and that they will have reasonable time to give presentations on 14 June 2003.

The DOTARS representative outlined the role of the Department in the master planning process indicating that the Department provides the recommendation to the Minister on the Airport's Master Plan.

The view was expressed that SACL may be able to change flight paths unilaterally. The following question concerning no change to the Operating Framework was endorsed by members:

The premise for the master plan is that there is no change to the Operating Framework (runways and flight paths) of Sydney Airport noting that any changes require stakeholder consultation. Is this premise valid?

Agenda Item 5: Development of SACL's Noise Model

The following presentations were not presented at this meeting

- ◆ Airfield Modelling
- ◆ Wilkinson Murray: Noise Model

Issues for consideration in the Submission on the Sydney Airport Master Plan

The Chairperson asked Members to indicate the issues that they would like included in the submission to SACL's Community Panel. The issues covered the following:

- ◆ The premise for the master plan be based on no change to current operating arrangements ie flight paths, curfew, movement cap
- ◆ The inclusion of LTOP into the master plan and the effect of the flights on the residents in the Cook Electorate
- ◆ Recognition of the employment opportunities that the airport generates for residents in surrounding areas
- ◆ SACF should indicate its support for tourism and the benefits that are derived from it



- ◆ Focus on SACF's orientation towards aircraft noise and the history of LTOP
- ◆ Educate the community on the Government's noise policy highlighting the issues that emerged for the development of this noise sharing policy
- ◆ Outline the history, the implementation and the principles underlying the Long Term Operating Plan indicating that there is a bias towards a north/south direction for aircraft movements.
- ◆ Indicate that there are risks associated with changes to the current airspace arrangements regarding noise sharing, Government noise sharing policy of LTOP and process of community consultation through SACF
- ◆ Recognition of the Bennelong issues such as the concentration of aircraft noise on suburbs from a north/south orientation of flight paths
- ◆ Provide background on the role of SACF and reasons for its establishment
- ◆ The community panel needs to be convinced of the democratic principles of noise sharing so that there is not return to the Bennelong funnel
- ◆ SACL to address the continued expansion/growth in aircraft traffic at the airport and indicate how it will address this growth and any associated problems stemming from it
- ◆ Address aircraft noise issues and that the targets of LTOP are not being met
- ◆ Concern that the panel will be given the best case scenario when it should also receive the worst case scenario in terms of traffic forecasts and the likely impacts from aircraft noise on residents in Kurnell
- ◆ SACF needs to ensure that it sources its own statistical data for presentation and consideration
- ◆ Focus on LTOP and the consequent effects on residents to the west of the east west runway
- ◆ Consideration should be given for a possible expansion of the Noise Insulation Program to cover areas outside current boundaries
- ◆ SACF should present a view on the implication of not constructing a second Sydney airport given that it has been an issue for the SACF as well as its predecessor – the Sydney Airport Community Consultative Committee
- ◆ Need to raise the issue concerning ground noise from aircraft idling engines and the consequences of this practice on residents nearby
- ◆ Address the adequacy of current noise monitoring program
- ◆ SACF's submission should not go beyond its terms of reference
- ◆ SACF should not submit its own traffic forecasts nor submit a worst case scenario. A better approach would be for SACF to nominate appropriate people to explain the SACL forecasts
- ◆ The Community Panel need to fully understand the noise sharing policy and relevant processes that have been developed over the years to deal with these issues such as the LTOP IMC and SACF
- ◆ The submission should be written to emphasise a more general view taking into account the effects of aircraft movements on people who live at the end of the runway or nearby



should find ways to alleviate the detrimental effects of aircraft movements on both these groups of people

- ◆ Emphasise the role of SACF outlining the diverse composition of its membership and SACF's long-term involvement to achieve the fundamental principles such as respite for the community of the Government's noise sharing policy (Long Term Operating Plan)
- ◆ Should emphasise that the issues affecting the residents in the west are quite contrary to the issues raised by Members from the north shore suburbs
- ◆ Suburbs to the west of the east-west runway receive flights during the early morning and late at night when people are home from work
- ◆ Wants it on the record that LTOP is not working perfectly for the residents in the west
- ◆ SACF should demonstrate some foresight to address issues that may be raised through the Community Panel
- ◆ There should be consideration by the Airport that it can not expand indefinitely and where its future lies in terms of the more broader issues concerning aviation.

The Chairperson indicated that SACF should approach the Community Panel with an agreed viewpoint and presentation. However, it was noted that every Member may not agree totally with every aspect of the Submission but it should reflect the primary concerns raised by Members. It was emphasised that the Submission should not contain any motherhood statements but address specific issues.

The Chairperson noted that it will be a challenge to formalise SACF's Submission given the breadth of viewpoints that were raised. The Submission should aim as much as possible to keep within the Forum's Terms of Reference of aircraft noise.

The Chairperson noted SACF should have a controlled and balanced list of witnesses to the community panel.

Agenda Item 4 Action MPI/6 DOTARS in consultation with SACF members develop a submission from SACF on the Sydney Airport Master Plan.

Agenda Item 6: Further SACF consultation

Members who were not present will be provided with the outcomes of this meeting by electronic mail.

The Chairperson indicated that further meetings may not be possible and that future communication should be by electronic mail.



ATTACHMENT A: Attendance

Members

M Payne	Senator for NSW, Chair
W Bennett	Board of Airline Representatives in Australia
C Connolly	Representing Robert McClelland MP, Federal Member for Barton
B Hayes	Representing Joe Hockey MP, Federal Member for North Sydney
K Hill	Representing the Kurnell Community
S Holroyd	Rockdale Council
S Hoopmann	Representing the Bennelong Community
J May	Lane Cove Council
M Megna	Representing Inner West
T Mumford	Representing Bruce Baird MP, Federal Member for Cook
M Patrinos	Canterbury Residents Against Aircraft Noise
D Robinson	Representing Trevor Jensen, Qantas Airways
F Sinclair King	Representing the Wentworth Community
L Smith	Sydney Airport Corporations Ltd



Advisers/Secretariat

A Joseph	Senator Payne's Office
L Addison	Dept of Transport and Regional Services
D Savage	Dept of Transport and Regional Services
G Kelly	Dept of Transport and Regional Services
S Skermer	Dept of Transport and Regional Services
A But	Airservices Australia
L Kenna	Airservices Australia
J Peters	Airservices Australia
B Pinney	Airservices Australia
M Hardy	Twyford Consulting for SACL
K Harrigan	Sydney Airports Corporation Ltd
G Stuart	Sydney Airports Corporation Ltd
N Valentine	Sydney Airports Corporation Ltd
A Sellick	Qantas Airways Ltd
R Bartsch	CASA
Observers	
R Evans	Botany Industrial Park
JCM Jones	Representing Clover Moore MP State Member for Bligh
D Tester	Delta Aviation Consulting
G Craig	Hills Airport Noise Action Group
R Craig	Hills Airport Noise Action Group
F Ristoh	Castle Hill