

Objections to the Queanbeyan Local Environmental Plan

(South Tralee) 2009.

Introduction

The Tuggeranong Community Council (TCC) was formed in 1983 as an incorporated, voluntary, not for profit, non political, community based association. The TCC is formally recognised as the peak community representative body of the more than 90,000 residents of the Tuggeranong Valley. The TCC meets on a regular basis and works with Governments, other community groups and organisations to improve facilities, services, the general amenity and the environment of the Tuggeranong Valley.

The Tuggeranong Community Council objects to the proposed residential development at South Tralee on the following grounds;

Statement of the Public Exhibition Draft

1.

Part 1. Par. 1.2 Aims of Plan.

(2) (b) To facilitate the orderly growth of the South Tralee urban release area in a staged manner *that promotes a high level of residential amenity* and the timely provision of physical and social infrastructure, through appropriate phasing of the development land.

The TCC is of the opinion that to approve residential development within the approach flight path of Canberra Airport will prevent the achievement of a' a high level of residential amenity "due to the overflying air traffic and the associated problems caused by this.

2.

Part 7. Additional local provisions.

7.1 Development in flight paths [local]

(1) The objectives of this clause are:

(a) To provide for the effective and ongoing operation of the Canberra International Airport, and

(b) To ensure that such operations are not compromised by future development.

The TCC believes, that as Canberra International Airport is the only capital city airport to have a dedicated, residence free, flight approach path, any residential development within the path area will impact upon operation of the airport. For example, Sydney's Mascot Airport is subject to a night curfew that restricts arrival and departure times of all air traffic to between 6am and 11pm. Such a restriction on Canberra airport would

seriously affect the future development of Canberra as a 24hour freight hub. Clearly, residential development of Tralee would compromise the future operation of the airport and would thus be contrary to the objectives of this clause.

3.

Part 7.2 Development in areas subject to airport noise [local]

(1) The objectives of this clause are to:

- (a) prevent certain noise sensitive developments from locating in proximity to the Canberra Airport and its flight paths, and
- (b) ensure that the development in the vicinity of the airport does not hinder or have any other adverse impact on the development or operation of the airport.

(2) This clause applies to all land subject to this plan.

(3) Development consent must not be granted for development for the purpose of a caravan park, childcare centre, hospital or educational establishment or for residential development (including subdivision for residential purposes, but not including the erection or use of a dwelling house) in the 25 or higher ANEF contour

The TCC believes that in view of the statement, *“Development consent must not be granted for development for the purpose of a caravan park, childcare centre, hospital or educational establishment or for residential development (including subdivision for residential purposes,”* it seems inconceivable that Queanbeyan City Council could consider granting approval for residential development at South Tralee when it is clearly stated **“DEVELOPMENT CONSENT MUST NOT BE GRANTED.”**

While this LEP is not proposing any residential zones within the 25 ANEF contour, it does include 19 hectares in region between the 20 – 25 ANEF contours. The residential zone boundary is only about 200 metres from the 25 ANEF contour. These contours are only theoretical and certainly change over time with aviation technology and flight procedures. 200 metres is only a small margin in terms of noise distribution from overflying aircraft and so the 25 ANEF contour restriction could easily be breached as contour changes take place in the future.

4.

Part 7.2 Clause (6)

In addition to any other requirements of this clause, development consent must not be granted for any development unless the consent authority is satisfied it will meet the Indoor Design Sound Levels shown in Tables 3.3 – Indoor Design Sound Levels for Determination of Aircraft Noise Reduction in AS 201-2000 Acoustics- Aircraft noise intrusion-Building siting and construction.

The TCC is of the opinion that quoting the " Indoor Design Sound Levels" ignores the fact that people do not live solely indoors! Families will spend time in their backyard playing with their children or gathering socially at family barbeques etc.

Even when the families are inside their houses they will at times want to have the windows open. In this context the Indoor Design Sound Levels are meaningless. Anecdotal evidence from the Sydney suburb of Earlwood, adjacent to Mascot Airport, showed that people living on the East/West approach to Mascot were affected by low flying approaching aircraft to the extent, that when outside their houses, had to cease their conversation until the aircraft had passed over. The " Indoor Design Sound Levels" is based on present day aircraft and present day technology. When Mascot was established, aircraft were tiny by comparison to those of today. No one foresaw the noise problem that would develop eventually requiring the Federal Govt. to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in sound proofing houses under the Sydney flight paths. Are we to believe that we have come to the end of aircraft development and that there will be no increase in the noise volume and frequency of aircraft movements? In addition, it was found that aircraft venting fuel above residential areas on the Mascot approach, coated those areas in an oily grime that settled on cars, exposed laundry, plants and property. There is no reason to expect that the same thing would not occur at Tralee.

South Tralee Supplementary Report to the Local Environmental Study dated 1st September 2009

Section 2.1.1 of this Report gives a summary of the Planning History. A report by the Independent Inquiry into future residential development for Queanbeyan was released in September 2006. Its recommendations for Sth Tralee included:

- Residential uses of land affected by aircraft noise should be avoided where alternative Greenfield residential development opportunities exist within the Queanbeyan LGA. **They do - Googong.**

- Tralee should not be considered for residential development on the basis that it has potential to become a significant regional asset, particularly as a future employment area and transport hub.

These recommendations make good sense and should be supported by the Queanbeyan City Council.

Section 3.5 of the Report covers Climate and Air Quality. No reference is made to the recent decision by the ACT Government to allow a Power Station/Data Centre to be built at Hume within one kilometre of the proposed residential zone at Tralee. The Power Station includes three gas fired turbines, two of which will be operating full time. The emissions from these turbines could have an adverse impact on the air quality at Tralee and should be taken into account by the Air Quality study.

Conclusion.

The TCC is of the opinion that if development approval is given and residential development goes ahead, that people will buy the homes in the noise affected areas notwithstanding any warning or disclaimer regarding aircraft noise or fuel residue. Based upon experience in other cities they will seek relief by “sharing the load” that is diverting flights over the Tuggeranong Valley and possibly other areas. Because the people of Tuggeranong Valley bought their properties on the basis of no overflights, the TCC strongly objects to any approval that would see residential development infringing upon the Canberra Airport flight path corridor. The recommendations of the Independent Inquiry of September 2006 concerning land use at Tralee should be complied with. The air quality impact of the future Power Station/Data Centre at Hume should be assessed.

Colin R. Petrie Vice President Tuggeranong Community Council / Planning Committee

Eric Traise Treasurer Tuggeranong Community Council/ Planning Committee

21 December 2009

Tuggeranong Community Council Online Survey

The Tuggeranong Community Council (TCC) conducted a survey of residents on the proposed Tralee residential development. Residents were invited to participate in the survey by visiting the TCC website and answering a series of questions about the proposed Tralee development.

The results of the survey show that a majority of residents believe it is a bad idea to allow homes to be built at Tralee. They believe residents at Tralee will be subjected to aircraft noise and a majority of respondents are concerned that as a result of complaints by Tralee residents flight paths will be relocated over Tuggeranong.

Eighty three percent of respondents said it was a bad idea to build homes at Tralee while only 9.8% supported the development. More than 90% believed that if homes were built at Tralee residents would be affected by aircraft noise, 8.4% did not believe there would be any impact from aircraft and 1.4% had no opinion.

Seventy percent of respondents said they were “extremely concerned” while 19.7% were “concerned” that eventually aircraft flight paths would be relocated over Tuggeranong.

While 97% of all respondents were aware of plans to build homes at Tralee 83% said they had not been consulted over the plans.

Tuggeranong residents made up 76% of all respondents. 14% were other ACT residents and 9.8% lived in Queanbeyan and other areas of NSW.

The survey was conducted from 17 December 2009 to 4 January 2010 including the Christmas and New Year. The survey attracted a total of 75 respondents.

Results of Tuggeranong Community Council On Line Survey

| | | | |
|------------|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Q 1 | <i>Where do you live?</i> | | |
| | Qbyn NSW 9.8% | Other ACT 14% | Tuggeranong 76% |
| Q 2 | <i>Are you currently affected by aircraft noise?</i> | | |
| | No 80.2% | Yes 19.7% | |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| Q 3 | <i>Are you aware of plans to build homes at Tralee east of the Hume Industrial Estate?</i> | | |
| | Yes 97.1% | No 2.8% | |
| Q 4 | <i>Do you believe building homes at Tralee is a good idea?</i> | | |
| | No 83% | Yes 9.8% | No opinion 1.4% |
| Q 5 | <i>Do you believe if homes are built at Tralee they will be subject to high levels of aircraft noise?</i> | | |
| | Yes 90.1% | No 8.4% | No opinion 1.4% |
| Q 6 | <i>Are you concerned that aircraft flight paths may be relocated over Tuggeranong if homes are built at Tralee?</i> | | |
| | Not concerned 9.8% | Concerned 19.7% | Very concerned to extremely concerned 70.4% |
| Q 7 | <i>Do you believe you have been adequately consulted about the proposal to build homes at Tralee?</i> | | |
| | No 83% | Yes 16.9% | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

TUGGERANONG COMMUNITY COUNCIL TRALEE ONLINE SURVEY RESULTS

| Where do you live? | Are you currently affected by aircraft noise? | Are you aware of plans to build homes at Tralee east of the Hume Industrial Estate? | Do you believe building homes at Tralee is a good idea? | Do you believe if homes are built at Tralee they will be subject to high levels of aircraft noise? | Are you concerned that aircraft flight paths may be relocated over Tuggeranong if homes are built at Tralee? Please indicate by "0" to "5" 0= Not Concerned 4= Extremely Concerned | Do you believe you have been adequately consulted about the proposal to build homes at Tralee? |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Other area of the ACT | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 3 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Other area of the ACT | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Other area of the ACT | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | Yes | No | 0 | Yes |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 5 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 5 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | Yes |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 3 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 2 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 2 | No |
| Other area of the ACT | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 0 | Yes |
| Other area of the ACT | Yes | Yes | I have no opinion | I have no opinion | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | No | 3 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Queanbeyan | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-------------------|-----|---|-----|
| or other area of NSW | | | | | | |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 0 | Yes |
| Queanbeyan or other area of NSW | No | Yes | No | Yes | 3 | Yes |
| Queanbeyan or other area of NSW | No | Yes | I have no opinion | Yes | 0 | Yes |
| Other area of the ACT | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | Yes | Yes | I have no opinion | Yes | 3 | Yes |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 3 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 3 | No |
| Other area of the ACT | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 3 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | Yes |
| Other area of the ACT | No | No | Yes | Yes | 4 | No |
| Queanbeyan or other area of NSW | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | Yes |
| Other area of the ACT | No | Yes | I have no opinion | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 3 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Queanbeyan or other area of NSW | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 0 | Yes |
| Queanbeyan or other area of NSW | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 0 | Yes |
| Queanbeyan or other area of NSW | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | 0 | Yes |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | No | No | Yes | 3 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 3 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-------------------|-----|---|----|
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Other area of the ACT | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | I have no opinion | Yes | 4 | No |
| Queanbeyan or other area of NSW | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 3 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |
| Tuggeranong | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4 | No |

Community Comments

1. I am concerned with the consistent lack of holistic forethought of suburban planning in the Tuggeranong.
2. I am concerned that the ACT Government does not take into account the impact of planning and development in the NSW regions surrounding the ACT.
3. There appears to be a lack of consultation across borders, when determining impact of development on the ACT community.
4. I have no problem with aircraft flight plans using Tuggeranong.
5. I do not understand why authorities would allow homes to be built directly under an airport flight path. This is very stupid idea.
6. Homes must not be built in Tralee.
7. Canberra is the only capital city to have a dedicated, residence free approach path to its airport. It is irresponsible of a State Govt. to give approval to a private developer to build houses under the flight path given that it cost hundreds of millions of dollars to sound proof homes under the Mascot flight path.
8. If Canberra becomes the second Sydney airport, the residents of Tralee will complain, and of course the flights will have to be shared over Tuggeranong.
9. We lived in Hornsby before moving to Canberra in Jan 2003, one of our reasons to move was the aircraft noise at Hornsby was impossible to live with. Hornsby's 23km away from Sydney Airport.
10. Perhaps it would be better if Tralee was developed as a light industrial area rather than for houses. That way no one will complain about noise.
11. Why do something that is going to inhibit and noble a major piece of transport infrastructure and a major economic generator for the whole National Capital Region.
12. Unfortunately, I have little faith in public opinion being considered in this proposal. We may be asked but our views won't be acted on.
13. Has the government thought about having to compensate home owners for the sound-proofing that will be required if flight paths are redirected.
14. If Canberra becomes Sydney's second airport, then Tralee will suffer dangerous levels of noise pollution, and the A.C.T. will be a most unpleasant place to live. Goodbye to the bush capital tag.

15. It is no good saying let the buyer beware...those buying in new should know better based on Sydney problems, and those buying in later down the track as 2nd hand home buyers, would possible be nuts to consider doing so. That means that original home buyers may have trouble selling, which leads to "suing" someone for their losses, and although it shouldn't, this scenario could be partly passed on to the ACT govt. who could then levy ACT residents.
16. Having lived in Victoria until last year, I know how pressure is put on airports when new homes are built under flight paths (e.g. Essendon Airport). If the airport came first, why should it suffer in the future, when people start complaining about noise, even when they knew the airport was there before they moved into the area? Secondly, I had no idea that there was any possibility of changes in flight paths, but whether it affects me personally or not, I repeat that developers or new home owners should not be allowed to pressure an existing airport.
17. The proposed development is not in the best interest of either the Tralee home owners of the Canberra community.
18. Queanbeyan Council and N.S.W. Government insisted on opening up land to build Jerrabomberra estate, which of course was under the flight paths, and as soon as people moved in they complained about aircraft noise. The same thing will happen with Tralee, so why not open land that is NOT under the flight path.
19. There is no reason in the world that aircraft should be directed over the peaceful Tuggeranong Valley to accommodate a greedy builders development plans at Tralee or in fact anywhere else.
20. On past performance by ACT, NSW and Federal Governments, even if I was consulted, my views would not have counted for anything. Governments see consultation as a means of selling preconceived decisions not as an input to democratic government.
21. I don't think there should be different rules in Canberra than any where else in Australia.
22. I think we need to have a system of meaningful consultation within the ACT and within these developments from NSW which border the ACT and affect the ACT. I am not surprised by the lack of meaningful consultation - I am just saddened that there are large groups of people who recognise that developments like this have the capacity to negatively affect the health and well being of established areas in the ACT for many years to come. Let's get a proper dialogue going here. Well done TCC for dealing with this issue this way - with such a short time frame I am impressed!!

23. As well as the noise pollution and effects on quality of life in southern Canberra and Queanbeyan, there are the environmental concerns. The hill slope south east and above the proposed Dunns Ck Rd is a good spot for several rare plants and animals; its all part of the vegetation corridor/bird migration route from the Tinderries to the Murrumbidgee, and most frightening of all will dry out the Woden and Wild Dog Cks parts of the already dying Jerrabomberra Ck surface and ground water system. That will make the area poor quality for periurban or urban living, and pollute Lake Burley Griffin even further.
24. Representatives from our community association east of Queanbeyan sat on an Aircraft Noise Abatement Group committee several years ago, shortly after new flight paths were designated following the development of Jerrabomberra. We were told "not to worry" by Canberra Airport representatives because new, quieter aircraft with steeper take-off and landing characteristics were being developed. Like that suggestion, the aircraft noise envelope being proposed by Canberra Airport is based on speculation and they can't both be right.
25. I suggest TCC could better spend their time campaigning for a curfew at the airport. According to the Canberra Airport's plan, the greatest noise increase is going to come from freight aircraft at all of the day and night.
26. The fetish to increase population continues unabated. "Developers", in pursuit of money and personal gain continue to press on toward total unsustainability.
27. The Tralee proposal will inevitably be followed by protests and lobbying against the airport and its flight paths. Furthermore it is ecological and environmental vandalism - the only good land in the eye of the "developer" is land with a building on it and its financial contribution to his/her already very well lined pocket
28. After the development of Jerrabomberra, flight paths were modified due to complaints from residents. As long as the flight paths will not be modified to have more impact on Tuggeranong, I would have no problem with the development but we know this is not the case.
29. Some developers are ONLY motivated by greed and they have NO empathy for those effected by their appalling behavior.
30. Currently aircraft noise over Fadden appears to be limited to diversions from normal flight paths due to storm activity and emergency low level flights by the South Care helicopter (significant noise and window rattling). If in a higher located residential area, such as closer to the hillside nature reserves, the former can be fairly noisy. In the case of the latter, so long as undertaking emergency transport the Southcare helicopter can legally avoid the normal rules about height and route of flights over residential areas.

31. A legally binding inter-Government agreement should be concluded that protects existing residential areas of Tuggeranong from detrimental air corridor changes (draft plan indicates that sizable areas of South Tralee are still to be affected by both aircraft and industrial noise). Otherwise, any such changes to the corridor arrangements would likely affect the amenity of Tuggeranong residences. Noise attenuation retrofitting of current residences would be costly and may not be possible or practical. A large development at South Tralee is also likely to lead to significantly reduced traffic amenity along major arterial roads such as Lanyon Drive, Tharwa Drive and the Monaro Highway due to additional NSW traffic utilising these roads. The supplementary report recognises that significant (cross-border) infrastructure investment will be required (ultimate cost to ACT taxpayers unknown?). However, based on the effect that the Jerrabomberra development and subsequent traffic had on such roads, it is likely that any such investment will be insufficient to maintain the amenity of these roads during peak periods (development proceeding prior to such investment would also be inappropriate: Jerrabomberra example). Depending on the location of traffic entry points into the ACT (e.g. if close to Isabella Drive) the proposed development may also exacerbate traffic problems in nearby Tuggeranong suburbs that residents of other suburbs use as shortcuts.
32. I note that the standalone Aircraft flight path and noise related maps were not made available via the Queanbeyan City Council Site.
33. While I'm aware that there is a history to the proposed Tralee development, the premise that it is reasonable to push forward with residential developments in areas of high aircraft noise should be questioned as it is not like all the surrounds of Queanbeyan are already built in leaving the Queanbeyan Council with no other options other than Tralee.
34. Hands off 'Tralee!' This wonderful historic property was sold out of the Morrison family for sheer greed and in return for a quick buck by a greedy individual who deserves nothing.
35. Some advocates of the development will advise that new airport approach technology will allow noise sensitive areas to be avoided by aircraft. This is only so for the handful of aircraft types that has the necessary equipment. This equipment and its supporting systems are expensive and its uptake by all aircraft types may take many years.
36. How many examples of the incompatibility of aircraft and homes do we need? Look at Sydney/Kingsford Smith, Bankstown, Melbourne/Tullamarine, Perth, ewcastle/Williamstown - the list goes on. This proposal has the potential to make Canberra Airport Management, the residents of Tuggeranong and the new residents of Tralee miserable. The only winners seem to be the Mayor of Queanbeyan and the faceless drones in the NSW Government.

37. I can remember when Jerrabomberra was just a sales caravan on the side of Lanyon Drive (Tharwa Road then) and the governments of the day said "don't expect the flight paths to ever change". Since then the flight path has gradually crept over to the Monaro Highway and Macarthur / Chisholm area. It was money grabbing then with the first developer and it's money grabbing now.
38. I live in Jerrabomberra and the planes fly right over me. I hardly hear them and they have no impact on us at all. I Hope they go ahead with Tralee. I will be willing to purchase a house their. The planes fly over every 1/2 hour and when ever we have visitors they comment on how nice it is to see the planes from our house.
39. Don't believe aircraft noise and residential housing can co-exist. Consequently, against green field developments under flight paths.
40. Aircraft noise is not the only problem of course, e.g. how will road traffic impact the already choking Monaro Highway at peak periods and how many 'escape routes' would residents have in the case of bushfires?
41. I think it is foolish to build homes that will be affected by aircraft noise, imagine trying to have a bbq outside with aircraft flying low overhead. In the interests of equity these affected people will want the rest of us to share in their problem, no thanks. I am also extremely concerned that the establishment of the Tralee Estate will mean thousands of more cars on the Monaro Highway during peak periods which is a road that hardly handles the peak load now. If this development is approved then the ACT Government must not allow a cross border road for this estate onto the Monaro Highway forcing Tralee drivers to drive through Jerrabomberra and Queanbeyan as QCC and the NSW Government will have approved this development and therefore should build the infrastructure to support it, not the residents and ratepayers of the ACT who will get no benefit from this estate, only problems.
42. On the matter of the Aircraft noise, remember all current residents around Sydney Kingsford Smith Airport who are always complaining about aircraft noise have moved into/purchased their house after the airport was built. This is what the future residents of Tralee will do and as this estate is in a federally marginal seat; their concerns will take priority over the concerns of the 'taken for granted' residents of Canberra. This should not go ahead for the two reasons stated above.
43. To clarify Re: question about whether currently' affected' by aircraft noise - we do hear aircraft from time to time, in the evening and on weekends (seems to depend on weather factors, e.g. there are more planes overhead when there are storms in Melbourne) - so far not too detrimental but would not want noise to increase. Also hear the Southcare helicopter but that is tempered by the fact that it is doing a worthy job. I live in Chisholm.
44. I am also (equally extremely) concerned about the airport's wish to operate 24/7.

45. I think it is totally irresponsible of the developers to even consider building at Tralee.....
46. Just don't build homes there, simple as that!
47. I hear about Tralee on the news but in no real detail. My concern is that once homes are built in Tralee and the new residents realise the amount of aircraft noise they are subjected exposed to they will lobby to introduce noise sharing and/or place curfews on airport operations. Tuggeranong is subject to occasional aircraft noise due to weather conditions etc at the ACT airport.
48. Tralee represents very poor urban planning that, if does go ahead will have a negative impact on everyone.
49. Say no to Tralee.
50. It seems odd to choose to place new housing under an established flight path and then suggest it could be moved over Tuggeranong.
51. I don't want aircraft noise over my house because of some developer wanting to make millions on people who will eventually complain about the noise of the aircraft over their houses!!!
52. It is inevitable that future residents will complain about noise - you just have to look at planes coming in over Jerrabomberra. It is just as inevitable that noise sharing will be proposed as a solution - totally unfair and the developer will have long taken his profits and gone! It's also inevitable that Canberra airport will grow not contract. So the noise risk is greater.
53. Although we have been assured that aircraft noise over the new development is at acceptable levels, other instances show us that more than likely the noise will become a problem, and then those residents will lobby to have the flight paths changed. Fair enough I guess, but I'm not keen to have the noise over us either!
54. There are so many other places to build new residences besides the Tralee area. If the Tralee project does go ahead, while many new residents may initially accept the noise level, there's a strong chance that the 'second generation' of residents may have other ideas and pressure the ACT Government, which has been singularly and spectacularly invisible on this issue, to relocate flight paths over the roofs of Canberra residents who bought, often decades ago, into the aircraft-free zone of Tuggeranong and other regions, for the quiet.
55. Tralee should not go ahead. If it does then the developers MUST make the houses totally noise proof and indefinitely indemnify householders for any noise related (including stress) injuries that may occur. They are just money hungry developers who control the land.
56. I believe that there is a new site under consideration which is not under a flight path.

57. It would be totally irresponsible to approve this development. I have lived "adjacent" to flight paths in Sydney and now refuse to stay over in Sydney at a friend's house that is under a flight path. Why bring this misery on people when there are other locations for development?