

Archived: Thursday, 21 November 2019 8:38:24 AM

From: [Jethro Nelson](#)

Sent: Sun, 17 Nov 2019 12:37:45

To: Noise Regulation

Subject: Proposed noise regulation of historic aircraft

Sensitivity: Normal

\f0Dear Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities & Regional Development,

\f0

\f0

\f0As the owner and operator of a historic aircraft, I have read with interest the review of Aircraft Noise Regulations for Specialised Aircraft and the proposed changes to the regulation of these aircraft.

\f0

\f0Here in Australia we have enviable historic aircraft and warbird communities, representing the aviation history and heritage of Australia & overseas. This in turn allows a rich diversity of such aircraft on display to the public at airshows and also available to the public for adventure flights.

\f0

\f0Ownership of these aircraft comes at considerable cost and commitment, and so owners want and need to be able to get reasonable use and value from their investment. Some owners obviously choose to sell adventure flights to help cover their costs. In recent years, the ability to also use these aircraft for private operations has significantly helped not only peoples' decisions in owning a historic aircraft, but also the variety of flights which can now be carried out in these aircraft. This has the beneficial effects of increased currency and proficiency for pilots on these types, thereby enhancing the safety of their operations.

\f0

\f0In para 3.7 of the Issues Paper, you list four proposals for noise regulation of historic aircraft:

\f0

\f0a. Different conditions or limits:

\f0

\f0I firmly believe that the current conditions and limitations on private historic aircraft flight are appropriate to the situation, and should not be changed.

\f0

\f0If individual owners or operators have attracted negative feedback, then the Department should consider different limits or conditions for them on a case by case basis, rather than adversely affecting everyone else.

\f0

\f0b. Extended/three year exemptions:

\f0

\f0I am strongly in favour of either 3 year exemptions, or ideally exemptions which last for the duration of the ownership/operator's use of an aircraft, providing there was no or negligible negative feedback for a particular aircraft or operations. This would in turn reduce the administrative burden for owners, operators, Councils, airports and the Department.

\f0

\f0c. Aligning exemptions with AWAL CofA issue:

\f0

\f0I am in support of this proposal, providing it is then a standing exemption approval remaining in force for the duration of the Cof A or ownership of the aircraft.

\f0

\f0d. Grandfathering:

\f0

\f0Providing there is no adverse feedback for a particular operator or aircraft, I believe the continued grandfathering of existing historic aircraft can continue, thereby reducing administrative loads. If a noise problem arises, then of course this should be reviewed for that aircraft/operator and a periodic exemption considered.

\f0

\f0 _____

\f0

\f0I hope this feedback helps to bring a reasonable way forward for historic aircraft; a way which keeps administration, restrictions and limitations to a minimum for the vast majority of people who operate these aircraft in a considerate and responsible manner, thereby allowing the Department's resources to be more focused on any problem cases.

\f0

\f0Yours,

\f0

\f0Jethro Nelson

\f0