

Mornington Peninsula Shire Council
Tyabb Airfield Community Reference Group

MEETING 2

5.00 to 8.00 pm, Wednesday 1 August 2018
Mornington Peninsula Shire - Hastings Office

Attendance

Dr Martin Cranmer (Tyabb Ratepayers Group; TRG), Katrina Chalke (TRG), Stuart Benton (local businesses and landowners), Dick Cox (community), Jack Vevers (Peninsula Aero Club; PAC), Peter Bernardi (PAC), Judy Pay (airfield businesses), Stewart Bracken (hangar owners), David Bergin (Mornington Peninsula Shire Council; MPSC), Allan Cowley (MPSC), Hugh Pierce (MPSC; CRG support), Bruce Turner – Independent Chair

Apologies

Councillor Julie Morris, Ben Hogan, Len Minty

1. Welcome and introductions

Bruce summarised the meeting agenda and referred to a number of recent emails indicating that there may be some tension in relation to a number of the issues listed. He called on everyone to use their 'best endeavours' (see Terms of Reference, section 8) to make the meeting as productive as possible.

Martin enquired if Niall McDonagh (Chief Operating Officer MPSC) would be attending meetings during the upcoming absence of Cr. Morris. David Bergin advised that in the absence of Cr. Morris, the Mayor would be the default replacement member.

2. Notes and actions from the previous meeting

Bruce ran through the actions from the previous meeting as noted in the minutes, including the following:

Actions 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 – these were completed and the final Terms of Reference were made available for endorsement by members.

Action 1.4 Website information

Judy enquired about the generic CRG email address for community contact which had been discussed at the previous meeting. Allan confirmed that this had been provided (on the Council TAPP webpage). Action completed

Action 1.5 Opportunity for CRG members to send questions regarding the proposed widening of the sealed section of the runway to Bruce as a possible basis for an FAQ.

Bruce indicated that, with Allan, he had put together a list of questions regarding the proposed widening of the sealed section of the runway, and other runway-related topics. These included a question raised by Len about the designation of the E-W runway. No other questions had been received from members. The questions had then been provided to Jack, who in turn had provided draft FAQs relating to:

- Widening the sealed section of the runway
- Jets, and
- Airfield Profile.

The draft FAQs had then been circulated to the other members of the CRG.

Bruce acknowledged that the circulation of the three draft FAQs, without reference to the Action in the minutes (which related only to the widening of the runway), nor a clear

indication that these were draft documents only, together with the inclusion of additional FAQs relating to jets and other aspects of the airfield's profile, had caused understandable confusion and concern. He apologised for this.

As a way forward, he suggested that the Group should focus just on the runway widening FAQ in direct response to Action 1.5. The other FAQs could possibly be considered under Other Business if there was time, but he acknowledged that some members felt these should not be on the agenda for discussion at this meeting.

Martin requested an opportunity to respond to the drafts following time to consider and deliberate with the Tyabb Ratepayers Group. Bruce advocated for at least an initial discussion of the runway FAQs, as a followup to the previous meeting, and given this type of discussion was very much within the scope of what the group was established to do. Martin reiterated that the FAQs could not be resolved within the meeting and that more time would be needed after the meeting.

(Action closed/ superseded by meeting 2 actions)

Action 1.6 Invitation to Mr Brewis Atkinson to attend the meeting

Allan advised that he had issued the invitation, but Mr. Atkinson had advised that he was not able to attend the current meeting. He had indicated that he would be interested in attending the following meeting. (Action superseded)

Action 2.1: Allan to invite Mr Atkinson to attend the next meeting as per the previous invitation.

3. Confirmation of Terms of Reference

Bruce noted that he had placed the finalised Terms of Reference (ToR) document on the table and that it was there to be signed by the members of the CRG, as an indication of everyone's endorsement, unless there were further concerns.

Dick advised that he wished to discuss one of the provisions within the ToR. He indicated concern regarding the extent of back and forward correspondence over the minutes of the previous meeting and raised his desire that the meetings be recorded.

Bruce acknowledged Dick's request and noted that under the ToR the meetings could be recorded, with the agreement of all members, but that this may have implications on the participation of members.

Martin indicated his preference for recording of meetings. Allan indicated concern that the recording of meetings could limit the willingness of members to provide their comments and engage in discussion of issues.

Dick said he was concerned about variations in the "tracked changes" document that was first sent out and which highlighted comments by Allan, Bruce and Hugh on the first draft. Judy enquired if there were any instances of inconsistencies within the minutes, compared to people's recollection of what was said. No specific examples were cited.

Allan noted the example of the comments regarding an accident at the airfield from the last meeting, and the need to ensure that events recounted in meetings are minuted in an appropriate manner (i.e. the minutes are not meant to be a transcript).

Stewart raised a previous comment from last meeting indicating that members should be able to ask for their comments to be repeated by the Secretary to ensure that their comments have been taken down as intended where this is critical.

Jack reiterated Allan's previous comments regarding people potentially being uneasy in providing open comments on topics where their comments are being recorded. He suggested that the draft minutes released to the members for comment should not include all the tracked changes from their preparation, as these are confusing (and wasteful of paper if printed).

Bruce suggested that there should be another attempt at producing the minutes without recording of the meeting, after which members could review whether recording would help.

The ToR document was ultimately signed by all present by the end of the meeting.

4. Scope of issues, opportunities and aspirations, and

5. Airfield Master Plan Update

Katrina advised that the Tyabb and District Ratepayers Group felt that the overriding aim of the CRG should be the preparation of the Airfield Master Plan so that the community can be aware of what is intended for the airfield in the future. She asked whether the PAC would submit the Master Plan to the CRG and the community.

Dick reiterated the TAPP recommendation that the PAC prepare a Master Plan for approval by Council. Martin asked whether the Councillors had changed their mind on this recommendation and Allan advised that this was not the case.

Allan confirmed that the TAPP recommends the preparation of an Airfield Master Plan by the PAC and that it be approved by Council. However, whilst that is Council's adopted position, the PAC is not obliged to prepare a Master Plan, and Council is not able to compel them to do so.

However, Allan advised that in his view the best way to ensure greater certainty is for a Master Plan to be prepared by the PAC and that it be submitted for endorsement/approval by Council, and that this is the process that Council is encouraging.

Jack advised that the PAC is committed to preparing a Master Plan and will submit it to Council for approval. He said PAC would use its best endeavours to come up with a Plan that is acceptable to the community, but that it is Council's decision on whether or not to approve it.

David referred to his experience with the preparation of master plans by private schools, which had facilitated a clearer understanding of their proposals for future development, acquisition of land etc. Bruce noted that the TAPP includes the intention to incorporate an approved Master Plan into planning policy within the planning scheme. In this context, David noted that a state-wide planning scheme amendment (VC148) had been introduced on Tuesday 31 July 2018, making substantial changes to the planning scheme. He noted that airports and airfields have been combined within the new planning policy framework. He advised that should the master plan and/or its recommendations be incorporated into the planning scheme, then it would possibly be located in this section.

Katrina asked if Jack was aware of this planning scheme amendment to which Jack replied that he was not. Martin asked for a summary of VC148. David advised that he had not had time to review the whole amendment as it involves extensive changes. He said he would be briefing the Councillors on the amendment in the coming weeks and could bring the same presentation to the next CRG meeting. He also agreed to provide an advisory note circulated by DELWP.

Action 2.2: David to provide a summary of the changes in VC148 and this topic to be listed for discussion at the next CRG meeting.

Bruce asked if the Amendment fundamentally changes planning policy. David advised that, while there are substantial changes, these will not undermine or substantially affect what is intended to be achieved by the CRG and TAPP. He noted that the planning scheme amendment is primarily seeking to avoid duplication across state and local policy.

Jack noted that whatever is proposed done on the airfield site in the future, with or without a Master Plan, there would have to be a review by Council's planning department. Bruce commented, in line with the earlier discussion on this item, that it would be preferable to have a clear Master Plan to provide context for consideration of specific proposals.

There was further discussion of the best process for development of the Master Plan through to a final version for approval. Jack outlined the iterative process of developing a plan through

several drafts. Judy advocated for involvement of the CRG before a draft was released for public comment. David mentioned his experience with Moorabbin Airport and indicated that the Council would want a draft Master Plan considered by the CRG before proceeding to a Council meeting. Allan also noted that before the Council considered any Master Plan there would be an expectation of public exhibition.

Bruce asked how the members would feel about reviewing a draft in confidence. Katrina said she thought this could be difficult and that it would be preferable for the CRG to review a close-to-final document rather than going through multiple drafts. Bruce noted that the Terms of Reference call on members to maintain confidentiality on matters discussed 'in camera' or when information is still in 'draft' for consideration by the group (ToR 12.4). All members confirmed they would honour this, if it was made explicit when 'draft' information was being provided to the group.

Jack noted that a noise management plan needs to be completed in conjunction with the Master Plan. He indicated that the PAC had identified around 90% of the elements that could be included in the Master Plan. Once the noise assessment work was done the PAC's planning consultants would be asked to complete the draft Plan.

From the discussion the intended process for the preparation of the Airfield Master Plan can be summarised generally as follows:

1. Initial discussion of issues between PAC and Council officers
2. Preparation of draft Airfield Master Plan (AMP) by PAC, including consideration of information generated by (concurrent) noise assessment study and any comments received on issues.
3. Briefing of Council on draft AMP (vision and general direction)
4. Discussion of 'exposure' draft AMP within the CRG and by PAC with its members
5. Further report to Council
6. Public exhibition/ consultation
7. Consideration of an AMP for endorsement by Council.

Jack said he would like the CRG to identify what it would like to see addressed within the master plan; i.e. expectations or concerns and ways these might be dealt with. He said the more issues they are made aware of, the more comprehensive the plan can potentially be.

Dick noted that feedback on a Facebook page on the airfield, and what he hears in the local community, indicate that people don't mind the airfield; they just don't want it to get any 'bigger'. He went on to say that he felt the airfield needs to have control over what happens on the site and that at present it does not.

Action 2.3: CRG members invited to provide comments to the PAC on issues /suggestions for inclusion in the draft Airfield Master Plan.

In response to a query from Bruce, Katrina indicated that she was satisfied with the PAC's confirmation of the expectation that Council approval of the Master Plan would be sought, since this was key to ensure certainty for the community.

Scope of matters for discussion by the CRG

Martin indicated that he wanted to return to Item 4 of the agenda (Scope of issues, opportunities and aspirations). He asked if the PAC was prepared to discuss hours of operation. Jack stated that if the discussion was related to the Fly Neighbourly Advice issued by the PAC then the answer is yes, but if it related to the Planning Permits and their respective conditions of approval, then no.

Martin asked for the PAC's position in regard to discussion of the number of aircraft movements. Jack indicated that there could be opportunities to discuss changes to the Fly Neighbourly Advice, and that there are already restrictions on night flying.

Allan noted that the PAC had previously applied to vary the planning permit conditions in instances regarding the air show – so in some situations the permit conditions do come under

review, and therefore might be discussed by the CRG.

Secondary consent applications

Martin asked Jack about six secondary consent applications recently included on Council's register of applications.

Jack advised that the PAC had recently made a number of applications to Council. One was for a balcony which needed replacing (which had a title 'new club rooms' on the Council register) and another was to put up a tractor shed. In addition, two applications for 'secondary consent' had been submitted involving changes to three existing permits – hence the six applications. One sought approval to widen the sealed section of the runway. The second was to remove the existing condition restricting flying on Sunday mornings between 9.30 am and 10.30 am.

Allan noted that the conditions of the permits do allow consideration of applications for secondary consent with the 'further approval of the Responsible Authority', but that this depended on the specific wording of each permit and the extent/ significance of the changes proposed. He indicated that there would need to be discussion with the planning officers about whether the current proposals would be considered under secondary consent provisions (which do not include public notice requirements or appeal rights).

Bruce asked if the Group could facilitate information-sharing to avoid instances where CRG members have to enquire about planning applications lodged between meetings. There was discussion of options, which included Council advising the CRG members of planning applications received, or the PAC to advise the CRG when/ if they apply. The first option was supported.

Action 2.4 Allan to arrange for a CRG "watch list" relating to new applications at the airfield

6. Runway issues

Bruce asked for clarification regarding the use of the E-W runway. Jack advised that whenever certain weather conditions raises issues in relation to safety on the main N-S runway, then the (unsealed) E-W runway is used and that the PAC intends to continue to use this runway. He emphasized that it is not an "emergency runway".

Allan advised that Council does not have the plans relating to the original planning permit (from 1965), which may have shown the E-W runway. Allan asked if the PAC has any record of the plans. Jack indicated that he did not know.

Katrina noted that the E-W runway wasn't raised at the last meeting, and hence queried why it was included in the draft FAQ regarding proposed widening of the N-S runway. Bruce advised that Len had asked the question following the meeting and he had passed this on to PAC.

Jack emphasised the runway widening is only about improving the safety of the airfield.

Bruce asked if the draft FAQs circulated prior to the meeting (with each one provided as a separate handout at the meeting) addressed all the issues of interest/ concern to the community in regard to the proposed runway widening.

Allan asked if the increase in the sealed width would change the types of aircraft that could use the runway. Jack indicated that he was not aware of any aircraft that are below the existing weight limit that require a wider runway. Stuart noted that the 8 metre taxiways are not proposed to be widened, so the physical constraints at ground level would remain.

Martin reiterated that he wanted to reserve his right of reply to the draft FAQs for after the meeting, but added that he thought that certain planes could be accommodated with the widened sealed runway. He pointed out that a widened runway would not necessarily attract

physically wider aircraft but could improve its appeal to heavier aircraft.

Jack referred to the conditions of planning permits limiting heavier aircraft. Martin suggested that there are larger (heavier) aircraft, still within the weight limit, that could use the airfield but would not use the airfield with its current runway width.

(There was discussion of the “mud on the runway” finding in the report of a landing accident discussed at the previous CRG meeting. It was clarified that the mud was on the grassed part of the runway, not the sealed part.)

Stewart asked if Martin’s only concern regarding runway widening is that large (heavier) aircraft could be accommodated. He queried whether, if this could be resolved, that would address Martin’s concerns.

Martin indicated that a key concern for the Tyabb Ratepayers Group was that the next step (following widening of the sealed runway) could be an application to increase the weight limit on aircraft able to use the airfield.

Jack advised that, even if this were to happen, a planning permit would be required which would include public advertising. He said he did not believe that Council would support such an outcome. In addition, Jack stated that the PAC has no intention to bring in heavier planes except for during the air show.

Allan queried if passenger services could be accommodated at Tyabb (within the existing weight limits). Jack indicated that the largest aircraft that could be accommodated would probably be a King Air aircraft which is very quiet and only used by a limited number of organisations, e.g. Flying Doctors, Army.

Martin suggested that in 2004 the PAC had applied to vary the weight limit. Judy, Jack and Allan all indicated that they were not aware of such a proposal.

Stewart sought Martin’s views on the proposed widening if the PAC confirmed that they would not seek to change the weight limit on aircraft using the airfield (apart from during airshows).

Martin commented that lack of clarity on this matter was one reason why he did not want to respond to the draft FAQs until he had had time to research and undertake further deliberation.

Action 2.5: Martin and Allan to look in to whether a planning application was lodged to vary the weight limit in 2004.

Allan noted that the weight limit for the long term could be confirmed in the Master Plan.

Allan then provided a brief update on discussion regarding the possible early termination of part of the existing section 173 agreement between Council and the PAC in relation to runway maintenance. Jack advised that further discussion had been had with Niall McDonagh of Council. He did not think it was appropriate to discuss this matter within this forum without Niall present.

7. Noise Management

Allan referred to the four-page document regarding the proposed Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) report sent to CRG members the previous week.

Allan provided an overview as to why Council proposed to undertake an ANEF assessment of the airfield and surrounds. He advised there are multiple methods to measure noise. Whilst ANEF has limitations, it is a common starting point, is the only approach with statutory recognition, and can be complemented by other measures such as N (‘Noise above’) contours. He indicated that N Contour mapping (which indicate how often a certain noise level is exceeded at a location) should also be undertaken as part of the assessment and could be completed under the same modelling and budget as the ANEF.

Jack advised that an ANEF provides knowledge of where noise is penetrating – a “noise footprint” – which could be the basis for adjustments to flight paths under the Fly Neighbourly Agreement.

Allan advised that Council would be paying for the noise assessment work due to there being no obligation on the PAC to complete an ANEF, and the need to ensure there are no concerns regarding the independence of the work.

Dick noted that Allan's document referred to AS2021-2015 on the front page but included an outdated table (AS2021-2000) on page 4. Allan stated that the table had come from EPA noise guidelines but acknowledged that this discrepancy needed to be rectified.

Action 2.6: Allan to ensure the correct standard (AS2021-2015) is used in the noise assessment.

Allan advised that the modelling must be based on assumptions regarding the growth in aviation. Jack confirmed that forecasts of the numbers and types of aircraft would need to be provided by PAC. He said this information is calculated using training data as proxies.

Martin raised a concern that ratepayers would be paying for the noise report and indicated that he did not consider the ANEF to be an appropriate mechanism since it was generally used for much larger facilities.

Allan advised that his initial discussions with consultants and the Shire's Environmental Health officers indicated that the combination of ANEF and N Contour measures is the best starting point.

Martin queried the prospect of applying noise monitors around the airfield. Jack and Stewart indicated that this would be accommodated as part of an ANEF. David confirmed with Allan that real time monitoring would be included within the brief for the project.

Stewart pointed out that if there was already concern about the validity of undertaking this study, then even when completed its credibility would still be in question.

Allan advised that other options do not offer any more valid outcomes than those achieved by the ANEF and N contour. Nevertheless, he said he was open to input from others as to a better approach.

Dick advised that he is across from the airfield (on Stuart Road) and does not get the noise as badly as other properties such as along the hill to the west. Martin also advised that a resident of Seaview Road had indicated that whilst you can have noise monitors out in their area there is a variation in noise up on the hill as opposed to that experienced in other areas around the runway.

Dick raised potential concern about using Marshall Day for the noise study due to their previous work with the Tyabb Airfield. Bruce asked if anyone would have hesitation in using Marshall Day, and no objections were raised in the Group. Allan indicated that he would ask Airservices Australia to review the work to ensure its technical validity.

Bruce concluded that, unless anyone can establish a more appropriate alternative, it appeared reasonable for the Shire to proceed with the ANEF and N contour study.

Allan advised the Shire had not yet commissioned a consultant to conduct the assessment and that the timeframe for completion has not been determined, as the Shire was still seeking quotations.

8. Other Business

Bruce indicated that there was time for some discussion of the two other draft FAQs that had been circulated, if the CRG was interested.

Jack indicated that at the last meeting he had stated that no jets would be landing at Tyabb and expressed a desire to get that message out in a FAQ.

Dick queried the accuracy of the statement "no jets" and read out a planning permit associated with the air show which included some allowance for jets. Jack commented that this was only for the short period of the air show. Stewart said his assumption was that the FAQ was intended to address whether jets were to be landed on a regular basis, rather than just on the

odd instances associated with the air show.

Jack noted that, in fact, no jets did land or take-off during the last airshow – they simply performed fly overs. The approval to land was therefore more of a precaution for safety purposes.

Bruce noted from the discussion that it seemed important to be careful in the FAQs to distinguish between information regarding the general operation of the airfield and any particular exceptions to these general statements.

Peter reiterated the need to broadcast agreed FAQs throughout both PAC and ratepayers network. (see next item 'Communication' for more discussion on this)

Martin referred to a CASA "drone map" that had been prepared for the area around the Tyabb airfield. and asked if the PAC was doing anything to promulgate this. Jack advised that the PAC was not involved.

Bruce confirmed that all members would sign off on the Terms of Reference before the end of the meeting.

9. Communication with wider community

[NB Discussion under this Item was actually brought forward by Bruce during the discussion of runway widening as it relates to the dissemination of FAQs, but the points summarised below were revisited at various times during the meeting]

Bruce again apologised for any concern/ confusion caused by the circulation of the draft FAQs (Frequently Asked Questions) without more explanation. He reiterated the value of FAQs in general in providing clarity on a range of issues of community interest or concern.

There was discussion about whether it would be possible /desirable for FAQs to be produced by the CRG as a whole, or if they should be clearly from the PAC. There was general agreement that if the content of a FAQ is agreed within the CRG then it is reasonable for it to be distributed by all groups (PAC, Council and the TRG). Jack indicated that the PAC's intention is to address ongoing rumours and that a shared release of FAQs would hopefully reduce uncertainty in the community.

Martin commented that outside of using the TRG newsletter and Facebook pages to publish details there are limited avenues to broadcast this information. He reported that there had been three 'likes' on Facebook in response to posting the notes of the first meeting. Katrina indicated that she received a few responses of thanks back from the TRG database in response to her sending the summary notes of the last meeting.

Stuart advocated for everyone involved to approach the communications in good faith, noting no one was here to 'shaft' anyone. It was noted that the TRG had played a 'straight bat' with agreed information following the first meeting.

Jack advised that he was happy to get all draft FAQs to a stage where members of the CRG are satisfied with the responses so that they could then be published on the web by all organisations involved.

Martin referred to a brief article on the CRG membership which had just been published in Peninsula News. Jack reported that the journalist had contacted him for comment and he had referred him to the information about the CRG on the web. In the light of this article, it was agreed that a press release about the formation of the group was redundant.

Action 2.7: All CRG members are invited to provide comments on the draft FAQs with the aim of these being finalised and shared collaboratively through organisations' web and Facebook pages.

Bruce reviewed the key points for the meeting summary that he had been recording on the whiteboard during the meeting, and asked for any further key points to be noted in the meeting summary.

Stewart suggested that the commitment of the PAC to produce an Airfield Master Plan and to provide it to council for approval should be noted.

The summary points as recorded on the whiteboard were:

- Airfield master plan
 - Purpose to provide certainty and clarity to community.
 - PAC committed to produce and provide to Council for approval.
 - Master plan should be made a public document as part of Council's approval.
- The ToR were endorsed
- Working on distribution of FAQs on runway widening and 'no jets' for distribution through networks
- Noise Management Plan – (there was) agreement to proceed despite limitations.

10. Next Meeting

Bruce raised the date for the next meeting. Due to Allan's upcoming leave, and timeframes for noise assessment etc, the decision was made to schedule the next meeting for Wednesday 24 October 2018 (5-8 pm, Hastings).

Summary of actions from second meeting:

	Action	Status (as at 15/8/2018)
2.1	Allan to invite Mr Atkinson to attend the next meeting as per the previous invitation.	Pending
2.2	David to provide a summary of the changes in VC 148 and this topic to be listed for discussion at the next CRG meeting.	Completed
2.3	CRG members invited to provide comments to the PAC on issues /suggestions for inclusion in the draft Airfield Master Plan.	In progress
2.4	Allan to arrange for a CRG "watch list" relating to new applications at the airfield.	In progress
2.5	Martin and Allan to look in to whether a planning application was lodged to vary the weight limit in 2004.	In progress
2.6	Allan to ensure the correct standard (AS2021-2015) is used in the noise assessment.	Noted
2.7	All CRG members are invited to provide comments on the draft FAQs with the aim of these being finalised and shared collaboratively through organisations' web and Facebook pages.	In progress