

Mornington Peninsula Shire Council  
**Tyabb Airfield Community Reference Group**

## **MEETING 4**

5.30 to 8.00 pm, Wednesday 13 March 2019  
Mornington Peninsula Shire - Hastings Office

### **Attendance**

Councillor Julie Morris (Watsons Ward); Dr Martin Cranmer (Tyabb Ratepayers Group; TRG), Katrina Chalke (TRG), Dick Cox (community), Len Minty (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), Martin Chin (MPSC; CRG support), Bruce Turner – Independent Chair .

Guest: Mr Lachlan Deen – Marshall Day Acoustics (for items 1 & 2)

### **Apologies**

Mr Stuart Benton (local businesses and landowners).

### **Summary points from the meeting** (as made publicly available from 19 March)

The Tyabb Airfield Community Reference Group (CRG) met for the fourth time on 13 March 2019 at the Hastings offices of the Shire. The CRG has agreed to issue the following summary points from the meeting in advance of the more detailed minutes:

- a. A representative of the Council-appointed noise consultant, Marshall Day Acoustics, presented to the group and answered questions about the scope and methodology of the noise study that is being conducted in and around the airfield. The study findings will be discussed with the CRG before being publicly released.
- b. Councillor Morris attended to present feedback from Shire councillors on the process to date and gauge members' support to continue the process.
- c. The CRG prioritised its focus on providing input to the Tyabb Airfield Master Plan (which is being prepared by the Peninsula Aero Club) and the concurrent Aircraft Noise Management Plan. Initial input on the scope of issues to be covered in the Master Plan has previously been provided by non-PAC members of the CRG.
- d. Council officers advised that the webpage with information about the airfield and CRG is to be revamped and will include additional facts about the airfield in response to community questions and concerns.
- e. There was discussion on whether to fill the vacant community representative (non-PAC member) position on the CRG at this time and, if so, the most appropriate process. This was to be finally determined by Council following the meeting.

The detailed minutes of meetings and further information about the CRG and its membership is available on the Tyabb Airfield Precinct Plan webpage on Council's website, <https://www.mornpen.vic.gov.au/Building-Planning/Strategic-Planning/Tyabb-Airfield-Precinct-Plan>. Interested community members are able to submit questions or comments relating to the airfield and the work of the CRG by emailing [tyabbairfieldcrg@mornpen.vic.gov.au](mailto:tyabbairfieldcrg@mornpen.vic.gov.au).

### **Detailed minutes**

#### **1. Welcome and introductions**

Bruce opened the meeting and noted an apology from Mr Stuart Benton. Bruce also acknowledged that there had been a number of points and queries raised in emails from members about the conduct of the CRG and its members, but suggested these be "parked" to be aired and hopefully addressed

later in the meeting after the discussion of the noise assessment. Bruce then introduced Mr Lachlan Deen from Marshall Day noise consultants

## 2. Noise assessment update

Lachlan provided an overview as follows:

- Marshall Day (MD) undertake a wide variety of acoustic investigations and noise control work, including in relation to restaurants, music venues, road and rail projects as well as advising on aircraft related noise. MD work a lot on airports, advising new homeowners, providing evidence at VCAT hearings etc.
- Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) Maps are used by local governments when planning land use around airports. ANEF maps are prepared using noise modelling software using a range of inputs, e.g. when and where aircraft fly, the number of movements, terrain and topography. Modelling does not rely on direct noise measurement on the site but rather is based on the known noise footprint of different types of aircraft.
- ANEF results are presented as noise contours, with the values deliberately scaled to give a relative indication of noise exposure at different sites. Australian standards are used to provide indicative guidance about whether a use near an airport is acceptable, conditionally acceptable or unacceptable.
- The ANEF system is not primarily intended to be used to provide information to the public on noise events – it is primarily a planning tool.
- N-contours are more readily used to communicate noise information to the public. N-contours are designed to indicate how many times a day the noise level exceeds a given decibel level; they are typically prepared for aircraft noise events above 60-70 decibels.

Martin asked whether the information on aircraft movement numbers available from the PAC (used in modelling) is comprehensive.

Lachlan indicated that movement numbers from the PAC are just one of several inputs and Marshall Day is still in the early stages of gathering information. They do not need the exact numbers of aircraft type operations to prepare a yearly average forecast. Differences in the order of a few percent are generally inconsequential.

Jack advised that the PAC videos every take-off and landing, month to month, and that this video information has been provided to Marshall Day. However, the recording is recorded over at the end of each month and the PAC does not count the movements *per se*. The airfield camera also does not capture overflying aircraft or aircraft doing training circuits. (later clarified that this system has been used for approx. 2 years, although initially some movements were not captured). David queried if the airfield video would correlate with noise monitoring? Allan advised that the video recording provides information about aircraft movements at particular times and he understands that this can be matched with noise monitoring.

Len enquired about where noise is being monitored. Allan advised that the noise monitors were located to the north, south, east and west of the airfield and at some distance from Mornington Tyabb Road. Members indicated that they did not need to know the exact locations (although this will be noted in the report). Cr Morris enquired about when noise levels were being recorded. Allan advised that noise monitoring had been undertaken 24 hours per day for four weeks and was now completed. There may be another period of monitoring if required.

A question was raised about how to separate aircraft noise from non-aircraft noise in the monitoring results. Lachlan advised that noise from aircraft tends to have a different profile and correlation with the video record will also be useful. Judy asked whether it was possible to distinguish between different aircraft types. Lachlan said the study was not looking to do this, although individual types

will go into the modelling. He added that the study was not going to focus on 'one-off' events like the biennial air show.

Len enquired whether different weather conditions affect noise monitoring and Martin queried whether the effect of higher ground is considered. Lachlan confirmed that modelling considers both different weather patterns and changes in topography. Martin asked whether the noise assessment results will be openly shared. Allan indicated that the results will be shared.

Jack indicated that he understood that there were recording instruments at different locations, and this made it possible to produce 3D noise modelling. Lachlan clarified that:

- Noise monitoring has been undertaken to sample across different areas and to get extra information to assist with noise modelling, but not to develop a 3D model per se.
- There are standards for noise modelling, with a whole suite of documentation. Australian Standard AS2021-2015 provides guidance on what land uses are acceptable, conditionally acceptable or not acceptable in proximity to airports, as well as providing guidance on internal building structure/ noise mitigation etc
- AirServices Australia is currently reviewing the noise modelling software used in ANEF modelling, but at the moment either version is acceptable.
- Marshall Day are still in the stage of gathering information and the timeframe for completion of this project is subject to this process – but it is likely to be in the order of two months.

Allan indicated that he would seek further information from the project lead (Alex Morobito) on the expected timeframe. Bruce noted that Action 2.6 (re the standard to be used in the noise assessment) was closed.

### **3. Follow up from previous meeting**

#### *Additional ground rules for CRG meetings*

Bruce acknowledged that the ground rules circulated with the agenda could not address all issues relating to the group dynamics. He urged everyone to exercise restraint and respect during meetings and to make sure even participation by members was encouraged. Bruce then invited Councillor Morris to speak to the group.

#### *The purpose and value of the Community Reference Group*

Cr Morris indicated that she had had many conversations about the airfield and planning around the airfield but had previously wanted to avoid direct involvement in the CRG. However, she was concerned about the focus and value of the Group and asked the CRG members: "What did you personally expect that the CRG was going to achieve?". The following summarised responses were received:

Len

- Had good expectations about what the CRG could achieve
- The CRG hasn't done as much as he would like but still believes it can achieve more
- The CRG is here to sort out the problems we currently have
- The Master Plan is key to resolving many issues
- Wondered why the current applications can't wait until the Master Plan has been developed
- Argued that the PAC's responses are too light on in details
- The CRG isn't meeting community expectations
- We are all the Tyabb community, including the PAC
- We need to cooperate with each other – everyone agrees
- We need to look after each other; the PAC looking after the community and the community looking after the PAC
- The CRG can do great things if allowed to

## Judy

- There is a lot of misinformation about operations at the airfield
- Also disappointed about community's concerns with permits
- Feels the community is negative about the airfield – as a result of misinformation being circulated
- Frustrated that whatever information the PAC puts out it gets pulled apart
- Hoping to educate people and address their misplaced fear, uncertainties and doubt

## Stewart

- Feels CRG is not productive and a waste of time
- Struggling to see what has been achieved since it began
- Ends up upsetting a lot of people
- Have been unsuccessful to date and questions chances of succeeding in the future
- Disappointed with so much background 'noise' occurring despite the high level of intelligence at the table
- Upset about Mr Atkinson's survey being given too much weight and consideration
- There has been little agreement to date. Seriously wonders whether there will be agreement even after the Master Plan has been developed

## David

- Formation of the CRG stems from a specific action in the adopted TAPP (Tyabb Airfield Precinct Plan)
- Disagreed with Stewart about the lack of progress and, in part, this reflects differing expectations.

## Bruce

- Also disagreed about little agreement to date
- Recalled past meetings and discussions and reminded everyone that there have been several agreements in relation to the Terms of Reference for the group, the process to be followed in preparation of the Master Plan, and on no support for jets at the airfield. Also the provision of comments on the scope of the Master Plan by the resident group representatives
- Stewart responded he didn't dispute that there had been some agreement on the process but that there has been little agreement on the key issues

## Martin

- The biggest disappointment was that, despite coming with an open mind, during the first meeting the discussion was shut down because PAC were not prepared to discuss so many things which should be on the table, such as planning permit conditions; meant community members feel thwarted
- The TRG had been instrumental in sharing information (on three face book pages); queried whether the PAC had been actively providing information including CRG meeting minutes on their website, social media, etc.

## Jack

- Emphasised that the exclusion of permit conditions from discussion was a proviso, made to Council, of the PAC being part of the CRG – this is why he made it so clear at the first meeting.
- He felt that condition wasn't made clear to other members thereby creating disappointment
- There is scope to discuss the Fly Neighbourly Advice.
- Stressed that PAC is committed to completing a Master Plan, but requires the noise assessment prior to completion of a draft Plan.
- Expected that the CRG would address most of the community's concerns but feel there has been lack of cooperation
- A good example is the jets myth. Silence on this matter from the CRG is providing tacit support for the rumour mill. He also felt the Shire hasn't helped much in this area.
- If there is more participation and collaboration, then we might have a chance but not when there is still so much negativity.

## Cr Morris

- Councillors had a vision that the members chosen to be part of the CRG would achieve a lot of things considering the valued attributes, skills and experiences of each member
- Want an honest and frank discussion
- Not sure where the CRG is heading
- Need everyone in the CRG to feel that they want to be here for the CRG to work
- Disappointed that there is so much disagreement and argument about the minutes
- Doesn't want to continue to waste Council resources into the future if this is not going to work

- Believes it is worth continuing provided the CRG knows where it is going
- Believes the CRG is currently distracted by a lot of 'noise'
- Considers that the Master Plan is crucial and would play an instrumental role in addressing key issues

*Discussion regarding the need to focus on the preparation of the Airfield Master Plan*

Allan commented that he believed that there was agreement that, at this stage, supporting the preparation of the Master Plan, building on the noise assessment, should be the main focus of CRG. Stewart commented that this was the first time he had heard about the focus on the Master Plan. He queried whether a Master Plan could really act as a panacea. He said he couldn't see that a Master Plan would be stronger than an FAQ document which the group had not been able to agree and finalise.

Cr Morris commented that if there is no Master Plan, or other planning document with ongoing status, then the PAC's word at any one time could only be taken as representing the views of the current PAC members and committee. For example, if Jack was no longer President, would things change? The Master Plan should provide greater certainty into the future and would be independent of who is operating the airfield at any moment in time.

Bruce supported Councillor Morris's comments and read from the Meeting 2 Summary Points where agreement was recorded that a key purpose of the CRG was to support preparation of an Airfield Master Plan and concurrent Aircraft Noise Management Plan. He proposed that narrowing the focus of the CRG's work to completing the noise assessment and then the Master Plan could enable the group to move forward and would provide the 'black and white' clarity on the future of the airfield that the community was needing.

Stewart asked about the group's broader role in improving communications and information sharing. Bruce suggested that once the core work was complete, Council could consider whether the group, or a new group, could have an ongoing liaison/ communications role as occurred with CRGs at other airfields and airports.

Jack said he was keen to consult the CRG and the public on the Master Plan but questioned the process, given the poor performance so far. David referred to the process for preparation of the Plan as outlined in previous meetings. He said a key step from his point of view was bringing a draft to the CRG for review and input. He commented that the airfield exists in a planning and regulatory 'vacuum' but that Council had shown its willingness to fill this by finalising the TAPP which had established the current process.

Allan noted that there had been previous agreement that rather than having to review many preliminary documents, it would be most effective to bring the Master Plan to the CRG for discussion when there was a draft document with some substance. Allan agreed that noise study was necessary to complete a draft and that this should be completed as soon as possible.

Martin commented that the PAC had already been provided with feedback from the community including the ratepayers group about what they would like considered in the Master Plan; but there had been no clear response thus far. Katrina reiterated that the ratepayer's group had provided comments about what they would like to see in the Master Plan and asked if that had been provided to the PAC. This was confirmed.

Stewart sought to further understand the process for preparing the Master Plan. Allan indicated that the Shire would work with the PAC to achieve a plan that satisfies the interests of all stakeholders as far as possible. The Plan would inform the consideration of future planning applications and may form the basis of a planning scheme /planning policy amendment.

Jack advised that a draft Plan had been prepared but the PAC needs to consider the noise assessment findings before finalising it. The PAC will also need to consider any need for infrastructure changes, and other implications, but will this can only be done once the noise assessment work is available. He encouraged the group to be patient. He said he thought with participation and goodwill the group had a chance of success.

## *Conclusion*

Councillor Morris reiterated her feeling that the CRG had the right people for the task. She asked how many of the members were committed to keep going. Stewart asked if she thought the CRG was providing value for money in terms of the time, effort and resources put into it. Cr Morris said she believed it was, provided it produced a result, which meant being able to stop being distracted by 'noise'.

The group consensus was to continue the CRG and its work as outlined, and some members expressed their strong commitment to this.

### **4. Airfield Master Plan**

(discussion of this item was covered in the previous one).

### **5. Other Business**

#### **a. Current Planning Applications**

David provided an update on the status of current planning applications:

- The application to remove the Sunday morning curfew on take-off and landings follows from complaints relating to aircraft movements during the restricted times. David initiated an enforcement action on this matter, and the application is a response to that action. In these circumstances, the Shire usually allows an application to be determined before further pursuing the compliance process.
- All three permits must be amended (as the curfew condition is repeated in all three of the permits).
- There is another permit amendment application to widen the sealed section of the runway. This involves amending the original permit for sealing of the runway.
- The Shire has received over 400 submissions in relation to both amendments; both objections and submissions in support.
- These applications will be referred to the Planning Services Committee for a decision (with an opportunity provided to submitters to speak to the Committee).

#### **b. Changes to the Shire website**

Allan noted that although the FAQs initiative did not proceed, it is still a responsibility of Council to provide relevant information to the community. The current webpage relating to the CRG and Tyabb Airfield Precinct Plan is cluttered, and it is intended to re-organise the site (possibly with a separate webpage for the CRG) and to include more factual information on existing approvals, progress on the TAPP actions etc. This will not include the draft FAQs discussed with the CRG (as there was no final agreement on that document) and the information will be clearly identified as being provided by Council, i.e. not a CRG-endorsed document.

#### **c. Changes to the minutes in relation to the discussion at CRG Meeting 3 with Mr Brewis Atkinson**

Allan advised that he had received a submission from Mr Atkinson seeking various changes to the minutes of the previous CRG meeting. Allan indicated that many of the requested changes were matters of interpretation and did not warrant changes. However, the minutes also refer to Mr Atkinson reading questions included in his survey and the minutes indicate that there were questions regarding the use of jet aircraft and widening of the runway. A copy of the survey questionnaire provided by Mr Atkinson indicates that in fact these matters are not referred to in the written

questions. Allan indicated that on this basis he considered a minor amendment of the previous minutes to delete these references was reasonable.

In this context, there was discussion regarding the conduct of Meeting 3 and whether it had been appropriate for Mr Atkinson to have been invited, and if in fact the CRG should invite other guests in the future. Bruce noted that it had always been intended to provide an opportunity for members of the CRG to hear a range of views but agreed that this needs to be balanced with consideration of the CRG process which aims to find common ground and discourage polarisation.

Councillor Morris commented that she thought Mr Atkinson simply wanted the community's views, as surveyed by him, to be heard, given some weight, and be considered. Councillor Morris emphasised that it is the role of Council, being representatives of the community, to listen to everyone, and make decisions based on community views, expert advice, legislative and regulatory requirements. She said the CRG is not responsible for making these decisions and encouraged members to take a step back and not let the survey and what occurred at Meeting 3 be a distraction. She asked members to let it go and look forward to helping produce a Master Plan for the airfield.

In regard to the specific point relating to the proposed change to the previous minutes, it was commented that as the written survey questions were not provided at the meeting, they should not be used as the basis of a change to the minutes. There was no agreement to change and so the minutes were not amended.

#### **d. Minutes**

Judy noted that the minutes of meetings are being approved through email consultation with members, rather than waiting for formal confirmation at the next CRG meeting. This is different from process outlined in the Terms of Reference and the ToR should be amended to reflect this.

#### **Action 4.1: CRG Terms of Reference to be amended to allow the current practice of finalising minutes between meetings, where members are able to agree.**

Cr Morris noted that a lot of time and effort goes into the production of minutes and, after Meeting 3, there was much dispute over their content. There have also been significant delays between meetings and minutes being published.

Stewart suggested that a summary of key points could be produced rather than a detailed account of what has been said. It was noted that both are produced, with the summary being issued relatively rapidly after a meeting.

Allan commented that although the production of minutes had been time consuming they do at least give members of the public a better sense of the actual discussions in the CRG, and hopefully with the intended focus on the Master Plan, the minutes will be more readily produced in the future.

Martin reported that he puts the minutes out on three Facebook pages that reach around 9000 people. He indicated he plays a 'straight bat' without commenting on the content so that people can draw their own conclusions.

#### **e. Consistent approach to correspondence received by CRG members**

Judy indicated that she had received an anonymous email and queried how/ whether this type of correspondence should be referred to the CRG.

There was general agreement that anonymous correspondence should not be considered by the CRG as it may encourage a flood of emails seeking to "lobby" the CRG without much new content. It was considered better for members to recommend that people who wish to remain anonymous to refer their queries to the Shire, where the Privacy regulations are better defined. The Shire officers can then refer matters relevant to the CRG to the meeting in an anonymous form, possibly as a list

of issues raised in correspondence. Anonymous complaints regarding Shire actions are beyond the scope of the CRG, and people should be referred to the Shire's complaints handling policy or the Office of Local Government.

Martin queried if anybody had bothered to write to the CRG email address. He was concerned about not getting any feedback from the community through the CRG email. Allan replied that very few emails (six this year) have been sent directly to the CRG email address [tyabbairfieldcrg@mornpen.vic.gov.au](mailto:tyabbairfieldcrg@mornpen.vic.gov.au) and that they have been mainly copies of complaints referred to Council or requests for contact details of CRG members. Most emails appear to be sent directly to Allan's email address or to the Councillors and/or CEO. Recently there have been a significant number (in the order of 30) pro-forma submissions to the Shire seeking clarification of points raised in the meeting minutes (the questions and response have been circulated to CRG members).

Cr Morris suggested that she and Allan should formulate a reply system that ensures consistency in the information being provided.

**Action 4.2: Council to develop a consistent approach to replying to community correspondence relating to the airfield.**

**f. Appointment to vacant community member position**

Bruce indicated this item related to the need to appointment a new member following Ben Hogan's resignation from the CRG (Action 3.4).

Allan advised that as per the discussion at the last CRG meeting, he had reviewed the previous Expressions of Interest from people seeking to join the CRG but was concerned that none of these would provide representation for the residential areas to the east of the airfield. At this stage he considered there were two options : a) to advertise for expressions of interest with the advert seeking applications preferably from residents to the east; or b) given the CRG has agreed to focus on the production of the Master Plan and there are other channels of community consultation, to leave the membership of the CRG as it currently stands, at least until the Master Plan is resolved, at which point the role of the CRG may change.

He indicated that on balance he felt the second option was preferable but wished to discuss it with the group.

There was discussion about the need for balanced representation on the CRG. Although it was recognised that the group doesn't decide matters by voting, the numbers can potentially shape the general discussion.

Jack commented that a new member should have been appointed much earlier and that at this stage, a new appointment might cause more distractions than benefit.

After further discussion, David indicated that he was inclined to seek expressions of interest to appoint a new community member and to target the area to the east of the airfield. He said he would further consider and decide this after the meeting. If pursued, this process would be arranged by the Shire.

Cr Morris indicated that she was open to attending all future meetings, but wondered if this would be helpful. Martin acknowledged the benefit but was concerned that Cr Morris' presence might influence what each member will say. Cr Morris noted this concern for further consideration.

**Summary for key points**

Bruce concluded the meeting, particularly thanking Councillor Morris for her attendance which had given real direction to the discussion and way forward for the group. A summary of key points was then produced for Bruce and Allan to work up into a draft for input by all members.

The next meeting date is to be determined, with a meeting to be called once information from the noise study and preliminary Master Plan documents are available for discussion.

The Meeting was declared closed 8:12 pm.

**Follow up actions**

No.	Action	Status
3.3	Council and PAC reps to hold further discussions on preparation of status and background section to the Airfield Master Plan	Ongoing
3.4	Shire to seek expressions of interest to replace general community member position on the CRG, preferably from the residential areas to the east of the airfield	AC to follow up
4.1	CRG Terms of Reference to be amended to allow the current practice of finalising minutes between meetings, where members are able to agree	
4.2	Council to develop a consistent approach to replying to community correspondence relating to the airfield	