

Gold Coast Airport Pty Ltd

# **2017 Master Plan Summary Supplementary Report**

November 2017



## Notice

This document has been prepared by Gold Coast Airport Pty Ltd (GCAPL) as a summary of the Supplementary Report submitted to satisfy the requirements of the Airports Act 1996 (Cwth).

While all care has been taken in preparing this summary report:

- It is based on certain forecasts and assumptions, and GCAPL makes no claim as to the accuracy of any information, or the likelihood of any future matter
- It should not be relied upon in any way by any person for making business or other decisions
- It does not commit GCAPL to any particular development
- GCAPL accepts no liability whatsoever to any person who in any way relies on any information in this booklet (including making any decision about development or any other activity on or off Gold Coast Airport).

## Copyright

Copyright in this document vests in GCAPL. No person may:

- Reproduce any part of this document in any form or by any means whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise
- Produce, store in a retrieval system or transmit any part of this document, without the prior written consent of GCAPL, unless the document is downloaded from the GCAPL website for the sole purpose of reviewing its contents in electronic or paper form. Any enquiries regarding copyright should be addressed to GCAPL.

## Table of Contents

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	About this Report .....	2
1.2	Background.....	2
1.3	Submission Responses.....	2
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Consultation during the Public Comment Period.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Introduction.....	3
2.2	Summary of the Consultation Tools and Activities during the Public Comment Period .....	3
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Consideration of Public Comments.....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Introduction.....	4
3.2	Submissions Received.....	4
3.3	Review of Submissions by Nominated Category .....	4

# 1.0 Introduction

---

## 1.1 About this Report

This document has been prepared by Gold Coast Airport Pty Ltd (GCAPL) as a summary of the 2017 draft Master Plan Supplementary Report. The Supplementary Report was submitted with the 2017 draft Master Plan to the Minister for Infrastructure to satisfy the requirements of the Airports Act 1996 (Cwth). It addresses the issues and comments raised in the 54 submissions that GCAPL received on the 2017 preliminary draft Master Plan during the public consultation period between 25 October 2016 and 30 January 2017.

## 1.2 Background

Prior to the release of the preliminary draft Master Plan for public comment, GCAPL proactively engaged with key community, industry, government stakeholders and elected representatives. These consultation activities focussed on raising awareness of the Master Plan ensuring the community and stakeholders were well informed of the purpose and process of the Airport Master Plan.

Engagement activities undertaken during the public consultation period were carried out between 25 October 2016 and 30 January 2017. The public consultation period was undertaken over 65 business days and this exceeded *Airports Act 1996* requirements of 60 business days.

Engagement activities were guided by the Airport Development Consultation Guidelines and in accordance with amendments made to the Airports Act (October 2012 issued by the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development).

During the 65 business day public consultation period GCAPL carried out formal presentations to the Community Aviation Consultation Group (CACG), Airport Noise Abatement Consultative Committee (ANACC) and representatives of local and state governments. Public information sessions were held at key locations across the region providing opportunities for the community to express their opinions on information in the preliminary draft Master Plan and provide channels for feedback.

Following the release of the preliminary draft Master Plan for public comment a range of engagement activities were planned. This is further discussed in Section 2.

## 1.3 Submission Responses

---

After completion of the 60 business day public comment period, GCAPL considered the comments received and revised the draft Master Plan as required. The draft Master Plan is submitted to the Minister, together with a supplementary report which includes a written statement listing the names of the persons consulted and a summary of the views expressed by the persons consulted and all comments.

The preparation of the Supplementary Report allowed GCAPL to consider and address community concerns raised during the public consultation process.

Out of the 54 valid submissions received, 16 were in support of the Master Plan, while 27 were in opposition and 11 were considered neutral.

To analyse the content of submissions, each submission was summarised and categorised into one (or a number of) categories. These categories were selected which aligned with the chapters of the draft Master Plan. Within each submission, the various comments, were identified and assigned a sentiment, whether supportive, opposing or neutral.

A response to each of the comments have been presented in this summary report. Where it was identified that clarification or insufficient information was provided in the preliminary draft Master Plan, amendments were made to the draft Master Plan.

## 2.0 Consultation during the Public Comment Period

### 2.1 Introduction

---

The preliminary draft Master Plan was placed on public exhibition for review and comment from 25 October 2016 to 30 January 2017. During this time the public were invited to provide comments on the preliminary draft Master Plan. During the 65 business day public comment period, consultation activities focused on informing the community about the 2017 preliminary draft Master Plan, the key strategies within the document, environmental management, and providing access to GCAPL personnel to address queries and providing information on how the community could have its say.

This chapter of the summary report focuses on the consultation tools and activities used during and after the public comment period as well as the outcomes generated by these activities.

### 2.2 Summary of the Consultation Tools and Activities during the Public Comment Period

---

GCAPL delivered a community consultation program during the public comment period. The consultation program encompassed:

- The preliminary draft 2017 Master Plan
- GCAPL website
- Published public notices and advertisements
- Briefings with key stakeholders
- Public information sessions
- Fact sheets
- Television and radio media coverage
- Printed media
- Social media
- Fielding telephone enquiries

#### 2.2.1 GOLD COAST AIRPORT PRELIMINARY DRAFT MASTER PLAN

Gold Coast Airport provided access to the preliminary draft Master Plan and supporting materials including factsheets in various formats (printed and electronic) so that stakeholders and members of the community could view the document in a way that suited their needs.

Copies of the preliminary draft Master Plan were available from:

- The Gold Coast Airport management office, Level 1 Airport Central, Bilinga;
- 2 Tweed Shire libraries – Kingscliff, Tweed Heads;
- 13 City of Gold Coast Libraries – Gold Coast City, Broadbeach, Burleigh Heads, Coolangatta, Elanora, Palm Beach, Southport, Upper Coomera, Runaway Bay, Helensvale, Mudgeeraba, Nerang and Robina.
- 6 Community information sessions.

The preliminary draft Master Plan and associated fact sheets were also available in electronic format:

- On the Gold Coast Airport website at [www.goldcoastairport.com.au](http://www.goldcoastairport.com.au)

#### *Consultation Outcomes*

- 104 letters introducing the 2017 preliminary draft Master Plan were distributed to relevant government, local community, business and industry groups;
- 28 copies of the preliminary draft Master Plan were distributed to key stakeholder and community groups;

- 20 copies of the preliminary draft Master Plan were distributed to local, state and federal elected representatives offices;
- 15 copies of the preliminary draft Master Plan were distributed to local libraries;
- 2 copies of the preliminary draft Master Plan were purchased by members of the public.

## 3.0 Consideration of Public Comments

### 3.1 Introduction

---

This section sets out the process by which GCAPL has considered comments received during public comment period and details how these comments have been given due regard in the preparation of the draft Master Plan for Ministerial consideration.

To ensure submissions were appropriately administered, reviewed and comments considered, individual submissions were logged into a submissions register and each submission allocated a unique submission number along with the submitter's name and address. Submissions were then summarised into one (or a number of) categories. Categories were defined so as to match the chapter structure of the draft Master Plan.

### 3.2 Submissions Received

---

A total of 54 submissions were received during the public comment period. Of the 54 submissions received, 16 were in support of the Master Plan, while 27 were in opposition and 11 were considered neutral. It is important to note that many submissions raised the same and/or similar comments.

This report addresses the comments that were identified during the review of the submissions and how GCAPL has shown due regard to these comments.

### 3.3 Review of Submissions by Nominated Category

---

The comments raised under each category were extracted from the submissions and then discussed under the sub heading of "Consideration of Points Raised." Where appropriate, changes were made or information added to the draft Master Plan resulting from consideration of the points raised.

### 3.3.1 CONSIDERATION OF POINTS RAISED

#### 3.3.2 CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

Comment	GCAPL Response
The vision and focus presented for the Airport over the next twenty years is fully supported.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the vision and focus for the Draft Master Plan.
The Master Plan could expand its vision to capture the benefits the Airport has on the lifestyle of southern Gold Coast and to highlight the strategic role of the Gold Coast Airport.	The vision for the Gold Coast Airport Master Plan is “Engaging customers, connecting communities, exceptional experiences” and is supported by a set of development objectives organised into four strategic pillars — Economic growth, Environmental sustainability, Aviation operations and People.  The strategic role of Gold Coast Airport is captured in Section 3.10 – Role of the Gold Coast Airport, Section 3.12 - Economic and Regional Significance, and Chapter 8 - Land Use.
Consider updating the Master Plan to broaden the heading statement to ‘Gold Coast Airport, the gateway to Australia’s premier tourism and lifestyle destination.’  Similarly in paragraph 2, consider broadening ‘business activities’ to include ‘business activities requiring a premium lifestyle location’.	The draft Master Plan has been updated to reflect the submitter’s comments in relation to capturing the words "lifestyle destination". The words now state ‘Gold Coast Airport, the gateway to Australia’s premier tourism and lifestyle destination.’  The statement in paragraph 2 of the preliminary draft Master Plan relates to a broad range of business activities and not only those requiring a "premium lifestyle location".

#### 3.3.3 CHAPTER 2 – THE MASTER PLAN

Comment	GCAPL Response
Living in Coolangatta, the submitter has vested interest in any new development in the area. The Submitter believes that the master plan for the airport will add value to the area.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the community benefits that the preliminary draft master plan will provide.
The Master Plan does not recognise the nature of its physical position in an area of high population growth as well as environmental sensitivity.	The preliminary draft Master Plan recognises that this region has grown to over 600 thousand people. Since the establishment of the airport in 1936 it has been integral to supporting the growing region of Gold Coast and northern New South Wales. The physical position of the airport is discussed in Section 3.1 - Airport Location, Section 3.2 - History of Gold Coast Airport, Section 3.10 - Role of Gold Coast Airport, Section 3.12 - Economic and Regional Significance, and Chapter 8 - Land Use.  The Master Plan also recognises the location of the airport in relation to areas of environmental significance. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 11 - Environment and Sustainability.
The purpose of a Master Plan is:  <i>“d) To reduce potential conflicts between uses of the Airport site and to ensure that uses of the Airport site are compatible with the areas surrounding the Airport.”</i>  By encroaching on the amenity and lifestyle of residents surrounding the airport with noise and pollution, this does not appear to be achievable.	The legislative framework for planning, approval and construction of development proposed in the master plan is detailed under Section 8 of the preliminary draft Master Plan. The preliminary draft Master Plan’s consistency with surrounding planning land uses is discussed in detail in sections 8.3.6 to 8.3.8.  GCAPL is committed to ongoing and proactive communication and engagement with the local community about airport development and growth activity and how this impacts on and supports the local community. GCAPL interacts with the community through the CACG and ANACC providing regular updates to these groups.
Information provided at the Kingscliff information session was fully appreciated.	GCAPL is committed to undertaking an extensive and detailed Master Plan public consultation process. GCAPL acknowledges with thanks the support from submitters on the level of information provided during the public consultation.

Comment	GCAPL Response
<p>Submitter raised concerns with the environmental impact on flora and fauna disturbed by the extension work as part of Project LIFT.</p>	<p>It is noted that submitters concerns are in relation to the vegetation cleared as part of the approved Project LIFT Major Development Plan (MDP). The Project LIFT MDP was approved by the former Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development the Hon Warren Truss on 10 February 2016. Work on the Project LIFT footprint is being undertaken in accordance with the conditions of approval and environmental controls and commitments detailed within the approved MDP.</p> <p>A copy of the approved Project LIFT MDP, including impact assessments and mitigation measures is available on the Gold Coast Airport website.</p>
<p>Submitters question the validity of the statutory community consultation process, highlighting there could be a potential conflict of interest. The submitters felt the Minister is not fully informed of various views from the community. GCAPL as the proponent collates and provides the overall information for the Minister.</p>	<p>Section 2 of the preliminary draft Master Plan outlined the regulatory framework in which GCAPL has consulted with the local community, organisations and government in the preparation of the master plan and the seeking of comments on the preliminary draft Master Plan before being submitted to the Federal Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. There has been extensive advertising of the preliminary draft Master Plan in the media (Local TV and Newspapers as well as social media) seeking public comments with extensive consultation with the community, organisations and government both before and following the closing date for comments as indicated in the Supplementary Report to the draft Master Plan.</p> <p>In accordance with section 79 of the Airports Act 1996, GCAPL is required to publish a preliminary draft Master Plan and provide the opportunity for public comment for a period of 60 business days. GCAPL exceeded the requirements of the Airports Act by allocating an additional 5 business days to this process.</p> <p>GCAPL has prepared this supplementary report in accordance with Section 79 of the Airports Act 1996, "If members of the public have given written comments about the preliminary version in accordance with the notice, the draft plan submitted to the Minister must be accompanied by: (a) copies of those comments; and (b) a written certificate signed on behalf of the company: (i) listing the names of those members of the public; and (ii) summarising those comments; and (iii) demonstrating that the company has had due regard to those comments in preparing the draft plan; and (iv) setting out such other information (if any) about those comments as is specified in the regulations."</p>
<p>Concerns regarding the effectiveness of CACG and ANACC, due to a reduction and frequency of meetings from four meetings to three and lack of community access.</p>	<p>Gold Coast Airport interacts with the community through the CACG and ANACC providing regular updates to these groups. The CACG is the primary community consultation forum for the Airport covering all areas of airport development activity. The ANACC focuses on aircraft noise issues in the local community and delivers information on community aviation noise concerns.</p> <p>This is further discussed in Section 3.13 of the preliminary Draft Master Plan.</p> <p>A wide range of organisations and community groups take part in CACG, with those member's providing avenues for effective delivery of community concerns and dissemination of relative information.</p> <p>ANACC, which is a subcommittee of CACG, changed the frequency of meetings (from 4 to 3) in 2013. This was undertaken to suit the CACG meeting frequency which occurred 3 times a year. Membership to the CACG and ANACC includes community</p>

Comment	GCAPL Response
	representatives that have access to 6 meetings per year, which include 3 CACG and 3 ANACC meetings.
A submitter, feels there has been a lack of consultation regarding the proposed developments.	During preparation of the preliminary draft Master Plan, and during the statutory community consultation process, GCAPL consulted with a wide range of government, industry and community representatives. This also included on airport stakeholders.

### 3.3.4 CHAPTER 3 – THE AIRPORT

Comment	GCAPL Response
The economic value of the GCA cannot be underestimated as one of the major employers in the region as well as facilitating jobs in associated aviation businesses and tourism. Surf Life Saving Club's south of the border have now extended lifesaving patrols to accommodate tourism which is indirectly due to the growth of GCA.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the economic benefit of the airport and the Master Plan.
Submitter acknowledges that the Airport is a significant employer and provides a significant economic contribution. Submitter is keen to work with the GCAPL in identifying opportunities to secure ongoing economic benefits to local residents and businesses.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the economic benefit of the airport and the Master Plan. GCAPL looks forward in working with stakeholders in identifying opportunities to secure ongoing economic benefits to local residents and businesses.
The submitter fully supports the expansion of the airport as the economic benefits to the area are vital.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the economic benefit of the airport and the Master Plan
Submitter feels the staff provided good information and is not concerned. The terminal is currently past its optimum performance and is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Too crowded</li> <li>– PA systems ineffective</li> <li>– Departure gates lacks the sophistication required for old persons</li> </ul>	GCAPL is currently underway with its terminal redevelopment, Project LIFT, which will increase the airport's capacity to meet future demand. Project LIFT also involves upgrading of the PA system and improvements to the departure gates.
Submitter suggest minor improvements to Figures 3.1 to 3.3 to clarify the location of the Tugun Depot site, and labelling of Coolangatta.	The draft Master Plan has been updated to reflect the submitter's comments in relation to Figures 3.1 and 3.3. Figures 3.3 was updated to include the label for Coolangatta. Wording in relation to Figure 3.1 was updated to describe the location of the Tugun Depot site.
Clarification is required for future water supply and sewer demands to be confirmed as part of future development proposals.	Future water supply demands were assessed as part of the preparation of the preliminary draft Master Plan. These demands will be confirmed as part of future development proposals.  Section 3.8 of the preliminary draft Master Plan was updated to clarify; future development proposals, existing and future water supply and sewerage demands will be confirmed to determine whether or not the existing networks can cater for the increased demand or require system upgrades.
Consider updating the Master Plan to include SCU Building B as a key development since the 2011 Master Plan.	The draft Master Plan has been updated to include SCU Building B as a key development since the 2011 Master Plan as approved.  For consistency, SCU Building B has been removed from the development timeframe.

Comment	GCAPL Response
<p>Consider updating the Master Plan to include Building A and C in the Airport Development Timeframe.</p>	
<p>Submitters suggest relocating the airport to another area or no further development should be permitted to occur. Submitters suggest that all international flights should be in and out of Brisbane.</p>	<p>The proposed airport development outlined in the Master Plan is consistent with the obligations under the airport lease from the Federal Government to invest in airport facilities to accommodate forecast aviation growth. It is important to note that this preliminary draft Master Plan is not proposing a new airport.</p> <p>Over the past 80 years Gold coast Airport has been a gateway to this region and has continually supported the regional economy and provision of employment. Currently Gold Coast Airport supports over 2,000 on airport jobs, during the life of this preliminary draft Master Plan this is expected to increase to 8,995 jobs. Since privatisation, the airport has actively been working closely with Local Councils to help inform surrounding land use planning is consistent with airport operations.</p> <p>Gold Coast Airport provides an important service to local and regional communities by offering close and convenient access to international flights. This reduces ground travel time for passengers who would otherwise be required to travel to a capital city airport.</p> <p>The Master Plan is a strategic planning document. Within this strategic plan, any major airport development to be undertaken to support the forecast demand and/or to support any non-aviation development, is subject to a Major Development Plan (MDP) to be approved by the Federal Minister for Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, taking into account public and stakeholder comments, through a legislated consultation process.</p>
<p>Submitter supports the improved access for travellers to and from the airport and the heavy rail. Submitter would like to see additional hanger facilities for helicopters.</p>	<p>GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the proposed improved access for travellers. GCAPL will continue to engage with internal stakeholders on helicopter hanger facility needs.</p>
<p>Comments were received in relation to the length of the runway, stating that it is not 2,492 metres stated in section 3.4 on page 31 of the preliminary draft Master Plan.</p> <p>The operational length of runway 14 is 2,342m for both landing and take-off and runway 32 has a landing distance of 2,042m and a take-off length (on approval) of 2,492m</p>	<p>Sections 3.3 and 3.4 of the preliminary draft Master Plan correctly state that the length of the primary 14/32 runway is 2,492 metres. The 14/32 runway was extended to the current length of 2,492 metres in 2007.</p> <p>There is no proposal in the preliminary draft Master Plan to extend the runway beyond the current 2,492 metre length.</p>
<p>The Master Plan should explain how the exception to the curfew compliance by small jets, propellers and freight aircraft and limited domestic jets will be managed.</p>	<p>Section 5.3.5 of the preliminary draft Master Plan includes details on permitted uses during the curfew period.</p> <p>The airport operates under legislated curfew conditions, outlined in Chapter 5 'Airport Noise,' in the preliminary draft Master Plan. The Federal Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development website advises that 'curfews balance airport commercial operations and safety requirements with the need to reduce night-time aircraft noise for nearby communities.</p> <p>The draft Master Plan does not propose to revise the curfew times and operating restrictions through any change in the regulations.</p>
<p>Submitter questions the accuracy of the Master Plan stating that the ILS MDP was approved in</p>	<p>As described in section 2.7 of the preliminary Draft Master Plan the Instrument Landing System (ILS) MDP was approved in January</p>

Comment	GCAPL Response
2016 given the Australian Administrative Tribunal appeal. The ILS MDP is unsustainable from a social and environmental impact perspective.	2016. The approved ILS MDP was subject to an Australian Administrative Tribunal (AAT) appeal. On 2 March 2017, the AAT decided to affirm the approval of an ILS at the airport.  GCAPL believes it is essential Gold Coast Airport has access to this fundamental navigation aid, which is vital to maintaining and enhancing the positioning of the Gold Coast and more broadly Queensland and Australia for domestic and international business and tourism. Gold Coast businesses and the Gold Coast economy will benefit from a reliable airport.
<i>In Shaping SEQ</i> , the Draft SEQ Regional Plan, Gold Coast Airport is identified as enabling infrastructure supporting an area of regional economic significance. The submitter sees opportunity to work with the Airport to investigate economic opportunities in Tourism, Knowledge industries, tech...	GCAPL acknowledges that the Airport is identified as enabling infrastructure supporting an area of regional economic significance. GCAPL is supportive of working with the submitter to proactively drive investment and maximise greater potential economic outcomes for the region.  Update has been made to include reference to the draft SEQ Regional Plan within Chapter 8 of the Master Plan.
GCAPL is requested to commit an adequate financial commitment to a strategic land-use planning study for land surrounding the Airport generally bounded by the ANEF contours.	Since privatisation, the airport has actively been working closely with Local Councils to help inform surrounding land use planning is consistent with airport operations. GCAPL is supportive of working closely with Local Councils during the development of their strategic land-use planning study surrounding the Airport.

### 3.3.5 CHAPTER 4 – AIRPORT FORECASTS

#### Consideration of Points Raised

Comment	GCAPL Response
Where is the methodology concerning the expected growth sourced?	The Master Plan forecasting methodology is described in section 4.2 of the preliminary draft Master Plan. Forecasting for the Master Plan has considered a range of macro and micro factors including: The strength of current and potential future markets. The broader aviation environment, trends and predicted aircraft fleet developments. The local and international drivers of demand in terms of economics, population growth and propensity to travel and the Airport's infrastructure capacity and capability to expand.  Based on the available industry information, the following assumptions have been made to forecast future airport activity: An average annual rate of growth over the period of five per cent in RPT passenger movements; Aircraft movements grow at a rate slightly below passenger growth, reflecting increasing use of larger gauge aircraft; No anticipated growth in non-RPT aircraft movements due to a combination of general aviation industry factors and the land bank available for non-RPT aviation development at Gold Coast Airport.

### 3.3.6 CHAPTER 5 – AIRCRAFT NOISE

#### Consideration of Points Raised

Comment	GCAPL Response
To further assist Council in the short term to both the 2047 ANEF and N70 contours are an important addition to its mapping catalogue, it would be appreciated if the digital data could be made available at the earliest opportunity to ensure that any assessment of planning	Digital data of 2047 and N70 Contours will be provided to Tweed Shire Council, City of Gold Coast Council and both Queensland and New South Wales State Governments upon approval of the draft Master Plan.

Comment	GCAPL Response
proposals or development applications are able to accommodate this latest information.	
The little inconvenience of Aircraft noise is far outweighed by the benefits this infrastructure offers socially and economically.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the economic benefit of the airport and the Master Plan.
New South Wales is being adversely impacted by curfew during Daylight Saving Time as the curfew in New South Wales effectively commences at midnight. Submitter is concerned that curfew may be changed or lifted	<p>The airport operates under legislated curfew conditions, outlined in Chapter 5 'Airport Noise', in the preliminary draft Master Plan.</p> <p>The curfew is regulated under the <i>Air Navigation (Coolangatta Airport Curfew) Regulations 1999</i>, as administered by DIRD. The regulations restrict aircraft at the Airport between 2300-0600 hours (Queensland local time).</p> <p>The draft Master Plan does not propose to revise the times and operating restrictions through any change in the regulations.</p>
Several submitters raised concerns about the projected increase in the number of planes resulting in increased noise pollution. The existing noise is already a problem.	<p>Although tolerance to aircraft noise is different with each individual, evidence is available through organisations including the World Health Organization and the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) regarding the impacts of night-time noise on sleep, health and cognitive performance. Studies have identified that night-time noise can possibly impact on health.</p> <p>Gold Coast Airport currently operates with a night-time curfew. This night-time curfew was introduced in 1999 at Gold Coast Airport and is designed to limit the ground perceived exposure to aircraft noise during night hours. The curfew is in operation from 11.00pm to 6.00am daily (Queensland time) and is regulated under the <i>Air Navigation (Coolangatta Airport Curfew) Regulations 1999</i>.</p> <p>Section 5.2 of the preliminary draft Master Plan detailed the four elements of the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) balanced approach to noise management and the roles of relevant regulators, agencies, local government authorities, aircraft operators and GCAPL.</p> <p>The ICAO balanced approach to noise management nominates the most effective way of managing aircraft noise impacts on properties within the vicinity of the airport is through the adoption and effective implementation of appropriate land use policies and acoustic standards for the areas adjacent to the airport. The Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) is the only metric approved and promoted by the Federal Government for use in determining the suitability of land use in regards to aircraft noise and has been included within the draft Master Plan.</p> <p>As detailed in section 5.4.2 Airservices Australia has a significant regulatory and decision-making role in efforts to reduce impacts of aircraft noise in Australian airspace. This is aligned to a wider remit focused on environmentally responsible air traffic management and related services to the aviation industry.</p> <p>Sections 5.0 of the draft Master Plan details GCAPL's strategy in coordinating Government and community needs related to aircraft noise issues arising from existing and proposed flight paths. GCAPL is committed to supporting Airservices Australia to provide ongoing and timely engagement with the local community on aircraft issues arising from existing and proposed flight paths. GCAPL has a long established Airport Noise Abatement Consultative Committee (ANACC) and the Community Aviation Consultation Group (CACG) to consider and where appropriate, make recommendations on matters generated from operations associated with GCA.</p>

Comment	GCAPL Response
	<p>Airservices Australia is responsible for handling airborne aircraft noise complaints and operates a national noise complaint service. Airservices Australia also implements several noise abatement procedures (NAPs) to provide noise respite for adjoining local communities.</p> <p>At Gold Coast Airport the NAPs in use are detailed within section 5.3.3 of the preliminary draft Master Plan. Below is an example of NAP's for Gold Coast Airport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gold Coast Airport is subject to the Air Navigation (Coolangatta Airport Curfew) Regulations 1999 that restrict aircraft movements at the Airport between 2300 -0600 hours</li> <li>• Runway 14 is preferred for both landing and take-off (all hours), weather permitting</li> <li>• For arriving aircraft, maximum use of over-water tracking is used until aircraft are established on their final approach course to minimise the overflying of noise sensitive areas.</li> </ul> <p>Gold Coast Airport will continue to work with commonwealth, state and local governments, airlines, operators and relevant stakeholders to observe the current curfew arrangements and review compliance with regulations through regular reporting to the Community Aviation Consultation Group (CACG).GCAPL works collectively with government agencies and community representatives on a range of initiatives to manage the noise impacts from aircraft and operations.</p>
<p>The Cobaki Broadwater is recognised as a significant habitat for shorebirds and migratory birds and is protected by EBPC Act and International Agreements. Their habitat is threatened with pollution with the increase in flight numbers, size of aircraft and the extension of the runway, which will also have an impact on residents and native fauna.</p>	<p>Aircraft larger than already discussed within the preliminary draft Master Plan are not anticipated. In addition, the preliminary draft Master Plan does not propose a runway extension.</p> <p>In determining flight paths, Airservices Australia is also required to consider obligations under the <i>Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999</i> in relation to aircraft operations which have, will have, or are likely to have, a significant impact on the environment. Obligations under the EPBC Act include the management of Commonwealth Heritage places for their natural indigenous and/or heritage value.</p>
<p>Clarification on the stated marginal change in the ANEF Contours from the 2031 ANEF in the 2011 Master Plan and the increase in the N70 Contours from the 2011 Master Plan.</p>	<p>Both the 2047 ANEF and the 2047 N70 have marginally reduced from the 2031 ANEF and the 2031 N70 in the 2011 Master Plan. Please see Figure 5.6 and Figure 5.7 of the preliminary draft Master Plan.</p> <p>Chapter 5 of the preliminary draft Master Plan provides detailed information on aircraft noise and technological advancements resulting in quieter aircraft. As an example Boeing 787 produces 60% less noise than an aircraft of comparable size such as the Boeing 767- 300ER. This trend is expected to continue.</p> <p>Historically, the extent of the ANEF impacted areas surrounding the Gold Coast Airport has been relatively consistent. This is evident in the 1990 Draft Final Master Plan for Coolangatta Airport. Please see Appendix G comparing the 2010 ANEF (from the 1990 Master Plan) against the Draft 2047 ANEF. Although the 2047 ANEF anticipates significantly more aircraft movements than what was included in the 2010 ANEF, the aircraft are generally quieter.</p> <p>The entry into service of new aircraft, such as the Airbus A320neo, Boeing B737 MAX and Boeing B787 Dreamliner, is expected to continue to further reduce the footprints of aircraft noise at airports. The noise exposure received by these new quieter aircraft is offset by increase in aircraft movements.</p>

Comment	GCAPL Response
	<p>Section 5.3.1 of the draft Master Plan has been updated to clarify that the noise exposure received by these new aircraft is offset by increase in aircraft movements.</p>
<p>The 2011 Master Plan adopted the 2031 ANEF reflecting the relocation of the runway 32 landing threshold approx. 310m south (pg.85). However, this has not yet occurred and there has been much promotion that the 2047 ANEF is similar to the 2031 ANEF when the community is yet to experience the increased impacts of the relocation of the landing threshold reflected in the 2031 ANEF. It must be noted the 2047 ANEF is only draft.</p>	<p>Both the 2031 ANEF from the 2011 Master Plan and the Draft 2047 ANEF from the preliminary draft Master Plan reflect the relocation of the runway 32 landing threshold by approximately 300 metres.</p> <p>In preparing the Master Plan, a technical investigation was undertaken to assess the impacts of moving the threshold by approximately 300 metres. The investigation has found that in the immediate vicinity of the Airport aircraft will be approximately 15 metres lower in altitude on approach from the south.</p> <p>The investigation has found that the changes in sound pressure at specific locations, due to aircraft altitude, are relatively small (between 0.3 dB(A) and 0.6 dB(A)). It is considered that changes in sound pressure of 3 dB(A) or lower are generally not noticeable. Therefore a minor change in sound pressure of between 0.3 dB(A) and 0.6 dB(A) is highly unlikely to be noticeable.</p> <p>Advice from Airservices procedural designers has indicated the proposed threshold relocation will instigate a change in altitude of approximately 50ft for aircraft in later stages of approaching runway 32. Noise impacts are expected to be negligible.</p>
<p>The ANEF maps do not include contours over Fingal Head, however it is subject to unacceptable levels of noise?</p>	<p>Aircraft noise is complex and varies according to a range of factors, including: size and type of aircraft, number of engines, altitude, weight and load factors. Atmospheric conditions heavily influence the spread of aircraft noise and intensity of sound levels on an hourly, daily and seasonal basis. The principal influences are attributed to temperature, atmospheric pressure, humidity, average headwind, elevation and terrain.</p> <p>The N70 contour lines have been included in the preliminary draft Master Plan to provide a better indication of expected noise events.</p>
<p>Page 66, 67. Aircraft Noise Abatement Operational Procedures.</p> <p><i>5.3.3 For arriving aircraft, maximum use of over water tracking is used until aircraft are established on their final approach course to minimise the overflying of noise sensitive areas.</i></p> <p><i>5.3.4 The preferred runway system has high levels of compliance for all aircraft types and is effective in reducing the impact of aircraft operations on nearby residential areas.</i></p> <p>The statement that the preferred runway system has high levels of compliance for all aircraft types and is effective in reducing the impact of aircraft operations on nearby residential areas, is totally unsustainable as it benefits a small number of people at the northern end of the airport and penalises a greater number to the south.</p>	<p>These extracts are from the section that describes the existing Aircraft Noise Abatement Operational Procedures (Section 5.3.3) and the findings of the 2012 Airservices Gold Coast Airport Noise Abatement Procedures Review (Section 5.3.4). The first extract from section 5.3.3 describes the operational procedures for aircraft arriving to Runway 14 from the North of the Airport. As the aircraft are arriving to Runway 14, there is no impact to residents that live to the south. The extract from section 5.3.4 describes the results of the 2012 Airservices Gold Coast Airport Noise Abatement Procedures Review and confirms that the preferred runway system has high levels of compliance for all aircraft types and is meeting its intended outcomes in reducing the impact of aircraft operations on nearby residential areas.</p>
<p>Why is the Boeing 747 aircraft included in the 2031 ANEF when the Gold Coast Airport does not comply with the standards required for this type of aircraft in RPT configuration?</p>	<p>The preliminary draft Master Plan, 2017, does not include Boeing 747 in the 2047 ANEF. These type of Aircraft are not expected as RPT at Gold Coast Airport within the life of this draft 2017 Master Plan.</p> <p>In the 2031 ANEF the Boeing 747 was included as large generic Code E aircraft as there were limited aircraft types available in the Integrated Noise Model (INM) during preparation of the 2011</p>

Comment	GCAPL Response
	Master Plan. The INM used to prepare the 2047 ANEF included more suitable options.
Could consideration be given to have the Helicopters fly over Cobaki Lake to gain height before flying over our house?	All effort is made to ensure helicopter operations have as little effect on the community as possible. Gold Coast Airport personnel work with commercial helicopters operators and local air traffic control to ensure operating heights and flight paths are compliant, safe and offer the best noise outcomes for the surrounding community whilst meeting air traffic management standards. This will continue through the ANACC, CACG and directly with residents as required.
Can the Airport commit to a policy that all carriers use RNAV accredited pilots by the end of December 2017 and the Airport commits to a policy that all carriers will be using RNP capable pilots by the end of December 2021	GCAPL do not have the ability to implement this request. Section 5.5 of the preliminary draft Master Plan indicated that flight paths and procedures to be followed by aircraft using Gold Coast Airport are promulgated by Airservices Australia with Airservices Australia being also responsible for air traffic control. Airservices Australia is a statutory authority established under the <i>Air Services Act 1995</i> and has responsibility for the provision of safe air traffic management services. Under the Act, Airservices Australia has responsibility, as far as is practicable, to ensure the environment is protected from the effects associated with the operation and use of aircraft (including noise impacts). Airservices Australia implements several noise abatement procedures (NAPs) to provide noise respite for adjoining local communities. At Gold Coast Airport the NAPs in use are detailed within section 5.3.3. GCAPL has one of the highest adoption rates of RNP of any airport within Australia, with approximately 60% of all arriving flights in to Gold Coast Airport are via RNP.
Can the existing flightpath be altered to avoid Casuarina, Salt and North Kingscliff?	The ANACC and CACG provide an opportunity for the community to discuss noise improvements with Airservices Australia. This preliminary draft Master Plan does not propose to change the existing flight paths.

### 3.3.7 CHAPTER 6 - AVIATION DEVELOPMENT

Comment	GCAPL Response
The submitter fully supports the expansion of the Airport as the economic benefits to the area are vital. Support shown for the proposed extension between taxiway A and D which will increase aircraft manoeuvrability thus decreasing congestion and the delivery of additional aircraft stands which will be beneficial provided their provision aligns with current demand and accurate growth projections.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the 5 Year Development Plan
It is essential for the airport to be easily accessible, user friendly and neighbourhood friendly.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the 5 Year Development Plan.
An ILS, to runway 14, will provide precision guidance to aircraft on approach and landing and improve the reliability of operations in adverse weather. It is hoped that the majority of airlines serving the	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the 5 Year Development Plan. The introduction of an ILS will play an important role in improving reliability of landings at the airport, which is a key priority for GCAPL.

Comment	GCAPL Response
airport would be able to take advantage of the benefits of an ILS.	
Consider updating the Master Plan to expand on the strategic opportunity of the GCA for high value and time-sensitive freight in the future.	The draft Master Plan has been updated in Section 3.6 to reflect the submitter's comments in relation to high value and time-sensitive freight.
There is a need for all weather access, such as aerobridges to accommodate for people with disabilities.	<p>Aerobridges are planned to be accommodated as part of the approved Project LIFT MDP.</p> <p>GCAPL's Disability Facilitation Plan, published on the Gold Coast Airport website, advises that special arrangements for people with walking or mobility assistance needs are provided by the airlines including boarding and disembarking the aircraft via a special mobile lift, of a type generally used at airports where no aerobridges are installed.</p>
The proposed relocation of the runway 32 landing threshold, by 300 metres to the south, will have increased noise impacts and will be used by larger long haul aircraft.	<p>Relocation of runway 32 landing threshold approximately 300m south is discussed within Section 5.7.3 and also within Chapter 6 of the preliminary draft Master Plan. The proposed threshold relocation within the existing runway length is required to improve reliability and safety during adverse weather for wide-body aircraft. The proposed threshold relocation is consistent with the proposal within the current 2011 Master Plan. Currently the existing runway is Code 4E and is capable of accommodating Code E aircraft. The relocation of the threshold will not change the category of the runway.</p> <p>In preparing the Master Plan, a technical investigation was undertaken to assess the impacts of relocating the threshold by approximately 300 metres. The investigation has found that in the immediate vicinity of the Airport aircraft will be approximately 15 metres lower in altitude on approach from the south. The investigation has found that the changes in sound pressure at specific locations, due to aircraft altitude, are relatively small (between 0.3 dB(A) and 0.6 dB(A)). It is considered that changes in sound pressure of 3 dB(A) or lower are generally not noticeable. Therefore a minor change in sound pressure of between 0.3 dB(A) and 0.6 dB(A) is highly unlikely to be noticeable.</p>
There should be provision in this current Master Plan for the ICAO standard RESA at the end of the new threshold extension to comply with the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) standard.	The relocation of the runway 32 landing threshold will require a change to the runway 32 threshold only. There is no change of the runway 14 departure RESA required or proposed. At this stage there is no allowance for the provision of the recommended ICAO RESA of 240m. Note the 240m RESA within the ICAO standards is a recommendation only.
<p>A runway extension will significantly increase noise and emission impacts, expand noise exposure areas and will adversely impact on property values and land will be sterilised and/or restricted from uses otherwise permitted under the Tweed LEP. The extensions required for this growth will impact negatively on the NSW Crown Reserve and will increase noise impacts and emissions.</p> <p>It is not supported that the PDMP continues to maintain protection for runway extension with an ultimate runway length of 2,858m when GCA's first two MPs (1999 &amp; 2000) were rejected as the runway extension.</p>	<p>There is no proposal in the preliminary draft Master Plan to alter the existing runway beyond the current 2,492 metre length.</p> <p>The Obstacle Limitation Surface included within the preliminary draft Master Plan provides protection for an ultimate runway length of 2,858 metre. This reflects the pre-privatisation long standing obstacle protection provision currently imposed through planning instruments for the surrounding local government areas, and is proposed to continue. An extension of the runway to the ultimate runway length of 2,858 metre is not proposed within the currency of the Master Plan.</p>

Comment	GCAPL Response
Submitter raised concerns with the installation of the HIAL and issues from blinding light.	<p>The high-intensity approach lighting system at the end of Runway 32 is proposed to enable safer aircraft landings in adverse weather.</p> <p>The proposed HIAL will not have impacts associated with blinding light. GCAPL will continue to consult with stakeholders as it prepares to design and install the HIAL.</p>
Comments oppose the installation of the ILS and state that the ILS appears to be outdated and a very short term fix given that Australia commenced transitioning to satellite technology from February 2016.	<p>As described in section 2.7 of the preliminary Draft Master Plan the ILS MDP (which outlined the benefits and need for the infrastructure) was approved in January 2016. The approved ILS MDP was subject to an Australian Administrative Tribunal (AAT) appeal. On 2 March 2017, the AAT decided to affirm the approval of an ILS at the airport.</p> <p>The introduction of an ILS will play an important role in improving reliability of landings at the airport, which is a key priority for GCAPL. Although the ILS has been in existence for a significant number of years it has proven that it has been instrumental in enabling safe landing of aircraft.</p> <p>GCAPL believes it is essential Gold Coast Airport has access to this fundamental navigation aid, which is vital to maintaining and enhancing the positioning of the Gold Coast, and more broadly Queensland and Australia, for domestic and international business and tourism. Gold Coast businesses and the Gold Coast economy will benefit from a reliable airport.</p>
Table 12-1 within Chapter 12 of the Master Plan omits the relocation of the runway 32 landing threshold approx. 300m south.	Chapter 12 of the draft Master Plan has been updated to include relocation of the runway 32 landing threshold approx. 300m south in the development plan.

### 3.3.8 CHAPTER 7 – AIRSPACE PROTECTION

Comment	GCAPL Response
The proposed relocation of the landing threshold 310 metres to the south on Runway 32 requires a new Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) which will increase the clearing and trimming of trees on the Crown Reserve.	<p>The Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) included within the preliminary draft Master Plan provides protection for an ultimate runway length of 2,858 metre. This reflects the long standing obstacle protection provision currently imposed through planning instruments for the surrounding local government areas and is proposed to continue.</p> <p>Additional vegetation management will be required to accommodate the relocation of the landing threshold, however this is not expected to be significant. An assessment of the extent of the vegetation management will be conducted prior to requesting any approvals.</p>

### 3.3.9 CHAPTER 8 – LAND USE

Comment	GCAPL Response
Submitter provides support for the Master Plan's long term approach for the terminal precinct development to focus upon improved pedestrian connectivity.	GCAPL acknowledges the support for the Master Plan's long term approach for the terminal precinct development to focus upon improved pedestrian connectivity.
Support is provided for the development guidelines for the western enterprise Precinct and the Terminal Precinct, specifically pedestrian connectivity and landscaping. There is potentially the opportunity to	GCAPL acknowledges the support provided for the western enterprise precinct and terminal precinct development guidelines. GCAPL recognises the importance of having pedestrian connectivity within the terminal precinct.

Comment	GCAPL Response
note a 'gateway opportunity' that exists when leaving GCA towards the Gold Coast Highway.	The draft Master Plan has been updated in section 8.4.2, for the terminal precinct to provide a "gateway opportunity" to the region.
As part of planning for the redevelopment, it is suggested that greater flexibility be considered for the range of uses on Mallaraba car park these sites to include rooming accommodation, educational establishment, and research and technology industry.	Although Mallaraba car park is located outside the Commonwealth airport lease, the preliminary draft Master Plan provides flexibility for a range of uses that include rooming accommodation, educational establishments and research and technology industry.
Consider updating the Master Plan to provide a 'gateway opportunity' when leaving the GCA towards the Gold Coast Highway.	The draft Master Plan has been updated in section 8.4.2, for the terminal precinct to provide a 'gateway opportunity' to the region.
The PDMP does not properly reflect the many local and state policies to protect the significant environmental, cultural and natural resource values of the NSW Crown Reserve and Cobaki precinct. Nor is there any acknowledgment of the number of management plans in place to preserve these values or a commitment to respect these plans.	<p>The Tweed Coast Crown Reserve was designated 25th August 2006. On 18th October 2013, the Minister for Regional Infrastructure and Services and the Minister administering the <i>Crown Lands Act 1989</i> approved a lease over the Crown Reserve to GCAPL. The permitted uses on the Crown Reserve under the lease agreement include airport infrastructure and land management.</p> <p>Reference to the 2014 Tweed Local Environment Plan (LEP) in the preliminary draft Master Plan is the appropriate planning document that is consistent with the lease agreement between the NSW government and GCAPL and reflects the most current zoning of the site.</p> <p>Consistency with surrounding planning legislation is described in detail within section 8.3.6 to 8.3.8 of the preliminary draft Master Plan. Section 8.3.8 specifically states that the zoning to the south of the airport as being a 'deferred matter' under the 2014 LEP, so as to not preclude development of aeronautical facilities.</p>
The submitter fully supports the expansion of the Airport as the economic benefits to the area are vital, but queries whether or not there will be public access to the terminal precinct facilities or whether these will be aimed exclusively at GCA passengers.	The preliminary draft Master Plan encourages the public use of the facilities anticipated within the terminal precinct.
It is unclear to what extent a new M1 interchange at Boyd Street would unlock (be a catalyst for) potential future economic activities associated with GCA.	At present, there is no interchange where Boyd Street crosses the Pacific Motorway, although tentative plans exist for such a connection. The adequacy and suitability of Boyd Street for any development generating significant volumes of traffic and/or industrial traffic will need to be assessed at the time of detailed planning studies for the precinct. This is detailed within Section 8.4.4 of the preliminary draft Master Plan.
There is a lack of information or clarity in the PDMP 2017 on the future of the Western Enterprise Precinct. It is noted that the PDMP 2017 is silent on the development aspects and future of this precinct.	<p>Planning within the western enterprise precinct is detailed within section 8.4.4 of the preliminary draft Master Plan. Except for navigation and communications equipment associated with aircraft operations, and some ancillary airport activities such as the fire training area, the precinct is essentially undeveloped. It is seen as a supply of available land for future airport development (20 year plan).</p> <p>The list of possible uses within the western enterprise precinct is detailed within Table 8-6.</p>
The submitter suggests that PDMP 2017 should recognise the Master Planning area's position in the	Although the preliminary draft Master Plan is specific to the Commonwealth Airport Lease Area, it recognises the airports position in the surrounding landscape. Chapter 3 details the

Comment	GCAPL Response
local landscape and the adjoining high conservation areas.	Airports location within the locality. Chapter 8 of the preliminary draft Master Plan details consistency with surrounding legislation. Chapter 11 addresses environmental considerations and their management associated with the airport activities.
I totally oppose the use of NSW Public land for exclusive use and expansion of a private for profit company – the Gold Coast Airport.  NSW Crown Reserve is public land and should be left so.	The Tweed Coast Crown Reserve was designated 25 <sup>th</sup> April 2006. On the 18 <sup>th</sup> October 2013, the Minister for Regional Infrastructure and Services and the Minister administering the <i>Crown Lands Act 1989</i> approved a lease over the Crown Reserve to GCAPL. The permitted uses on the Crown Reserve under the lease agreement include airport infrastructure and land management.  During preparation of the preliminary draft Master Plan, GCAPL consulted with a wide range of government, industry and community representatives.

### 3.3.10 CHAPTER 9 - PROPERTY STRATEGY

Comment	GCAPL Response
Submitter supports the GCA five year development plan especially for commercial opportunities that benefit from location on GCA land and within close proximity to John Flynn Hospital and Southern Cross University.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the Aviation development five year and 20 year plans.
Submitter supports that the proposals to deliver short-term accommodation and a multistorey carpark at the airport would in general be good for the airport.	GCAPL acknowledges the support provided for delivery of short-term accommodation and a multistorey carpark at the airport.

### 3.3.11 CHAPTER 10 – GROUND TRANSPORT PLAN

Comment	GCAPL Response
The submitter is supportive of the plan and suggest that the passenger pickup point should be moved away from the terminal as soon as possible.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the ground transport for the Master Plan. The five year ground transport plan proposes to relocate the passenger pickup away from the terminal.
The submitter fully supports the expansion of the Airport as the economic benefits to the area are vital, especially with regards to the light rail future planning.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the light rail.
Given the likely improvements to car parking and terminal, support is given to the proposed road improvements.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the improvements to the road network.
The development of additional transport infrastructure is welcomed in particular, the draft Master Plan proposes construction of a second access onto the Gold Coast Highway.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the improvements of the road network.
The submitter fully supports the expansion of the Airport as the economic benefits to the area are vital especially the extension to the light/heavy rail into the Tweed.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the heavy and light rail.
The submitter fully supports the expansion of the airport as the economic benefits to the area are vital, especially the planning of the light rail.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the light rail.

Comment	GCAPL Response
Full support for the light rail to come to Tweed Heads and supports the cross border commission and Tweed Shire Council and airport to work together in achieving this goal.	Light rail alignments outside the Commonwealth Airport Lease area are beyond the scope of the master planning process. GCAPL, however, is supportive of light rail extending to Tweed Heads.
Submitter is supportive of the transport planning. Amend Figures 6.2 and 10.7 to indicate that the Light Rail and Heavy Rail alignments are indicative only.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the light rail. Figures 6.2 and 10.7 have been amended to depict heavy and light rail as 'Indicative only'.
The preliminary draft Master Plan identifies the proposed construction of a second road access point to the Gold Coast Highway. Whilst the Gold Coast Highway is a State-controlled road, Council would support a coordinated approach to the planning and design of this future access.	The proposed second access to the airport from the Gold Coast Highway is from New South Wales and therefore requires coordination with the NSW Roads and Maritime Services as well as Tweed Shire Council. GCAPL would support involvement of all government stakeholders to the planning and design of this future access.
Can the Master Plan identify the preferred ultimate alignment of light rail through the GCA to include operational width requirements, station location and the interface between light rail and road networks also any planned building/structures.	The preferred light rail alignment is depicted in Figure 6.2 and Figure 10.7 of the preliminary draft Master Plan.
Can the Master Plan be updated to show the ultimate pedestrian and cycle networks with a suggestion to separate the cycle and pedestrian pathways? Can provision be made for shower/changing facilities?	Upgrading pedestrian and cycling facilities is discussed within Table 12-2, Twenty-Year Development Plan and within Section 10.5.6 Pedestrian and Cycling Active Transport.  It is proposed that cycling lanes be included on all internal roads with end-of-trip facilities at either end of the terminal, and in the non-aviation development lots.  The twenty-year Ground Transport Plan includes seamless connections between the airport internal and external pedestrian and cycling network.
Comments relate to the timing of the light rail to the airport and flexibility of the road network to cater for an even should the light rail be introduced earlier than anticipated.  Comments also relate to the preferred route of the light rail through the airport.	Light rail alignments outside the Commonwealth Airport Lease area and associated timing are beyond the scope of the master planning process.  During the preparation of the Draft 2017 Master Plan both Queensland State Government and City of Gold Coast Council were consulted with regards to the likely alignment and potential timing of light rail arriving to Gold Coast Airport, during these discussions Queensland State Government and City of Gold Coast Council estimated that this will not occur within the first five years of this Master Plan.  The indicative location of light rail within the airport site including the location of the indicative light rail station was developed in consultation with the City of Gold Coast.
The submitter does not support the introduction of the heavy rail line. The location of the proposed heavy rail route through the airport and through the University campus is not practical and should be considered an obsolete plan.	State and local government transport strategies have identified future transport infrastructure near the Airport, including heavy rail. The heavy rail corridor, as proposed by the Department of Transport and Main Roads (Queensland), continues to be included in the preliminary draft Master Plan just as it was included in the 2011 Master Plan. Further detailed planning and design, along with ongoing reviews and collaboration with Department of Transport and Main Roads, will confirm future alignments.
Concerns raised about the possibility that heavy rail will cause an increase in "heavy" freight aircraft.	State and local government transport strategies have identified future transport infrastructure near the Airport, including heavy rail. The heavy rail corridor, as proposed by the Department of Transport and Main Roads (Queensland) continues to be included in the preliminary draft Master Plan just as it was

Comment	GCAPL Response
	included in the 2011 Master Plan. Further detailed planning and design, along with ongoing reviews and collaboration with Department of Transport and Main Roads, will confirm future alignments. It is expected that the future heavy rail will be used for transportation of passengers rather than freight.
Support the long term approach where terminal development will focus upon improved pedestrian connectivity, the submitter also supports the proposal to integrate internal and external pedestrian and cycle networks and to provide end-of-trip facilities at either end of the terminal and other areas. Submitter suggests updating the Master Plan to provide further detail on the proposed ultimate pedestrian and cycle networks within the GCA boundary and how these networks integrate with the external network.	Pedestrian and cycling active transport is detailed within Section 10.5.6 of this preliminary draft Master Plan. It is proposed that cycling lanes be included on all internal roads with end-of-trip facilities at either end of the terminal and in the non-aviation development lots.
Support is given to Gold Coast Airport for incorporating cycling and pedestrian provision within the master plan and encourages the Gold Coast Airport to consider the recently published South East Queensland Principal Cycle Network Plan.	GCAPL acknowledges the support for incorporating cycling and pedestrian provision within the Master Plan. The South East Queensland Principal Cycle Network Plan has been considered in preparation of the preliminary draft Master Plan. The Master Plan provides cycling connectivity to the indicative principal cycling route network along the Gold Coast Highway.

### 3.3.12 CHAPTER 11 – ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY

Comment	GCAPL Response
We commend the airport for its efforts in protecting the Cobaki Environment Precinct.	GCAPL acknowledges the support from submitters regarding the Cobaki Environment Precinct.
Why does Gold Coast Airport continually refer to the Coolangatta Creek as 'drainage'?	The Airport acknowledges that some stakeholders are of the view that given the historic presence of a creek on and neighbouring the Airport that the current drainage reserve should be referred to as Coolangatta Creek. The current drainage reserve has been diverted and heavily modified from the natural watercourse that originally existed 70 years ago.
The draft Master Plan references the Cobaki Environment Precinct however the precinct is not reflected in the mapping – particularly the ESA mapping.	The ESA mapping is intended to indicate Environmentally Significant Areas and not land use precincts such as the Cobaki Environment Precinct which is depicted in Figure 8.1 - Land Use Plan.
This plan includes a statement to cover any planned or unplanned destruction in the future ie. 11.5.5 Page 172 – 'Environmentally significant areas identified in this Master Plan are current at the date of preparation. These areas may change during the planning period of the Master Plan. For example, when a Major Development Plan for a development affecting an environmentally significant area is approved and the development completed it may result in areas no longer being considered environmentally significant'.	The statement referred to within section 11.5.5 simply highlights the fact that ESAs depicted in the master plan are correct at the time of preparation of the master plan and that implementation of approved MDPs, particularly those where approval allows impacts to ESAs, may result in the area no longer being considered environmentally significant. The Master Plan does not allow for any 'unplanned destruction' of ESAs.
The current dot points are difficult to apply and assume the reader of the Master Plan has a working knowledge of the original ESA methodology.	Section 11.5.5 of the draft Master Plan has been updated to include further information regarding the methodology used to determine ESAs.
More detail should be provided on the level of environmental impact associated with the Airport's	GCAPL considers the level of detail provided in the preliminary draft Master Plan regarding the potential environmental impacts

Comment	GCAPL Response
Development Plan, which does not have a formal mitigation strategy over the next five to 20 years.	<p>associated with the development foreshadowed in the Master Plan and the proposed measures to prevent, control or reduce the environmental impacts as appropriate for the purpose of the Master Plan.</p> <p>Figure 6.2 (20 year development plan) and Figure 11.4 (Environmentally Significant Areas) can easily be read in conjunction to obtain an understanding as to the extent the 20 year development plan will result in loss of ESAs.</p> <p>Impacts to ESAs would normally trigger the need to prepare a Major Development Plan and application for subsequent building approval(s) as detailed in section 8.3 of the preliminary draft Master Plan. In preparing the Major Development Plan and building approval documentation, impacts to ESAs would be assessed in details and appropriate mitigation measures implemented.</p>
Table 11-2 should include a requirement to monitor groundwater draw down as a result of the PDMP 2017 development plan implementation.	<p>Development of specific monitoring requirements, including groundwater, associated with implementation of projects foreshadowed by the Master Plan are addressed in relevant Major Development Plans and/or Construction Environment Management Plans rather than in the Master Plan.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Table 11-2 in the draft Master Plan has been updated to included construction related monitoring as detailed in relevant Major Development Plans and/or Construction Environment Management Plans.</p>
The Master Plan does not address the presence of ASS, but only acknowledges that it may be present on-site. Appropriate consideration should be given to its presence and management.	<p>Section 11.7.1 of the preliminary draft Master Plan notes that both actual and potential acid sulfate soils are present at the airport, rather than may be present as suggested in the submission. Section 11.7.2 and 11.7.3 provide further detail regarding potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures respectively associated with airport activities in relation to acid sulfate soils.</p>
The monitoring regime for storm water in Table 11-2 should be reviewed to adequately cover the range of flow conditions. Monitoring data should be reviewed bi-annually to identify and respond to any issues.	<p>Both event and periodic surface water monitoring currently take place to capture a range of flow conditions which were specifically acknowledged in the preliminary draft Master Plan.</p> <p>Surface water monitoring is revised following each monitoring round. Response to any issues identified are addressed section 11.5.6 of the preliminary draft Master Plan which states '<i>If a non-conformance or declining trend is identified, appropriate corrective actions are implemented</i>'.</p>

Comment	GCAPL Response
<p>We would like to see testing for PFAS extended to the ground water in suburbs surrounding the airport and Coolangatta Creek where it enters and leaves the airport.</p>	<p>Section 11.7 of the preliminary draft Master Plan acknowledges the presence of per-and poly-fluorinated alkyl substances (PFASs) contamination at the airport.</p> <p>GCAPL believes the preliminary draft Master Plan sufficiently deals with the presence of PFASs on the airport site and identifies potential, environmental impacts and associated measures to prevent, control or reduce impacts.</p> <p>However, in response to the public interest in the subject further detail has been included in Sections 11.7 and 11.8 of the draft Master Plan in relation PFASs, including actions being undertaken to investigate and/or manage impacted areas.</p> <p>While GCAPL is not in a position to commit other parties to offsite PFASs testing, in implementing the actions above and those already contained in the preliminary draft Master Plan, testing of ground water in suburbs surrounding the airport by Airservices Australia is already in the planning phase. PFASs testing of the drainage reserve where it enters and leaves the airport has already been undertaken with results available on the Gold Coast Airport and Airservices Australia websites.</p>
<p>Several submitters raised concerns with regards to the presence of PFAS at the Airport and seek clarification on Management Strategies that are in place.</p>	<p>Section 11.7 of the preliminary draft Master Plan acknowledges the presence of per-and poly-fluorinated alkyl substances (PFASs) contamination at the airport.</p> <p>GCAPL believes the preliminary draft Master Plan sufficiently deals with the presence of PFASs on the airport site and identifies potential, environmental impacts and associated measures to prevent, control or reduce impacts. However, in response to the public interest in the subject further detail has been included in Sections 11.7 and 11.8 of the draft Master Plan in relation PFASs, including actions being undertaken investigate and/or manage impacted areas.</p>
<p>What is being done regarding existing aircraft exhaust pollution over beaches and properties at Currumbin?</p>	<p>Emissions associated with the flying, landing, taking off or taxiing of aircraft is governed by the Commonwealth <i>Air Services Act 1995</i> and the <i>Air Navigation (Aircraft Engine Emissions) Regulations 1997</i> and therefore not regulated by the Master Plan as detailed in Section 11.11.1 of the preliminary draft Master Plan.</p>
<p>The airport must ensure appropriate management of species listed under the <i>Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i>.</p>	<p>Biodiversity and measures to manage potential impacts to biodiversity values, which apply to species listed under the EPBC Act, are detailed within Section 11.9 of the preliminary draft Master Plan. Targets for biodiversity management are detailed within Table 11-7.</p>
<p>Concerns regarding the conservation and management of known Aboriginal sites within the Master Planning area, recommendation for a Detailed contingency provisions be included as part of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan to ensure that locations of Aboriginal Cultural Heritage are identified and managed in an appropriate manner.</p>	<p>Section 11.10 of the preliminary draft Master Plan outlines potential impacts to cultural heritage, including know cultural heritage sites identified in Figure 11.7, and details measures to prevent, control or reduce impacts.</p> <p>Due to a delay in the finalisation of the Whole-of-airport CHMP which was intended to be completed prior to submission of the draft Master Plan, the CHMP has been removed as a mitigation measure and it's finalisation included as a target in the draft Master Plan. Contingency provisions already form part of the draft CHMP and will be a key component of the CHMP once finalised.</p>

Comment	GCAPL Response
<p>Page 191: “Extensive ground disturbance over the past 50 years, from sand mining, land reclamation and development, has altered or removed much of the physical heritage that may have been present at the Airport.” While these activities have damaged the cultural landscape, I do not agree with this statement, as it implies that most or much of it is now destroyed. The results of the archaeological investigations for Project Lift is a prime example that much of our heritage remains, with over 3,500 artefacts salvaged during limited monitoring activities in an area that was thought to be “all sand mined”.</p>	<p>This comment appears to have been provided out of context as the section of text being referred to in section 11.10.1 of the preliminary draft Master Plan also states ‘<i>However, less disturbed areas of the Airport, such as the Cobaki Environment Precinct, still contain relatively undisturbed cultural heritage sites. Several cultural heritage sites are also present in more disturbed areas of the Airport, including the Western Enterprise Precinct and southern portions of the Terminal and Runway precincts. Some cultural heritage sites also exist within developed portions of the airport. These sites are where artefacts have been found within the soil profile indicating the potential presence of other artefacts below the developed profile of the site</i>’ which addresses the submitters comment.</p>
<p>The Aboriginal stakeholders for GCAPL have not been consulted regarding the development of CHMP.</p>	<p>When preparing the preliminary draft Master Plan it was envisaged that the draft Whole-of-airport Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP) would have been issued to Indigenous stakeholders for review/comment prior to/during public exhibition of the preliminary draft Master Plan. Due to a delay in the preparation of the draft CHMP and its issue to stakeholders for comments, the CHMP has been removed as a mitigation measure and its finalisation included as a target in the draft Master Plan.</p>
<p>Environmental offsets should be located within the Cobaki Broadwater.</p>	<p>Provision of environmental offsets is related to the approval of the Project LIFT MDP. Environmental offsets for Project LIFT are being undertaken in accordance with the EPBC Act offsets policy and EPBC approval No: 2014/7266</p>
<p>We acknowledge that GCAPL has a place to manage potential impacts on sites and areas of Aboriginal cultural heritage significance and is aware of the cultural significance of the Airport site. GCAPL is encouraged to maintain close liaison with the local Aboriginal community and council regarding this matter.</p>	<p>GCAPL will continue maintaining close liaison with the local Aboriginal community and Councils.</p>
<p>Environmental offsets should be located within the Cobaki Broadwater.</p>	<p>Submitter’s comments are related to the approved Project LIFT MDP. Environmental offsets for Project LIFT are being undertaken in accordance with the EPBC Act offsets policy and EPBC approval No: 2014/7266.</p>
<p>The Master Plan should include information on the recycling initiatives and food waste initiatives. It should also include sustainable building practices such as retro fitting to the existing buildings on airport</p>	<p>Current and future recycling and waste management/initiatives along with GCAPL’s plans regarding sustainable building practices, including retrofitting of existing buildings, are detailed within section 11.6 of the preliminary draft Master Plan.</p> <p>Section 6.1 of the preliminary draft Master Plan details that GCAPL has implemented recycling programs in Terminal 1 public spaces and for cardboard, which have diverted over 600 tonnes of waste from landfill over the past 5 years. GCAPL sends waste oil, batteries, printer cartridges and office paper for recycling, and unwanted building materials are stockpiled onsite for re-use where possible. GCAPL also provides commingled recycling for tenants. Management of organic waste will form part of the waste management review target in table 11-4.</p>

