

Submission by Author type	Issues	Comments
Aerodrome Operator 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Master Plan should allow low capacity Regular Transport Services (RPT) – 8-12 pax 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCA is the focus for RPT operators on the Sunshine Coast Caloundra has limited facilities for passengers. It is not proposed to duplicate SCA's role at Caloundra
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extension of 05/23 should happen ASAP to provide for RPT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not supported see above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new parallel taxiway needs to cross 12/30 and reach the 05 end of 05/23 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would involve a extension of approximately 315m to the proposed taxiway. Given that the need to use the 05 runway would be wind driven, i.e. no one would be using the 12/30 runway at the time crossing the 12/30 runway and using the Southern end of the 05 runway is considered to be low risk – No change is recommended
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to 15m 'exclusive' parking area being added to leases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted – the proposal was part of a redesign of the apron to achieve compliance with MOS 139 – the design has now been revised and the proposed 'exclusive' parking areas deleted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Helipad should be provided at the N.E. end of the apron with a tow way to apron for heavy helicopters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of a heavy helicopter pad at the N.E. end of the apron has been considered, however it would encroach upon the OLS for 05/23 and/or cause rotor wash problems for aircraft parked nearby - a revised apron design includes a heavy helicopter bay, compass swing area and engine run up bay south of the taxiway to 05/23
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits should be imposed on the size/weight of hover taxiing helicopters on the current apron 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed operators will be instructed that hover taxiing will not be permitted beyond the helipad or designated helicopter parking bays
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking bays shown in figure 11 don't reflect the need to park aircraft into the wind 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The industry standard is to provide tie downs to secure aircraft. Suitable tie downs will be installed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking arrangements don't reflect enough space for taxiing/manoeuvring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressed in revised apron design

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
SCA based operator 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As an SCA based operation he should be regarded as a Caloundra local with respect to the “fly neighbourly” policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NO, unless he takes up a lease and bases aircraft at Caloundra
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Night training ‘curfew’ should be extended in summer months so as to permit enough night hours flying for trainees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not supported
Golden Beach Resident 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to increased helicopter usage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Master Plan discusses the maximum likely increase in traffic – recent events suggest helicopter traffic has reduced and will fluctuate over time
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More detailed noise measurements reflecting the helicopter noise should be included in noise modelling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TNIP does include a variety of aircraft including the types of helicopter that operate at Caloundra
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flight paths in MP are not accurate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Master Plan doesn’t show flight paths Figures 7 & 8 show ANEF and N70 outputs respectively
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expresses concerns over the safety of operations over residential areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASA regulates aircraft maintenance and pilot licencing to ensure aviation is as safe as is possible
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recreational and environmental attributes of the aerodrome should be enhanced and made accessible to the local community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The key issue for the management of the aerodrome is operational safety – it is not an area that can be made available for general recreational use
Moffat Beach Resident 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports retention of the aerodrome 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
Pelican Waters Resident 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise/safety impacts upon current and future residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussed in detail in the report
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caloundra G.A. activity should be relocated to SCA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCA's primary focus is Regular Public Transport (RPT) The current Caloundra businesses could not be accommodated at SCA The Coast requires a complimentary suite of aviation infrastructure of which Caloundra is a component
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Envisaged economic benefit is "illusory" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The aviation sector is one of a number of industry sectors being targeted by Council to assist in the crucial task of diversifying the Coast economy
Caloundra West Resident 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aerodrome should not be allowed to expand The aerodrome was to be moved Bells Reach development should not have been approved, now that it has the aerodrome should not expand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council and the State Government confirmed in late 2010 that the aerodrome would remain. Aerodrome businesses as with any business need to be able to grow and develop, if they are to remain viable. These businesses and the aviation sector more broadly should not be penalised for land use decisions made many years after the establishment of the aerodrome. If the suggested approach is applied widely there will be no aerodromes left and no aviation industry.

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
Caloundra West Resident 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aircraft are too low on approach over Bellvista – the descent should be steeper and start closer to the runway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is the pilot's responsibility to operate in a safe manner. The OLS for Caloundra sets a glide path of 4 % for landings this is considered safe and reasonable.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training circuits should occur in a remote location not over residential areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The option of re-considering the Johnson Road area as a possible "satellite" training area has been raised at an officer level with the Department of State Development Infrastructure and Planning.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aircraft should be noise tested 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no mandated standards for individual aircraft noise with respect to G.A. aircraft
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for a local air traffic controller to respond quickly to complaints about operators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the future Council may have a fulltime presence at Caloundra, however current traffic levels don't warrant it
CASA 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Master Plan statement that RPT is currently not permitted is "not entirely accurate". RPT up to 10 pax can operate at a suitable ALA and provided CASR 139D requirements are met up to 30 pax are permitted on an ALA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted, appropriate amendment have been made to the Master Plan, noting however, that RPT is not being proposed for Caloundra
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to include comment on lighting in the vicinity of the aerodrome and bird hazard management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of lighting used in developments surrounding the aerodrome is more appropriately addressed in Councils planning scheme. A wildlife hazard management plan will be included in the Environmental Management Plan for the aerodrome

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
Caloundra West Resident 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was previously told the aerodrome would close • Objects to increase activity especially helicopters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This issue is addressed above • Helicopter activity will fluctuate with the amount of training being undertaken. The Master Plan represents a maximum estimated amount of traffic to ensure the full impact is not understated
Caloundra West Resident 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to increase in helicopter activity • A satellite facility should be established for helicopter training • Opposes lengthening the runway as it will attract larger aircraft 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See above • See above • The runway extension is not programmed to occur in the planning horizon of the Master Plan – it is being shown as a runway reserve to preserve a future option
Caloundra West Resident 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise/sleep disturbance caused by low flying aircraft approach to Caloundra 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fly neighbourly policy and the identified circuits at Caloundra are intended to minimise the impact of aircraft noise, recognising that the aircraft do have to approach and depart the aerodrome at relatively low levels. It has been Councils practice to engage with aircraft operators (where they can be identified) to resolve specific issues. This will continue.
Bellvista Residents Association 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong community support for satellite helicopter training facility – this should be a ‘major plank’ of the Master Plan document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is agreed that a satellite training facility should be pursued with the State Government. Such a facility would greatly enhance the amenity of surrounding residents. It is however not a matter for direct inclusion in the Master Plan as the Master Plan relates to the aerodrome site, not lands further afield.

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
Battery Hill resident 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site should be retained as an aerodrome in perpetuity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MP sets out a 20 year plan for the aerodrome. It will be reviewed every 5 years
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vital need for access to mechanical services for light to medium sized aircraft 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable pilot training facilities such as Caloundra are important to the industry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caloundra offers favourable weather conditions and reduces pressure on ATC services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Main runway should be extended 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan provides for the possibility however the cost and likely demand mean that it is not proposed to occur in the planning horizon of the Master Plan, i.e. before 2032
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public viewing access, joy flights. Sky diving and the museum should be encouraged as tourism generators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted – the MP includes provision for enhanced public viewing facilities and a major expansion of the museum
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 'residential air park; should be provided to the South/Southwest as a buffer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Before the ULDA granted approval for the Caloundra south development numerous attempts were made to convince them of the need to consider non-noise sensitive land uses in close proximity to the aerodrome. It would appear from the approvals granted that this opportunity has been lost

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
Aerodrome Lessee 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to exclusive airside parking • Cost but no benefit to him 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See above. This issue has been resolved
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to registration – costs and no benefits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This issue is addressed in the body of the report
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lease area J floods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The advice of the current occupant of lease area J is that recently completed drainage works have resolved this issue
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lease H has been ‘truncated’ to provide access to the fuel activities – lease fee should be reduced accordingly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This issue has been resolved with the redesign of the apron referred to above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No landing fees should be charged • Believes we have overestimated future aircraft movements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed in the body of the report • Addressed in the body of the report
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unhappy with new leases and MP generally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. Where appropriate the Master Plan has been amended to reflect submissions. The lease issue is not relevant to the Master Plan
Property Council 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes TNIP – MP should only refer to ANEF • The growth of the aerodrome should be limited by the land use decisions that have been made around it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This issue is addressed in the body of the report • Addressed above
Aerodrome Lessee 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal to register – no benefit if RPT ops are not being considered – only costs • Objects to expanded lease areas • New leases will not attract new business to the aerodrome 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed above • Addressed above • Addressed above

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
<p>Pelican Waters Resident 17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise levels around airport are excessive • ANEF and TNIP should be subject of independent assessment • Claims to experience excessive noise despite being outside ANEF and N70 contours 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The noise modelling was done by consultant firm GHD, independent of council. The issue of aircraft noise is addressed in the body of the report however it is noted that the submission raises a very valid point – noise and perceptions of noise impact are highly subjective – the TNIP/N70 model will calculate how many daily occurrences of noise events in excess 70 decibels will occur in a particular locality. The submission author may regard 50 decibels as intrusive and be affected when others may not.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A fly neighbourly program is required (FNP) where small helicopters operate at 1000 feet and large ones at 4000 feet • FNP should provide guidance to pilots on how to reduce the noise foot print • FNP should be linked to leases • Council should consult surrounding communities on the effectiveness of the FNP • A noise and flight path monitoring system could be implemented • The aircraft noise ombudsman should be provided with minutes of quarterly meetings between pilots, operators Council and community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current fly neighbourly policy requires fixed wing circuits to be at 800 feet and helicopter circuits over the aerodrome to be 500 feet. Having helicopter circuits increased to 1000 or 4000 feet isn't considered practical as the helicopters would still need to climb to that altitude • The current FNP does require instructors to ensure noise issues/environmental awareness included in pilot training • The option of more closely linking activities to leases is discussed in the body of the report • Council does engage on a quarterly basis with the Caloundra Community Aviation forum. Noise management is a regular agenda item • Airservices Australia monitors flight paths where radar is available to track the aircraft. This facility is not available at Caloundra • These parties are invited to the quarterly meetings any relevant matters can be referred to the Commonwealth Aircraft Noise Ombudsman

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
Pelican Waters Resident continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quieter aircraft could be phased in over a 5 year period • Target noisier older aircraft and require 'hush' kits to be fitted • Limit museum activities that might involve noisier aircraft • Curfews – all training be limited to 9am to 3pm week days • No weekend flying • All airside activities be limited to 9am to dusk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The thrust of the discussion around older aircraft is that they should be excluded from the aerodrome or modified to quieten them. It is sometimes, but not always true that older aircraft are noisier. It is also noted that the G.A. fleet is generally older aircraft. To limit access to the aerodrome to newer aircraft would effectively exclude the bulk of the G.A. fleet – this is not supported • Curfews are not being considered. The limited hours suggested would not allow the current aerodrome businesses to viable
Campbell Newman – Premier 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks for the advice and noting the engagement with relevant State agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted
Caloundra West Resident 19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the proposed development of the aerodrome on noise and safety grounds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed above
Residents Association South Sunshine Coast 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally satisfied with the plan • Overall the plan is sound and takes a sensible view of growth of the aviation sector • Pleased that Council has proposed to retain the aerodrome and its businesses, jobs etc. rather than terminate its use for the sake of a few complaints from recent residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Noted • Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most residents get more noise from the traffic and garbage trucks than from light aircraft • Supports the concept of the 400m extension but is concerned that it would be a downhill slope and might be dangerous for particularly at night • Don't support gravel apron due to potential damage to aircraft – would prefer it be left grass if not fully sealed • Doesn't support fees as they will discourage visiting pilots and impact upon businesses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • The design of the extension, should it proceed would have to involve the filling of the runway platform to create a safe, and, a close to constant runway slope as per CASA requirements • It is now proposed to seal the apron • The fees are not strictly a matter for the Master Plan, however it is one means of generating

Residents Association South Sunshine Coast continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports extension of apron/lease areas 	<p>funding to go towards the operating costs of the aerodrome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Association applauds the proposal to introduce the commercial area to the east as a buffer to aircraft noise • Council should approach Stocklands with a view to creating an 'air park' estate on Bells Reach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Previously addressed
Caloundra West Resident 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be no expansion of the aerodrome based on noise and safety concerns and recent residential development approvals will only make matters worse 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previously addressed
Golden Beach Resident 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus of growth at Caloundra should be a helicopters given it has developed a speciality role in this area – why this is an extension of the runway and apron mods being contemplated which focus on fixed win not rotary wing • Expansion of G.A areas is all airside - many G.A. businesses don't need airside land • Pathfinder drive land (north) should be developed if the road is to be extended • objects to registration of aerodrome – costs and no benefits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Runway reserve is intended to preserve an option for the future • Apron mods are about achieving compliance with minimum standards • The draft Master Plan provides for both 'airside' and 'landside' expansion • The exhibited draft plan does show this • This issue is addressed in the body of the report
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Master Plan should not deal with aircraft noise as aircraft noise is not a land use planning issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This view is not supported
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to landing and parking fees as they will discriminate against local users as opposed to 'touch and go' itinerants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'touch and go' itinerants will be 'captured' by the landing fee system as the system includes the monitoring of radio traffic at the aerodrome
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to 'non-aviation' commercial development as it is 9.5 hectares where only 6.8 hectares of G.A spaces is provided • Non-aviation development should only proceed if it certain the land isn't required for G.A • Objects to aircraft apron 'exclusive use' areas – assumes it has led to the changed in the apron design • Current apron has been in place since 1978 and is safe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This issue is addressed in the body of the report • Agreed • The revised apron design has resulted in this aspect being deleted from the Master Plan • Current apron does not comply with MOS 139

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
Golden Beach Resident continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed two way system of taxiway is dangerous – current apron allows drive through parking • Gravel apron not supported – damage to aircraft • Proposed apron will encourage ultra-lights who will pay no parking or landing charges • Heavy helicopter pad should be developed between Henebery Place and Caloundra Road • Fuel farm should be relocated to N.E of taxiway of 05/23 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exhibited apron design is compliant with CASA requirements, it has however been modified to reflect the concerns of the operators • It is now proposed to seal the apron • All registered aircraft will be charged • Noted, addressed in redesign of the apron • This issue was explored early in the process with the current fuel retailer – (BP). BP were not prepared to relocate the facility or install a remote bowser/pressurised delivery line. The revised apron plant retains the currently refuelling location. It is proposed they revisit this issue at the upcoming lease ‘renewal’ in June 2014 with B.P.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed taxiways to 05/23 should not be ‘opposed’ so that aircraft taxi towards each other – suggest 45° offset to avoid problem • The eastern extension of the taxiway at the Nth end of 05/23 destroys the grass runway used by bi-planes • The angled alignment of the proposed development to the east of the runway and the different distances from the runway development on the western and eastern sides could confuse pilots and lead to problems with wind shear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not supported, taxiways other than rapid exit taxiways should approach a runway at 90° to maximise pilot view in both directions along the runway • The grass runway does not legally exist. All aircraft are required to use paved surfaces at Caloundra • The alignment is angled to allow for the OLS to runway 05/23 to be maintained • The different distances to development to the east and west are a product of the existing drainage to the west of the runway. A detailed analysis of potential wind shear effects can be done once building designs are known – this will be at a later stage
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCA should not be running Caloundra Aerodrome and it should revert to being run out of the local Council office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not relevant to the exhibited Master Plan

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
Golden Beach Resident continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of suggestions are made with respect to the text of the Master Plan document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where appropriate the amendment have been made
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of suggestions are made with respect to the text of the Business Strategy document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy has not been publicly exhibited, however where appropriate amendments will be made.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of MP will kill the aerodrome business – outrageous cost imposition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Master Plan objectives are clearly intended to support the future of the aerodrome businesses
Aerodrome Lessee 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally opposed to SCA running the aerodrome • Opposed to registration of the aerodrome • Opposed to landing and parking fees • Suggest the objectives should refer to a balance between flying and non-flying aviation business rather than a balance between aviation and commercial businesses • Traffic forecast can't be substantiated and should be removed from the plan • Expresses concern regarding the inferences of some statements in the Master Plan • Since amalgamation the aerodrome has be over managed by SCA and should be managed by Council officer based at Caloundra • Support the development of the aerodrome as per the 1997 Management Plan • The lease costs at Caloundra are too high and compares unfavourably to places such as Coffs Harbour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a Master Plan matter • This issue is addressed in the body of the report • This issue is addressed in the body of the report • This issue is addressed in the body of the report • This issue is addressed in the body of the report • This issue is addressed in the body of the report • Where appropriate amendments have been made to the text of the Master Plan document • The level of management may be more than experienced by the submitter in the past, the intent however is to ensure safe operation of the aerodrome in compliance with CASA requirements • The 1997 Management Plan was reviewed in the preparation of this Master Plan • The costs for leases at Caloundra are not a matter relevant to the Master Plan. It is noted however that the Ministerial exemption granted to current lease holders to renew their leases for 30 years without having to go to public tender are conditional upon market rates being applied to lease fees

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
Aerodrome Lessee 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A separate submission that requests its authors name be put to the submission summarised above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted – the issues are addressed above
Queensland Air Museum 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> QAM have provided a plan for the expanded museum area with a discussion of their goals/objectives including a flyable collection with an airside hangar facility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In principal the QAM proposal is supported. The proposed expansion of the museum will be a boost for the tourism and aviation industries on the coast. QAM, Council and the State Government will need to work together to bring the project to fruition. Initial discussions with relevant Council and State Government officers have identified the process and some of the issues that will need to be resolved
Department of Transport and Main Roads 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DTMR has advised that it will not include Caloundra Aerodrome as a significant aviation facility within the revised/updated State Planning Policy and requests that the references to this be removed from the Master Plan The DTMR wish to identify a road link from Caloundra South to Pelican Waters Boulevard, and that the road be located as close as possible to the aerodrome boundary A road corridor permit application will need to be lodged with the DTMR regarding the proposed left in – left out access to Caloundra Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted this is not unexpected. Council will need to rely upon the planning scheme to protect the operational curtilage of the aerodrome There is no objection to the road link proposed provided that the construction and use of the road does not compromise the OLS as shown in the Master Plan and that the wetlands proposed as part of the road design be deleted as they present a bird strike hazard to aircraft using the aerodrome This will be actioned upon adoption of the Master Plan

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
<p>Pelican Waters Resident 27</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aircraft noise and safety concerns • Planes should turn right, not left when taking off from 12/30 towards the coast • Was previously told by council that the airport was going to move • Why is Council still allowing land close to the aerodrome to be subdivided? • The airport should be moved to ensure the safety of surrounding residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed in the body of the report • The approved circuit pattern for aircraft taking off towards the coast on the 12/30 runway is a right-hand turn – no change is required • Council resolved in the 2010 to retain the aerodrome in its present location upon receipt of advice from the State Government that they were no longer interested in relocating it • The State Government did look at 5 possible options for relocating the aerodrome. The State decided not to pursue the relocation any further in late 2010. The reality is that it is far easier to find residential land than airport sites
<p>Four local residents with interest in the Isobel Jordan Reserve 28</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the expansion of the museum into the Isobel Jordan Reserve – it's spring wildflower species have featured in Sunshine Coast annual wildflower festival • Any 'land swap' would have to be of greater ecological value 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options to expand the museum are constrained by existing development. Preliminary flora investigations into the expansion area indicate that there are no species of significance in the context of State and Federal conservation legislation. The value of the area to the community is recognised and it is proposed to do a 'land swap' at a rate of around 5 to 1 to "offset" the use of the reserve for museum purposes

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
Aerodrome Lessee 29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contradiction between the 2012 Business Strategy and the draft Master Plan • Regional issues cited in the plan are not relevant to Caloundra's unique circumstances • Too much emphasis of the flight traffic when most of Caloundra business doesn't generate much traffic • Why propose an extended runway when future growth is cited as rotary wing? • The plan should identify 'landside' business opportunity not just airside • The strategy and the Master Plan should be combined • Opposes registration • Objects to Master Plan addressing the noise of aircraft in flight • Objects to landing charges • Objects to non-aviation commercial development • Objects to 'exclusive use' parking area as being added to lease areas • Objects to the reconfiguration of the apron • A dedicated emergency services helipad should be provided on the current carpark, and the current carpark relocated to the area between Henebery Place and Caloundra Road • A heavy helicopter landing pad should be provided • Objects to the loss of the grass runway • The aerodrome should not be managed by SCA • Lease fees are too high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific contradictions were cited. The Business Strategy was prepared in 2011 to guide the preparation of the Master Plan. This function has been fulfilled • The Master Plan considers Caloundra in its regional context not in isolation • Part of the role of the Master Plan is to enable the general public to understand the likely impact of the aerodrome. - Aircraft in flight and noise generated by them are the significant issue for the surrounding community • There is no proposal to extend the runway. the Master Plan identifies a runway reserve to enable a possible runway extension to be considered in the future beyond 2032 • The plan does • Previously addressed • Previously addressed • Previously addressed • Previously addressed • Previously addressed • Previously addressed • A combined heavy helicopter pad which will be able to accommodate emergency helicopter has been provided adjacent to the main apron. The existing carpark area is not considered suitable for this purpose on safety grounds. The current carpark/amenities area will be reconfigured to enable a tow-through area for the Queensland Air Museum • See above • Previously addressed • Previously addressed • Previously addressed

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
Developer of adjoining land 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports relocating the aerodrome to Johnston Road • The Master Plan should better acknowledge adjoining land uses and how noise impacts could be mitigated by controlling flight operation • Object to TNIP noise modelling wants only ANEF to be used • Further investigation is required of the projected traffic levels • Need for ongoing consultation – a meeting should be held with Council, the developer and the ULDA to discuss noise impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why? They have convinced the State government that their development will not be impacted upon by operations at Caloundra otherwise they would not have been granted an approval • What is being suggested it that now that they have approvals to develop noise sensitive residential development alongside the aerodrome the aerodrome's operations should be curtailed as a consequence. • The submission seems to express concern not at the noise impact itself but rather in the publication of mapping showing the likely noise impact. The Master Plan does not impose land use constraints – this work is done by Council's planning scheme, or ULDA approvals – all the Master Plan does is informs people of what they could experience in terms of the number of disturbances each day. The developer would prefer that only the ANEF be shown as the ANEF suggests noise impact is largely retained within the aerodrome's boundaries – clearly this is not the case as evidenced by the past and current experience of surrounding residents • At no time during their lengthy campaign to convince the UDLA to approve their development proposals did the developer attempt to consult aerodrome management. SCA did meet with the UDLA planning officers and noise consultant on the Bells Reach site in 2011 – before the development was approved – the developer must have satisfied the ULDA that the land was suitable for residential development – what has changed?

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
Department Environment and Heritage Protection 31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEHP is concerned that the expansion of the aerodrome will have impacts upon threatened species – that could be avoided through planning • The museum expansion will impact upon a state owned reserve and is identified as having essential habitat for Acid frogs • The proposed commercial buffer area will impact upon habitat when there remains vacant industrial land in the locality • The extension of the runway will impact upon significant biodiversity values • The proposed widening of Caloundra Road and the Camcos corridor will impact on habitat values • The Department seeks clarification as to why and clearing is necessary and asks us to demonstrate that the existing cleared areas are being fully utilised • Stormwater – the MP should consider the potential impact of stormwater and contaminants upon wetlands and frog habitat • Expresses concern over the impact of the aerodrome on the newly approved residential; developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed museum area has been assessed for threatened plants – none have been identified in this area • The proposed museum expansion site has been the subject of future investigations which concluded that compliance with a Species Management Plan for Wallum Froglet will ensure that potential impacts to this species as a result of the planned works are minimised and appropriately mitigated • The area has been identified as a possible future development area. The biodiversity status would be one of a number of issues to be resolved before my decision to proceed to development would be made • As per above these matters would need to be fully explored before a decision to proceed with this element is taken, noting that there is no intention to do so before 2032 • These are matters for the DTMR. The Master Plan merely reflects their advice on these matters • The Master Plan has been the subject of post exhibition discussions with both the DEHP and DNRM – addressed in the body of the report • This is an element of the Environmental Management Plan to be prepared if the Master Plan is adopted by Council • The UDLA has considered this issue and determined that the development will not be adversely affected by operations at Caloundra. The UDLA were advised of the potential growth of the aerodrome in written submissions on at least 3 occasions

Submission by author type	Issues	Comments
Aerodrome Business Operator 32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional objectives in Master Plan are correct but registration will be counterproductive in this regard • The Master Plan should not focus on aircraft movement and 84,000 is unrealistic for Caloundra • The Master Plan should focus on attracting aircraft owners who want to build hangars and pay lease fees this would generate more income than parking charges • Current apron complies with MOS 135 chapter 13 • Concerned that in seeking registration we are seeking to turn Caloundra into SCA – or that we somehow have a conflict or interest in managing both aerodromes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The issue of registration is addresses in the main body of the report • The Master Plan doesn't focus on aircraft movements it merely makes a prediction as to what the growth potential is • The Master Plan makes provisions for additional airside land which will be subject to tender. If hangarage is viable it will happen • The current relevant regulations pertaining to the apron design is MOS139 chapter 6 – the existing taxiways on the apron at Caloundra do not meet this standard. It is noted that MOS 135 is a proposed regulation that is silent on taxiway widths relying therefore on the current MOS 139 chapter 6 requirements • There is no intent to attempt to replicate SCA at Caloundra
Aviation Consultant 33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A compass swing area should be included at one of the proposed engine run up bays • Private hangar sites should be included in the MP i.e. 15x15 metre lots for the erection of hangars. The cost could be recouped by a “flag fall” up front \$10,000 fee • The timeline for development should be brought forward – 5 years us too long to wait for additional hangar sites • Questions the efficiency of parking/landing charges – too much effort and too little return 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to cost this seems reasonable and is proposed in the amended apron design • Lot sizes proposed are around 2000m2 to facilitate employment generating business. Once cut up into 15x15 metre lots the land would never be available for aviation businesses • Subject to Master Plan adoption design and financial feasibility it is proposed to bring on additional lease areas for aviation business to meet market demand • Addressed in the body of the report
Aerodrome Business Operator 34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master Plan should provide for large wheeled helicopters up to 10T gross weight as used by emergency services and defence • Would like Caloundra to be able to cater for more large helicopters to take advantage of business opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted: Amendments have been made to the Master Plan to reflect these suggestions

Submissions by author	Issues	Comments
<p>Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association Australia 35</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caloundra is an important base for emergency services, flight training, aviation education and recreational flying • Caloundra is well positioned to provide flight training removed from RPT environment at major airports – reduces traffic burden at Sunshine Coast Airport • The role of Caloundra will become more important as the community grows • The Master Plan is deficient because it fails to address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ recreational needs ○ emergency services ○ usage as a secondary facility • The plan is based on the requirements of a regional RPT airport • The Queensland Air Museum has the potential to become one of the biggest attractions on the Sunshine Coast however the Master Plan does not promote Queensland Air Museum other than offering a small number of additional car spaces • Leasing costs are too high • The plan should address regional development beyond 2020 • The plan should recognise community views and expectations for an airport adjacent to coastal residential development • The plan should look to aviation as a potential new industry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Noted • Noted • The Caloundra Aero Club has been consulted in the preparation of the draft Master Plan, the Master Plan has been amended to provide for a heavy helicopter/emergency services helicopter landing pad. The Master Plan notes the role of Caloundra Aerodrome in the context of a suite of aviation infrastructure on the coast • The plan is very clear that it is not intended to develop Caloundra for RPT purposes • The Master Plan recognises the opportunities inherent in the future growth of Queensland Air Museum – the site area provided for the museum has been increased from 2 hectares to 6.15 hectares • This is not a matter for the Master Plan • The Master Plan addressed the development of the aerodrome to 2032, a 20 year planning horizon • The Master Plan exhibition has indicated that there are a diverse range of views on the aerodrome throughout the local community. The views have been considered in the finalisation of the Master Plan • Noted: The plan does recognise the opportunities that Caloundra Aerodrome presents with respect to growing the aviation sector on the Sunshine Coast

Submissions by authors	Issues	Comments
<p>Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association Australia continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan should provide for Council to subsidise the development of low cost hangarage for private aircraft – 100 hangars initially • Landing and parking fees are opposed • Opposed to the extension of runway 05/23 • The Master Plan overlooks the requirement to minimise noise and supports the increased aircraft movement • Increases in resident general aviation may not increase overall traffic levels as most recreational aircraft spend most of their life stored in hangars • The submission generally seeks that Council subsidise the development of hangars for the storage of private aircraft 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council’s practice at both Caloundra and Sunshine Coast Airport is to provide the core aviation infrastructure, including developing serviced leased sites that are available for businesses to lease and develop hangars, workshops, training facilities or whatever aviation business is commercially viable. At Caloundra this cost is estimated at \$5 million to provide 7 airside and 8 landside lease ‘lots’. If private aircraft hangarage is viable commercially it will happen. • Addressed at the body of the report • The Master Plan does not propose the extension of 05/23 runway it merely projects this possibility for the future • The issue of noise management is addresses in the body of the report. The Master Plan does not “support” increased aircraft movements it merely includes a traffic forecast prepared by independent consultants to ensure that the surrounding community is informed of the potential impact • Noted • Previously addressed
<p>Unitywater 36</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unitywater has no concerns about the Master Plan from a strategic perspective • Future engagement with Unitywater will ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ future development can be adequately serviced ○ future development contributes to the cost of trunk infrastructure • Unitywater advises it will need to discuss easements for services to service the adjacent Caloundra South Development with Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Noted, this will occur in the design phase of any future aerodrome development that requires Unitywater services • Noted, this process has already commenced

Submissions by authors	Issues	Comments
<p>Pelican Waters Resident 37</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over aircraft noise particularly helicopter noise • Amount of helicopter traffic • Council doesn't follow up on noise complaints • Concerns over the safety of operations • Flying times are adhoc • No control over who sets up a business on the aerodrome • Concern over future air traffic growth • New leases should have limits on operations particularly helicopters and training flights • Training aircraft should be relocated to Beerwah 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed in body of report • Addressed in body of report • Airservices Australia is the body responsible for addressing aircraft noise, however Sunshine Coast Airport does investigate each noise complaint received and where possible Sunshine Coast Airport raises the complaint with the aircraft operators. This process has often led to changes in the operation of aircraft • The safety of aircraft operations throughout Australia is overseen by CASA • Flying, particularly flying training, is heavily dependent upon the weather • Addressed in the body of the report • Noted: Addressed in body of report • Addressed in the body of the report • Addressed in the body of the report
<p>Aerodrome Business Operator 38</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned at proposal to double aircraft movements at Caloundra by 2030 • Need to reduce noise impacts on surrounding community • Council should plan to increase the extent of aircraft service businesses rather than the number of fights • The proposed "development" on the aerodrome is being driven by the traffic forecast and could be avoided if a lower traffic figure were maintained, the development will increase lease fees • Opposes registration • Opposes parking/landing charges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed in the body of the report • Noted: Addressed in the body of the report • Council has not 'planned' the air traffic forecast. It is a forecast based on a number of assumptions. It will be reviewed at each 5 yearly review of the Master Plan. The Master Plan does provide for additional space for aviation support industries both airside and landside • The proposed works fall into two broad categories – ensuring compliance with MOS 139 – and the expansion of aviation business development • Addressed in the body of the report • Addressed in the body of the report

Submissions by authors	Issues	Comments
Wildlife Preservation Society of Queensland 39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the retention of the aerodrome in its current location • Runway lighting: Supports the Master Plan regarding maintaining the current aerodrome lighting system • Note that the stage 1 expansion area includes one threatened plant species and two vulnerable frog species and notes that the development of this area will require DEHP approval and asks that appropriate measures will be taken to minimise impact on these species • Concerns over the expansion of the museum into the Isobel Jordan Reserve • Concerned over the widening of Caloundra Road which would also affect the Isobel Jordan Reserve • Concern over noise impact upon residents of recently approved developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Noted • Noted: The area has been the subject of discussions with DEHP. Any development will need to comply with DEHP permit conditions • Noted: Addressed in the body of the report • Noted: This is a DTMR proposal – not Council. The Master Plan merely illustrates the possible impact upon the aerodrome • Noted: Addressed in body of the report