

Caloundra Aerodrome

Att 2 Industry Subs

Source	Feedback Comments	Responses
Operator	<p>1 The largest operational problems that need immediate attention seems to be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • parking, for long term and itinerant users • aprons • taxi-ways. 	Noted
	2 The proposal reduces the available parking.	The apron design maximises the use of the apron in a manner that is compliant with MOS 139 with respect to Code A aircraft.
	3 The design removes all existing the helicopter hard stand parking.	Additional helicopter parking is provided in a defined area of the apron adjacent to the taxiway.
	4 Does the proposed new parking apron comply with MOS 139?	The apron parking as proposed is compliant with CASA regulations (MOS 139).
	5 The proposed run-up bays would be a long awaited improvement.	Noted
	6 The proposed taxi-way seems to contravene the provisions of MOS 139 as the view of the runway from the proposed taxi-way is obstructed by parked aircraft.	The existing hold point is 20m closer to the runway than the extent of the parked aircraft. The view is unlikely to be obstructed.
	7 The design of the taxiways and apron appears to limited it to code A type aircraft and would preclude the use of the airfield by larger aircraft in the future.	The taxi lanes as shown in Fig 11 are full Code A compliant. For larger (Code B) aircraft the runway would need to be upgraded. This would trigger a redesign of the entire apron layout.
	8 Operational issues are addressed Part 10.6 which refers to 11.5. My copy of the proposal does not have part 11.5	Noted. Corrected reference is 11.2.4
	9 The registration of the airfield is laudable	Noted
	10 Concern is expressed over the cost of achieving a standard that would allow registration.	The purpose of registration ensure all aspects of the operation of the Aerodrome occur as safely as possible. Some costs incurred by Council in running the Aerodrome will be recouped via lease fees and parking fees.
	11 In recent years the costs, as reported by the lease holders, have skyrocketed. The increases do not reflect the statements in the 1992 deed between Council and the Commonwealth.	Rentals levied have been a reflection of leases signed by lease holder. Increases in rental reflect increases inherent value of the land and therefore benefits to the leaseholder.

Caloundra Aerodrome

Att 2 Industry Subs

Source	Feedback Comments	Responses
Operator	<p>12 Caloundra aerodrome (YCDR) will always exist in the shadow of the Sunshine Coast Aerodrome (YBSU). The regulatory issues of an ALA pale into insignificance when compared to those of an international airport.</p> <p>13 There is reference to non-aviation business. In far as this may aid cost recovery, it should be encouraged. To expect existing users to pay for it is unfair.</p> <p>14 I can see that there may be advantages of registration for the Council, but there would be some disadvantage too. Larger, more substantial, airfields attract larger insurance premiums and increase the liability.</p> <p>15 Registration should not be a short term priority.</p> <p>16 Consideration should be given to providing a secondary free aircraft parking area.</p>	<p>It is not intended to recreate SCA at Caloundra. The approach recommended with respect to regulatory matters is to ensure that the highest practical level of safety is achieved.</p> <p>The non-aviation business development suggested will not impact upon existing users.</p> <p>Registration will not affect the size of the Aerodrome.</p> <p>Registration is related to safety. It will be progressed as quickly as is practical.</p> <p>The purpose in introducing parking fees is two fold:-</p> <p>i) to provide some income and</p> <p>ii) to manage the demand for aircraft parking thereby reducing the need for further capital expenditure on aircraft parking areas.</p>
Lessee	<p>17 The desire of SCA to have Caloundra Aerodrome conform to CASR MOS 139 is not a feasible option at this point in time. The added costs and the inconvenience to operators in order to meet these parameters is not justifiable as - The airport is not in controlled airspace and has no RPT.</p> <p>18 The removal of taxi in and taxi out parking which is of great benefit should not be changed. This will be lost with the master plan as it now stands.</p> <p>19 From the point of view of my leases, let me say that I have no desire to increase the lease area sizes. This would be of no advantage especially where access to taxiways is available in the current format.</p>	<p>The intent to conform to MOS 139 is to maximise the safety of operations at Caloundra. That there is no RPT or that the aerodrome is not within controlled airspace is not relevant.</p> <p>The current parking layout is not compliant with MOS 139.</p> <p>The intent of this aspect of the master plan is to provide clearly defined aircraft parking for each lease area, in recognition that the current parking arrangements are going to change significantly. These parking areas would not attract the proposed parking fees – if a lessee does not want to take on the additional area it will become 'public' apron parking.</p>

Caloundra Aerodrome

Att 2 Industry Subs

Source	Feedback Comments	Responses
Lessee	<p>20 Contrary to the master plan information lease J is subject to flooding. As a result, Insurance costs are affected. The master plan does not recognise the problem although SCA personnel are aware of this issue.</p> <p>21 I endorse the extension of the lease areas to the south and the corresponding tarmac area.</p>	<p>The information contained in the master plan identifies the land affected by storm events up to and including the 15 events of greater magnitude that flooding will occur. The lease fees are based upon independently sources valuations. The valuation process can take into account known or demonstrated constraints upon the use of the land.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Operator	<p>22 I feel I should disassociate myself and this company from comments made by XXXX in his email of yesterday purportedly representing the views of all Caloundra operators. I used to be a member of a group that met as the airport users group but I did not attend any meeting associated with the latest draft plan. The group that apparently did meet would be more accurately describes as a "present leaseholders group" and as such, may well have a different agenda to the operators on the airfield. I am appalled at the inference in the email that none of us (operators) wants any of concepts and plans in the draft plan. There are a lot of good things proposed in the plan that we support. I thought the draft master plan was a good start – I agree that the issues of leases (both existing and new) needs to be resolved because if lease costs are too high, or conditions too onerous, then the whole thing will be pointless.</p> <p>23 Consideration should be given a annualised landing and parking fees rather than the expense of the installation of equipment to monitor and levy parking/landing charges.</p> <p>24 The cost of this equipment will have to be passed on via the charges – this will discourage visiting aircraft and compromise the existing businesses.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The option of prepaid parking and landing charges will be available to regular users. There will remain a need to capture itinerant/non regular users landing and parking charges. The cost of the equipment is estimated to be \$20,000 and will be recouped via the landing and parking charges.</p> <p>Most aerodromes in SEQ have landing and parking charges. The fees proposed at Caloundra are around 50% of the fees at SCA.</p>

Caloundra Aerodrome

Source	Feedback Comments	Responses
Operator	<p>25 The biggest problem facing the airport's future security – and therefore the master plan – is aircraft noise particularly affecting the expanding residential area of Bell Vista. The draft plan does address the issue of noise in many places but does not appear to offer any solutions.</p> <p>26 The residential zoning of the vacant land adjacent to the aerodrome should be changed to light industrial.</p> <p>27 Over 90% of the complaints are about helicopters. A satellite helicopter air-strip to the South/South West of Caloundra where helicopters could do their circuits/autos all day without disturbing residents of Caloundra should be developed. The field would only need to be small – perhaps 100m x 100m. This should be included in the master plan.</p> <p>28 In Para 2.2, the draft plan states RPT operations are not contemplated. However, the draft CASR 135 proposes the merging of RPT and charter into, as far as Caloundra operators are concerned, small aircraft passenger transport. At present, the major limiting factors to RPT operations at Caloundra are the lack of certification/registration and the short length of the runways. The plan's proposed extension of runway 05/23 and the proposed registration of the airport might make small aircraft passenger transport a viable option for Caloundra airport so perhaps the master plan should acknowledge this.</p> <p>29 In addition to the new taxiways shown onto runway 12, a new taxiway to the end of the extended runway 05 would be ideal.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Att 2 Industry Subs</p> <p>The key difficulty is that as yet there are no known solutions to aircraft noise except distance/separation.</p> <p>Noted: Council did attempt, via submissions to State Government and the ULDA to prevent residential development adjacent to the aerodrome.</p> <p>The possibility of a 'satellite' training area to alleviate some of the helicopter training issues is being discussed, however the master plan deals with the aerodrome in its present location. If the 'satellite' training area eventuates amendments would be made to the aerodrome's fly neighbourly policy.</p> <p>At this stage it is intended to retain SCA as the sole RPT facility on the Sunshine Coast. If the runway extension were to occur this issue may be revisited. No change to the master plan is warranted at this time.</p> <p>A parallel taxiway to the extended 05 end might be considered as part of the runway extension if, and when, that occurs and traffic levels made it necessary.</p>
Lessee	<p>30 There has been insufficient time to totally scrutinize the document due to your deadline of the 30th July. However our initial comments are that it is totally unsuitable and contains concepts and plans that no one at the aerodrome wants, needs or has even asked for. The things that do matter like developing new leases and extending Pathfinder Drive hardly rate a mention.</p>	<p>Noted: No suggested changes.</p>

Caloundra Aerodrome

Source	Feedback Comments	Responses
Operator 31	The document does not appear to adequately address the operational and commercial needs of the current stake holders at the Caloundra Aerodrome, some of the proposed changes will have a negative impact on our operations and we have concerns with the commercial suitability of the proposed plans for and staging future development of the site. We would suggest that there is a need for significant further discussion at the Aerodrome before any plan be developed further.	Att 2 Industry Subs No specific suggestions have been made. Further discussions will be held with all stakeholders as the draft master plan is progressed.
Lessee 32	The Caloundra users group will be preparing a formal comments to the Council. We find the document as being unsuitable to our needs and containing concepts and plans that no one at the Aerodrome wants needs or has even asked for. Where as the whys and wherefores in regard to developing new leases and extending Pathfinder Drive hardly rates a mention.	Noted: No specific suggestions have been made.
Operator 33	Master plan does not show any financial justification or proposed plan to interest any prospective investor or operator. As we all know that the Council leases for existing land plots are extremely high. I would expect that further development of this Aerodrome is dependent on a suitable mix of business, operations and available aircraft stationed at Caloundra. The aircraft are important for the maintenance, flight school, etc to be successful.	The master plan is not a marketing brochure. The lease fees are set by independent valuation.
34	Current hangar facilities are very poor and rental very high due to lack of space. I would hope that the Master Plan would identify these issues in order to determine suitable growth and way forward potential.	The current hangar improvements and rentals are determined by the lease holders not Council. The master plan identifies new lease sites for new development.
35	As far as traffic is concerned, most of this is from the flight schools (operating on shoe strings) and far smaller usage coming from the maintenance activities and private recreational aircraft. The mix of business needs to be controlled in order to have a successful plan. I guess no one wants a situation where it is left to go its own way – uncontrollably ending in uncertainty along the way and eventually disaster for any interested party.	The mix of businesses has not been determined by council. The lease holders have sublet leases to meet their own commercial imperatives. The tendering for new leases will provide council with some scope to manage the mix of businesses to best advantage. Hangar rentals are currently being set by the lease holders. Council currently charges lease fees ranging from \$16.00 to \$22.00 per SQM per annum.