

Objection to MP-06__0309 Mod 3. Trinity Point Helipad

Objection – Maureen Aungle

Acoustic Report

The current acoustic report and PPR summary response table lodged with NSW Department of Planning and Environment by Johnson Property Group states on page 10:

“Helicopters, in commercial operations, do not operate at maximum load as such loadings restrict operations. For that reason, AS 2363 that guides helicopter noise surveys does not require operations to be at maximum load, but rather to be ‘according to usual commercial practice’.”

Listed on page 8 of Johnson Property Groups acoustic report is the following statement;

“During test flights two persons were on board - approximately 230 kg with the fuel supply being replenished when transferring passengers to keep the helicopter near 90% maximum weight.”

Comment

The design of the H125 Airbus is a single engine helicopter configured for commercial operations to carry 4 passengers + pilot + luggage + fuel with a total useful and safe operating load totalling 1092.7 kgs.

A ‘near 90% maximum weight’ as described by JPG in the acoustic report means that the helicopter used for the noise tests must have been carrying 987kgs. However when calculating the weight for a full tank of helicopter fuel 541 litres = 415 kgs + the 2 persons on board = 230 kgs the total weight of the helicopter when conducting the noise tests was only 645 kgs.

This means during the noise tests the helicopter operated at a 65% load capacity and **not** *“the near maximum operational level of 90%”* as stated in the acoustic report.

In fact the tests were carried out with 1 passenger and 1 pilot on-board a helicopter which is designed to carry 4 persons + one pilot + luggage + fuel.

What does this mean for the resulting acoustic tests?

Less weight= less power required;
Less power required = less noise.

On the 31/05/2016 Johnson Property Group proudly displayed and marketed to the community *“Acoustically, Trinity Point helipad could cater for some 40 movements per day and sit*

within relevant noise criteria” and without a doubt noise calculations relating to a significantly under loaded helicopter would produce these results.

The difficulty is that the developer intends to land heavier, more powerful twin engine helicopters and bases this on the current acoustic report where the noise test data is skewed (by using lightly loaded helicopter) to generate favourable results for the developer.

Recommendations

Fundamental to the validity, reliability and authenticity of Johnson Property group’s original and revised acoustic report is the type of helicopter used and the helicopter’s lift off and landing weight when undertaking the noise tests in March 2016.

The tests conducted are not *‘fit for purpose’* as they do not measure what is meant to be measured i.e. an accurate collection of noise from a commercially loaded helicopter, 2 people on-board during the noise tests certainly does not constitute or any way resemble commercial helicopter operations.

The information contained in the report is not reliable and does not truly reflect the noise a commercially loaded helicopter and a twin helicopter will inflict on this area.

There is no new evidence from JPG’s response to refute the 400+ objections already received by the NSW Department of Planning & Environment.

Reviewing an acoustic test which is flawed by the very method in which the data was produced is ineffective and unrealistic.

It is therefore recommended that the acoustic report is deemed as invalid and the Modification application cancelled as it has not met the requirements for the SEARs report.

I have not contributed to any political party.