URBIS

# NATIONAL AIRPORTS SAFEGUARDING FRAMEWORK

| Control | Provision | Compliance |
|---|---|---|
| **Guideline A: Measures for Managing Impacts of Aircraft** | | |
| Not applicable. The site is not located within a greenfield area, brownfield area, nor does it propose noise sensitive uses within an existing residential area. | | |
| **Guideline B – Managing the Risk of Building Generated Windshear and Turbulence at Airports** | | |
| Control 37. | When a proposed development penetrates the 1:35 surface, within the assessment trigger area, a qualified wind engineer or other suitably qualified wind professional may be required to assess the proposed structure using wind tunnel testing or computational fluid dynamics (CFD) in order to satisfy the approval authority/decision maker (and CASA if their advice is sought) that the structure is acceptable. | The approved warehouse contained within the site already penetrates the 1:35 surface and therefore triggers the need for a more detailed wind assessment.<br><br>The proposal seeks consent for a free-standing awning, which represents the only proposed structural element with the remaining elements of the proposal relating only to alterations and additions.<br><br>A Desktop Wind Assessment has been prepared to assess whether the free-standing awning will worsen the existing wind conditions (refer to **Appendix I)**. The awning is positioned at a lower height.<br><br>The results of the Desktop Wind Assessment confirm that the proposed free-standing awning will have an immaterial |
| Control 33. | The purpose of wind tunnel or CFD testing is to assess when and in what circumstances the 6-knot (3.1 m/s), 7-knot (3.6 m/s) and 4-knot (2.1 m/s) windshear and turbulence criteria (outlined in paragraphs 49-53) are expected to be exceeded. | |
| Control 34. | The assessment report should provide enough information (e.g. whether the criteria will be exceeded, what wind strength and direction would cause each criteria to be exceeded, how often this can be expected to happen) to allow planners to decide whether the proposed structure is acceptable, whether the | |

| Control | Provision | Compliance |
|---|---|---|
| | risks can be mitigated through operational procedures at the airport, or whether the proposed structure should be refused. | impact on the existing wind conditions associated with the site and broader surrounds. |
| **Guideline C – Wildlife Management and Waste** | | |
| 12. | Most wildlife strikes occur on and in the vicinity of airports, where aircraft fly at lower elevations. The risk of a strike on airport relates to the level and form of wildlife activity both within the boundary of an airport and in surrounding areas. Wildlife attracted to land uses around airports can migrate onto the airport or across flight paths, increasing the risk of strikes. Airports actively reduce wildlife populations and manage the risk of strikes on airport land. Such on-airport activities are underpinned by current aviation safety regulations. | The proposal relates to alterations and additions to an existing facility. It seeks to continue the warehouses' additional distribution functions. Whilst a change of use from an airside facility to a warehouse is sought, the proposal does not seek consent for additional land use activities that would attract wildlife or waste. Aside from a free-standing awning and additional car parking / driveway access point, the proposal does also does not introduce any new built form elements or landscaping which would attract wildlife.<br><br>The following measures will be adopted to ensure that the proposal does not attract wildlife or additional waste which may hinder the operations of the airport: |
| 13. | The appropriate authority shall take action to eliminate or to prevent the establishment of garbage disposal dumps or any source which attracts wildlife to the aerodrome, or its vicinity, unless an appropriate wildlife assessment indicates that they are unlikely to create conditions conducive to a wildlife hazard problem. Where the elimination of existing sites is not possible, the appropriate authority shall ensure that any risk to aircraft posed by these sites is assessed and reduced to as low as reasonably practicable; and | |

| Control | Provision | Compliance |
|---|---|---|
| | States should give due consideration to aviation safety concerns related to land developments in the vicinity of the aerodrome that may attract wildlife. | ▪ Provision of a new 2.2m fence along the southern and the western boundary which will restrict the movement of wildlife and waste to and from the site.<br>▪ Provision of waste facilities internal and external to the development.<br>For the reasons outlined above, the proposal will not produce waste or attract wildlife which could compromise the safety and operations of the airport. |
| **Guideline D – Windfarms – Not relevant to the assessment of the application** | | |
| | Not applicable. | The provisions relate only to windfarm and therefore do not apply to the proposal. |
| **Guideline E – Lighting and Airports** | | |
| Control 15 | The primary area is shown at Attachment 1. This drawing also nominates the intensity of light emission above which interference is likely. Lighting projects within this area should be closely examined to ensure that they do not infringe the provisions of regulation 94 of CAR 1988. | The existing lighting in and around the site was approved under the existing consent that applies to the site under DA.2006.11 and building application number BAN-22-BKN-0037. The provision of additional lighting will be assessed either as part of the ABC Application or a Building Permit |
| Control 16 | The fact that a certain type of light fitting already exists in an area is not necessarily an indication that more lights of the same type can be added to the | |

| Control | Provision | Compliance |
|---|---|---|
| | same area. Even though a proposed installation is designed to comply with the zone intensities shown in Attachment 1, designers are advised to consult CASA as there may be overriding factors which require more restrictive controls to avoid conflict. | Application at a later date. It is anticipated that this lighting will comply with AS1680.5 and MOS139. |
| Control 17 | Light fittings chosen for an installation should have their iso-candela diagram examined to ensure the fitting will satisfy the zone requirements. In many cases the polar diagrams published by manufacturers do not show sufficient detail in the sector near the horizontal, and therefore careful reference should be made to the iso-candela diagram. For installations where the light fittings are selected because their graded light emission above horizontal conform to the zone requirement, no further modification is required. | |
| Control 18 | For installations where the light fitting does not meet the zone requirements, a screen should be fitted to limit the light emission to zero above the horizontal. The use of a screen to limit the light to zero above the horizontal is necessary to overcome problems associated with movement of the fitting in the wind or misalignment during maintenance. | |
| Control 19. | Coloured lights are likely to cause conflict irrespective of their intensity as coloured lights are used to identify different aerodrome facilities. Proposals for coloured lights should be referred to CASA for detailed guidance. Proponents should check with the nearest CASA office by calling on 131 757 for advice on | |

| Control | Provision | Compliance |
|---|---|---|
| | the likely effect on aircraft operations of proposed lighting in the vicinity of an aerodrome. | |
| Control 20. | The potential for glare caused by reflected sunlight from structures such as buildings has been raised in some quarters as a potential source of distraction to pilots. However, CASA has advised that glare from buildings tend to be momentary and therefore unlikely to be a source of risk. The potential for risk from building glare is further attenuated by the use of sunglasses which pilots normally wear in bright daylight. | |
| **Guideline F – Managing the Risk of Intrusions into the Protected Airport of Airports** | | |
| Control 5. | Intrusions into operational airspace affect airport operations. The operational efficiency of safe operations at airports is affected by geographical features such as surrounding hills and artificial structures and activities such as those outlined in paragraph 2 (c) above. Tall structures and other activities that intrude into operational airspace have the potential to lower safety levels of aviation operations at airports. If these activities are not regulated, the aviation safety regulator may have to mitigate risk by placing restrictions on operations at affected airports. | An Aviation Report has been prepared for the proposal and is included at **Appendix C**. It confirms that the proposed will not obstruct the operation and movement of aircraft. The proposed development does not intrude into the OLS or PANS-OPS surfaces, nor is it within the Building Restricted Area of any communication, navigation or surveillance infrastructure.<br><br>Further discussion is provided in **Section 10.3** of the Planning Report and the Aviation Report at **Appendix C.** |
| Control 15. | Structures, trees or other activities that intrude into the OLS could constitute obstacles to aircraft taking off or approaching to land. The OLS for an airport charts the volume and dimensions of operational airspace that should be kept | |

| Control | Provision | Compliance |
|---|---|---|
| | free of obstacles to aircraft operations being conducted under VFR or during the visual stages of IFR operations. | |
| **Guideline G - Protecting Aviation Facilities – Communication, Navigation and Surveillance** | | |
| 27 | Where a proposed development or activity is likely to infringe a BRA, details should be referred to Airservices or Defence to allow them to make an assessment. The referral ensures awareness of the proposed obstacle and that mitigation measures are available. Airservices or Defence will also assess the cumulative impact of the proposed development or activity and all other obstacles in a BRA. | The development does not trigger an assessment against *Guideline G* given the proposal does not have the potential to impact on the functioning of CNS facilities. |
| **Guideline H – Protecting Strategically Important Helicopter Landing Sites** | | |
| 21 | When undertaking any strategic review of height limits within land use planning controls, the maximum height limit specified should not extend into any flight path for a SHLS. | The proposal relates to alterations and additions which do not seek to increase the height of the existing development as demonstrated by the Architectural Plans at **Appendix F**. The proposed free-standing awning represents the only new building element and sits below the height of the warehouse and does protrude into a flight path for a SHLS. |
| 25. | In assessing applications/proposals land-use planners should be informed by the advice received from the SHLS asset owner/operator and CASA, including recommendations to specify conditions to mitigate risk or impacts | |

| Control | Provision | Compliance |
|---|---|---|
| 27. | Nothing in this guideline overrides the need to refer any development to an airport operator, where it potentially intrudes into the operational airspace of that airport. | |
| 31. | In the event that a development also encroaches into the OLS for an airport, then the relevant referral and approval processes in association with that airspace is also still required to be undertaken (in addition to the processes identified within this guideline). When considering the need of the OLS protection, the most limiting of these categories relevant to the use of the HLS needs to be used. Further, any object extending above 110m above existing ground level must be assessed by CASA under CASR Part 139 to determine whether it is an obstacle to aircraft operations, including helicopters. | The proposal does not exceed the OLS. As highlighted in the Aviation Assessment at **Appendix C**, the proposed awning sits below the height of the OSL height constraint. |
| 34. | The flight paths to a SHLS need to be protected from intrusions (permanent and temporary) and land use planning activities that could interfere with safe operations of the HLS (see paragraph 9). | The proposal does not intrude into the SHLS flight paths. The alterations and additions are confined to the existing site which has been approved to support a warehouse development. The proposal also does not seek consent to extend the height of the development. |
| 46. | Regardless of whether the proposed development extends into the flight path, if the crane to be used during construction is anticipated to extend into the flight path, CASA and the SHLS asset owner should be contacted for advice. | |

| Control | Provision | Compliance |
|---|---|---|
| | Advice received during that referral must be taken into consideration in the assessment of the application. | The proposal relates to minor alterations and additions. It is not anticipated that the construction of the proposed works will necessitate the use of a crane at the CC phase. |
| 49. | Lighting erected onto any obstruction (building, crane, or telecommunication tower for example) within the flight path or above 110 metres in height (whether it is located within a flight path or not), must be able to be detected by Night Vision Goggles (or equivalent). It is understood that lighting that is red in colour and low intensity steady light is preferable. Additionally, any buildings, cranes, etc above 110 metres in height (regardless of their location) should be referred to CASA as part of the assessment process. | |
| 50. | At night, and in periods of poor visibility during the day pilots rely on the particular pattern of the aeronautical ground lighting to assist in aligning themselves with the correct touchdown point. It is therefore important that lighting in the vicinity of the HLS is not configured or is of such a pattern that pilots could either be distracted or mistake such lighting as being ground lighting from the HLS. | |
| 51. | Where planning applications involve significant lighting in proximity to a HLS, planning authorities should seek detailed advice on potential impacts from CASA. For developments not requiring planning approval, the proponent should contact CASA for advice on potential impacts on aircraft operations. | It is envisaged that the proposed lighting will remain consistent with the existing building. Should additional lighting be proposed, consent for this lighting will be sought under a Building Application at a later date. |

| Control | Provision | Compliance |
|---|---|---|
| 52. | Glare from buildings should be assessed in the planning stage of a SHLS as its impact will vary from site to site and can change significantly in transient conditions associated with time of day, sun angle, and time of year and weather conditions. | As demonstrated by the Architectural Plans at **Appendix F**, the proposal does not seek to amend the external façade, nor does it alter the existing glazing. In light of this, it is not anticipated that the proposal will generate additional glare beyond that already approved. |
| 67. | For development proposals involving tall structures in immediate proximity to a SHLS (or its flight paths) developers/planning authorities should consult with the asset owner/operator to seek advice on any potential safety impacts. | The proposal does not seek to increase the height of the approved building envelope. The proposal seeks consent for the construction of a free-standing awning / canopy adjacent to the southern boundary which interfaces with airside land. This awning reaches a maximum height of 6.378m, sits below the height of the existing building envelope and is confined to the existing site boundaries. It is not anticipated that the awning will affected an SHLS flight path. |
| **Guideline I – Public Safety Areas** | | |
| 51. | Approval bodies are encouraged to consider the potential public safety risk, and hence the application of a potential PSA, in the vicinity of airport runways as a component of the development assessment process, taking into account the nature of the development and the balance of public interest in terms of an objective analysis of the costs and benefits | Noted. The Aviation Assessment included at Appendix C demonstrates that the proposal will not compromise the safety of the airport. The proposal seeks to enclose the site's current airside access arrangements by installing a 2.2m fence along the southern boundary. This area, which is |

| Control | Provision | Compliance |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | | wholly located within the site’s boundary, will be used for the loading of delivery vans. |