

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Record 1 - s47F

Date 18/12/2025

Location Primrose Sands

Rec 4 No

NAP Retention No preference stated

Feedback & rationale Flight routes over Primrose Sands, Carlton River and Connelly's Marsh Tasmania.
I note that ASA prefer the Green route.
It is basically between Susan's Bay and Connelly's Marsh.
We are at the s47F
For the residents in this area it is not far enough to the East.
There is a far better almost unpopulated area between Connelly's Marsh and Dunalley that is wide.
So we very much prefer that the Green route be moved there.
It is a no brainer. If you adopt this route you will solve the issue without any further problems.

Brings planes closer and lower 1

Record 2 - s47F

Date 14/01/2026

Location Primrose Sands

Rec 4 No

NAP Retention No preference stated

Feedback & rationale I understand that community feedback on this issue has now closed. However, given that I personally attended the community meeting at which I was unable to obtain relevant information or give feedback because it was hijacked by (understandably distressed) members of other communities, and that I was unable to write until now, I hope you will consider this feedback. I will keep it brief.
I live at the s47F and will be directly affected by this change.
The proposed new flight path is notionally located over primarily vacant land. However, in practice airlines do like to and do cut corners - both figuratively and literally - as anyone who has ever walked along the Primrose Sands beach will attest. Planes regularly cut across the beach - something not shown on any flight paths. This means that the new flight path will end up being directly overhead my community, as was the case for a time starting in 2017. We have come a full circle, it seems.
We already have all the noisy departures going up the coast, most of which happen in summer when all the windows tend to be open, as well as all the noise and visual pollution from the arrivals for runway 30. The current one is s47F
s47F during the NAP. All are noisy enough to be well heard inside my house which is well insulated and has double glazing. We also have helicopters flying directly overhead and a variety of other small aircraft
Adding the new flight path, possibly directly over our heads will make things completely unbearable.
By implementing the proposed change you will simply move the problem to another community. You are not improving anything.
Your population data is taken from the 2016 census. It is very out of date. The Sorell council area has experienced tremendous growth in the last few years and that is also the case for the "less populated" area of Primrose Sands. s47F
s47F There are at least three entire new subdivisions between the Primrose Sands beach and Susan's Bay beach. Most of those blocks have either been built on already or are waiting to be built on by unsuspecting future community members who are completely unaware of what's coming. The new properties are family homes, built for young families, they are not shacks - unlike many on Carlton Bluff.

Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise 1

Brings planes closer and lower 1

Moves problem to other communities 1

Record 3 - s47F

Date 11/01/2026

Location Connellys Marsh

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise	1
Brings planes closer and lower	1
Moves problem to other communities	1

Date	11/01/2026
Location	Carlton
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Further changes requested	Yes
Feedback & rationale	HS47F You're fairly comprehensively aware of my views, which largely align with the Carlton/Primrose area group. On balance, many of the group reluctantly supports the RNP-AR shift. On balance, there appears to be considerable fear that without such support, things will not change or become worse. 'Get the wretched noise and toxic pollution of from over my head, at any cost'. This is duress. The proposed move shifts the problem, not remediate it. It is very poor public administration. The inevitable remediation ensures further disruption and taxpayer expense, whilst perpetuating inappropriate and unlawful harm to overflow individuals and communities. As you are aware, various aspects of these decisions and processes are subject to appeal to the Commonwealth Ombudsman and the FOI Commissioner. There are far better options which have been willfully and inappropriately rejected. In the interim, I will support the proposal as the preferred option of many who can no longer endure what they have suffered for the last few years, but have no alternative. Note previous corro to large to attach but consistent with final comments on Rec 4

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Moves problem to other communities 1

Record 5 - s47F

Date 11/01/2026
Location Dunalley
Rec 4 No
NAP Retention No preference stated
Feedback & rationale Dear Airservices,
 Reverse Recommendation 4 to avoid compounding the unfair concentration of aircraft noise on communities that already bear more than their share.
 Your recommendation to proceed with this action should be withdrawn, a sentiment which aligns with by 58% of community respondents to the proposal.
 The assessment is fundamentally flawed as it ignores the cumulative effect of aircraft noise from all arrival and departure paths. Airservices has repeatedly assured communities that flight path impacts would be considered holistically, not in isolation. This has not occurred.
 Since the Noise Abatement Procedure (NAP) was permanently adopted in December 2024, 57% of arriving aircraft already use the wider RNAV path. In addition, 100% of jet departures — introduced without community consultation — track close to the same area. The consequence is that nearly 80% of all Hobart jet aircraft movements are now concentrated over communities between Connoley's Marsh and Dunalley. These residents, who were not overflown prior to 2017, are now disproportionately burdened.
 Shifting the RNP-AR further east will intensify this inequity, bringing even more noise to these communities. This does not represent fair and reasonable noise sharing.

Reduces Noise sharing 1

Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise 1

Moves problem to other communities 1

Record 6 - s47F

Date 11/01/2026
Location Carlton
Rec 4 Yes
NAP Retention No preference stated
Feedback & rationale Hi,
 I want to add to my partner's submission on the flight path proposal.
 s47F
 s47F
 s47F This became much more problematic once the current flight path was established and has not been much improved by the recent adjustment in the afternoon (which seems to be inconsistently followed).
 I am often disturbed and woken by plane noise in the day. s47F, also disturbs my life in peaceful and beautiful place.
 Please implement this change. It is clear that while some different people will be somewhat disadvantaged, it is not nearly as bad as what has been put onto Carlton and Primrose

Less house holds impacted 1

Higher and less noise 1

Record 7 - s47F

Date 11/01/2026
Location Carlton
Rec 4 Yes

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

NAP Retention	No preference stated
Feedback & rationale	Hi there I write in support of the implementation of recommendation 4. The present flight path passes directly above our property, and over many other homes in denser areas, as shown. The present alignment is extremely unsuitable and should never have been selected. I expect we are one of the most acutely affected households. The environment review makes clear that the proposed redistributed impacts are much lesser, and imposed on fewer people, than those experienced by those most affected at present. While I do not wish (even much reduced) aircraft noise on anyone, I do note that the homes around Connellys Marsh are significantly shack and secondary residences. This is borne out empirically in eg. the differing ratios of dwellings to residents between the suburban localities of Carlton, Carlton River, Primrose Sands and then Connellys Marsh shown in the 2021 census. The present level of aircraft noise at our home is disruptive and acute. It has woken me repeatedly on mornings when I would be otherwise fortunate enough to sleep later (through to the NAP window, or otherwise disturbed by non complying aircraft). I also experienced, recently, startling aircraft noise as late as 11:30pm, disrupting sleep (VA1334 on 6 Jan). s47F including during the NAP hours. It is good and desirable that recommendation 4's approach includes overflight of (lesser) populated areas only at higher altitude, to mitigate noise. It does make me wonder why this courtesy was not extended to the communities of Carlton River, Carlton, and Primrose Sands these past years. While regrettable, the marginal additional CO2 emissions are acceptable given the major net benefit to, per the assessment summary, 1053 people. The CO2 emissions might be offset by, in time, adjusting the parameters for the NAP and the use of the long approach, as noise impacts will be much reduced. Per the above, I expect the notional "1053 person" improvement (considered quantitatively and qualitatively) may be understated, given the preponderance of temporary residents and often-empty dwellings in the vicinity of the proposed path. I can attest to this personally, being a visitor to the beach and community at Connellys Marsh multiple times every week. Most dwellings appear empty the vast majority of the time. I look forward to the quick implementation of this important change for our communities. Thank you.
Less house holds impacted	1
Higher and less noise	1

Record 8 -s47F	
Date	10/01/2026
Location	Carlton
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Feedback & rationale	To Whom it may concern, As property owners and residents in Carlton River 7173 affected by aircraft noise and movements the following feedback is submitted in relation to the above. After considering information provided on the proposal we wish to register our support for "Recommendation 4" as shown in your documentation. For reference purposes our details are: s47F We would like to be included in any further information distributed on this matter.
Less house holds impacted	1
Higher and less noise	1

Record 9 -s47F	
Date	07/01/2026
Location	No Address Details
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Further changes requested	Yes

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale We support the relocation of the current RNP-AR and make further comments in relation to this submission. Align all aircraft to the RNAV and reconfigure the RNP-AR standards to RNAV. Consideration should also be given to extending the RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height and reduce the noise impact. As ASA has not provided Forcett residents, particularly those within the immediate area of BAVUR, with any relief, consideration must be given to relocating this waypoint 3kms to the south east on vacant land.

Record 10 -s47F	
Date	07/01/2026
Location	No Address Details
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Further changes requested	Yes
Feedback & rationale	We support the relocation of the current RNP-AR and make further comments in relation to this submission. Align all aircraft to the RNAV and reconfigure the RNP-AR standards to RNAV. Consideration should also be given to extending the RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height and reduce the noise impact. As ASA has not provided Forcett residents, particularly those within the immediate area of BAVUR, with any relief, consideration must be given to relocating this waypoint 3kms to the south east on vacant land.

Record 11 -s47F	
Date	05/01/2026
Location	Dodges Ferry
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Further changes requested	Yes
Feedback & rationale	Good afternoon, Thank you for the opportunity to respond to Recommendation 4, Preferred design option for arrivals to Hobart Airport. The recommendation to shift runway 30 to the east by 3km appears to be a very reasonable option. I understand that this option for arrivals will reduce noise levels and avoid homes being overflown. This sounds like a good improvement and should produce a positive outcome. As an aside and general comment, the best idea for an island is that planes fly over the ocean, but I can see that this poses some concerns for you in design. In response to questions at the information session I attended, the presenters indicated that once this aspect of the project is completed (and recommendation 4 is implemented) Airservices will be in a position to explore options regarding changes to departure paths. I look forward to this occurring. Thank you once again. regards,
Less house holds impacted	1
Higher and less noise	1
Improves environment	1

Record 12 -s47F	
Date	27/12/2025
Location	Primrose Sands
Rec 4	No preference stated
NAP Retention	No preference stated

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale

Hi,
I would like some more information on the purposed change to the current flight path.
We live at s47F
Your website said you had a community engagement session on the 23rd of November at the Primrose community hall. I would like to know where the advertisement was for this session? The first we were notified of the changes was a flyer we received in the mail only a few weeks ago, after the official feedback had closed.
Why wasn't there any notification about the feedback session? Were the people at Connelly's Marsh notified of the info sessions also? Do you have any evidence of the notifications or was it only on your website?
s47F and didn't hear anything about an information session and neither did my neighbors.
We understand the new flight path will affect less people with the noise but for the people that will now be affected transparency should be taken on the new changes.
Is there a copy of the full environmental report? As there are also wedge tail eagles in this area that should be taken into consideration.
Also with the videos on your website showing the new flight path there are a bit distorted and unclear about exactly where it will be. Are there all using exactly the same path or do the planes vary depending on where they are arriving from?
Thank you for your time.

Record 13 -s47F

Date 23/12/2025
Location Carlton
Rec 4 Yes
NAP Retention No preference stated
Feedback & rationale s47F . i support recommendation 4 for the move of the flight path to connells marsh

Record 14 -s47F

Date 23/12/2025
Location Connelys Marsh
Rec 4 No
NAP Retention No preference stated
Feedback & rationale To whom it may concern,
With regards to the investigation of a proposed change to flight paths to and from Hobart airport, I wish to put forward the following perspective.
It is painfully obvious that any community of size would prefer that their smaller nearby cousins bear the brunt of any discomfort and impact on lifestyle than themselves. This unfortunately is the selfish attitude that pervades Australian culture. So let me put forward an alternative view of the world.
As a household at Connelly's Marsh, any discomfort experienced when a plane flies overhead, is experienced as an individual household. This discomfort or impact is not magnified simply because my neighbours experience the same. They experience their own individual discomfort. The same principle would apply to Dodges Ferry, Primrose Sands, Dunnally etc etc. So how to move forward? If each individual household experiences the same level of impact, then wouldn't it be the fair and right thing to do by sharing out equally the flight path. No community takes all of the impact, no community takes none of the impact, all communities take some of the impact in an equal share. There are no 'not in my backyard excuses' such as we're a tourist destination, we're a large community, it makes my beer go flat! The airport has been there with planes flying in and out long before most people decided to live in a flight path location. So let's give everyone a fair go and just share it out (now that's the Australian culture that we need to keep alive).

Reduces Noise sharing

1

Record 15 -s47F

Date 20/12/2025
Location Carlton
Rec 4 Yes
NAP Retention No preference stated

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale

I wish to complain very bitterly about the flight path over Carlton River as 90% of the time the aircraft fly directly over my roof at about 3-4000 feet (has been measured many times) you don't care about us in this area we are all on water tanks and we must be getting the exhaust pollution on our roofs that gets washed our drinking water tanks I personally invite all the heads of Qantas and all the airlines company managers to my place where I will offer you all a free cup of tea made from the polluted water from my water tank until I hear from you please feel free to move your flight path to a more suitable less polluting flight path that's not as noisy not as polluting you have a flight path you do use at times but you still insist flying directly over my roof usually many times a day I ask you to move to the other flight and bloody gives us a fair go here at Carlton River .Has been many surveys done over the last few year surely the message has reached your brain telling you we are not happy you have the ball do something positive with it like move your flight path that would please 90% of the people of this area. Another plane has just gone over my roof as I sit here writing this.

Improves environment

1

Record 16 s47F

Date 17/12/2025
Location Carlton
Rec 4 Yes
NAP Retention No preference stated
Feedback & rationale My name is s47F
I support the proposed recommendations 4 for the move of the flight path to Connelly's Marsh.

Record 17 s47F

Date 17/12/2025
Location Connellys Marsh
Rec 4 No
NAP Retention No preference stated
Further changes requested Yes
Feedback & rationale The people of Connellys Marsh typically reside down here and are mostly retired, looking for a quiet life. I understand plans have to fly over somewhere but when there is so much vacant farmland, why on earth would you concentrate them over a peaceful hamlet? It is not logical. Particularly as we bear more than our fair share of helicopter noise- barely a day goes past without a few choppers flying low overhead. There is 8km of coastline between here and Dunaelley that is most uninhabited. Please let common sense prevail.
Reduces Noise sharing 1
Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise 1

Record 18 s47F

Date 17/12/2025
Location No Address Details
Rec 4 No preference stated
NAP Retention No preference stated

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale

S

Best wishes for the holidays and the new year!
I asked AI to put together a few charts/ maps (though clearly it did not benefit from human generic or specialist expertise).
Anyway, in terms of 30 rather than 12 surely in Tasmania there is an opportunity to avoid sensitive areas as in without coming near population centres be it sea or land (populations or sanctuaries).
We were initially quite concerned with social/ the media coverage of 30 flights being on the land side of Maria (van Diemen) Island for example.
As in affecting Triabunna, Primrose Sands into the airport.
And as far as 12 goes, surely you can take flights out over the sea rather than overland. GHG/ CO2 calculations be they what it may.
(And let's not forget the government propping up airlines during Covid-19 without getting equity.)
As a frequent traveller family, be it work or private, with family interstate and overseas, and a s47F, we can't wait to see one stop flights to Asia (such as Singapore and/ or Hong Kong).
Right now Hobart at best has seasonal flights to Auckland.
Are there any thoughts yet on further runways at HBA?

Record 19 s47F	
Date	16/12/2025
Location	Boomer Bay
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Feedback & rationale	Feedback on Recommendation 4:RN-PAR Relocation - I write to simply support the relocation as recommended i.e. 2kms further East of the current flight path. My main concern was the potential disruption to the quiet enjoyment of the East and South East Coast regions of Southern Tasmania. This is an area where there are many holiday shacks and tourist facilities, which many Tasmanians and visitors to the State go to for rest and relaxation. Given this is a competitive edge for the State, it is important that impacts are kept to a minimum, while still allowing reasonable access to the Island. While impact on flora and fauna values is very important to consider, it would seem the level of disturbance to these values is not hugely increased.

Record 20 s47F	
Date	16/12/2025
Location	Carlton
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Further changes requested	Yes
Feedback & rationale	I support adoption of Recommendation 4 as soon as possible. In the longer term, as this section of coast develops further, it may be necessary to reconsider the east coast option (Recommendation 6).

Record 21 -s47F	
Date	15/12/2025
Location	Buckland
Rec 4	No preference stated
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Feedback & rationale	I would love to but I can't understand the maps and I can't ring you. Are you planning to divert planes over Buckland again? Regards s4

Record 22 s47F	
Date	15/12/2025
Location	Carlton

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Rec 4 Yes
 NAP Retention No preference stated
 Feedback & rationale My name is s47F, I support the proposed Recommendation 4 for the move of the flight path to Connelly's Marsh.

Record 23 -s47F
 Date 15/12/2025
 Location Carlton
 Rec 4 Yes
 NAP Retention No preference stated
 Feedback & rationale Hi there,
 I am a resident of Carlton. I feel the proposed new flight path will significantly reduce the impact to dodges ferry and Carlton area and will be better for residents. The predominant noise will be concentrated over farm land and this will be much more peaceful for residents of the area.
 Higher and less noise 1

Record 24 -s47F
 Date 15/12/2025
 Location Carlton
 Rec 4 No
 NAP Retention No preference stated
 Feedback & rationale I have no problem with the current flight routes and no problem with Recommendation 4- as a resident of Carlton Beach I enjoy seeing and hearing the aircraft on the flight paths, reminds me that we are part of a bigger world, and the alleged noise is less than that made by cars along nearby roads.
 Sick of the whiners- this is not a real problem!

Record 25 -s47F
 Date 15/12/2025
 Location Connellys Marsh
 Rec 4 No
 NAP Retention No preference stated
 Feedback & rationale To Whom It May Concern,
 My name is s47F and I live at Connellys Marsh.
 I see that our little hamlet is considered vacant land according to your proposed flight change. Obviously this is wrong, we already have plans flying over please do not allow more.
 Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise 1
 Brings planes closer and lower 1

Record 26 -s47F
 Date 15/12/2025
 Location Connellys Marsh
 Rec 4 No
 NAP Retention No preference stated
 Further changes requested Yes

Released by Airservices Australia under the Freedom of Information Act 1982

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale

Dear Airservices Australia,

As a resident of Connellys Marsh, I have read the report in regards to Recommendation 4 re the Hobart Community airspace flight plans.

Unfortunately, on this occasion I do not agree with the reports and would like to see alternative options to reduce the noise pollution from the Primrose/Connellys area.

Would it not be possible to move the flight plan slightly further south to be between Connellys and Dunalley? The noise pollution with the current plan is truly already disturbing and disruptive.

Additionally, the bird life in this area is precious to locals and there are great concerns. We have already seen a huge reduction in biodiversity and species.

Cumulative impacts -
concentrates flight paths and
noise

1

Brings planes closer and lower

1

Moves problem to other
communities

1

Record 27 s47F

Date 15/12/2025

Location Cremorne

Rec 4 No preference stated

NAP Retention No preference stated

Feedback & rationale Hi,

As I thought would be the case, it is difficult for us to understand your consultation process, what problem you are addressing, how bad that problem is, who is affected and then what impact Recommendation 4 has on relieving the problem and the extent to which it transfers new problems to others.

From what I can understand, it appears that flights will be closer to us at Cremorne. It looks like flights will go over Sipping Island which is a shame in itself as it's a beautiful unspoilt area. We will definitely see the planes at night time and hear them at other times.

At face value it seems like the usual thing of citizens complaining at Carlton Beach or wherever being assuaged by transferring the problem to others.

I did email a comment it seems years ago that we don't want to be deluged with a mountain of consultation stuff which is largely incomprehensible to us. We only want to know if we are adversely affected, how badly and why are we needing to suffer noise and light nuisance to benefit others.

Didn't those affected under current arrangements choose to live in those locales knowing what they were going to get from flight path impacts?

Record 28 s47F

Date 15/12/2025

Location Primrose Sands

Rec 4 Yes

NAP Retention No preference stated

Feedback & rationale I live at s47F and I agree with the above recommendation number 4. This option appears to fly over a lot less permanent residences and I'm told it will be at a greater height than at present.

Higher and less noise

1

Record 29 s4

Date 15/12/2025

Location Sorrell

Rec 4 No

NAP Retention No preference stated

Feedback & rationale I live at s47F and when I commenced living at this address many years ago the aircraft would fly on descent to airport overhead and myself and my family loved it.

I presume this latest flight path option is going to take flight path further away from my property than it is at present. ☹️ ☹️.

People should get a life.

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Record 30 -s47F

Date	14/12/2025
Location	Connellys Marsh
Rec 4	No
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Feedback & rationale	With regards to the recommended action 4 I want to lodge my objection to the proposal. When we first bought our property at Connellys Marsh no planes were flying over this area. Since 2017 there's been a huge increase in the planes overhead. The noise is becoming increasingly disturbing and I see that this proposal is going to make it much worse. I'm concerned about how this will affect my family who frequently spend time here with me and will inherit my home.
Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise	1
Brings planes closer and lower	1

Record 31 -s47F

Date	13/12/2025
Location	Connellys Marsh
Rec 4	No
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Feedback & rationale	Hello, I want to object to the changes in flight paths over Connellys Marsh, where I reside full time. I am appalled at the suggestion that the flight paths be shifted closer to our area. We already endure a far greater level of aircraft noise than before the 2017 changes. People who live in Connellys Marsh are part of a close knit community who live here permanently, not just occasionally in shacks. We choose to live in a quiet coastal environment because we enjoy the lack of noise pollution. When we purchased our home here at Connellys Marsh there were very few overhead flights, which was tolerable. The current changes put us more directly under paths that operate both early in the morning and sometimes quite late in the evening. I ask that the flights be diverted to avoid flying above our homes.
Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise	1
Brings planes closer and lower	1

Record 32 -s47F

Date	12/12/2025
Location	Carlton
Rec 4	No
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Feedback & rationale	Shirley and I received your card (air services australia) ref the change to arrival flight path to Hobart Airport and an invitation to provide feedback. We have lived at the current address for more than 11 years, when we first came air traffic arrival over our property was common until a change saw more traffic go further out over Primrose Sands. This change both surprised and disappointed us, living in proximity to the Airport brought an expectation of arrival and departure noise. The air traffic does not disturb us in any way, indeed we find it disappointing that some traffic has been diverted away. The departing traffic has never come over us as the arrivals do, not sure why that is however, the departing traffic that fly's over Primrose is clearly visible and we are alerted by the noise. Again, neither of these are a distraction in any way. In closing we do not understand or support any need to change flight paths and would welcome any increase in arrivals flying over us.

Record 33 -s47F

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Date	03/12/2025
Location	Connellys Marsh
Rec 4	No
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Feedback & rationale	Good afternoon, I live in Connellys Marsh. I am appalled at the suggestion that the flight paths be shifted closer to our area. We already endure a far greater level of aircraft noise than before the 2017 changes. Connellys Marsh is not vacant land. We are a close knit community who choose to live in a semi rural environment because we enjoy the lack of noise pollution. The background noise in the more built up communities reduces the impact of the aircraft noise. Connellys Marsh previously was not under a flight path and pushing this on us now is unreasonable.
Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise	1
Brings planes closer and lower	1

Record 34 -s47F

Date	03/12/2025
Location	Connellys Marsh
Rec 4	No
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Feedback & rationale	To whom it may concern I am a long term resident of Connellys Marsh and I have been made aware of the moves to shift the flight paths closer to this area. We already put up with an increasing amount of aircraft noise since the paths changed in 2017 - Usually loud enough to be disturbing - Sometimes truly deafening. Connellys Marsh is a close knit community of people who choose to live away from the conveniences of an urban setting to enjoy the birdsong - Not to listen to jet engines and the whines of flaps being lowered. The majority of us moved here when Connellys Marsh was not under a flight path. I can accept that planes have to go somewhere, but specifically flying them over a quiet community where the noise is going to be especially loud seems ill considered at best, unfair at worst. I urge you to consider spreading the load across different paths. This way everyone gets Some noise, but noone gets it all the time. This must surely be manageable in a highly automated system.
Reduces Noise sharing	1
Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise	1

Record 35 -s47F

Date	27/11/2025
Location	Carlton
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Further changes requested	Yes
Feedback & rationale	Thankyou for this communication, I am a resident of Carlton Tasmania and am writing to express my support for recommendation 4 plus NAP. This would greatly reduce the intrusion from noise into my everyday living space and over my property. I would also like to suggest that the BAVUR waypoint could be moved to alleviate the pressure on the residents of Forcett.
Higher and less noise	1
Improves environment	1

Record 36 -s47F

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Date 24/11/2025
Location Carlton
Rec 4 Yes
NAP Retention No preference stated
Feedback & rationale Hallo **s47F**,
My name is **s47F**, Carlton River, Tasmania 7173. Please note that I am registering my support for the proposed changes as detailed in Recommendation 4.

Record 37 - **s47F**

Date 24/11/2025
Location Carlton
Rec 4 Yes
NAP Retention No preference stated
Feedback & rationale Hi Tim,
Thank you for both your and **s47F** time today at Dodges Ferry.
I would like to formally have recognised that I support the changes.
I live at **s47F** Carlton River - directly under the current flight path.
The proposed change, will have a direct and positive impact!
I look forward to the changes being implemented.

Higher and less noise

1

Record 38 **s47F**

Date 24/11/2025
Location Primrose Sands
Rec 4 No
NAP Retention No preference stated
Feedback & rationale Hello to whom it may concern;
I have reviewed the maps and the recommendations as put forth in the engagement process. **s47F** **s47F**
s47F prior to any changes in aircraft frequency and pathways, however we still did begin to experience flight noise and it was on the cusp of becoming an intrusion and detrimental to our enjoyment of our beach house and boat sheds, but bearable at the time.
In **s47F** we bought the property and invested in **s47F**, by a local contractor, we then used our property personally and when work took us out of State we rented it out consistently. We also improved our boatsheds and obtained a **s47F**
s47F
Recommendation 4 will increase flight traffic and noise and will directly impact our use of our property in our **s47F** and likely impact the value of our property, our house and our boat sheds. We do not support recommendation 4 and find it preposterous to move more flights and noise to an area that previously was not experiencing the same amount of air traffic. Property values at the time we invested, reflected the fact that there was a relatively quiet and peaceful atmosphere in our area and our decision to invest 100's of thousands of dollars was based on that neighbourhood profile. This change likely would impact us to a degree that surely compensation of some sort will be made available?
If this flight change was made over a more affluent community certainly loss of equity would be considered.
Again, to be clear we do not support recommendation 4 and we do appreciate the opportunity to submit our feedback in the engagement process.

Reduces Noise sharing

1

Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise

1

Brings planes closer and lower

1

Record 39 **s47F**

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Date 24/11/2025
Location Triabunna
Rec 4 No preference stated
NAP Retention No preference stated
Feedback & rationale NOT HAPPY !! NO COOKIES THANKS

Record 40 s47F

Date 17/11/2025
Location Carlton
Rec 4 Yes
NAP Retention No preference stated
Feedback & rationale I am strongly in favour of the new flight path. I would like to thank air services Australia for their thoughtful and sensible alternative to the current pathway.
Local resident of Carlton.
Higher and less noise 1

Record 41 s47F

Date 06/01/2026
Location Connellys Marsh
Rec 4 No
NAP Retention No preference stated
Further changes requested Yes
Feedback & rationale Hi Community Engagement Team,
We've recently moved to Connellys Marsh and have just become aware of the proposal to change flight paths in this area, due to a letterbox drop over the past fortnight.
The full extent of this consultation process and recommendations is hard to digest as we're late to the party, however, it seems the proposed changes creates a very concentrated area of air traffic movements over Connellys Marsh. We've already been surprised by the amount of noise and number of jet movements over the local area and this proposal significantly adds to this load and concentration of air traffic movements.
If you are to adjust the arrival flight path to runway 30 RNP (AR) closer to Connellys Marsh can you please adjust the longer departure path on runway 12 further to the east so that Connellys Marsh doesn't bare the brunt of the majority of air traffic movements?
Reduces Noise sharing 1
Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise 1

Record 42 s47F

Date 06/01/2026
Location No Address Details
Rec 4 No
NAP Retention No preference stated

Released by Airservices Australia under the Freedom of Information Act 1982

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale

Please find below feedback on Recommendation 4 of the Hobart Airspace Design Review- Post Implementation Review Report

1)The current RNAV Approach implemented as part of the Noise Abatement Procedure (NAP) trial borders Connelly's Marsh on the South East. The proposed changes to the Required Navigation Performance Authorisation Required (RNP-AR) for Runway 30 under Recommendation 4 would border Connelly's Marsh to the North East. This would result in the community of Connelly's Marsh receiving the majority of the noise from both the adjusted RNP-AR, and RNAV approaches/departures from Runway 12/30.

Additionally, this adjusted flight path under Recommendation 4 would see a significant increase in the number of 60 DB or above noise events for the community of Connelly's Marsh.

2)The proposed adjustment to the RNAV Approach under recommendation 4 does not result in "noise sharing" across communities, as it is concentrating the noise over a single smaller area. Multiple alternative approaches should be considered, including Westerly, if Air Services Australia are attempting to "noise share" across multiple communities.

3)The community of Connelly's Marsh is semi-rural with less background noise than other, more established neighbouring communities. This in turn results in a larger impact from the noise of the increased flights around this community.

4)As per data available on the LIST and via the Natural Value Atlas this area has a high likelihood of Eagle habitat within the adjusted RNP-AR flight path proposed under recommendation 4. Multiple studies have proven that aircraft both visually and from noise can cause birds to leave their nests. Repeated disturbances may cause lower reproductive success for the eagles.

Reduces Noise sharing
Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise

1
1

Record 43 -s47F

Date 06/01/2026
Location Primrose Sands
Rec 4 Yes
NAP Retention No preference stated
Feedback & rationale Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback on the preferred option 4. I was in favour of Option 4 and still concur with the proposed change. To be completely honest, the planes do not cause any issues where I live in Primrose Sands.

Record 44 -s47F

Date 11/01/2026
Location Dunalley
Rec 4 No
NAP Retention No
Further changes requested Yes
Feedback & rationale Dear Airservices Australia,
 I am writing to formally object to Recommendation 4: Preferred Design Option for Hobart, on the basis that it will increase aircraft noise over the township and surrounds of Dunalley and Connellys Marsh, where current aircraft noise levels are already excessive and inappropriate for the local environment.
 My position is straightforward: the existing level of aircraft noise over Dunalley and Connellys Marsh is unacceptable, and Recommendation 4 will increase that impact.
 I respectfully request that flight paths not be moved further east. They should in fact be moved further west, away from east coast rural communities, including Dunalley.
 Inconsistency with Airservices Noise Management Principles
 Airservices Australia's published Noise Management Principles state that aircraft noise should be managed in a way that:
 •minimises the number of people affected by aircraft noise
 •avoids unnecessary concentration of noise over particular communities
 •considers fairness and equity in the distribution of noise impacts
 •recognises that noise impacts are highly context-specific
 •seeks to reduce noise exposure where practicable
 While these principles are acknowledged in the Recommendation 4 material, the proposed outcome for Dunalley and Connellys Marsh is inconsistent with their intent and application. In particular, Recommendation 4:
 •will concentrate noise over the communities of Connellys Marsh and Dunalley,

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale continued

- is not a fair and equitable distribution of noise impact,
- does not recognise the context-specific impact of noise on our community.

Existing impacts on Dunalley

Dunalley is a small, rural coastal community located a significant distance from Hobart Airport. Aircraft noise in this landscape is highly intrusive, persistent, and out of place.

Aircraft are clearly audible inside homes with windows closed, and there is no practical way for residents to avoid exposure. This level of impact is not occasional or incidental. It represents a sustained environmental burden.

Airservices' principles recognise that the acceptability of aircraft noise depends heavily on the surrounding sound environment. In a quiet rural community, even relatively infrequent overflights can have a disproportionate impact.

This context has not been adequately reflected in Recommendation 4.

Mischaracterisation of "vacant land" and noise minimisation

Recommendation 4 relies in part on the assertion that the proposed flight path is located over "primarily vacant land between Connellys Marsh and Primrose Sands," thereby reducing impact.

This approach conflicts with Airservices' principle that noise management should consider actual impact, not merely population density.

So-called "vacant land" in this region includes:

- landscapes with high biodiversity, cultural and heritage value
- native forests, wetlands, coastline, and nationally protected conservation reserve areas

Feedback & rationale continued

- working farms and rural properties

The absence of dense housing does not mean the absence of impact. Noise exposure in these areas still affects:

- residents living nearby
- wildlife and ecological systems
- tourism, recreation, and cultural uses

Treating lightly populated land as suitable for increased aircraft noise undermines both environmental protection and long-term land stewardship.

Noise as an environmental pollutant

Airservices' noise management framework acknowledges that aircraft noise is an environmental issue, not merely an operational one.

Noise is recognised by the World Health Organisation as a major environmental pollutant, with demonstrated impacts on:

- physical and mental health
- stress and sleep disturbance
- wildlife behaviour, communication, and breeding

On our property in Dunalley alone, more than 5,000 hectares of native forests, wetlands, grasslands and coastline are actively managed, including over 2,000 hectares of nationally protected conservation reserves. These landscapes support rare and endangered species and habitats, many listed under the National Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act, including:

- Tasmania's largest known wild population of disease-free Tasmanian devils
- endangered swift parrots
- breeding sea eagles and wedge-tailed eagles
- more than 120 bird species and numerous native mammals

Feedback & rationale continued

The new flight path proposed by Recommendation 4 will fly directly over approximately 1,000 hectares of Nationally Protected Nature Conservation Reserves, impacting these areas of nationally recognised environmental significance.

Airservices' principle of minimising environmental impact requires that noise effects on ecosystems be considered, even where human settlement is sparse. Recommendation 4 does not adequately address this, increasing the stress and impact on the natural environment.

"Noise sharing" and equity

Airservices' Noise Management Principles emphasise fairness and equity in the distribution of aircraft noise.

Recently, a Noise Abatement Procedure was introduced in order to share the noise of aircraft arrivals into Hobart. However, Recommendation 4 will move the current arrivals path 3 km eastwards, resulting in the two arrivals paths being located very close together. Combined with the departure path, this concentrates all aircraft noise over a small area.

This goes against Airservices Australia's Noise Management Principle of "avoiding unnecessary concentration of noise over particular communities".

Applying "noise sharing" in a way that disproportionately affects small, rural, and socially disadvantaged communities, is inconsistent with Airservices' Noise Management Principles and is fundamentally unfair.

Communities close to airports reasonably expect aircraft noise, and make informed decisions accordingly. Remote rural communities such as Dunalley and Connellys Marsh do not.

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale continued

Using complaint numbers or population density as a proxy for impact, disadvantages communities that:

- are small
 - lack organisational capacity
 - experience socioeconomic disadvantage
 - have limited resources to engage in prolonged consultation processes
- This risks shifting noise toward communities, such as Dunalley, with the least ability to respond, rather than those best placed to absorb impact.

Equitable noise management should protect vulnerable communities such as Dunalley and Connelly's Marsh, not expose them to increased burden because they generate fewer submissions.

Cultural and heritage considerations

Airservices' principles acknowledge that aircraft noise affects amenity and quality of life, not only health metrics.

Dunalley and its surrounds hold:

- deep Aboriginal cultural significance
- early convict and colonial farming heritage
- long-standing maritime and fishing traditions
- an ongoing rural and agricultural identity

The natural soundscape of this area is a core part of its cultural and social value.

Aircraft noise degrades:

- social interaction and community cohesion
- tourism, accommodation and hospitality activities
- ceremonies and celebrations, wellness activities, and cultural events
- the experience of public spaces intended for rest and connection

Feedback & rationale continued

Noise that might be tolerated in urban environments causes far greater harm in quiet rural settings. This aligns directly with Airservices' recognition that noise impacts are context-specific. Our soundscape must be protected, and Recommendation 4 threatens that.

Social disadvantage and cumulative impact

Dunalley experiences significant socioeconomic disadvantage compared to state and national averages, including:

- lower median incomes than the Tasmanian and National median
- higher rates of chronic illness and disability
- poor educational outcomes with some of Tasmania's, and Australia's, lowest year 12 completion rates
- among Tasmania's and Australia's highest youth unemployment rates
- limited access to healthcare, public transport, and education

The community is also still recovering from the catastrophic 2013 bushfire, which destroyed hundreds of homes, along with businesses, employment opportunities, the local school, and essential infrastructure. Recovery has been prolonged and exhausting.

Airservices' commitment to fairness requires that cumulative impacts be considered. Increasing aircraft noise over a community already facing social and economic challenges is inconsistent with this principle, and is fundamentally unfair.

Recommendation 4 shifts noise toward communities, such as Dunalley and Connellys Marsh, that are vulnerable, with the least ability to engage and respond to this process.

Long-term responsibility

Once flight path decisions are finalised, Airservices Australia moves on. Affected communities do not.

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale continued

Residents of Dunalley will live with the consequences of these decisions every day, long after modelling exercises and consultation processes conclude.

This is not an abstract issue - it is a permanent change to a place where aircraft noise does not belong.

Request

In accordance with Airservices Australia's own Noise Management Principles, I respectfully request that Airservices:

1.Reject Recommendation 4 as currently proposed – specifically, do not move any flight paths further east

2.Reduce aircraft noise over Dunalley, rather than increasing it

3.Move flight paths further west, away from east coast rural communities, providing relief from the pollution of our natural soundscape

4.Value the natural soundscape of Tasmanian East coast communities, protecting them from noise pollution as a high priority - formally acknowledging the natural soundscape of our region as a core part of its cultural and social value.

5.Apply noise management principles in a way that genuinely reflects context, equity, environmental value and cumulative impact, not simply population density or submission volume.

Dunalley and surrounds should not be asked to absorb increased aircraft noise simply because it is small, quiet, and less able to defend itself.

The concentration of all aircraft noise over such a narrow area so far east of the airport, as proposed by Recommendation 4, disproportionately affects our community.

Personal statement

On a personal note, I want Airservices Australia to understand that aircraft noise has a real and ongoing impact on my quality of life and on the lives of people in my community.

The aircraft noise over Dunalley does not sit quietly in the background. Each overflight dominates the sound environment for a prolonged period as aircraft approach and depart, often with little respite between movements. The effect is cumulative, one aircraft following another, and it fundamentally alters the character of the landscape.

The noise is clearly audible inside our home, even with all windows and doors closed, leaving no practical way to avoid exposure. This is not a minor inconvenience; it is a persistent intrusion into daily life in a place where quiet is central to wellbeing, connection to nature, and community identity.

As I was lying in bed listening to JetStar Flight 712 fly over at 10:50pm last night, I was yet again reminded of just how persistent and relentlessly intrusive the aircraft noise is over Dunalley.

I ask Airservices to consider that decisions made on paper translate directly into lived experience for real people, every day. Please do not further degrade the quality of life of my community by adopting Recommendation 4 and pushing aircraft noise further east.

I respectfully request that flight paths be moved further west, to provide meaningful relief to Dunalley and surrounding rural communities.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Reduces Noise sharing 1
Cumulative impacts -
concentrates flight paths and
noise 1
Brings planes closer and lower 1
Moves problem to other
communities 1

Record 45 -s47F

Date 09/01/2026
Location SECLA
Rec 4 No
NAP Retention No

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale

SECLA is opposed to the imposition of Option 4 – moving the RNP-AR flight path to the East.

Since implementation of SIDS and STARS in 2017 Dunalley and surrounding communities who were never previously overflown have been unfairly impacted.

The initial RNY30 arrival RNAV flew directly over Dunalley and surrounding areas after being implemented with no community consultation. It was only after the Air Noise Ombudsman's (ANO) intercession that some relief was provided by moving this flight path further to the West.

After an initial flight path review of the SIDS and STARS implementation, departures from RNY12 were moved to the East, completely blindsiding this community as there was no mention of this in community 'consultation' sessions held previously to this in 2019. The community was now being impacted from both arrivals and departures.

Around this time a shorter arrivals path was introduced, the RNP-AR and at a community meeting in Hobart Airservices Australia (ASA) proposed this as a noise mitigation for our community as, though at the time only a small number of aircraft and crews were trained and equipped to fly the more technical approach, it was clearly stated that the expectation was that all airlines would move to use this new approach over time to leverage the savings in costs and time.

As part of the Post Implementation Review (PIR), a Noise Abatement Procedure (NAP) was proposed. Key to the community consultation that Airservices enacted was a community survey, with four options available to choose. The NAP proposed requiring aircraft to travel on the longer RNAV approach which impacts our community far more than the shorter RNP-AR. The longest option on the survey for travel on the RNP-AR was 8 hours.

The results of this survey were split 48%/52%. On the basis that there was no clear mandate to continue with the NAP it was initially rejected. It was then brought back in after a challenge from the ANO based on an argument that the use of the RNP-AR was higher than that originally predicted – which was completely at odds with what the community was told previously; ASA had always expected aircraft would move to the shorter approach. After pressure on the ASA CEO, the NAP was brought in as a trial – not at one of the selected survey options, but at 18hrs – a full 10 hours longer than the longest community survey option and representing 75% of the day on the longer approach. ASA refused to go back to the community to seek a mandate for this extraordinary increase in NAP timing, thus completely invalidating their community engagement.

Feedback & rationale continued

ASA advised that this timing allowed for noise sharing as it balanced aircraft movements 50/50 between communities. This simplistic approach assumes that aircraft movement directly relates to impact and takes no account of the timing of the movements. i.e. impact of an aircraft in a low ambient noise community at 10pm = impact of an aircraft movement in suburbia at midday.

It is also concerning that there is no quantitative trigger for reassessment of the hours of the NAP in the face of increased aircraft movements and larger, noisier [older] aircraft increasing seat numbers (and international flights being planned).

At the recent Dunalley community consultation in discussion with ASA, it was made very clear that it was very unclear what this trigger would be. It currently is apparently sitting around 40/60 with Dunalley impact on the 60 side, and will increase with new routes having commenced already (e.g. direct to Newcastle) and extra flights being added, the former new flights are all in the NAP period. ASA is apparently "looking at it regularly". What does this mean for actually actioning a change and for how many years will this be managed before the case is closed and forgotten? What is the quantitative trigger point? If Option 4 is brought in, it will move flights closer and lower to the Dunalley and surrounding communities. If the current situation is 'fair' according to ASA's reasoning behind bringing in the NAP at the current outrageous level, then surely increased flights, increased flight routes and bringing the RNP_AR closer and lower to the community will make the increased noise the community is subjected to as manifestly unfair...

It is notable that during the six-hour period, 8am to 2pm in which the NAP is not in effect, during the weekday at least, many of the residents of the areas impacted are not even in these areas as they commute to work and schools, as evidenced by the large amount of peak hour traffic on the Arthur highway up until the Primrose Sands turnoff (which also encompasses the Carlton Beach and Dodges Ferry turnoffs).

Option 4 will bring more aircraft noise to areas already heavily impacted by ASA's so called "noise sharing" arrangements. SECLA has repeatedly requested that PIR measures not be considered in isolation, and that the cumulative impact must be investigated. When put to ASA representatives at both "Community Engagement" sessions and at Hobart Airport CACG meetings, they agreed on multiple occasions that this would occur. We have seen scant evidence of this in any of the publically released ASA documentation.

Stop unfairly pushing more aircraft noise on our communities. We are doing more than our fair share already.

Reduces Noise sharing 1
Cumulative impacts -concentrates flight paths and noise 1

Record 46 -s47F

Date	15/12/2025
Location	Murdunna
Rec 4	No
NAP Retention	No
Further changes requested	Yes

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale

I am completely opposed to this relocation of the RNP over Hobart.
I am completely opposed to the continuation of the NAP on runway 30 Hobart even if the relocation does not occur.
I see a large amount of controlled airspace above Dodges Ferry and Carlton River available for take offs if the RNP is moved this would be consistent with noise sharing.
It is completely unreasonable to burden the south east corner of Hobart with three flight paths.
The departures need to be relocated either to the West or in the current RNP path.
Departures would be significantly higher than the current RNP over Carlton River.
The communities closest to the airport are being offered COMPLETE relief from large aircraft noise at the expense of more distant areas.
This is a complete failure by Air Services.
I say again and again.....move departures to the West, NOT arrivals. there is NO technical reason to not move departures to the West.
There is talk of a class action in the Dunalley community if this proceeds as indicated.

Reduces Noise sharing

1

Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise

1

Moves problem to other communities

1

Record 47 - s47F

Date 27/11/2025, 28/07/2025

Location Primrose Sands

Rec 4 Yes

NAP Retention Yes

Further changes requested Yes

Feedback & rationale

Dear Airservices Australia,
Implementation of the Noise Abatement Procedure (NAP) in July 2024 brought significant relief to my household. I live on s47F. Aircraft such as the older B738s operated by VA generate extremely high noise levels, and the NAP has meaningfully reduced my exposure to these operations.
I am pleased to see PIR Recommendation 4 progressing. In combination with the NAP, this represents the least impactful option in terms of both aircraft noise and the protection of eagle habitats. It is a balanced solution that supports safety, environmental considerations and community well-being.
I am concerned, however, that some opposition to the NAP is coming from individuals who do not live under the RNP-AR or RNAV flight paths and therefore do not experience the concentrated noise burden that communities like mine endure. Noise monitoring data clearly shows that the impact is not evenly distributed. Those directly affected should be prioritised in the decision-making process, consistent with the principles of fairness and evidence-based planning.
I encourage Airservices Australia to continue relying on objective noise data, environmental assessments and the lived experience of communities that are most directly exposed to aircraft operations. These voices should carry particular weight in determining the long-term flight path design.
Thank you for your ongoing work and for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Option 4 - I welcome the decision to proceed to the implementation phase. I currently have noisy jets thundering 1950' above my house on s47F. Moving the flight path 2 to 3 km east makes sense as it impacts few households. Aircraft will also cross the coast 1050' higher. NAP - This has brought us much relief. I am glad this was made permanent. Option 6 - I think flights from BNE and SYD should use this flight path as part of an enhanced NAP. I understand ASA have a problem tracking aircraft down the east coast. I believe this is the main unstated reason why Option 6 is not being progressed, even though it is not that expensive to install ADS-B ground stations. The emissions calculations are based on data from ancient B738 aircraft that are being retired from service. This overstates the CO2 emissions for Option 6.

Less house holds impacted

1

Higher and less noise

1

Improves environment

1

Record 48 - s47F

Date 24/01/2026

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Location	Carlton
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	Yes
Further changes requested	Yes
Feedback & rationale	Good Morning I live at s47F and I am directly under the flightpath (RWY30 RNP-AR) which has been very disruptive and annoying since it was implemented. There are s47F and we hate it - all have significant frustration and disruption from the current flight path. Was are also very concerned about the quality of our drinking water as we are on rainwater tanks. The noise is far too loud – cannot talk on the phone with aircraft over head, scaring livestock, devaluing the property, destroying the serenity we purchased as our forever home. We s47F) support Recommendation 4, and it would seem to minimise those impacted. s47F I would also like lodge a complaint about the Community Engagement Session held on 25 November in Dunalley. Dunalley is a 10 minute drive for us and we could not attend the other sessions. Assuming the session would be as described on your website – s47F s47F

Feedback & rationale continued

In the building chaos of voices getting louder – the air services organiser, who seemed to know the most vocal in the room asked him how he would like the session to be run and they spoke of a ‘town hall style’ session. This was where everyone formed a circle and one would talk at a time while everyone listened (and in this case - shouted you down if you support Rec.4) . Completely intimidating after the realisation that we weren’t welcome as we lived in Carlton River and this session was only for those in Dunalley. And it would seem the most vocal in the room (with an opposing view to us) was well known to organisers and given the opportunity to decide how the session was run and to ‘hold court’.

We felt there was no opportunity to engage with air services on our position and the session was uncontrolled and intimidating. Only about 3 out of approx. 30 spoke and were heard.

Below seemed to be something we could go to and have a chat to air services.... NOT the case!

We are also aligned with the group supporting to

1. Accept ASA’s Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east.
2. Accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm -8.00am.

Further to this we also request a critical review be completed of the:

3. New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised.
4. Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV.
5. Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height.
6. BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.

If recommendation 4 is not implemented – I will be very vocal about the ineffective consultation process described above.

I look forward to your response.

Improves environment 1

Record 49	s47F
Date	10/01/2026
Location	No Address Details
Rec 4	Yes

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

NAP Retention Yes
Further changes requested Yes
Feedback & rationale To whom it may concern,
I am writing due to my concern for the Primrose Sands area, the community who live there and the people who visit.
I have been visiting and staying in the area for s47F and have enjoyed very much the beauty and quiet solitude it previously offered, however since the changed flight paths to Hobart Airport, it has impacted the area greatly and from my point of view the health hazards to the community are enormous and totally unacceptable (especially when there are other appropriate and safe options available).
My main concerns below.
1.Noise pollution – the constant noise from overhead commercial aircraft travelling very low.
2.Air pollution – this includes the toxic aviation exhaust from low flying aircraft that directly contaminates the tank water. How can it be safe to drink? I personally buy bottled water to ensure safe drinking
3.Health and safety of families and children living directly underneath low flying aircraft.
I understand from talking with people in the area that there are flight options which would alleviate the above concerns and offer Primrose Sands and other affected communities a safer environment in which to live.
With above said, I confirm I hold a s47F), where the study highlighted s47F ,
so I understand the process which should be done to ensure health and safety for all.

Feedback & rationale continued Moving the flight path may be a financial and time issue for air services, but the cost of not addressing the significant health and safety issues/concerns which are impacting the community, communities and environment will I believe be more costly in the future with possible legal ramifications.
I submit the following as feedback on Airservices Australia's Rec 4 options:
1. I support ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east.
2. I support the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm -8.00am.
Also, I strongly support that Air Services Australia undertake a critical review of the following:
3. New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised.
4. Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV.
I am standing with Primrose Sands residents and visitors to the area in advocating that the southern arrival flight path should fly over open vacant land between Connelly's Marsh and Dunally. This open vacant area would substantially reduce negative flight impacts and address the current real health concerns.
5. Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height.
6. BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east
Transparency is important; therefore, in HOPE I look forward to an open, honest, and appropriate safe outcome for all.
I would appreciate acknowledgement of my feedback, as well be included in your updates and outcome.
Thank you for your time
Yours Sincerely,

Record 50 s47F

Date 09/01/2026
Location Primrose Sands
Rec 4 Yes
NAP Retention Yes
Further changes requested Yes

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale	Good afternoon, I continue to be crop dusted by the ongoing low flights directly over our home at Primrose Sands. Current arrival and departure flights continue to have no order or designated flight corridor. Our health continues to be eroded each and every day. Please action flight change as soon as possible. Please register my feedback as per below. 1. I accept ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path >3 km east. 2. I accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm -8.00am. I also request that Air Services Australia undertake a critical review of the following: 3. New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised. This must be conducted properly and thoroughly by ASA to ensure accuracy with expected outcome. 4. Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV. ANO have acknowledged that this is a feasible, safe option – CASA just need to approve this. 5. Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height. Utilise the new RNP-AR for flight separation only. 6. BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.
Feedback & rationale continued	This urgently needs to be reviewed as Forcett residents have received no relief and have seen an increase in both aircraft activity, noise and aviation pollution. Moving the BAVUR waypoint northeast would increase aircraft height and distance from residential dwelling in this area. The proposed area has a vacant land corridor directly to the coast. The community position concerning the current RWY30 RNP-AR has been expressed many times by our affected community 1.the "Change Runway 30: Save Our Communities" petition in 2022 with 656 signatories, 2.March 2024 community survey "RWY30 RNP-AR flight path: Online survey of Community Reactions to Aircraft Noise" submitted to the Government Senate Hearing and AA with 152 valid responses, 3.Group and individual Senate Hearing submissions, including attendance in person at Hobart session, 4.A signed motion from two Community Engagement sessions in Nov 2024 totalling another 40 signatories. 5.Community representation at the recent AA community engagements held in Nov 2025 Community members are asking the following: Q: Will Airservices Australia accept the 2022 Petition / 2024 Survey / Senate Hearing submissions and motions as feedback on the Runway 30 flight changes? If ASA reject the above feedback, please supply a reason why.
Higher and less noise	1
Record 51 s47F	
Date	08/01/2026
Location	Dodges Ferry
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	Yes
Further changes requested	Yes

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale

Hello

I live in Dodges Ferry and want to support people who are adversely impacted by the flightpath into Hobart International Airport.

I have three major concerns with the flight paths into Hobart in general.

1. Generally south of Sorell houses rely on rainfall and resultant tank water supplies. There is no reticulated water supply. Having planes fly low over houses is not conducive for a healthy water supply. Changes to flight paths should be considered under the Tasmanian Environmental Management and Pollution Control (General) Regulations 2017, and the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, where humans are the "animals" in the latter act. I haven't seen this work, but if it hasn't been done, it is a serious breach.
2. Similarly noise is an environmental problem, and having low flying planes over populated areas/houses, isn't sensible in sparsely populated Tasmania, even under a noise sharing protocol between 2.00pm -8.00am. A flight path over unpopulated areas should be selected to minimise any noise impacting houses.
3. Airport usage is only going to increase, so getting a sustainable solution now, with the lowest community impact/highest level of acceptance, seems a logical approach. While the airport is considered an essential facility, it shouldn't be operated without considering that this is Southern Tasmania. People live here because they like the lifestyle. This distinctive attribute of living around the airport should not be disrespected.

I hope that in making the decision of flight path changes, that any impact on flying time and overall fuel usage be offset against the least community impact on all parameters. The benefit and luxury of having an international airport should not be taken for granted, nor the service level of life in southern Tasmania not be respected. Both would be grave injustices.

I support the sensible approach and detailed as follows:

1. Accept ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east.
2. Accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm -8.00am.

And also, that Air Services Australia undertake a critical review of the following:

3. New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised.
4. Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV.
5. Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height.
6. BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east

Thank you for noting our concerns.

Higher and less noise
Improves environment

1
1

Record 52 - s47F

Date 07/01/2026

Location No Address Details

Rec 4 Yes

NAP Retention Yes

Further changes requested Yes

Feedback & rationale As an affected resident I support the following....

1. Accept ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east.
2. Accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm -8.00am.

Further to this we request a critical review be completed of the:

New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised.

3. Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV.
4. Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height.
5. BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.

Record 53 - s47F

Date 07/01/2026

Location Primrose Sands

Rec 4 Yes

NAP Retention Yes

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of Primrose Sands and have had to endure the constant and regular planes that fly so low directly over the top of our home. I cannot understand why Aviation Australia allow and continue with this flightpath when there is clearly far better options that would not adversely impact nearly as many residents. The current flightpath makes living in affected areas so much less enjoyable and desirable. The planes are far too low, incredibly noisy and cause pollution to areas solely reliant on stored water supply.

I would urge you to accept the two major recommendations to adopt the ASA's Rec 4 to move the flightpath 3 kms east that would have significantly less impact on residents as well as reducing the noise, allowing the planes to fly higher as well as producing far less pollution on water supplies and resident's mental health issues.

The second recommendation I urge you to accept is the continuation of the Noise Abatement Procedure.

Surely if there are options available that would minimize residential impact then that would be the best option for so many people.

I trust that the right and ethical decision is made and both recommendations are adopted as soon as possible.

Less house holds impacted
Higher and less noise
Improves environment

1
1
1

Record 54 - s47F

Date 07/01/2026

Location Primrose Sands

Rec 4 Yes

NAP Retention Yes

Further changes requested Yes

Feedback & rationale

Good afternoon.

I've been involved in numerous community meetings with Airservices as well as politicians, ministers and industry representatives.

This flight path needs move!!

The current health impacts to our family, friends and neighbours from the current low RNP-AR flight path is clearly unacceptable on all levels.

My feedback is as follows

1. I accept ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path >3 km east.
2. I accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm - 8.00am.

Further to this I request a critical review be completed on the following:

3. New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised.
4. Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to the RNAV.
5. Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height.
6. BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.

Thank you for your time at the Community Engagements in listening to my feedback and hopefully the above flight path improvements are implemented as soon as possible.

Record 55 - s47F

Date 30/12/2025

Location Primrose Sands

Rec 4 Yes

NAP Retention Yes

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale

To whom it may concern

I am a long time shack owner at Primrose Sands and stay there on a regular basis for rest and relaxation in a peaceful setting. That rest and relaxation has been seriously negatively impacted by changes to the flight path into Hobart. I understand that the airline industry must operate safely and be financially viable. However, having a flight path over populated areas, where aircraft are flying so low that markings on the undercarriage can be easily read from ground level, has many detrimental consequences for residents of those areas. The preferred design option suggested by affected communities is that the RNP-AR arrival path be moved 2-3 km to the east with the goal of reducing aircraft noise over Carlton River/Primrose Sands. I welcome and endorse the speedy implementation of the preferred design option for RNP-AR to runway 30 at Hobart Airport and I am also pleased to note that the NAP will remain in place. I believe that this is an excellent compromise for the industry and impacted communities.

Higher and less noise

1

Record 56 - s47F

Date 23/12/2025

Location Carlton

Rec 4 Yes

NAP Retention Yes

Feedback & rationale I accept Recommendation 4.
The NAP must stay in place.
I holiday annually in Carlton River and find the noise levels of the planes are far too much.

Higher and less noise

1

Record 57 - s47F

Date 23/12/2025

Location Carlton

Rec 4 Yes

NAP Retention Yes

Feedback & rationale I accept recommendation for. The NAP must stay in place.
s47F in Carlton river and I find the planes flying over head to be noisy and disturbing.
Best wishes and Merry Christmas.

Higher and less noise

1

Record 58 - s47F

Date 23/12/2025

Location Carlton

Rec 4 Yes

NAP Retention Yes

Further changes requested Yes

Feedback & rationale I accept Recommendation 4 and it should be implemented as soon as possible. This flight path is too low, too noisy and too polluting of our rain tanks and drinking water.
The NAP must stay in place to give some relief to people affected by the new flight path.
Monitor the impacts of this new flight path and move it further East if it does not achieve its desired outcomes.

Improves environment

1

Record 59 - s47F

Date 21/12/2025

Location Carlton

Rec 4 Yes

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

NAP Retention Yes
 Further changes requested Yes
 Feedback & rationale Good morning
 Please see below feedback on the RNP-AR flight path in southern Tasmania.
 1. Accept ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east.
 2. Accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm -8.00am.
 Further to this, we support our community groups request for a critical review be completed of the:
 New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised.
 1. Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV.
 2. Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height.
 3. BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.
 Thanks

Record 60 -s47F

Date 20/12/2025
 Location Carlton
 Rec 4 Yes
 NAP Retention Yes
 Further changes requested Yes
 Feedback & rationale To Whom It May Concern ASA Community Engagement
 I live a s47F and have attended one of the community meetings held in Dodges Ferry as well as providing feedback at the Senate committee hearing held last year in Hobart.
 My main concern is that the flights are TOO LOW, TOO NOISY and far TOO POLLUTING!!
 The planes fly right over the wetlands in Carlton River and are disrupting the bird breeding behaviour. Low aircraft flight paths can disturb birds during the breeding season, particularly as young birds fledge and take to the skies.
 Bird strikes are common, especially during late summer and autumn, when young birds are more vulnerable to collisions with planes. Disturbances can lead to reduced reproductive success, as birds may abandon their nests or territories due to aircraft noise, affecting their ability to feed and breed effectively.
 Urban noise and aircraft noise pollution can also disrupt breeding behavior, leading to decreased energy reserves and potential population declines.
 Sources:
<https://theconversation.com/collisions-between-planes-and-birds-follow-seasonal-patterns-and-overlap-with-breeding-and-migration-new-research-241238>
https://fai.org/sites/default/files/documents/In_3-1_aircraft_effects_on_birds.pdf
 So not only is the new low flight paths disturbing the pleasant environment for the locals who moved out here for peace and quiet, the new flight paths are destroying our precious wetlands and upsetting the wildlife.
 I therefore support the following:
 Accept ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east.
 Accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm -8.00am.
 Further to this we request a critical review be completed of the:
 New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised.
 Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV.
 Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height.
 BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.
 In reality low flying aircraft should be nowhere near urban and wetland environments.

Improves environment 1

Record 61 s47F

Date 20/12/2025
 Location Forcett

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Rec 4 Yes
 NAP Retention Yes
 Further changes requested Yes
 Feedback & rationale I am the s47F and as I do not have a computer or a smart phone my submission is being done on s47F computer and with s assistance.
 I reside in the Forcett area and after 6 years of fighting to have this too low, too noisy, polluting path directly over our homes relocated, I fully support the moving of RNP-AR 3kms to the east and maintaining the NAP both over Connelly's Marsh and Primrose Sands.
 After 6 months of the RNP-AR relocation I am requesting ASA to carry out a critical review to ensure that community impact is minimised and that this relocation is benefiting the community. Consideration must be also given to align all aircraft to the RNAV and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV. Consideration should also be given to extending the RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height and reduce noise impact.
 As ASA has totally ignored providing Forcett residents, particularly those in the immediate vicinity of BAVUR, with any relief consideration must be given to relocating this waypoint 3km to the north east.
 ASA should also impose new restrictions on pilots to prevent them flying 3km either side of the new RNP-AR and back over Primrose Sands. This is totally unacceptable.

Improves environment

1

Record 62 s47F

Date 20/12/2025
 Location Primrose Sands
 Rec 4 Yes
 NAP Retention Yes
 Further changes requested Yes
 Feedback & rationale I've been involved in the community meetings and also the Senate hearing, making a submission based on the significant health and wellbeing impacts of the current flight path, which is clearly unacceptable on all levels.
 My formal feedback to this stage of the process supports the community group's assessment and conclusions, including the below:
 1. I fully support/accept ASA's 'Recommendation 4' to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km to the east.
 2. I also support/accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm - 3.00am.
 Further to the above, I support the call in requesting a critical review to be completed of the following:
 • New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised.
 • Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV.
 • Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height.
 • BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.
 Thank you for the opportunity to submit my feedback and strong determinations in regard to ensuring the health and well being of our community.

Improves environment

1

Record 63 s47F

Date 16/12/2025
 Location No Address Details
 Rec 4 Yes
 NAP Retention Yes
 Further changes requested Yes
 Feedback & rationale I support the proposed relocation of RNP-AR runway 30 flight path that is currently directly over Primrose Sands and Carlton River, 2-3kms to the east, keeping the NAP both for Connelly's Marsh and Primrose Sands, permanently close the current RNP-AR path and prohibit pilots from accessing this old path within the 2-3km corridor they are permitted to fly. Also we require ASA to review the current flight paths affecting Forcett and residents immediately residing in the vicinity of BAVUR and finding relief for these residents.

Record 64 s47F

Date 15/12/2025
 Location Carlton
 Rec 4 Yes

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

NAP Retention	Yes
Feedback & rationale	HS47F and Team Thank you for taking the time to visit Hobart recently to discuss Recommendation 4 and share the latest Fact Sheet with residents from south east communities. Unfortunately I was unable to attend the meeting at Dodges Ferry but I would like to provide the following feedback. I support the Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option that is to move the current RNP-AR 2-3 kilometres to the east, placing the path primarily over vacant land. The NAP for the flight path into runway 30 provides significant relief for residents living directly under the current RNP-AR and it is good news to hear the NAP will remain in place should the preferred design option be implemented. Communities of Carlton, Carlton River and Primrose Sands have been experiencing aircraft noise for over 6 years now and we look forward to a favourable preferred design assessment outcome in 2026. In the meantime best wishes for a happy Christmas and enjoyable holiday period.
Higher and less noise	1
Record 65 -s47F	
Date	15/12/2025
Location	Primrose Sands
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	Yes
Feedback & rationale	I am a resident of Primrose Sands and am happy with Recommendation 4 in that it meets with all my needs regarding noise abatement and pollution. I look forward to its implementation in the new year.
Higher and less noise	1
Record 66 -s47F	
Date	15/12/2025
Location	Primrose Sands
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	Yes
Feedback & rationale	I fully support the implementation of the Rec 4 without change, including the continuation of the current NAP for this runway.
Record 67 -s47F	
Date	03/12/2025
Location	Carlton
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	Yes
Further changes requested	Yes

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale

Dear ASA

I am writing to provide my feedback on the Above Information Sheet.

I want to reiterate my concerns communicated to you in previous correspondence that the current flight path over my place at Riviera Drive Carlton is too low, too noisy and most importantly too polluting for an area that relies on water tanks for our drinking water.

In relation to the proposal my feedback is as follows:

1. Accept ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east.
2. Accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm - 8.00am.

Further to this I request a critical review be completed of the:

3. New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised on east Primrose Sands, Susan's Bay and Connelly's Marsh.
 - o Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV
 - o Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay not shortcutting Susan's Bay
4. BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.
5. Ensure that all aircraft have noise abatement technology as a minimum requirement similar to that required in the UK.

Improves environment

1

Record 68 -s47F

Date 27/11/2025

Location Primrose Sands

Rec 4 Yes

NAP Retention Yes

Feedback & rationale I support the implementation of recommendation 4 and the continuation of the current nap.

Record 69 -s47F

Date 06/01/2026

Location Primrose Sands

Rec 4 Yes

NAP Retention Yes

Further changes requested Yes

Feedback & rationale

To Whom It Concerns

We wish to make a number of comments regarding the changes to Hobart Airport flight paths proposed by Air Services Australia.

The current flight path which directs incoming flights directly over Carlton Bluff Road, Primrose Sands where we live, is an unfolding community health disaster due to the EXTREMELY LOW height of the planes. This results in excessive noise over our house being measured at up to 92 decibels and the toxic aviation pollution that is released and falling on our home. The pollution particles are being washed directly off our roof and into our water tanks, which is our drinking water.

Action is required by Air Services Australia to move these low flying aircraft away from built up areas especially Primrose Sands

See below for more information...but you need to act...you need to voice your opinion!!

Based on the information provided by Air Services Australia, we support the following:

1. Accept ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east.
2. Accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm - 8.00am.

Further to this we request a critical review be completed of the:

- New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised.
- Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV.
- Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height.
- BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.

Higher and less noise

1

Improves environment

1

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Record 70 s47F	
Date	05/01/2026
Location	Carlton
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	Yes
Further changes requested	Yes
Feedback & rationale	As residents we support the following.... 1. Accept ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east. 2. Accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm -8.00am. Further to this we request a critical review be completed of the: New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised. 3. Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV. 4. Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height. 5. BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.
Record 71 s47F	
Date	05/01/2026
Location	Forcett
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	Yes
Feedback & rationale	I support Recommendation 4 with added provisions: Align all aircraft to the RNAV and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV. Consideration should also be given to extending the RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height and reduce noise impact. As ASA has not provided Forcett residents, particularly those in the immediate area of waypoint BAVUR, with any relief, consideration must be given to relocating this waypoint 3km to the north east. In supporting Recommendation 4 I demand/request that: 1. the current RNP-AR must be permanently closed and not permitted to be reopened 2. the current NAP regulations must be maintained over Primrose Sands and Connelly's Marsh 3. Pilots must be prohibited from flying over Primrose Sands in the 2- 3 km corridor currently permitted and severe penalties imposed if breached 4. Currently the area for relocation is experiencing high levels of "ad hoc" flights particularly in the Forcett area and these need to be examined and deterred 5. A further review must be undertaken into the relocation of waypoint BAVUR over vacant land to provide much required relief to the residents of Forcett who for 6 years have had no relief from the 3 flight paths or the NAP. 6. A 6 month review after the RNP-AR is relocated must be initiated to ensure that this relocation is not detrimental to surrounding communities.
Record 72 s47F	
Date	02/01/2026
Location	Primrose Sands
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	Yes
Feedback & rationale	Hi, I would like to: Accept Air Services Australia Recommendation 4 to move the RNP-AR flight path 3 km east of Primrose Sands And Accept the continuation of the Noise Abatement Procedure noise sharing between 2.00pm – 8.00am.
Record 73 s47F	

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Date 27/11/2025, 26/11/2025, 12/08/2025
 Location Carlton
 Rec 4 Yes
 NAP Retention Yes
 Feedback & rationale

Hi s47F I would like to submit the following comments in support of Option 4. "Move current flight path RNP-AR arrivals into HBA Airport, 2-3 kms to the East". Given the extensive investigation by Air Services on this option and the significant reduction of noise etc on a considerably reduced number of residence, and increased altitude when being overflown, I am very much in favour of this option being progressed. I would also be strongly in favour of continuing the current NAP and it being carried over to Option 4. as this would significantly enhance the benefits of option 4., and provides welcomed relief for those residents who will be negatively affected under option 4. and for the residents who will continue to be affected, (2-3 kilometres is not that far so noise will still be an issue. However, that distance and increased altitude will, as ASA have determined will reduce noise to some extent and this will be most welcomed). Donna & Tim, you have both been very helpful and understanding of the issues we face and I sincerely apologise to you both for the irreverence and rudeness of some of our community members! My kindest regards Glen Ransley

I would like to inform you that I am 100% in favour of Recommendation 4: Preferred Design Option for HBA APT RWY 30, 2-3kms to the East.

Hi s47F
 I would like to advise my absolute backing to move the current RNP-AR RWY 30 into Hobart Airport, 2-3 kms to the East and to retain the current NAP.
 It is imperative that the NAP follows the new RNP-AR RWY 30 flight path into Hobart Airport as this will provide a major noise relief from those affected by the changes.
 Thank you both for your great work and for listening to affected communities.

Less house holds impacted 1
 Higher and less noise 1

Record 74 s47F

Date 20/12/2025, 26/11/2025
 Location Forcett
 Rec 4 Yes
 NAP Retention Yes
 Further changes requested Yes
 Feedback & rationale

s47F and I Accept ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east. Accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm -8.00am. Further to this we request a critical review be completed of the: New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised. Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV. Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height. BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.

Good afternoon s47
 s47F I have emailed backwards and forwards to s4 @ ASA Who I believe is trying to help The community of Forcett, Carlton and Primrose Sands
 Get some relief from the noise and pollution that we are all receiving (WE NEED ACTION).
 on a personal note I'm or s47F when the Jets were put directly over s47F it is totally unacceptable for big organizations like ASA to do this kind of thing to the general public! and to make it worse there was no notification that this was going to occur... many have been affected and I am in total agreeance with everything that is written below...
 Kind regards

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale continued

s47F

Good morning s47F

s47F another horrible weekend of air traffic at home s47F, did you realise people are selling there houses because they think there's no hope of getting relief from ASA?

(When Are the Jets moving?)

The engagement will focus on the proposal to shift the RNP-AR (short approach) 2 to 3km to the east.

Please help the people of my community its been too much for too long...

We are in desperate need now.!

Good morning,

I'm a resident of Forcett Tasmania and I've been going to meetings with my local community since the flight paths were changed, I'm absolutely disgusted with the lack of changes to Air traffic over Forcett and surrounding neighbourhoods, the mental health of locals is diminishing and change is needed NOW.!

Our community health needs to be properly addressed...

MOVE THE JETS AWAY...

I understand that air services still need to provide the service to Tasmania...but not at the cost of the people directly below existing paths. The flight paths need to be moved now - they need to be moved to the east of the existing flight path.

It doesn't require much digging or surveys to understand the unhappiness and relentless impacts of the current paths over Forcett and surrounding residential areas, you can simply follow the community Facebook page:

<https://www.facebook.com/share/g/19gdmYAQpi?mibextid=wwXlfr> and remain informed.

Feedback & rationale continued

URGENT, URGENT, URGENT!!

HOW LONG DO WE HAVE TO ENDUR THIS CRAP?????

Please send these jets out to the EAST of FORCETT.

COMPLETELY OVER IT..... affecting health, water, birds, sleep, our peace, which we are entitled too.....

PLEASE CARE WE ARE SO STRESSED BECAUSE THEY ARE SO LOW AND IMPACTING OUR WAY OF LIFE. DO SOMETHING, DO SOMETHING, DO SOMETHING. 🙄 🙄 🙄

s47F

nd I Accept ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east. Accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm -8.00am. Further to this we request a critical review be completed of the: New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised. Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV. Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height. BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.

Record 76 -s47F

Date	12/12/2025
Location	Primrose Sands
Rec 4	No preference stated
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Feedback & rationale	We bought s47F close with flight paths not over our are, you are moving them this affects our property value, will you compensate. We gave feedback that wasn't listened too last round, you already made decisions as community feedback was all negative suggesting it approaches via Orford coastline.

Record 77 -s47F

Date	26/11/2025
Location	Carlton
Rec 4	Yes
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Feedback & rationale	I would like to inform you that I am 100% in favour of Recommendation 4: Preferred Design Option for HBA APT RWY 30, 2-3kms to the East.

Record 78 -s47F

Date	20/11/2025
Location	Carlton
Rec 4	Yes

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

NAP Retention	No preference stated
Feedback & rationale	As a resident of Carlton, Tasmania, I strongly support the preferred design option recommendation to shift the runway east over less populated areas. The factsheet outlines many reasons supporting the viability and feasibility of the recommendation.
Less house holds impacted	1
Higher and less noise	1

Record 79 s47F	
Date	20/11/2025
Location	Primrose Sands
Rec 4	No preference stated
NAP Retention	No preference stated
Feedback & rationale	Hello, On the fact sheet re: Recommendation 4 Preferred Design it states that we can access a short video, however, the link does not take the user to the video. Please could you provide a direct link to the video. Thank you

Record 80 s47F	
Date	11/01/2026
Location	Marion Bay
Rec 4	No
NAP Retention	No
Further changes requested	Yes
Feedback & rationale	I am opposed to the implementation of Option 4: Move RNP-AR flight path 2-3 km further to the east, as we are already doing more than our fair amount of noise sharing. I have lived at s47F, I am a s47F. Our communities have never previously been overflown prior to 2017 as per ANO report, April 2018. Stop using our area as a dumping ground for "unwanted noise" from other communities. We already have the 18-hour NAP implemented (PIR recommended option 5) and arrivals AND departures, which have been dumped on us in 2019, once again without any community consultation. All the PIR recommended options are assessed in isolation. Option 4 is moving flights closer to our area and lower. This will add to our noise exposure even more in addition to the NAP, plus there is no management strategy in place for the NAP, no curfew at Hobart Airport, freight planes operate at night, bigger jets are used to service increasing passenger numbers, more routes/flights have been added, international flights are being planned. We have genuinely worked with ASA over the last 9 years, but we have not been heard. There should be some concessions for our communities in lieu of Option 5 and 4 (if implemented); Option 6 should not be considered a concession as this option was previously already rejected on sound grounds. Concessions could include: moving departures away from us, forcing airlines to invest in quieter aircraft or modifications to reduce noise (this should be a standard requirement for any airline operating out of Hobart Airport anyway), less NAP hours. Over the last few months we have been hammered by aircraft noise. It is not fair to burden us with even more by implementing option 4.

Reduces Noise sharing	1
Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise	1
Brings planes closer and lower	1

Record 81 s47F	
Date	11/01/2026
Location	Marion Bay
Rec 4	No
NAP Retention	No

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale

I am opposed to the implementation of Option 4: Move RNP-AR flight path 2-3 km further to the east, as we are already doing more than our fair amount of noise sharing. I have lived at Marion Bay all my life and have seen the area being immensely degraded with the introduction of the new flight paths in 2017, to communities that have never previously been overflown. If Option 4 is implemented in addition to the NAP, our community should get some sort of "benefit" in exchange. It is unreasonable to evaluate all options individually as this distorts the cumulative noise impact on our community. The 18-hour NAP by itself is enough noise sharing.

s47F

Reduces Noise sharing

Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise

1

1

Record 82 -s47F

Date 11/01/2026

Location Marion Bay

Rec 4 No

NAP Retention No

Further changes requested Yes

Feedback & rationale I am opposed to the implementation of Option 4: Move RNP-AR flight path 2-3 km further to the east.

-I lived with my family at s47F prior to 2017 as per ANO report, April 2018. Our communities have never previously been overflown

-Stop using our area as a dumping ground for "unwanted noise" from other communities; We are already doing more than our fair share with the 18 hour NAP (implemented PIR recommended option 5), arrivals AND departures, which have once again just been dumped on us without ANY community consultation at the time. This ought to be sufficient. Other communities can share as well. It might be the easiest and cheapest solution for ASA to dump it all on us, but if a fair approach would sincerely be considered and consistently be applied, other communities should noise share as well. These could even be areas that never before have been overflown, similar to what has happened to our area.

-All the PIR recommended options are assessed in isolation. They need to be assessed together to show the bigger picture and the accumulated impact of all the recommended options on our community. Option 7 – 10, New Zealand departure and arrival routes, yet to come.

-Option 4 is moving flights closer to our area and lower. This will add to our noise exposure even more and the already added 18-hour NAP impact. The following also needs to be considered in regard to the NAP: There is no management strategy in place for the NAP, no curfew at Hobart Airport, freight planes operate at night, bigger jets are used to service increasing passenger numbers, more routes/flights have been added, international flights are being planned.

-We have genuinely engaged with ASA over the last 9 years, but we have not been heard. There should be some concessions for our communities in lieu of Option 5 and 4 (if implemented); Option 6 should not be considered a concession as this option was previously already rejected on sound grounds. Concessions could include: moving departures away from us (this would be the preferred concession), forcing airlines to invest in quieter aircraft or modifications to reduce noise (this should be a standard requirement for any airline operating out of Hobart Airport anyway), less NAP hours.

-ASA has immensely negatively impacted our area since 2017, and our once tranquil tourism gem has been hugely degraded due to the initial introduction of SIDS and STARS and ongoing dumping of noise from other communities on our area. This needs to stop as we are doing more than our fair amount of noise sharing already. ASA is destroying a once unique tourist destination and is s47F

In the last few months we have been hammered by aircraft noise, being the summer months/peak season and the introduction of extra flight routes and bigger noisier aircraft, the noise seems endless and is affecting our health and lifestyle immensely. We do not need any more! STOP HERE AND NOW!

Reduces Noise sharing

Cumulative impacts - concentrates flight paths and noise

Brings planes closer and lower

1

1

1

Record 83 -s47F

Date 20/11/2025

Location Primrose Sands

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Rec 4 No preference stated
 NAP Retention No preference stated
 Feedback & rationale Hello, On the fact sheet re: Recommendation 4 Preferred Design it states that we can access a short video, however, the link does not take the user to the video. Please could you provide a direct link to the video. Thank you

Record 84 -s47F
 Date 11/01/2026
 Location No Address Details
 Rec 4 Yes
 NAP Retention Yes
 Further changes requested Yes
 Feedback & rationale Hello, I would like to give my feedback on Recommendation 4. 1. I agree with ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east. 2. I agree with the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm - 8.00am. In addition, I request a critical review be completed of the: 3. New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised on east Primrose Sands, Susan's Bay and Connelly's Marsh. - Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV - Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay not shortcutting Susan's Bay - BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement 3km north east. Thank you

Record 85 -s47F
 Date 07/01/2026
 Location No Address Details
 Rec 4 Yes
 NAP Retention Yes
 Further changes requested Yes
 Feedback & rationale The current flight path is far TOO LOW, TOO LOW TO NOISY and are detrimental to our health & wellbeing in addition to our tank water As property owners under the current flight path we support the following.... 1. Accept ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east. 2. Accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm -8.00am. Further to this we request a critical review be completed of the: 1. New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised. 2. Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV. 3. Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height. 4. BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.
 Higher and less noise 1
 Improves environment 1

Record 86 -s47F
 Date 20/12/2025
 Location Primrose Sands
 Rec 4 Yes
 NAP Retention Yes
 Further changes requested Yes
 Feedback & rationale I accept ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east. I accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm -8.00am. Further to this I request a critical review be completed of the: New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised. Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV. Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height. BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.

Record 87 -s47F
 Date 15/12/2025
 Location Carlton
 Rec 4 Yes
 NAP Retention Yes

Recommendation 4 Preferred Design Option Community Feedback

Airservices FOI 05/26/27

Feedback & rationale

Dear Airservices Australia, Thank you for your work on recommendation 4 - moving the current flight path RNP- AR a distance of approx. 3km East to sit over vacant land between Susan's Bay and Connelly's Marsh. I understand that this would increase the height of the aircraft and reduce the negative impact on the majority of the currently affected communities. I support and accept the ASA's recommendation 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east and support and accept the continuation of the Noise Abatement Procedure (NAP) noise sharing. Implementation of the Noise Abatement Procedure (NAP) in July 2024 brought significant relief to my household. I live on Carlton Beach Road directly under a flight path. Aircraft such as the older B738s operated by VA generate extremely high noise levels, and the NAP has meaningfully reduced my exposure to these operations. I am pleased to see PIR Recommendation 4 progressing. In combination with the NAP, this represents the least impactful option in terms of both aircraft noise and the protection of eagle habitats. It is a balanced solution that supports safety, environmental considerations and community well-being. I am concerned, however, that some opposition to the NAP is coming from individuals who do not live under the RNP-AR or RNAV flight paths and therefore do not experience the concentrated noise burden that communities like mine endure. Noise monitoring data clearly shows that the impact is not evenly distributed. Those directly affected should be prioritised in the decision-making process, consistent with the principles of fairness and evidence-based planning. I encourage Airservices Australia to continue relying on objective noise data, environmental assessments and the lived experience of communities that are most directly exposed to aircraft operations. These voices should carry particular weight in determining the long-term flight path design. Thank you again for your ongoing work and for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Higher and less noise
Improves environment

1
1

Record 88 -s47F

Date 01/01/2026
Location Primrose Sands
Rec 4 Yes
NAP Retention Yes
Further changes requested Yes
Feedback & rationale Hello, I would like to provide my feedback, I accept and support: - ASA's recommendation 4 to move the flight path 3km (not 2km as the recommendation states 2-3km). - the continuation of NAP noise sharing between 2pm and 8am. In addition, I request the new RNP-AR flight path: - Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV - Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay not shortcutting Susan's Bay - BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east. Thank you

Record 89 -s47F

Date 30/11/2025
Location Carlton
Rec 4 Yes
NAP Retention Yes
Further changes requested Yes
Feedback & rationale Flight path RNAPR 1. Accept ASA's Rec 4 to move this RNP-AR flight path 3 km east. 2. Accept the continuation of the NAP (Noise Abatement Procedure) noise sharing between 2.00pm -8.00am. Further to this we request a critical review be completed of the: New RNP-AR flight path to ensure that community impact is actually minimised. 1. Align all aircraft to RNAV (long track) and reconfigure RNP-AR standards to RNAV. 2. Extend RNP-AR flight path towards Lime Bay to increase aircraft height. 3. BAVUR waypoint through Forcett for movement ≈3km north east.

Record 90 -s47F

Date 05/12/2025
Location Carlton
Rec 4 Yes
NAP Retention Yes
Feedback & rationale NAP Breach at 9:34pm over Carlton River. Move this flight path ASAP> Implement Recommendation 4 and keep the NAP in place. Make pilots adhere to it.