

I am unaware of any oversight, this part of the trials problem, no clear line of sight to who is responsible for what within the trial. Nor who to go to with issues or problems.

b. Commonwealth agencies such as Air Services Australia, Civil Aviation Safety Authority  
There has been no practical support provided by Air Services Australia in resolving issues. If contacted they were less than helpful and failed to provide a clear path to assist in resolving issues

4) The extent of any environmental impact as a result of trialling drone delivery technology on;

a. Residents within the trial area

**See response under first point**

b. Native wildlife

**See response under first point**

c. Domestic animals

I don't have domestic animals myself however the howling of dogs within the area was prominent during the flying hours of the drone. This decreased immediately upon cessation of flights at the end of the day.

5) Ways to improve the use of drone delivery technology within the ACT

- Limit drone delivery to essential services, not all services
- Allow Drone delivery only for specified use cases such as those who are unable to leave their residence for medical (proven) reasons. Delivery of pharmaceutical products to these cases.
- Follow arterial roads and diverge across suburbs at multiple point
- Prevent flight paths over residential areas being used more than once a day
- Enforcing a separation for flights of 50m or greater over residencies for each delivery ensuring noise pollution is not concentrated over a few homes
- Halt further rollout until quieter drones are available.
- Lift flight ceiling to 100m to further reduce noise pollution.
- Set a goal of halving noise pollution before further approvals are given to the commercialisation of services.

6) Any other relevant matter

It is hugely disappointing that the government of the day has not actively sort to engage with those constituents who have been immediately impacted by the trial. If the submissions for commencement were clear on business case, success criteria and community consultation then it would have been better to have dealt with community concerns and impacts prior to starting of the trial.

It seems the territories race to be a "smart city" is at the expense of constituents with little to no recourse.

Sincerely



John Reis

preferences for lifestyle. Wing and the ACT Government have made no effort to address through the trial the intrusion into seclusion for any of the residents.

- **Commercialisation of my private space** – the space directly above my property should be a space that is free of commercial invasion. At the very least it should be an opt in or out model. This would provide the clearest indication of support and allow for flight paths to be appropriately plotted. It should also allow any householder to opt out at any stage should they find the invasion too much.
- **Social exclusion** - In a modern world where isolation of people is becoming more and more prevalent, this trial seems to support further isolating the lonely and vulnerable. It is surely better for people to leave their homes and engage in social activities such as going to the shops and interacting with people (no matter how small) rather than allowing them to further shut themselves out. Is it not enough that we have others to provide delivery services such as Uber eats for food, both Woolworths and Coles for shopping and countless delivery services for online purchases.
- I may be in favour of providing a Drone service to those who are elderly or confined to the house for medical reasons. Allowing for delivery of Pharmaceuticals and essential services.
- **Consultation** – to date I have had zero consultation with either Wing or the ACT Government and considering my residence is one of the most impacted in this whole trial I am shocked that no effort has been made to discuss with me the impacts or my views on ways to make the service better and more palatable to the public and residents. The flippancy in which statements are made by both Wing and The ACT Government in public forums belies the real impact and experience of those within the trial area.
- Mr Gentleman has shown no care nor skill in understanding any of the issues raised during the trial nor has there been any adjustments made following feedback.
- **Lack of monitoring** - What monitoring took place during the trial as I am unaware of any monitoring of any sort. This I presume is to zero consideration being given to what does a successful trial look like for all.
- What measurements were taken and what are the criteria to measure the success or failure of the trial, were these set prior to commencement or are we just expecting Wing to advise us how well the trial went, and rubber step the continuation into a commercially viable model without listening nor gathering and implementing lessons learnt.
- **No independent authority to provide feedback** – It was never clear who to contact during the trial in order to provide feedback or seek answers to questions.
- This felt deliberate by both parties as it was impossible to find someone to talk to or assist with issues around the trial, including the very real issue of immediate impacts to individuals lives and mental health and wellbeing.

2) The economic benefit of drone delivery technology being tested in the ACT including;

a. The investment that has been brought in to the Territory

The investment is self-serving and just fits within the “delivery” sector i.e. it is just another service being provided for delivery. I do not see any clear investment as we do not build drones and there are many methods for delivery that would allow Google to provide goods delivery to residents

b. The number of jobs that have been created as part of the trial

This is unclear, and would they not have been created regardless of the delivery method?

c. The extent of collaboration with local industry and academic institutions

3) The extent of regulatory oversight of drone technology at various levels of government including;

a. Local authorities such as EPA, Worksafe, Access Canberra

***I would like to comment on the following terms of reference:***

1) The decision to base the trials of the technology in the ACT and surrounding region I live directly under the flight path of the Bonython trial, I am subjected to the drone passing overhead (directly) twice for every delivery made. As the entry and exit point to the suburb on trial I am well placed to comment on the intrusive and invasive nature of the trial and technology.

My issues with the drone trial are:

- No consultation with those most impacted by the trial, those directly impacted should have been easily identifiable had Wing provided intended flight paths to the Government prior to commencement and alternatives investigated to residential fly overs.
- **NOISE** – It is difficult to explain to those who are NOT constantly exposed to the noise i.e. those that are receiving deliveries would not experience the constant exposure of those who are directly under the suburbs entry and exit point for flights, as I am. This cannot be understated as it was by the Chief Minister as no more than a neighbour mowing their lawn. At most in my time in Canberra I have had no more than 5 neighbours who mowed their lawn irregularly and not daily and all day. This is a flippant line that should be discarded or at the very least tested.
- You cannot accept the statement by Wing that quieter drones are being developed on face value as they don't believe there is an issue with the noise produced by their current model. There is no timeline nor facts/figures on the decibel output to be achieved/targeted by these "new drones"
- Wildlife just disappear not over weeks, not over days, not over hours, it is immediate and noticeable to all that are backing reserves, who have trees in the vicinity of their property or bushes that attract the wildlife. I have large trees and native bushes that whilst the trial was being conducted were not visited or nested in during the duration. Since the cessation of the trial they have returned. I hope that someone had measured the before/during/after impacts on the natural wildlife, if not then this is another failure of the trial boundaries.
- **I don't believe the same flight path should be allowed to be used (within 50 metres each time) twice in a day. This would have the effect of sharing the noise pollution that is currently concentrated over a very small area.**
- **Property Value** – I have owned my property for 8 plus years and feel that if the trial were to go live that being directly under the flight path will directly impact on my property value in a substantial manner as the on-going noise would not be an attractive feature for new home buyers. Unless the government and Wing are prepared to noise proof our homes (provide noise insulation and triple glassing) this however does not address the outside ambience when trying to relax in your own yard of a weekend. It is far from relaxing to have the constant noise pollution provided by the drones.
- **Wellbeing** – it is difficult to state just how "angry" the start up and constant buzz throughout the day makes me. It impacts on me on a daily basis and upsets me beyond that which is normal or acceptable. I feel that my wellbeing was never a consideration in approving the trial nor does it appear to be a consideration in moving forward with commercialising the service. I expect that the impact I have experienced in the time of the trial will only multiply if it were to continue in its current state and flight paths.
- **Outside impacts** – It is impossible to ignore the noise pollution when inside my house little own when I am outside in the garden, entertaining or just living life at my property. The noise is invasive and not conducive to wanting to be outside. Visitors to my property often comment on how they are glad it is me and not them who has the Drone trial as they too find it an appalling noise.
- **Intrusion into seclusion (invasion of privacy)** – the introduction of the drones has directly impacted upon my solitude (property was purchased for its natural bush setting and set back from main roads and at the back of the complex to reduce through traffic), the drone has trampled all of these conscious decisions made by myself for my personal wellbeing and

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM**

**Submission: INQUIRY INTO DRONE DELIVERY SYSTEM IN THE ACT**

**Personal Details:**

Name:	John Reis
Postal Address:	[REDACTED]
Phone:	[REDACTED]
Email: (if applicable)	

**Optional:**

How long you have lived in the area:	[REDACTED]
Occupation:	[REDACTED]
Any other background information:	

NOTE: Most submissions are made public once they are submitted. If you do not feel comfortable identifying yourself, make it clear in a covering letter that you wish your submission to remain anonymous. Your submission may still be made public but your personal details won't be.

**What you can include in your Statements:**

Below are some points that you may want to include in your submission -

- Why you are writing to the Inquiry: e.g. you live in the area, you have pets, small children, medical concerns etc.
  - Issues and concerns, e.g. privacy, data collection, safety, pets and wildlife.
  - Any problems, or how the drone deliveries have affected you and your household.
  - The location of your home to the flight path.
  - Examples of the impact it has had on you, e.g. noise, feeling angry or unsafe, animal behaviour, neighbour relationships.
  - Detrimental social impact in the community when many neighbours are now at loggerheads.
  - Selfishness of one person to get a delivery at the expense of so many households.
  - Why you think it is not feasible for drone deliveries in a suburban area eg sensibility of delivery of minor or one off consumables when a large shopping centre is so close.
  - Your feelings on the consultative process by Project Wing and the ACT Government.
  - Lack of regulations and monitoring of the trial.
  - No independent authority to provide feedback.
  - Concern and risks of delivery of chemist items.
  - Suggestions or improvements.
  - General comments.
-