

Rebecca Holden for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 25 November 2016

Airport Zone Chapter – Hearing Stream 08

1. The purpose of the Airport Zone at Wanaka and Queenstown Airports is to provide for a range of airport and airport related activities and to recognise the unique role of the airports in providing for the social and economic wellbeing of the community.
2. I have recommended a number of changes to the notified Queenstown Airport Mixed Use chapter (proposed to be renamed **Airport Zone**)¹ as a result of the submissions received and direction given from the Panel² in the Rural Hearing Stream 02.³
3. The most significant amendments recommended include:
 - (a) a full set of provisions (objectives, policies and rules) to incorporate a Wanaka Airport Zone (the extent of the Airport Zone at Wanaka Airport correlates with the boundary of Designation #64);
 - (b) identifying Queenstown Airport as nationally significant infrastructure;
 - (c) including a provision for the promotion of walking, cycling and public transport services to support the functioning of Queenstown Airport;
 - (d) managing exterior lighting on buildings associated with Airport Related Activities at Queenstown Airport; and
 - (e) removing reference to the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (**HSNO**) and Civil Aviation Authority (**CAA**) requirements.
4. The evidence filed by Mr John Kyle on behalf of QAC (433) proposes a number of changes to the recommended revised chapter appended to my s 42A report. At **Appendix 1** to this evidence summary I have included a table in which I state my view on each of Mr Kyle's proposed changes. In some instances I have indicated that, although I consider a recommended change has merit, I am unsure whether scope is provided through submissions to make it.

¹ Chapter 12.

² Minute Concerning Provisions Applying to Wanaka Airport, 16.6.16

³ Paragraph 15.6 – 15.10 (pages 66-67), Section 42A Hearing Report For Hearing Commencing: 2 May 2016 (Chp. 21 S42A), dated 7 April 2016, prepared by Mr Craig Bar.

Acoustics issues at Queenstown Airport

5. Mr Chris Day on behalf of QAC and Mr Malcolm Hunt on behalf of RPL (807) have provided acoustics evidence on visitor accommodation and general noise limits for the Airport Zone in Queenstown. Dr Stephen Chiles has provided comments on these matters in his summary of evidence.
6. With respect to visitor accommodation:
- (a) I accept that there is significant potential for adverse effects to arise from locating visitor accommodation activities within the Air Noise Boundary. However, I am of the opinion that these adverse effects can be mitigated by appropriate standards;
 - (b) I agree with Dr Chiles that short-term visitor accommodation, such as an airport hotel, should be considered an ASAN;⁴
 - (c) I consider there to be merit in the proposed additional control discussed by Mr Day in relation to limiting outdoor amenity areas and as well as the notified control requiring an indoor design sound level of 40 dBL_{dn} for visitor accommodation;⁵
 - (d) I do not support including a control to limit the maximum length of stay for visitors/guests.⁶ I rely on Dr Chiles' view expressed in his summary of evidence that such a control is not necessary. It would also be unreasonable for the Council to enforce; and
 - (e) I accept the recommendation of Dr Chiles in his summary of evidence that it would be appropriate for any visitor accommodation in the Airport Zone at Queenstown to be required to have individual certification that the Indoor Design Sound Level will be achieved, given the sound insulation standards set out in Chapter 36 may not be sufficient for some locations within the zone. However, in my view there may not be scope to make this change.

The evidence provided by Mr Hunt⁷ and Mr Day,⁸ and the summary of evidence provided by Dr Chiles address the fact that the noise limits for Queenstown Airport are inconsistent with the general noise limits that apply to other zones within the

⁴ Evidence of Mr Chris Day at Paragraph 17.
⁵ Evidence of Mr Chris Day at Paragraph 25(b)-(c).
⁶ Evidence of Mr Chris Day at Paragraph 25(a).
⁷ Mr Hunt's evidence at paragraph 48.
⁸ Mr Day's evidence at paragraphs 26-31.

PDP. I accept Mr Hunt and Dr Chiles' evidence that the difference is not justified. However, I have been unable to find a submission on this matter. Accordingly there may not be scope to make a change.

Activities provided for at Queenstown Airport

7. Mr Serjeant in his evidence for RPL and QPL raises a number of concerns regarding the extension of the Queenstown Airport Zone both in terms of location (a matter for the rezoning hearings) and the increase of activities provided for (a matter for this hearing). Mr Serjeant has raised issues relating to the impacts on the wider environment including urban design and transport matters. I acknowledge that the process of looking outside the zone was not part of the s 32 assessment for the Airport Zone Chapter. However, I do not wish to provide a view on the merits of this issue until I have heard all the evidence provided by QAC and RPL, and intend to address this comprehensively in my reply evidence.
8. I consider there to be merit in Mr Serjeant's suggestion that buildings for Airport or Airport Related activities should be subject to a controlled activity resource consent. This outcome has also been suggested by Mr Kyle in his evidence. However, in my view there may not be scope to make this change.

Temporary Air Shows at Wanaka Airport

9. I note that QAC requested a specific rule providing for temporary air shows at Wanaka Airport. This submission point (433.107) was missed out of Appendix 2 to my s 42A report.
10. Evidence on this issue has been provided by Mr Kyle on behalf of QAC. Further submissions were received from Queenstown Park Limited (**QPL**) (FS1097) and Remarkables Park Limited (**RPL**) (FS1117), who have been served notice of this hearing. Further, as noted within my s 42A report, these further submissions are focused on the Queenstown Airport and are not relevant to Wanaka Airport. My view on Mr Kyle's evidence on this issue is noted in **Appendix 1**.

Airport Related activities at Wanaka Airport

11. Ms Rachel Tregidga and Mr Kyle have filed evidence on behalf of QAC and seek to remove the standards from my recommended chapter limiting the size of commercial activity within the Wanaka Airport Zone.

-
12. Mr Heath has confirmed that his recommended 100m² and 1,000m² thresholds were intended to apply only to non-aviation and non-ancillary commercial activity. His approach is that the thresholds should not apply to commercial activity that falls within the definition of 'Airport Related Activities- Wanaka Airport' (which includes commercial activity ancillary to the use of the Airport). I had misunderstood Mr Heath's recommendation when I recommended the specific limits in Standards 17.5.13 and 17.5.14. However, my view remains that given the broad definition of 'Airport Related Activities – Wanaka', some parameters should be imposed to limit the nature and scale of commercial activity that is also ancillary to Airport Related Activities.
 13. Ms Tregidga's⁹ evidence is that alternative (non-airport related) activities are critical to the profit cycles of airports. Although the comment was made in relation to Queenstown Airport, it highlights the concerns that I have in terms of modern day airports needing to create additional revenue streams beyond those directly related to airport activities, and in my view justifies the need for a limit on ancillary commercial activity. Mr Tim Heath has also identified this issue in his summary of evidence.
 14. Ms Tregidga is concerned that the maximum total gross floor area for Airport Related Activities of 1000m² (contained in recommended standard 17.5.14) may already be exceeded by existing Airport Related Activities at Wanaka Airport. My review of Council records has identified that existing activities which meet the definition of 'Airport Related' total approximately 1505m² of gross floor area within the Wanaka Airport Zone. These activities include the Wanaka Transport and Toy Museum, ancillary retail activities, a café servicing employees and visitors within the proposed zone and the Warbirds and Wheels War museum exhibit area. Therefore, I accept that Rule 17.5.14 might require adjustment. However, I wish to hear the evidence for the submitters before I form a view on how this might be done.
 15. In addition, I note that from my review of Council records, activities that fall outside the definition of 'Airport Related' include a commercial import business operating from an existing hanger, which was approved by resource consent RM130118. This building has a ground floor area of 1200m² and therefore exceeds the

⁹ Evidence of Ms Rachel Tregidga at paragraph 35 and 36

1000m² threshold that has been identified within Mr Heath's evidence for non-ancillary commercial activities.

Intensification of incompatible activities at Wanaka Airport

16. I have reviewed the evidence of Mark Laurenson for Z Energy Limited, BP Oil New Zealand Limited and Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited (768). Given Wanaka Airport's inclusion into the Airport Zone Chapter, I agree that it is appropriate to refer to Wanaka Airport in notified Policy 17.2.2.3 (Redrafted 17.2.3.3).

APPENDIX 1

Key:

Mr John Kyle's recommended changes to the section 42A report version of the chapter are shown in red underlined text for additions and ~~strikethrough text~~ for deletions. Blue underlined text shows where Mr Kyle has recommended to revert back to the notified drafting.

Recommend changes to notified chapter are shown in underlined text for additions and ~~strike through~~ text for deletions. Appendix 1 to s42A report, dated 2 November 2016.

Note: a numbering error occurred in the final Revised Chapter attached to my s 42A report. For the avoidance of doubt, I accept the consequential renumbering proposed by Mr Kyle and this will be corrected in my reply evidence. The numbering used in this chapter reflects the numbering in the chapter that was filed with my s 42A report.

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
17.1 Zone Purpose	<p><u>Wanaka Airport is Regionally Significant Infrastructure to the District and is an important commercial and recreational aviation hub for the Upper Clutha. Wanaka Airport has capacity for commercial passenger flights and flights through until 10pm at night and, as such, the Airport may one day accommodate scheduled and chartered air transport services.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p><u>The objective and provisions for Queenstown Airport promote a wide range of activities and reflect the location of Queenstown Airport within the Queenstown Urban Growth Boundary. The objectives and provisions for Wanaka Airport reflect the more remote location of Wanaka Airport outside of the Wanaka Urban Growth Boundary.</u></p>	Support in part	I support the removal of reference to the consented environment (commercial passenger flights and flights through until 10pm at night). However, I oppose the removal of reference to avoiding adverse effects from inappropriate commercial activities locating at the Airport. This purpose provides background to the framework which includes provisions to manage retail and commercial activities.

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
	<p>and seek to avoid adverse effects from inappropriate commercial activities locating at the Airport. The strategic importance to the District of both airports and the finite nature of the land resource for both airports is also recognised in the Airport Zone provisions.</p>		
17.3.1.1	<p>17.3.1.1 17.2.1.1 Airport activities are enabled, provided Provide for those aviation activities airport activities necessary to enable Queenstown Airport can to operate in a safe and efficient manner.</p>	Support	I agree with the recommended change as it uses defined terms from within the PDP and aligns the policy to that which was notified. I consider Mr Kyle's recommended policy improves drafting and is more directive, providing greater clarity of the outcome that this policy seeks to achieve. I also consider that the policy recommended by Mr Kyle gives better effect to Redrafted Objective 17.3.1.
17.3.1.2	<p>17.3.1.2 17.2.1.2 Provide for a range of airport related service, business, industrial and commercial activity activities to support or complement the functioning of Queenstown Airport.</p>	Support	I agree with the recommended change. Scope for this change may be provided by submitter 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd).
17.2.1.4	<p>17.2.1.4 Promote the use of walking, cycling and public transport services</p>	Oppose	<p>I oppose the deletion recommended by Mr Kyle. Queenstown Airport is a significant employer of the District, as well as facilitating business and local passenger movements (not necessarily carrying luggage). Therefore I retain my opinion of promoting walking, cycling and public transport services and infrastructure as part of any development at the Airport.</p> <p>Queenstown Airport is the catalyst for a significant number of passenger movements therefore alternative modes of transport, including public transport, should also be facilitated with expansion of the airport. This would also enable wider consideration to impacts on the transport network.</p> <p>Additionally, Chapter 14 of the ODP is yet to be reviewed.</p>

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
			Pressure and congestion on transport and the roading networks is identified as an issue within Queenstown Airport's Statement of Intent, as outlined at paragraph 9(c) of Ms Tregidga's evidence.
Policy 17.2.3.3	Move to sit under objective 17.2.1.	Support in part.	Moving this policy has some merit. However, in my view this change has a substantive effect and there may not be scope to make it.
Objective 17.2.2	Objective – At Wanaka Airport, Airport Activities and Airport Related Activities support the essential functioning of aviation activities. Social and economic wellbeing is supported by enabling airport and airport related activities at Wanaka Airport.	Oppose	Oppose the objective proposed by Mr Kyle. The objective proposed within the recommended Chapter in Appendix 1 to my s42A report provides an appropriate framework for the supporting policies, rules and standards. I agree that 'aviation activity' is not a defined term in the PDP. However, in my view the use of this term is appropriate and can be easily understood when read in the context of the objective.
Policy 17.2.2.1	Airport Activities which are core to the safe and efficient operation of Wanaka Airport are enabled and provided for. Provide for airport activities to enable Wanaka Airport to operate in a safe and efficient manner.	Support in part.	I am of the opinion that 'core' is inferred by both the definitions of 'Airport' and 'Airport Related' activities, and the proposed development controls. The use of Wanaka Airport by third party operators associated with recreational or tourism aviation is captured by the definitions and, as such, are considered to be 'core'. Further, although I agree with Mr Kyle's proposed redrafting of Policy 17.2.2.1 to provide for airport activities to enable Wanaka Airport to be safely and efficiently operated, I consider that the development standards I have proposed to restrict airport related activities at Wanaka Airport would also give effect to my proposed policy 17.2.2.1 by ensuring that inappropriate activities do not establish, that airport activities are not displaced by airport related activities, and that the ability of the airport to function in accordance with its primary purpose is not

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
			undermined.
Policies 17.2.2.2 – 17.2.2.4	<p><u>17.2.2.2 Enable a range of airport related activities provided they are ancillary to the use of the Airport and avoid those activities that are not.</u></p> <p><u>17.2.2.3 Avoid the establishment or intensification of activities that are incompatible with the ongoing operation and functioning of Wanaka Airport.</u></p> <p><u>17.2.2.2 Ensure land uses including Airport Related Activities have a legitimate relationship with Airport Activities and are only allowed where they are of a size (either individually or cumulatively) that: a. is ancillary to and support part of the operation of an Airport Activity; and b. do not adversely affect the key local service and employment function of Wanaka Town Centre or other commercially zoned areas within the District.</u></p> <p><u>17.2.2.3 Only allow retail and food and beverage facilities which are designed and operated and of a nature, scale and intensity to service visitors, passengers or workers engaged in or associated with Airport Activities or Airport Related Activities within the Wanaka Airport zone, and are unlikely to attract significant patronage outside of this purpose.</u></p> <p><u>17.2.2.4 Ensure buildings and activities are adequately serviced with a water supply for fire-fighting purposes as well as provision of potable water, sewage treatment and disposal.</u></p>	Oppose	I do not support the deletion of policies 17.2.2.2-17.2.2.4 to be replaced by those policies recommended by Mr Kyle. The policies recommended within the recommended revised chapter at Appendix 1 of my s 42A report provide greater certainty and clarity to users of the District Plan regarding anticipated outcomes within the Airport Zone at Wanaka and, in terms of section 32 of the RMA, are more appropriate than those sought by Mr Kyle.

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
17.4 Other Provisions and Rules	17.4 <u>17.3</u> Other Provisions and Rules ... (all those outlined in Mr Kyle's evidence)	Support	Also support the suggested changes to General Rule 17.3.2.6 outlined in Mr Kyle's evidence. However, I note that these changes were not included in the revised Chapter appended to his evidence.
Rule 17.4.1	Any airport activity or airport related activity <u>Airport Activity – Queenstown Airport, Airport Related Activity – Queenstown Airport</u> or farming activity that <u>which</u> complies with all the relevant standards in Table 2 rules in section 17.5 shall be a Permitted Activity.	Support	I agree that this change improves drafting.
<u>New Rule 17.4.2</u>	<u>17.4.2 - Buildings, except security fencing greater than 2m high which shall not be subject to this rule and is permitted.</u> (Controlled activity status) <u>Control is reserved to all of the following:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>whether building form, colour and texture are used to reduce the apparent height and bulk of large buildings when viewed from adjoining sites;</u> • <u>whether there will be a consistency of building materials and colours between buildings;</u> • <u>when located near the boundary of the zone, whether the building aligns with other buildings on the site (existing or potential) or on the relevant adjoining site;</u> • <u>whether any proposed landscape treatment is in scale with the proposed development, providing for the visual softening of large buildings and the screening of parking, loading and storage areas,</u> 	Support in part	I agree with the merits presented within Mr Kyle's evidence for buildings being listed as a controlled activity at Queenstown Airport. I agree that Council's control should be limited to matters associated with design and appearance, bulk and location, and landscaping. However, I have not identified a submission to provide scope for this change.

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
	<p><u>while recognising operational requirements of airside facilities;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>whether the proposed plantings are to be placed to that they do not obstruct views of outstanding natural landscapes and/or features</u> 		
<p><u>New Rules 17.4.3 and 17.4.4</u></p>	<p><u>17.4.3 – Signage</u> (Permitted activity status)</p> <p>a. <u>Advertising or promotional signage located greater than 20m from the zone boundary.</u></p> <p>b. <u>Signage to be viewed by persons within the zone and not directed at persons outside the zone.</u></p> <p>c. <u>Instruction or directional signage.</u></p> <p><u>Note: for all other signs, Section 18 – Signs of the Operative District Plan apply.</u></p> <p><u>17.4.4 – Signage</u></p> <p><u>Signage on the roof of buildings.</u> (Non-Complying activity status)</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>I agree with the merits presented within Mr Kyle's evidence for these changes. I consider that these changes are not substantive in that the regulatory effect of this notified Rule 17.5.9 has not changed.</p>
<p>Rules 17.4.11 and 17.4.12</p>	<p>17.4.11 - Any Airport Activity – Wanaka Airport, <u>Airport Related Activity – Wanaka Airport (excluding buildings) or farming activity</u> that complies with the relevant standards in Table 3.</p> <p>17.4.12 – Airport Related Activity – Wanaka Airport that complies with the relevant standards in Table 3.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>I support the recommended consolidation of redraft Rules 17.4.11 and 17.4.12 by grouping Airport and Airport Related Activities within the same rule.</p>

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
Rule 17.4.13	<p>Buildings for Airport or Airport Related Activities</p> <p>Except security fencing greater than 2m high which shall not be subject to this rule and is permitted.</p> <p>Control is reserved to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Design and appearance; ● The effects on visual amenity when viewed from the zone boundary; ● <u>The purpose of the building and the operational requirements of the activity it contains.</u> ● Provision for firefighting; ● Wastewater; ● Stormwater; ● Water Supply. ● <u>whether building form, colour and texture are used to reduce the apparent height and bulk of large buildings when viewed from adjoining sites;</u> ● <u>whether there will be a consistency of building materials and colours between buildings;</u> ● <u>when located near the boundary of the zone, whether the building aligns with other buildings on the site (existing or potential);</u> ● <u>whether any proposed landscape treatment is in scale with the proposed development, providing for the visual softening of large buildings and the screening of parking, loading and storage areas when viewed from adjoining sites;</u> ● <u>whether the proposed plantings are to be placed so that they do not obstruct views of</u> 	Oppose	<p>Oppose the recommended expanded list of matters of discretion. This level of detail is not consistent with the drafting of other chapters e.g. the matters of discretion for buildings located in the Rural Lifestyle Zone whereby discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● External appearance. ● Visibility from public places. ● Landscape character. ● Visual amenity <p>The recommended provisions contained within my recommended Revised Chapter (Appendix 1 of my s42A report) are concise and provide certainty and direction to plan users.</p>

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
	<p><u>outstanding natural landscapes and/or features when viewed from adjoining sites;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The number, location and formation of car parks.</u> • <u>The location and formation of site access to ensure that the safety and functionality of adjacent roading networks is maintained.</u> • <u>The design and location of new buildings and structures located to the north of the runway to the extent that the built form should be clustered together to maintain, as far as reasonably practicable, clear view shafts from State Highway 6 towards the north.</u> • <u>Provision for firefighting, wastewater, stormwater and water supply.</u> 		
17.4.14	<p>17.4.14 <u>16</u> Instructional or directional signage <u>or signage directed at persons within the zone.</u></p> <p>Control is reserved to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Dimensions of signage</u> • <u>Location of signage</u> <p><u>Note: for all other signs, Section 18 – Signs of the Operative District Plan apply.</u></p>	Support	I agree with the proposed redrafting of provisions relating to signage.
Rules 17.4.15 – 17.4.23	<p>17.4.15 Community Activities limited to police stations, fire stations, medical facilities and aviation schools (provided they serve an aviation related purpose)-</p> <p>17.4.16 Wholesaling or Commercial Storage Activity</p>	Oppose	Mr Kyle states that redraft Rule 17.4.15 (community activities limited to police stations, fire stations, medical facilities and aviation schools, provided they serve an aviation related purpose) is inconsistent with and contradicts redraft Rules 17.4.11 and 17.4.12 which permit 'Airport Activities – Wanaka Airport' and 'Airport Related Activities - Wanaka Airport'.

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
	<p>(NC)</p> <p>17.4.17 Forestry (PR)</p> <p>17.4.18 Factory Farming (PR)</p> <p>17.4.19 Mining (PR)</p> <p>17.4.20 Any activity requiring an Offensive Trade Licence under the Health Act 1956 (PR)</p>		<p>The definition of 'Airport Activity – Wanaka Airport' includes 'rescue facilities' and, 'medical facilities' whereas the definition of 'Airport Related Activity – Wanaka Airport' includes 'aviation schools'.</p> <p>I note that community activities such as police stations and fire stations are not included within the definition of 'Airport Related Activities' which are permitted by Rule 17.4.14 as proposed within Mr Kyle's evidence. Therefore I recommend the retention of the Discretionary activity redraft Rule 17.4.15 for Community Activities being limited to police stations and fire stations (provided they serve an aviation related purpose). A prohibited activity status is provided for Community Activities that are not covered by redraft Rule 17.4.15.</p> <p>I oppose the deletion of the other activities identified in redraft Rules 17.4.16 – 17.4.20.</p>
Rules 17.4.21 and 17.4.23	<p>17.4.21 Residential Activity (PR)</p> <p>17.4.23 Day Care Facilities (PR)</p>	Support	I agree with deleting these rules and replacing them with the proposed Rule 17.4.17 contained within Mr Kyle's evidence.
Standard 17.5.5.3	<p>All fixed exterior lighting on buildings associated with Airport Related Activities shall be directed away from adjacent sites and roads.</p> <p>*Discretion is restricted to all of the following: limited to the extent of adverse effects from lighting on Residential Activities. And</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which the lighting is required for operational purposes. • <u>The effects on urban design outcomes;</u> 	Support in part	I consider that Mr Kyle's proposed redrafting has merit. However, I have not identified a submission to provide scope for this change.

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Visual effects;</u> • <u>The purpose of the building and the operational requirements of the activity it contains.</u> 		
Standard 17.6.5	<p>Building Design and Glare</p> <p>17.6.5.1 <u>17.5.5.1</u></p> <p>The exterior of buildings situated within the landside area at Queenstown Airport shall be designed so that roof and wall colours are limited to a maximum reflectivity of 36%, except where:</p> <p>a Trims, highlights and signage totalling up to 10% of the façade area may exceed this level and be of contrasting colour.</p> <p>17.6.5.2 <u>17.5.5.2</u></p> <p>Any landside activity which requires the lighting of outdoor areas shall ensure that direct or indirect illumination does not exceed 10 lux at the windows of residential buildings in any adjacent Residential Zone</p> <p><u>17.5.5.3</u></p> <p><u>All fixed exterior lighting on buildings associated with Airport Related Activities shall be directed away from adjacent sites and roads.</u></p> <p>*Discretion is restricted to all of the following: limited to the extent of adverse effects from lighting on Residential Activities. And The extent to which the lighting is required for</p>	Support in part	I agree with the merits presented within Mr Kyle's evidence for this change and consider scope to be provided by the submission received from RPL (807). I agree to the expanded list of discretion which may go some way towards addressing RPL's concerns.

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
	<p>operational purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effects on urban design outcomes; • Visual effects; • The purpose of the building and the operational requirements of the activity it contains. 		
17.5.7	<p>Visitor Accommodation– Queenstown Airport</p> <p>17.5.87.1 Within the Air Noise Boundary (ANB) – New buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings containing Visitor Accommodation shall be designed to achieve an Indoor Design Sound Level of 40 dB Ldn within any Critical Listening Environment, based on the 2037 Noise Contours. Compliance shall be demonstrated by either adhering to the sound insulation requirements in Table 1 of Appendix 13 Table 4 of Chapter 36 of the Operative this District Plan and installation of mechanical ventilation to achieve the requirements in Table 2 of Appendix 13 Table 5 Rule 36.6.3 of Chapter 36, or by submitting a certificate to Council from a person suitably qualified in acoustics stating that the proposed construction can achieve the Indoor Design Sound Level with the windows open.</p> <p>17.5.87.2 Between the Outer Control Boundary (OCB) and the ANB - New buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings containing Visitor Accommodation shall be designed to achieve an Indoor Design Sound Level of 40 dB Ldn within any Critical Listening Environment, based on the 2037 Noise Contours. Compliance shall be demonstrated by either installation of mechanical ventilation to</p>	Support in part	I consider there to be merit in restricting the provision of outdoor amenity space, however do not agree with imposing a maximum length of stay. This standard would be impracticable to administer.

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
	<p>achieve the requirements in Table 2 of Appendix 13 Table 5 <u>Rule 36.6.3</u> of Chapter 36 of the Operative this District Plan or by submitting a certificate to Council from a person suitably qualified in acoustics stating that the proposed construction can achieve the Indoor Design Sound Level with the windows open.</p> <p><u>17.5.7.3 The maximum length of stay for any visitor / guest shall be three nights;</u></p> <p><u>17.5.7.4 No outdoor amenity space shall be provided.</u></p>		
17.5.9	<p>Signs</p> <p>17.5.109.1 For a Any advertising or promotional signage shall not be located within 20m of the zone boundary, whether it is affixed to a building or freestanding the rules in Section 18 – Signs of the Operative District Plan apply.</p> <p>17.5.109.2 For signage to be viewed by persons within the zone at not directed at persons outside the site, no limits apply.</p> <p>17.5.109.3 There are no restrictions on the dimensions or location of instructional and directional signage. No signage shall be permitted on building roofs.</p>		I consider there to be merit in the drafting improvement suggested by Mr Kyle. I have not identified a submission to provide scope for this change but do not consider it to be substantive.
Standards 17.5.10 and 17.5.11	<p><u>Minimum Building Setback</u></p> <p>a. The setback from all zone boundaries shall be</p>	Oppose	The meaning of 'effect' contained within section 3 of the RMA includes any positive effect. Therefore I consider this insertion superfluous and inconsistent with drafting of the

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
	<p><u>5m.</u></p> <p><u>b. The setback from the eastern side of the centreline of the main runway (as at 2013) shall</u></p> <p><u>c. be 217 metres.</u></p> <p><u>d. The setback from the western side of the centre line of the main runway (as at 2013) shall be 124 metres.</u></p> <p><u>e. The setback from any public road shall be 5m. Except no setbacks shall apply to security fencing greater than 2m in height.</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to the following (where relevant):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>For non-compliances with (a) or (d) only, the visual effects of the bulk and location when viewed from the boundary of the zone or adjacent public roads.</u> • <u>For non-compliances with (b) or (c) only, the effects on the current and future operation of the Airport.</u> • <u>For all non-compliances, the purpose of the building and the operational requirements of the activity it contains.</u> 		<p>remaining chapters of the PDP.</p>

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The positive economic, social and/or cultural effects that may be generated from the proposed activity.</u> <p>Maximum Building Height</p> <p><u>The maximum height of all buildings shall be 10m.</u></p> <p><u>Except this limit shall not apply to control towers, lighting towers or navigation and communication masts and aerials which are not subject to a height limit.</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Visual effects of the bulk and location noncompliance when viewed from the boundary of the zone.</u> • <u>The purpose of the building and the operational requirements of the activity it contains.</u> • <u>The positive economic, social and/or cultural effects that may be generated from the proposed activity.</u> 		
Standard 17.5.12	<p>Glare</p> <p><u>Within all landside areas, All lighting shall:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a- <u>ensure that direct or indirect illumination does not exceed 3 lux spill of light at any</u> 	Support	Agree with proposed changes regarding lighting within all landside areas.

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
	<p>adjacent site.</p> <p>b. <u>be directed away from adjoining sites and roads;</u></p> <p>e. <u>not be directed upwards.</u></p>		
Standards 17.5.13 – 17.5.15	<p>17.5.13 Identified Airport Related Activities – Maximum Gross Floor Area</p> <p><u>The following activities shall not exceed 100m² in Gross Floor Area as part of any single activity:</u></p> <p>a. <u>cafes and other food and beverage facilities;</u></p> <p>b. <u>retail activities;</u></p> <p>c. <u>offices;</u></p> <p>17.5.14 Identified Airport Related Activities – Maximum Total Gross Floor Area</p> <p><u>The maximum Gross Floor Area of the following activities shall not exceed 1000m² over the zone, irrespective of any site, tenancy or lease arrangement within the zone:</u></p> <p>a. <u>cafes and other food and beverage facilities;</u></p> <p>b. <u>retail activities;</u></p> <p>c. <u>offices</u></p> <p>17.5.15 Hours of Operation for Airport Related Activities</p> <p><u>The hours of operation for the following Airport Related Activities shall be undertaken between 6.00</u></p>	Oppose	<p>I do not agree with Mr Kyle's recommendation to remove the standards limiting the gross floor area of activities within the Airport Zone at Wanaka.</p> <p>My view remains that standards should be retained in order to limit the nature and scale of the listed airport related activities to ensure that they are legitimate, and that the Wanaka Airport Zone accords with the Strategic Directions of the PDP, as discussed in my s32AA analysis attached to my s42A report. The retention of the standards would help to ensure that airport activities are not displaced by airport-related activities within this zone.</p> <p>However, I recognise that the existing environment may already exceed 1000m² by activities that meet the definition of 'Airport Related' (cafes and other food and beverage facilities, retail activities and offices) Therefore standard 17.5.14 may need to be adjusted.</p>

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
	<p>am and 10.00 pm;</p> <p>a. cafes and other food and beverage facilities;</p> <p>b. retail activities;</p>		
<p><u>New Standard 17.5.12</u></p>	<p><u>Air shows</u></p> <p>a. <u>The air show (including set up, flying programmed and pack down) shall be limited to 12 days inclusive;</u></p> <p>b. <u>The flying programme for the air show shall be limited to a period of not more than five days;</u></p> <p>c. <u>The hours permitted for the air show shall be between 0600 and 2000;</u></p> <p>d. <u>The air show operator shall submit to the Council, no later than 30 working days prior to the air show taking place, a report detailing the noise and environmental aspects of the air show. The Council may request changes to the air show to avoid unreasonable noise exposure on the community. Comments are to be provided by the Council within 10 working days of receipt of the air show programme.</u></p> <p>e. <u>The relevant noise standards for the Zone shall not apply to the air show.</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to the following:</u></p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Air shows have been provided for under the proposed definition of 'airport related activity – Wanaka Airport' and the permissive conditions of Designation #64 (which only benefit QLDC as the requiring authority). I agree with Mr Kyle in terms of imposing parameters around the nature and scale of air show events such as Warbirds over Wanaka. These standards can help manage the impacts of the event off site. I also agree with Mr Kyle's recommendation that Air Shows should be exempt from the Noise Standards contained within Chapter 36 given such matters as their limited duration and contribution to the economic wellbeing of the District.</p>

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Adverse amenity effects for surrounding landowners;</u> • <u>Measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse amenity effects;</u> • <u>The positive economic, social and/or cultural effects that may be generated from the proposed activity.</u> 		
Definition of 'Airport Related Activity – Queenstown Airport'	Means an ancillary activity or service that provides support to the airport. This includes, but is not limited to, land transport activities, buildings and structures, <u>signage</u> , servicing and infrastructure, police stations, fire stations, medical facilities and education facilities provided they serve an aviation related purpose, retail and commercial services, industry and visitor accommodation associated with the needs of Airport passengers, visitors and employees and/or aircraft movements and Airport businesses. <u>Also includes farming activities.</u>	Support in part	<p>I agree with Mr Kyle's recommended changes in respect of including signage and farming within the definition. However, I have not identified a submission to provide scope for this change.</p> <p>I also support My Kyle's recommendation of an advice note being added under to the definition of Farming Activities to notify plan users that the definition is linked to the definition of Domestic Livestock"</p>
Definition of 'Airport Related Activity – Wanaka Airport'	<u>Means any ancillary activity or service that provides support to the airport. This includes, Means any retail activity, cafes and other food and beverage facilities, administrative offices, freight facilities, industrial and commercial activities, provided they are ancillary to the use of the Airport.</u> Also includes <u>aviation schools, space research and associated activities, facilities and activities associated with veteran, vintage and classic aircraft operations, aviation museums and aero recreation. Also includes Temporary Activities associated with Air Shows, Conferences and Meetings, and rental</u>	Support in part	I agree with changes proposed by Mr Kyle with the exception of 'freight facilities' being included. As discussed at paragraph 6.64 to 6.66 of my s42A report for Hearing Stream 07 – Designations I am concerned that provision of freight as a permitted activity at Wanaka Airport will have adverse effects in terms of limiting the land available for airport activities and on transport routes. If freight facilities are permitted Council would want to have the ability to manage the scale and intensity of the activity, for example limiting freight facilities to transportation of goods via air, as opposed to land based freight activities. A standard such as this would ensure that freight facilities were ancillary to the airport and not part of

Provision - Appendix 1 of s42A report	Change Recommended by Mr Kyle	My position (support or oppose)	Reason for position
	<p>vehicles, valet activities, and public transport facilities. Includes Military Training Operations. Also includes grazing and the keeping of livestock for land management purposes</p>		servicing State Highway 6.
<p>Consequential changes to Chapter 27 (Subdivision) and Chapter 36 (Noise) (right of reply versions)</p>	<p>Rule 27.5.6 All urban subdivision activities, unless otherwise state, within the following zones:</p> <p>9. Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone – <u>Queenstown</u></p> <p>Rule 27.5.10</p> <p>All subdivision activities in the Rural General and Gibbston Character Zones and <u>Airport Zone – Wanaka</u> , with the exception of unit title, strata title or cross leas subdivision undertaken in Accordance with Rule 27.5.5.</p> <p>Rule 36.5.3 Zone sound received in: Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone</p>		<p>I agree with Mr Kyle's recommended consequential changes to subdivision and noise chapter rules to include Wanaka Airport and do not consider these to be substantive.</p>