

Appendix B - A copy of the Appellant's submission;

Submission on the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan 2015 (Stage 1)

Pursuant to Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Queenstown Lakes District Council

Address: Sent via email to: services@qldc.govt.nz

Name of submitter: Andrew Fairfax

About the submitter: Andrew Fairfax owns land on the northern side of Malaghan Road, and regularly flies helicopters and fixed wing aircraft. He has a particular interest in the rules relating to the informal airports.

Trade Competition: The submitter cannot gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

Submission and decisions sought: The proposed district plan provisions this submission relates to, and the decisions sought, are as set out in the attached table.

Hearings: The submitter wishes to be heard in support of this submission.

Address for Service: Andrew Fairfax
C/- John Edmonds + Associates Ltd
Email: reception@jea.co.nz
Phone: 03 450 0009

Date: 23rd October 2015

Submission point	Plan Provision	Relief sought (amended wording sought shown in <u>underline</u> strikeout)	Reasons
1	All provisions	Alternative, amended, or such other relief deemed more consistent with or better able to give effect to these submissions or the provisions referred to by these submissions.	
2	Chapter 21	Objective 21.2.10 Support the objective and policies that enable the use of land and water for occasional / infrequent for the take-off and landing of aircraft	The submitter agrees that a flexible regime should be established to enable infrequent and occasional landing and take-off of aircraft without the need for consents.
3	Chapter 21	Add new Objectives and Policies that enable assessment of proposals that exceed the occasional/ infrequent limitations	The Proposed Plan is currently silent on how applications to exceed Standards 21.5.26.1 and 21.5.26.2 will be assessed and considered.
4	Chapter 21 Table 6 Standard 21.5.26.1	Amend: Increase the daily limit to one flight per day.	<p>The submitter considers that a more flexible regime is necessary to enable the infrequent use of land for the teak-off and landing of aircraft.</p> <p>The actual level of ownership of private aircraft is comparatively low, and the effects of a single flight per day would have minimal adverse effects.</p> <p>A limitation of 3 flights per week will be difficult to monitor and likely to be an inefficient method.</p>
5	Chapter 21 Table 6 Standard 21.5.26.2	Delete: Remove the 500m separation	A 500m separation from any road or house would severely limit the prospect of any site being used, as a result the proposed separation rule nullifies the overall enabling intent.
6	Chapter 36 Table 1 - Noise Rule 36.5.13 –	Amend rule so that the noise limits are measured as Lmax, not Ldn. Also amend rule so that non-compliance is a discretionary activity, not a non-complying activity.	More appropriate means of measurement.

Submission point	Plan Provision	Relief sought (amended wording sought shown in <u>underline</u> strikeout)	Reasons
	noise from helicopters		

Submission on the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan 2015 (Stage 1)

Pursuant to Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Queenstown Lakes District Council

Address: Sent via email to: services@qldc.govt.nz

Name of submitter: I and P Macauley

About the submitter: Ian and Philippa Maculey own farmland on the northern side of Malaghan Road. Part of the farm has been used as a fixed wing grass strip for many generations and continues to be used.

The Macauley strip is located on an elevated terrace, such that wider noise effects on the wider environment are minimised.

The airstrip is one of the few remaining in the Wakatipu basin and it is an important from an aviation safety perspective to ensure that a light aircraft alternative landing strip is available.

Trade Competition: The submitter cannot gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

Submission and decisions sought: The proposed district plan provisions this submission relates to, and the decisions sought, are as set out in the attached table.

Hearings: The submitter wishes to be heard in support of this submission.

Address for Service: I and P McAuley
C/- John Edmonds + Associates Ltd
Email: reception@jea.co.nz
Phone: 03 450 0009

Date: 23rd October 2015

Submission point	Plan Provision	Relief sought (amended wording sought shown in <u>underline</u> strikeout)	Reasons
1	All provisions	Alternative, amended, or such other relief deemed more consistent with or better able to give effect to these submissions or the provisions referred to by these submissions.	
2	Chapter 21	Objective 21.2.10 Support the objective and policies that enable the use of land and water for occasional / infrequent for the take-off and landing of aircraft.	The submitter agrees that a flexible regime should be established to enable infrequent and occasional landing and take-off of aircraft without the need for consents
3	Chapter 21	Add new Objectives and Policies that enable assessment of proposals that exceed the occasional/ infrequent limitations.	The Proposed Plan is currently silent on how applications to exceed Standards 21.5.26.1 and 21.5.26.2 will be assessed and considered.
4	Chapter 21 Table 6 Standard 21.5.26.1	Amend: Increase the daily limit to one flight per day.	The submitter considers that a more flexible regime is necessary to enable the infrequent use of land for the take-off and landing of aircraft. The actual level of ownership of private aircraft is comparatively low, and the effects of a single flight per day would have minimal adverse effects. A limitation of 3 flights per week will be difficult to monitor and likely to be an inefficient method.
5	Chapter 21 Table 6 Standard 21.5.26.2	Delete: Delete the 500m separation.	A 500m separation from any road or house would severely limit the prospect of any site being used, as a result the proposed separation rule nullifies the overall enabling intent.
6	Chapter 36 Table 1 - Noise Rule 36.5.13 –	Amend rule so that the noise limits are measured as L _{max} , not L _{dn} . Also amend rule so that non-compliance is a discretionary activity, not a non-complying activity.	The changes provide for a more appropriate means of measurement. It is reasonable that exceedances are considered on a discretionary basis as in many instances they will be appropriate.

Submission point	Plan Provision	Relief sought (amended wording sought shown in <u>underline</u> strikeout)	Reasons
	noise from helicopters		