



## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

**IN THE MATTER OF** the hearing of Proposed Plan Change 26 to the Queenstown Lakes District Plan.

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF** the hearing of Notices of Requirement by Queenstown Lakes District Council to alter Designation 64 (Aerodrome purposes) and Designation 65 (Airport approach and land use controls) for the Wanaka Airport,

Held in Wanaka, 13<sup>th</sup> –15<sup>th</sup> June 2011

### **REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HEARING PANEL ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 26, AND THE NOTICES OF REQUIREMENT FOR DESIGNATIONS 64 & 65 IN THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PLAN**

**BY**

**HEARING COMMISSIONERS: Dr S. G. CHILES, and  
Mr R. W. BATTY (Chair).**

#### **APPEARANCES:**

**Queenstown Lakes District Council (Wanaka Airport)** - Ms A. Noble, environmental planner; **Councillor L. Overton**, Chair, Wanaka Airport Management Committee; **Mr I. Munroe**, General Manager of 'Airbiz' aviation consultants; **Mr D. Park**, aviation consultant; **Mr S. Peakall**, acoustic consultant.

Mr J. Ashford, transportation consultant was unable to attend the hearing due to disruption caused by the Christchurch earthquakes at the time. His written evidence was considered solely by Commissioner Batty for the procedural reason set out below.

#### **Submitters:**

**Mr S. Spencer-Bower** – Chair, Wanaka Airport Users Group; **Mr J. Beatie** and **Mr A. King** – on behalf of Wanaka Chamber of Commerce; **Mr A. Heath** – on behalf of A. & N. Heath; **Mr N. T. McDonald** a land development consultant – on behalf of Ms J. Umbers; **Ms F. Taylor**; **Ms B. J. Tree**, Counsel, and **Mr E. Morgan**, Infrastructure Manager, - on behalf of Air New Zealand Limited; **Mr P. J. Page**, Counsel, together with **Mr J. Bell**, **Mr D. Hoskin**, aviation consultant, and **Mr J. Brown**, a resource management planner, - on behalf of J. & M. Bell and Jeremy Bell Investments Limited.

**Section 42a Reporting officers:** Ms A. Robertson, a resource management planner, and Dr M. Read, QLDC's senior landscape architect.

## **Executive summary**

### **Background to the proposals**

1. Wanaka Airport was established at its current location in 1983. Since then it has expanded its operations to their current level which caters for some 17,500 aircraft movements and over 19,700 scheduled and non-scheduled passengers per year. In 2002, an 'Outline Master Plan' was developed for the Airport, including a projected 'Air Noise Boundary' and 'outer control boundary based on modelling undertaken in 1995 forecasting anticipated aircraft noise effects to 2010. That modelling is the basis for the noise boundaries currently included in the District Plan. The Master Plan was then further updated in 2008 by Peak Projects International Limited and in 2010 revised forecasts of potential future aircraft movements to 2036 were called for, being provided by aviation consultants 'Airbiz' Aviation Strategies Limited.
2. Revised projected aircraft noise contours ('the contours') were produced based upon the 2010 forecasts for 2036. They were called for in the light of the potential for future 'reverse sensitivity' conflicts to arise between aircraft operations and the expansion of noise sensitive activities into the 'Rural General' zoned areas surrounding the Airport. They are also intended to provide the basis to enable the Airport to plan for its medium to long term growth with some confidence that it has adequate land area and flight protection provisions in the District Plan to enable it to do so. Proposed Plan Change 26 ('PC26') provides for these updated forecasts and contours.

### **Notices of Requirement and Proposed Plan Change 26**

3. The revised contours include a 65 dB Ldn 'Air Noise Boundary' ('ANB') and a 55 dB Ldn 'Outer Control Boundary' (OCB'), produced in accordance with guidelines set out in NZS 6805:1992 "Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning". These proposed boundaries are to be shown in the District Plan on Planning Map 18a. In addition, the proposed change also introduces a new 'Night Noise Boundary' ('NNB') based upon a sound exposure level of 95 dB.
4. Alterations are also proposed by Notices of Requirement (NoRs) to the two existing Designations (64 & 65) relating to Wanaka Airport in the District Plan. Designation 64 (Aerodrome Purposes) currently specifies the range of activities provided for or restricted on the Aerodrome, including a specific provision preventing its use by scheduled passenger services during the hours of darkness unless a lighting plan is prepared and noise contours reassessed. Noise

controls are also specified in general accordance with NZS 6805 to minimise adverse environmental effects from aircraft noise on the surrounding rural area. Designation 64 also currently provides for a future 197m extension to the main runway ('11-29') in a north westerly direction so as to permit a maximum runway length of 1,397 and a total runway strip length of 1,157m including 60m Runway End Safety Areas ('RESA') at each end.

5. Designation 65 sets out Airport Approach and Land Use controls including Obstacle Limitation Surfaces ('OLS') which restrict the construction or placement of any object or planting that would intrude into these surfaces and potentially cause hazards to aircraft approaching or departing from the Aerodrome.
6. Other limitations on the Airport's operations during hours of darkness (particularly during winter) occur due to the absence of runway and surrounding terrain lighting. Wanaka Aerodrome is also currently 'non-certified' under Civil Aviation Rules and this precludes the operation of scheduled passenger flights for aircraft with seating capacity over 30 persons. Improvements to these circumstances are envisaged over the next twenty years and once those have been provided, passenger arrivals are forecast by the 2008 Airport Master Plan to grow to between 72,800 (low) and 155,000 (high) passenger movements at 2036.
7. In PC26, QLDC seeks to amend objectives, policies, rules and other methods in the District Plan dealing with the management of growth at the Airport while also managing reverse sensitivity effects on surrounding land uses within rural areas predicted to be affected by airport noise. Within the ANB, the OCB and the new NNB contours, Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise ('ASAN') are to be prohibited. An exception is made for buildings on existing consented building platforms, and visitor accommodation within the Windermere Zone, which could be built subject to sound insulation (and mechanical ventilation) requirements. Definitions of terms used in connection with noise mitigation measure are also to be clarified.
8. The NoR for Designation 64 seeks that it be amended to:
  - include the additional (approximate) 96ha of land now owned by the Airport within the boundary of the Airport;
  - enable a further extension of the main runway length to 1,700m plus a 50m starter extension, and a width of 150m;
  - the formation of runway end safety areas 240m long by 90m wide at both ends of the main runway;
  - provide for a new alternative runway 1,700m long and 30m wide contained within a strip 2,300m long by 150m wide north of and parallel to the existing runway;
  - to amend the provisions relating to aircraft operations during hours of darkness; and
  - to include noise control provisions for aircraft engine testing, and noise monitoring obligations for the airport.

9. The NoR for Designation 65 seeks to amend the provisions for Airport approach and land use controls for both the existing and future alternative runways so as to provide for new takeoff climb and approach surfaces together with amended transitional surfaces. Any object (building, structure, mast, pole or tree) penetrating these surfaces are to be subject to approval by the requiring authority. Amended horizontal and conical surfaces are proposed and any object penetrating these will not be permitted authority, except where the object is determined to be shielded by an existing immovable object (e.g. intervening terrain) in accordance with recognised aeronautical practice or prior approval of the requiring authority has been obtained.
10. Lapsing periods of 20 years are sought in order to give effect to both Designations 64 & 65 as modified.

**Forecast airport growth, extended airport noise contours and potential night-time operations**

11. Although largely within the current OCB as shown in the District planning Map 18a, the validity of and extent of the 2036 forecast passenger movements and revised noise contours together with the methods used to derive and monitor the accuracy of those forecasts over that time frame was questioned by some submitters and witnesses who gave evidence at the hearing.
12. The majority of the airport noise criteria and controls proposed by the QLDC have been assessed as recommended by NZS 6805. However, while that Standard mentions the need for specific consideration of night-time operations in some cases, it does not provide a recommended method for doing so. Although the methodology used to forecast the potential future passenger growth and aircraft movements up to 2036 was explained in some depth by the Airbiz witness Mr Munroe, we were unconvinced as to the likely (small) number of night flights that might be entailed, particularly given Councillor Overton's evidence that the progressive future development of Wanaka airport was to be focussed very much on domestic aircraft movements rather than international air traffic. However, no direct evidence of likely commercial demand/take up of such late flight arrival times (either domestic or international) was presented by the QLDC and the only airline operator to present evidence (Air New Zealand) indicated that it doubted that there was currently any indication nationally of a demand for late-night domestic flights.
13. Turning to consideration of the OCB, we note that the proposed planning restrictions and prohibitions within that area are duplicated in the ANB which is within the OCB. In this particular instance therefore we conclude that in those circumstances there would be no useful purpose to be served by defining a separate ANB. For the reasons set out more fully below we have concluded that the duplication of the controls in the ANB cannot be supported and should be deleted. Given the lack of any substantial evidence before us on the scale and timing of any

night flights (i.e. after 10pm and before 7am) neither did we consider that there was any reasonable necessity to provide for the planning restrictions and prohibitions within a NNB (also within the OCB) in order to enable this airport to cater for its overall forecast growth potential.

14. Subject to the deletion of the above provisions we are otherwise satisfied that it is appropriate to include the revised OCB contour in the District Plan in line with current forecast of air passenger growth at the Airport to 2036. We therefore recommend that the objectives, policies and rules in PC26 be incorporated in the District Plan, subject to their modification deleting all reference to extended hours of operation to enable night operations, together with the removal of the proposed NNB and ANB as set out in Appendix A.
15. As was the case in Queenstown, we consider the introduction of night-flights (post 10pm) at Wanaka Airport would represent a significant 'threshold' in the on-going growth of the Airport, particularly as it relates to the introduction of noise effects on adjoining and surrounding rural areas and potentially upon Wanaka township itself albeit that those would be well beyond the forecast OCB and NNB. We accept that the Airport should not be restricted as to its reasonable future development as a significant regional infrastructure resource. However the presence or absence of an as yet unquantifiable number of night flights does not on the evidence presented to us appear to prejudice that 'growth' outcome. While any such additional 'growth' would necessarily require further change to the Designation (and the District Plan), that significant environmental threshold would by then need to be shown to be justifiable.

#### **Notice of Requirement and noise mitigation measures**

- 16 For the reasons stated above, while we do not accept the necessity for an ANB or NNB in this particular instance, we accept that it is prudent for the QLDC to safeguard the potential to cater for future airport growth and to 'prohibit' new activities sensitive to aircraft noise (ASAN) within the OCB (except for activities located on a building platform approved before 20 October 2010, or located within the Windermere Rural Visitor Zone). For extensions or alterations to buildings within the OCB we consider that the insulation requirements should be consistent with Queenstown Airport (PC35), rather than the requirements proposed in PC26 which are amalgamated with night-time noise mitigation.

#### **Obstacle Limitation Surfaces**

- 17 Coupled with the forecast growth are the necessary amendments to the obstacle limitation surfaces relating to the extended main runway and/or the new parallel main runway. The 'extension' of these surfaces result in restriction of the height of structures or planting on adjoining property that might penetrate them. Such potential penetrations would normally require the approval of the

requiring authority and consideration by the Civil Aviation Authority ('CAA').

- 18 The alteration to Designation 65 does have a major impact by removing an existing provision that allows structures within the OLS up to 10.7 m high. No evidence was provided to explain why there was a 10.7 m height allowance, but both aviation experts at the hearing, Mr Park and Mr Hoskin, confirmed that it is not consistent with CAA rules. We accept that the removal of the 10.7 m height allowance within the OLS is appropriate. However, structures within the OLS could still be built if they are either shielded by terrain, or by agreement with requiring authority and the CAA.
- 19 The Wanaka Airport Management Committee ('WAMC') and their experts have worked with J&M Bell and Jeremy Bell Investments Ltd and provided a terrain shielding drawing showing where structures could be built on this land without approval by the requiring authority. Both parties accepted the technical details of the terrain shield for this land. The submitters proposed that this figure should be included within Designation 65. We have considered whether a terrain shielding diagram should be produced for all land within the OLS and included in the District Plan. Ms Noble was concerned that the expense of providing such a diagram would be not be warranted given that much of the land affected would be unlikely to be developed. However, we conclude that where a terrain shielding assessment is likely to be an issue for any specific site in future, such investigations should be at the expense of the requiring authority. In the meantime we recommend that the general penetration map as depicted on Sheet 3 (of 3) on drawing number 8/8934, submitted by Ms Noble at the hearing, be included in the District Plan to serve as a general guide as to where such issues may occur.

### **Engine testing**

- 20 For the control of unplanned engine testing noise the s42A Report suggested adopting the same provisions from Queenstown Airport. This type of testing occurs infrequently and often less than once a year at Queenstown, and would normally be required following emergency maintenance when a scheduled flight has a bird strike or other issue on approach or landing. Based on the lesser flight numbers, it seems likely that at Wanaka such unplanned tests would only occur once every few years on average. The provisions for unplanned engine testing at Queenstown do not set a noise limit but require minimisation of the noise and reporting of reasons for the test and measures taken to control noise to the Airport Liaison Committee. We consider that method would provide a practical and effective control for these sporadic infrequent temporary events that could be managed by a new Wanaka Airport Liaison Committee ('WALC') without the need for a separate engine testing noise management plan. We consider that planned engine testing should be subject to the general noise limits in the District Plan.

- 21 Currently, Designation 64 excludes aircraft using the airport in preparation for and participation in air shows from compliance with the noise contours. We accept the rationale for this exemption in the context of the biennial Wanaka Air Show, but as currently written, this provides a potential loophole for aircraft to 'prepare' months in advance of the air show. Ms Noble agreed and suggested restricting this to 5 days prior to an air show and 3 days afterwards. We accept this as an appropriate restriction. Mr Peakall also suggested that the air show be the subject of a separate noise management plan. It is unclear to us what noise mitigation would be practicable for this event. However we accept that the most effective means of dealing with any such issue would be via effective communication with the community prior to the event and that this already occurs. Overall therefore we do not consider that it appropriate to require a separate noise management plan for this purpose.

### **Consultative committee**

- 22 Mr Spencer-Bower described how the Wanaka Airport Users Group ('WAUG') promotes flight paths avoiding built-up areas near the airport has also become the body that investigates and addresses complaints. Only one noise complaint has been received by the WAUG to date. As part of Designation 64, we recommend that in order to manage the effects of the planned growth at the airport, a Wanaka Airport Liaison Committee ('WALC') should be established and that it should comprise an independent chair appointed by the airport operator and representatives of the: airport operator, Lakes Environmental Ltd, WAUG, commercial airlines, Airways Corporation and Wanaka Community Board. This committee would then become the key interface for addressing any community complaints or other issues that may arise from future growth of the Airport. The committee should meet at least twice a year to consider progress on or issues arising from the Wanaka Airport Management Plan ('WAMP'), regardless of whether any complaints as such are received.

### **Designation lapsing period**

- 23 Air New Zealand submitted that the lapse period for the designations should be reduced from the 20 year period now sought to 10 years, so as to provide more certainty for surrounding landowners as to whether controls affecting their property were justified. Legal submissions directed us to a decision of the Environment Court on a highway designation, which had been reduced from 20 years to 10 years. We note that the designation was for construction of a single project whereas the WAMP sets out staged development over the period to 2036. Airport growth rate forecasts do not support faster development, and the progressive investment in new facilities might not occur without certainty of a 20 year timeframe in which they might be achieved. We therefore accept the 20 year lapse period as sought.

## **The Hearing**

### **1.0 Procedural matters**

- 1.1 No formal procedural matters were raised during the hearing. However, as a matter of record we note that prior to the commencement of the hearing, Commissioner Chiles observed that NZ Transport Agency ('NZTA') had made a submission partly in support of the NoR for Designation 64. As Dr Chiles is currently advising the NZTA on a number of completely separate matters elsewhere in New Zealand, we agreed that he should step aside from any consideration of the matters raised by that submission. Only the written evidence from Mr Ashford (on behalf of the Airport) referred to the issues raised by the NZTA. In the event, during the hearing I was provided with an email from Mr Ian McCabe of the NZTA confirming that the agency was satisfied with the intention to pursue a 'Memorandum of Understanding' between the Requiring Authority and NZTA as to responsibilities for improving traffic access from SH6 to and from the Airport and surrounding properties.
- 1.2 We consider that our deliberations on these matters are to be carried out in accordance with the provisions of section 74 of the Act with regard to PC26, and section 168A (rather than s171 as referred to in the s42A report) with regard to the Notices of Requirement for Designations 64 and 65.
- 1.3 Air New Zealand submitted that under s168A the Panel should make a decision on the Notices of Requirement rather than a recommendation. We note s34A(2)(c) of the Act prevents the local authority delegating certain powers, and we have proceeded on the basis that we are to make a recommendation on the Notices of Requirement.

### **2.0 Summary of the hearing**

- 2.1 The hearing took place over three days with submissions and evidence being presented by five technical witnesses on behalf of Wanaka Airport (Mr Ashford's written transportation evidence being considered in his unavoidable absence). Some seven submitters either appeared in person, and/or were represented by technical witnesses including counsel. An independent assessment report pursuant to s42A of the Act was presented by Ms Annemarie Robertson, a consultant planner, with input from Dr Marion Reid, QLDC's senior landscape architect.

### **Queenstown Lakes District Council (Wanaka Airport)**

- 2.2 Ms Noble presented initial general evidence outlining the purposes and contents of PC26 and the two Designations (64 & 65), concluding that both the amended designations and the plan change procedures were necessary and appropriate in this case to enable Wanaka Airport ('the Airport') to protect future airport operations and safeguard the wellbeing of the community.
- 2.3 Councillor Overton (QLDC) presented evidence on behalf of the Wanaka Airport Management Committee ('WAMC'), of which he is the Chairperson. He confirmed that although owned by QLDC, Wanaka Airport currently remains the responsibility of WAMC with day-to-day management being undertaken by Queenstown Airport Corporation ('QAC'). In 2002 an outline Master Plan for the Airport was produced and addressed three issues:
- Allocation of sites for parachute operations and other commercial/private tenancies;
  - Key planning issues to facilitate scheduled air services to the airport;
  - Preparation of an initial plan in sufficient detail to secure funding for a full master plan and feasibility study.
- The 2002 plan was reviewed in 2008 to include the addition of further land purchased by the Airport and to take account of the potential implications of the scheduled service that had by then commenced. In addition additional survey and runway planning work was anticipated.
- 2.4 WAMC envisages that in the medium to long term, the Airport will need to expand its services to cater for larger aircraft. However it was accepted that there is little likelihood of the Airport attracting international flights in the next 20 years and so WAMC has resolved to provide for domestic operations only. Nevertheless, the airport is currently experiencing increasing development pressures and the review of anticipated growth (produced by 'Airbiz') forecasts anticipated growth in annual movements to reach between 72,800 and 150,000 passengers by 2036. WAMC considers that it therefore faces potential constraints on Airport operations due to conflicting surrounding land uses. In Cr. Overton's opinion it is therefore sensible to be proactive and establish appropriate protection to enable future growth of activities at the Airport before such external surrounding developments constrain this significant element of local and regional transport infrastructure.
- 2.5 While Wanaka airport does not currently have a formal statement of its objectives and policies, Cr. Overton referred to statements in the Master Plan as reflecting something similar. These are:-
- "To operate a safe and reliable airport facility based on sound business principles that services and promotes the range of aviation operations including scheduled air transport services for the economic and social wellbeing of Wanaka and surrounding districts."*
- and:-

- 1) *To provide a gateway to Wanaka Ward and surrounding districts and provide a complementary facility to Queenstown airport for the Southern Lakes area.*
- 2) *To maintain and improve land and facilities to meet the needs of all airport users in accordance with sound business principles based on forecast demand.*
- 3) *To promote the maintenance and development of scheduled air transport services to meet the travel requirements of business, residents, visitors and tourists.*

2.6 WAMC considers that it is appropriate to provide for both an extension to the existing runway and a potential re-location of the runway to the north in order to cater for potentially significant increases in aircraft movements. Similarly, Cr Overton stated that WAMC supported increasing the present strip width to enable heavier certified take-off weights for aircraft and for scheduled operations at night.

2.7 Mr Munroe is a Director of 'Airbiz', and provided input to the Airport's 2008 Master Plan and the subsequent 'high level' review of that plan in 2010, followed closely by production of revised movement forecasts up to 2036. His evidence was focussed primarily upon the methodology that Airbiz had employed to produce the range of forecast passenger and aircraft movements now adopted by WAMC. Base levels of passenger and aircraft movements (as at 2009) comprise 11,300 scheduled passengers, 1,000 charter passengers and an estimated 7,400 'flight-seeing' passengers. In his opinion, the need for long-term planning of airport facilities has been shown world-wide to be essential to support the strategic development of the cities and regions they serve as transportation hubs. Such planning needs to be done carefully to ensure operational and environmental compatibility with adjacent land uses so that they do not compromise the long term requirements of the Airport.

2.8 As part of that planning process Mr Munroe advocated regular reviews of airport master plans so as to take account of changing operational requirements of new (and usually larger) aircraft types. He also advised that it was imperative in his view for the WAMC and QAC to be able to exercise as much control as possible over the uses able to be made of the Airport's land, especially those areas immediately adjacent to and within the vicinity of the runways.

2.9 The methodology used for forecasting purposes was 'demand' led rather than 'supply' led, meaning that it was focussed upon assessment of potential passenger demand rather than aircraft movements. The three segments considered were:-

- scheduled passengers,
- charter passengers, and
- 'flight-seeing' passengers.

Inputs considered in the preparation of passenger forecasts for each of the above were:-

- Historical trends for passenger movements at Wanaka airport;

- Queenstown Lakes District and Wanaka population projections;
- Treasury GDP forecasts;
- Ministry of Tourism's regional forecasts for Wanaka;
- Long-term average growth rates for domestic aviation in New Zealand
- The original (2009) Master Plan passenger and aircraft movement forecasts
- Queenstown Airport Master Plan domestic passenger forecasts.

A further consideration was whether there is or may be scope for Queenstown and Wanaka Airports to be managed as an integrated airport system so as to optimise where services, routes and infrastructure investments might be best placed.

### **Scheduled passenger forecasts**

- 2.10 Mr Munroe stated that there are no reliable records of the numbers of scheduled passenger movements (arrivals and departures) at the airport, Air New Zealand's services having initially commenced in 2004. Records of scheduled aircraft landings (around 390 over the period 2007 to 2009) are available however and an estimate of average loading was applied to these, suggesting 8,800 in 2007 rising to 11,300 in 2009 – an average growth rate of 13% per annum. That rate can be compared with the average annual NZ domestic aviation growth rate of 3.5% to 4.5% and Queenstown airport's rate of 5.5% over the past 10 years.
- 2.11 Statistics NZ's forecast median population growth of the Queenstown Lakes District for the period 2006 to 2031 is 2.2% per annum. GDP forecast growth rates were considered to be short run reflecting short-term volatility in the economy, but a return to a growth rate of around 3.1% by 2013. Similarly, tourism visitor growth rates forecast by the Ministry of Tourism for Lake Wanaka RTO to 2015 are just 1% (0.3% domestic visitors and 2.1% for international visitors). Mr Munroe considered these figures to suggest an overall domestic growth rate of 4% per annum. This may be compared with the forecast domestic growth rate for Queenstown Airport of:
- 5.4% p.a. to 2013; then
  - 4.3% to 2025; then
  - 3.3% to 2037.
- The growth rates for Wanaka airport to 2036 previously forecast in the 2008 WAMP review were very high and "...*significantly over-optimistic..*". In Mr Munroe's opinion those would be unsustainable and were inappropriate or guiding either investment decisions by the airport authority or as the basis for aircraft noise controls.
- 2.12 Airbiz therefore compared the ratio of scheduled passenger movements at Wanaka airport per 1,000 resident population with that of other regional airports throughout New Zealand. The median ratio obtained from that analysis was then applied to the median forecast population for Wanaka in three time intervals to 2036 (derived from statistics New Zealand) to produce forecasts of

scheduled domestic passenger growth rates. The resultant figures were;

- 2010 - 2016 10.0%
- 2017 - 2026 7.5%
- 2027 – 2036 5.0%

Mr Munroe considered these growth rates to be realistic for Wanaka resulting in annual forecasts of scheduled domestic passengers as follows:-

- 2009 (estimated) 11,300;
- 2016 22,000;
- 2026 45,700;
- 2036 74,000.

### **Charter passenger forecasts**

2.13 Mr Munroe explained that similar methodology to that above was used to forecast charter passenger numbers (through seats and load factors) to produce a range of estimates for the period 2007 to 2009 and then 2016, 2026 and 2036 as follows:-

- 2009 (estimated) 1,100;
- 2016 5,100;
- 2026 6,800;
- 2036 9,200.

### **Flight-seeing passenger forecasts**

2.14 Again using a similar analytical approach to that adopted for the above forecasts, historical aircraft movement records by known aircraft types were examined and annual growth rates slightly lower than those observed at Queenstown Airport were adopted. Applying the aircraft and load types experienced at Wanaka the following median annual passenger estimates were produced:-

- 2009 (estimated) 7,400;
- 2016 10,420;
- 2026 17,790;
- 2036 26,330;

2.15 From all of the above, the median **total domestic passenger movement** forecasts by Airbiz for Wanaka Airport to 2036 are as follows:-

- 2009 (estimated) 19,800;
- 2016 37,500;
- 2026 70,300;
- 2036 109,900;

2.16 The forecasts were then applied by Airbiz to derive annual aircraft movements. In addition to those aircraft used for various types of passenger movements, general aviation ('GA'), 'other GA' and helicopter movements were also assessed. The 'other GA' category includes pilot training, skydiving and general recreational flying. From those various assessments, **total aircraft movements** were forecast by Airbiz to be:-

- 2009 (actual) 17,487;
- 2016 22,900;
- 2026 31,300;
- 2036 37,500;

- 2.17 The above forecasts were then utilised by Marshall Day Acoustics ('MDA' – Mr Peakall's evidence) as the inputs for noise contour modelling. The WAMP also includes a potential for the possibility of jet aircraft and operations during the hours of darkness, either on a scheduled or charter basis. A small number of those night-time movements (10% each) allowed for both GA and domestic scheduled operations. Flight tracks were also provided by Airbiz to MDA based upon information derived from standard arrival and departure tracks set out by Airways New Zealand in their Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP) – the rule book for flight operations in the vicinity of an airport.

**Obstacle limitation surfaces**

- 2.18 Mr Park's evidence related in particular to the NoR which seeks to alter Designation 65 as it relates to the runway development plans and Obstacle Limitation Surfaces ('OLS') for Wanaka Airport developed on his advice, together with the potential effects of these proposals on the property rights of various submitters in the surrounding rural areas. Wanaka Airport is currently 'non-certified' under Civil Aviation Rules and this restricts regular air transport operation of scheduled passenger flights for aircraft with seating capacity over 30 persons to less than four arrivals or departures in any consecutive 28 day period. For the purposes of specifying runway design standards, aircraft are classified by the International Civil Aviation Organisation 'Annex 14 – Aerodromes'. Currently the main runway at Wanaka airport enables the operation of Code 2B aircraft, and under restricted conditions Code 3C aircraft. The NoR would enable the operation of aircraft up to Code 4C jets used on domestic routes in New Zealand.
- 2.19 The main runway currently has no ground-based navigational facilities or runway and terrain lighting that would enable all weather day/night operations. In Mr Park's opinion, that runway would also need to be extended significantly (1,750m total sealed length is proposed, or in the alternative, a parallel 1,700m runway) together with a 240m RESA at each runway end in order to enable the operation of larger turboprop or jet aircraft used on domestic routes in NZ. These proposals are contained entirely within Airport owned land.
- 2.20 In addition to consideration of runway length, Mr Park also drew our attention to the requirement for a runway 'strip' clear area extends beyond the end of the runway for a minimum of 60m together with between 75 or 150m on each side of the runway centreline. This is to provide a basic safety area in the event aircraft depart the runway while landing or take-off. To accommodate the existing runway with the proposed 550m northwest extension the strip length requires to be increased to 1,820m, plus an additional 240m RESA at each end of the runway – a total overall length of 2,300 at 150m wide. A similar provision is required for the alternative replacement runway.

- 2.22 New OLS would be required for either of the above alternatives. Mr Park recommended adopting a 2% upslope and 15,000m length for the take-off and approach OLS, and a common inner edge length so as to enable a combined approach for both existing and proposed runways in the designation. The proposed northwest runway OLS is approximately 11m lower than that of the existing runway, resulting in a penetration of that proposed OLS by a low ridge together with a plantation of trees in a similar location. In addition a consented building platform (the Umbers property) is also located in this vicinity and would enable the penetration of the OLS by approximately 8.6m. Any penetration of the take-off and approach surfaces and transitional surfaces is now to be required to obtain the approval of the requiring authority.
- 2.23 Turning to discuss potential penetration of the horizontal and conical surfaces, Mr Park referred to the potential for 'terrain-shielding' to provide circumstances under which such penetrations might be accepted by the airport authority. That methodology had been studied in relation to the submissions by J. & M. Bell and Jeremy Bell Investments Limited and a map of such 'shielded' areas produced. No agreement between the parties had yet been reached on that particular matter or the application of that 'mitigation' technique to surrounding areas affected by the OLS.
- 2.24 Commenting upon issues concerning future flight paths and noise raised by submitters, Mr Park considered that those now proposed for Designation 64 were little different from those currently enabled by the operative District Plan, other than aircraft on normal approach profiles being slightly lower (approximately 18m) on approach to runway 11. In his opinion, Mr Park considered that any future noise issues would best be managed by a local airport liaison committee.
- Projected noise contours**
- 2.25 Mr Peakall explained the application of the information on predicted aircraft and passenger movements to produce revised noise contours using the 'Integrated Noise Model' ('INM') developed by the US Federal Aviation Authority, in accordance with the approach recommended by *NZS 6805:1992 Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning*. That information is contained in the Marshall Day Technical Report appended (Appendix G) to PC26.
- 2.26 The current District Plan contains an Outer Control Boundary ('OCB') defined by a 55 dB Ldn (+10 dB night-weighted) noise contour, within which is located an Air Noise Boundary ('ANB') defined by a 65 dB Ldn noise contour, both of which were developed in 1995 using data that forecast Airport growth to 2010.
- 2.27 The updated OCB and ANB contours utilise the data forecast for Airport growth to 2036. In addition a further Night-time Noise Boundary ('NNB') contour has also been projected. The District Plan currently does not permit operations at the airport during the

'hours of darkness'. That is different from the term 'night-time' as used in NZS 6805, being between 10pm and 7am. The updated noise contours allow for some 43 helicopter movements per day with the resultant 'heli-noise' assessed according to NZS 6807 *Noise management and land use planning for helicopter landing areas*. Such noise is recommended by Mr Peakall to be combined with fixed wing aircraft noise to form the proposed OCB using just NZS 6805. Accordingly, he recommended that the existing OCB in the District Plan be replaced with the predicted combined 55 dB Ldn contour for fixed wing and helicopter operations. Similarly, he recommended that the predicted 2036 65 dB Ldn contour ANB replace that currently is shown in the District Plan.

2.27 Mr Peakall considered that a NNB of 95 dB SEL (sound exposure level) should also be provided for. However, while NZS 6805 recommends that noise from such operations should be taken into account it does not prescribe a specific noise criteria for such activity beyond which sleep disturbance would become more likely. He had also carried out an overall assessment of the likely change in noise environment predicted to 2036 at the four closest existing dwellings and five other locations (including the two consented building platforms) without the proposed runway extension. These ranged from +5 to +7 dB. He further contrasted those projections with the noise levels currently 'permitted' by the District Plan and observed changes ranging between -4 to +2 dB. Given that such changes were likely to occur gradually over the intervening years to 2036, Mr Peakall concluded that such effects would not be discernable.

2.28 However, when a similar assessment was carried out with allowance for the runway extension to the north, enabling domestic jet aircraft to operate he concluded that the noise effects of a single movement would be a significant increase for residents and would be perceived as more than twice as loud as existing noise levels from turboprop aircraft. He noted about 10% of the population experience sleep disturbance at the 95 dB SEL level. Consequently he recommended that new noise sensitive activities should be prohibited within the proposed NNB. For the two consented building platforms he considered these to be likely to be unacceptable and recommended that further noise mitigation measures would be required in those locations (such as alternative ventilation systems) in order to reduce internal noise from the effects of night-time operations.

#### **Airport noise management**

2.29 Mr Peakall recommended that noise effects from aircraft operations be managed by the Airport so as to achieve the following:-

- That noise levels from any aircraft operations do not exceed 65 dB Ldn outside the proposed ANB and 55 dB Ldn outside the OCB;
- That within the first 6 months of PC26 being adopted a calculation of Aircraft Noise contours is carried out using the

INM and records of actual aircraft activity at the Airport, and is thereafter repeated at 2 yearly intervals;

- That noise monitoring should be undertaken by the Airport Authority to verify that its noise levels are not exceeding the requirements set out above;
- That any aircraft proposing to operate during night-time hours shall be certified in advance to have an SEL 95 dB contour that does not exceed the NNB;
- That any Airshow activities be explicitly excluded from compliance with the above requirements, but that an Airshow Noise Management Plan be prepared in advance to enable noise management of the Airshow to be undertaken as far as may be practicable to achieve reasonable compliance with the objectives of the District Plan.

### **Engine testing**

2.30 Aircraft engines are required to be tested following planned and unplanned maintenance, prior to returning to service. Resultant noise cannot be accommodated within standard District Plan limits or allowed for in noise contour projections. At some airports in New Zealand engine noise is limited to a Leq level, averaged over 15 hours for day time testing and 9 hours for night-time activity. The levels recommended by Mr Peakall for Wanaka Airport are:

- That between the hours of 7am and 10pm noise generated by engine testing shall not exceed 55 dB LAeq(15 hours); and
- That any essential unscheduled engine testing shall be limited to no more than 18 occasions per year with resultant noise levels from such limited to:
  - 55 dB LAeq(9 hours); and
  - 80 dB LAF max.

### **Traffic Movements**

2.31 In his absence, Mr Ashford's evidence was taken as read. It focussed upon the potential for transport effects on the surrounding road network arising from the forecast increase in passengers using the Airport to 2036. The principal vehicular access to and from the Airport is via SH6 (a major arterial road in the District Plan) via a single uncontrolled T intersection vehicle crossing known as Lloyd Dunn Avenue, which currently complies with NZTA requirements and those of the District Plan.

2.32 In Mr Ashford's opinion, the Airport now has sufficient land to cater for all foreseeable parking and internal traffic movement needs associated with its proposed growth. In terms of the growth of traffic on the surrounding network stemming from predicted state highway and Airport growth, this had been analysed using the 'Signalised & un-signalised Intersection Design and Research Aid' ('SIDRA') model. That showed that the predicted increases in traffic volumes would result in a minor increase in delay and queue lengths, as well as a minor decrease in level of service on SH6, with right-turn movement into the site being the worst

affected, however the model confirmed that the current 'T' junction can continue to operate efficiently.

- 2.33 Additional growth in the locality ('Transport & Toy Museum', 'Have a shot' and others), anticipated that this location will become a hub for tourist activities. Multiple traffic access points for such activities along a short length of high-speed road are not desirable, particular for visitors not familiar with the area. The NZTA share this view and is concerned to provide for an integrated solution to rationalise access points along this stretch of road. Mr Ashford's evidence confirmed that to this end a Memorandum of Understanding ('MoU') was being drafted between the WAMC and NZTA in order to progress that outcome as part of the NoR process. A copy email from NZTA to Mr Ashford was submitted in confirmation of those arrangements. Ultimately agreement to any such outcome will also be required between NZTA and other property owners in this vicinity and that will be pursued separately from this NoR process.

### **Statutory planning requirements Plan Change 26**

- 2.34 This element of Ms Noble's evidence outlined her consideration of whether PC26 fulfilled the statutory requirements of s32, s74 and Part 2 of the Act. She had also assessed the NoRs against s171 of the Act, however as we have noted in our opening procedural remarks we believe that because these NoRs have been issued by the Local Authority itself, our consideration must be under s168A(3) of the Act.
- 2.35 Ms Noble reiterated the conclusions reached by other expert witnesses who had been called to present evidences on behalf of the Airport. From these she concluded that PC26 and the NoR's were reasonably necessary to enable the efficient and sustainable management and operation of the Airport together with the effects of such operations on the surrounding environment. She therefore concluded them to be consistent with the purpose of the Act (s5). There are no 'Matters of National Importance' (s6) relevant in this case, nor were any identified by local Iwi as being of relevance to the consideration of the Treaty of Waitangi (s8).
- 2.36 In considering the effects of these proposals on amenity and the quality of the environment (s7), she referred to the concerns expressed in the landscape assessment carried out by Dr Reid as part of the s42A report. In her opinion however, the land in the vicinity of the airport was characterised by a corridor of tourism related facilities developing alongside the state highway and including not only the Airport buildings themselves but also the Transport and Toy Museum, and Have a Shot. Resource consent has recently been granted for an entertainment park and proposals for an aviation park adjacent to the airport are also under consideration. In that context she concluded that the existing landscape had the capacity to absorb the visual, environmental and amenity effects of Designation 64.

- 2.37 There are no 'National Policy Statements' or 'Regional Plans' that are of relevance to these considerations, however those in both the Regional Policy Statement ('RPS') and the District Plan were considered by Ms Noble. Chapter 5, objective 5.4.1 of the RPS promotes the sustainable management of the region's land resource so as to meet foreseeable needs of the community. PC26 is in her view consistent with that objective. Chapter 9 contains several objectives and policies relative to the region's Built Environment and regional infrastructure as well as protection of the environment and amenity values in relation to the sustainable management of those. PC26 was again considered by Ms Noble to be consistent with these statements.
- 2.38 Chapter 4 of the District Plan deals with District Wide issues and of particular relevance to this case is Objective 3 which provides for '*avoiding, remedying, or mitigating effects of activities on rural amenity*'. The Airport has existed in this rural zone since 1983 and in Ms Noble's opinion the measures proposed by PC26 will not preclude rural activities on the surrounding rural area but will ensure that adverse noise effects are avoided or mitigated. Chapter 14 of the Plan (Transportation) seeks to protect and maximise the cost-effectiveness of existing transport infrastructure and ensure that the District's airports are managed as valuable long-term community assets.
- 2.39 PC26 contains additional and or amended objectives, policies and implementation methods in District Plan Sections 4 (District Wide Issues), 5 (Rural Areas), 12 (Rural Visitor zone), and 14 (Transportation). Overall, Ms Noble considered these to be appropriate to provide for the on-going capability of Wanaka airport and the objectives of the District Plan which are concerned with the operation of the Airport. Further, she considered that the proposed policies and methods will also assist to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on the environment and will better manage/prevent issues such as reverse sensitivity that could otherwise arise from increasing aircraft operations over time.

**Notice of Requirement to alter Designation 64**

- 2.40 Assessing the NoR to alter Designation 64, Ms Noble identified the relevant objectives of the requiring authority (as expressed in the Airport Master Plan) to be:
- To provide for expansion to accommodate projected growth;
  - To maintain operating capacity;
  - To recognise and protect the on-going capability of the Airport to host the bi-annual 'Warbirds Over Wanaka' Airshow;
  - To provide a visitor 'gateway' to Wanaka and surrounding districts;
  - To provide a complementary facility to Queenstown Airport;
  - To maintain and improve airport land based facilities on sound business principles so as to meet forecast demand;

- To promote the maintenance and development of scheduled air transport services to meet transport requirements of business, residents, visitors and tourists.

In the light of the above, Ms Noble concluded that the proposed amendments to Designation 64 were 'reasonably necessary' for achieving these objectives. She rejected landscape opinions expressed by Dr Read in the s42A report that further buildings to the northeast of the existing (or alternative) main runway should not be permitted, as being unnecessarily restrictive of the Airport's ability to cater for its future operational and business needs.

#### **Notice of Requirement to alter Designation 65**

2.41 The key objective for the alteration of Designation 65 is to protect obstacle limitation surfaces so as to provide for an extended and/or future parallel runway. Other objectives of the Requiring Authority were stated by Ms Noble to be:

- To maintain and enhance the capacity of the Airport to cater for domestic aircraft services;
- To act as an alternative for certain aircraft types unable to land at Queenstown Airport due to adverse weather conditions;
- To enable the sustainable use of the Airport to accommodate growth in general aviation activities;
- To meet international aviation standards and CAA rules in relation to the protection of flight paths;
- To provide the community with certainty as to height limits applicable to all properties affected by Airport operations.

In the light of the above, Ms Noble also concluded that the proposed amendments to Designation 65 were 'reasonably necessary' to safeguard land and implement land use controls now so as to be in a position to respond to growth demands on the Airport as they occur to achieve the above objectives.

#### **Assessment of alternatives (s32 RMA)**

2.42 Ms Noble outlined the 'alternatives' that had been considered by the Airport Authority pursuant to the requirements of s32 of the Act. These were:-

1. Take no action. This would result in the current designations and District Plan provisions remaining in place. It would not take account of revised (lower) passenger forecasts revised noise contours or revised obstacle limitation surfaces.
2. Up-date planning maps in the District Plan to show revised ANB and OCB and introduce the new Night Noise Boundary. No further amendments to the Plan were contemplated. *(Commissioners comment: It is not clear to us what district Plan rules, if any, would then be applied to the NNB)*
3. Include revised noise boundaries and provisions for land use controls in a new Designation for Wanaka airport in the District Plan. Effectively this would replace existing District Plan based rules with new ones entirely under the control of the airport as the Requiring Authority.
4. Amend the District Plan maps with the new noise contours, revise the District Plan Provisions and alter the Aerodrome

and OLS Designations. The 'cost' of this option is that prohibitions will be imposed on ASAN's within the OCB. QLDC will be required to finance the monitoring of noise associated with the operation of Wanaka Airport.

5. Move the Airport. This would involve a significant loss of investment in the Airport and its associated buildings and infrastructure, assuming that an alternative location could be identified and agreed upon, which appears highly unlikely given the terrain constraints in the surrounding district.

From all of the above Ms Noble concluded that option 4 was the only one that practically meets the likely requirements of the Airport and Wanaka community. Overall she was satisfied that PC26 and the proposed amendments to Designations 64 & 65 accord with the provisions of s32 of the Act.

### **Submissions**

- 2.43 Mr Spencer Bower spoke to his submission in support (acceptance) of PC26 and that the amendments to Designations 64 & 65 should be confirmed. He is currently Chair of the Wanaka Airport Users Group. He indicated that in his view Wanaka currently hosts the most advanced / busiest helicopter training school in New Zealand and that both as a Wanaka ratepayer and occupier of land at the Airport he considered its future growth to be a special opportunity which should be supported and 'owned' by the local Wanaka community, rather than as an off-shoot of Queenstown Airport Corporation. He endorsed the need to make provision for the growth of future general aviation ('GA') activity together with associated maintenance needs.
- 2.44 The submission by the Wanaka Chamber of Commerce ('the Chamber') was presented by Mr John Beattie. The Chamber considered the Airport to be a key determinant and pivotal community owned asset for the future robust growth of Wanaka and the surrounding basins of the Upper Clutha including Cromwell, the Upper Waitaki and the Wakatipu Basin. In its view, the Airport needed to be "...*future-proofed now.*" rather than waiting until surrounding land uses effectively constrained such potential. Mr Beattie considered that insufficient thought had been given in the Wanaka Airport Management Plan to the desirability of Wanaka Airport becoming the principal destination (as a multi-seasonal alpine resort) for international night-flights by Code 4C aircraft, when Queenstown airport was unable to do so. In that regard he also considered that greater attention should be given to a more cohesive plan for the operation of the Region's two airports. The Chamber considered that the growth forecasts by Airbiz were flawed because they underestimated the total number and composition of visitor guest nights to Wanaka, especially those for international visitors.
- 2.45 Mr Heath spoke to the submission by his wife and himself opposing all of the proposed changes, unless these were modified to reflect their joint concerns. These focussed upon a number of matters. Firstly, in relation to property access, he questioned whether the

Airport / MoU process was appropriate (in that it did not currently involve other adjacent landowners). He considered that there could also be significant impact on sensitive landscape views from potential development / new buildings on the Airport. Their submission questioned the 'credibility' of the airport growth forecasts used as the basis for the proposed imposition of building constraints on surrounding landowners and expressed concerns / doubts about the desirability of providing potential for the diversion of aircraft to Wanaka from Queenstown Airport. In conclusion he expressed some support for the future growth of Wanaka Airport if this were to be focussed on it becoming a 'regional turboprop airport'.

- 2.46 Mr McDonald presented evidence in support of the submission by Ms J. Umbers opposing both PC26 and the NoR for Designation 65 (Airport approach and land use controls). Ms Umbers' concern is in relation to the effect of the proposed OLS and land use controls on the approved building platform on her property near the Airport, being Lot 1 DP 25276, all of that land being within the OCB. That 'platform' was created subject to a covenant to the benefit of QLDC and following consultations with the Wanaka Airport Management Committee. The proposed changes would now have the effect that any change in location of that platform (required by the modified OLS) or the erection of a house thereon (an ASAN) would be likely to become a 'prohibited activities'. At this point it was indicated by the Airport witnesses that there had been no intention to apply such controls to previously approved building platforms. A revised wording of the relevant rule (5.3.3.5.ii) to that effect was subsequently handed to the hearing panel by Ms Noble on behalf of the WAMC.
- 2.47 Ms Taylor's submission on PC26 expressed general support for the Airport to have what she called 'a land bank' to allow for its future development, however she questioned the scale and extent of the land use controls proposed as a consequence of the 2036 forecast growth. In her view any growth should be planned over shorter periods to allow the wider Wanaka community to determine the 'character' of airport operations taking place. She expressed concern that any growth at the Airport should not lead to Wanaka growing "...to be another Queenstown".
- 2.48 Legal submissions on behalf of Air New Zealand ('ANZ') were presented by Ms Tree. ANZ largely supported the general principles underlying PC26 and the attendant amendments to Designations 64 & 65, but considered that the forecast growth figures were unrealistic and lacked a sufficient degree of confidence to justify specific Airport land needs and the resultant extent of land use and noise controls stemming from those aircraft type and movement forecasts. ANZ submitted that the NoR should therefore be withdrawn to submit what it called "...an appropriate and robust assessment of future aircraft movements and infrastructure that is reasonably necessary for Wanaka Airport." (our emphasis). Ms Tree contended that QLDC had failed to show that was the case here.

- 2.49 Ms Tree's legal submissions also drew our attention to the Act's requirements that in this case the NoR was to be considered and determined pursuant to s168A of the Act rather than s171 as stated in the s42A report and we accept that to be correct. She also contended that the hearing Panel should make the decision on the NoR in this instance. Ms Tree also submitted that the lapse period of 20 years sought by the Airport to give effect to Designation 64 was too long and that it should be reduced to 10 years.
- 2.50 Mr Morgan appeared as a witness in support of the Airline's submissions. He outlined ANZ's current operations and its perception of the future role of Wanaka Airport. ANZ currently provides scheduled flights to and from Wanaka by a 19 seat Beech 1900 aircraft operated by its subsidiary Eagle Airways. The total number of round trip seats on a weekly basis is 342, with an annual passenger seat total of 17,784. In his words this service is currently "...economically challenged..." and ANZ has no plans to expand it. However should load factors reach adequate levels (circa 80%) additional frequency would be added using similar Beech aircraft for the foreseeable future.
- 2.51 Looking to the future Mr Morgan considered that passenger movement demand per annum in 2036 (based upon Eagle airways current passenger volumes) would be of the order of 40,000. He contrasted this with the Airbiz passenger movement forecast for scheduled domestic aircraft flights of between 106,550 (high) and 46,900 (low). He noted that one submitter had called for the Airport to plan for the potential of international flights into Wanaka, but contrasted that with the QLDC's recent investment of between \$40-50 million at Queenstown Airport to accommodate its forecast future growth. Referring to the potential for Wanaka to cater for diverted aircraft from Queenstown, he noted that the recent installation of multi-lateration equipment at that airport had dramatically reduced the number of diversions from an average of about 35 per year to 7 over the last 12 months. In his opinion there is no (or very little) demand in the domestic aviation market for aircraft operations beyond 10.00pm.
- 2.52 ANZ had only become aware of QLDC's intentions for Wanaka Airport when PC26 and the NoRs were publicly notified. In addition to its concerns noted above, ANZ also considers that the 20 year lapse period sought for Designation 64 introduced further uncertainty as to whether and / or when such future developments at the Airport might occur. Overall ANZ considered the rates of growth forecast by Airbiz are ambitious and not reasonably foreseeable in the absence of a broader economic analysis being provided, noting that the previous 2006 WAMP forecast passenger and jet aircraft movements had themselves already been substantially revised downward. In Mr Morgan's opinion the long term view for Wanaka Airport should not be

finalised until a comprehensive aviation development plan for the whole region has been developed.

- 2.53 Legal submissions on behalf of J. & M. Bell and Jeremy Bell Investments Ltd ('JBIL') were presented by Mr Page. JBIL owns Criffel Station which fronts SH6 to the southeast end of the Airport's main runway. It has land affected by PC26 together with the proposed NoR for Designation 65, the OCB, and the NNB air-noise contours. All of the land concerned is zoned Rural General in the District Plan. The JBIL submission contends that Designation 65 and the associated PC 26 have the potential to blight the utilisation of significant areas of Criffel Station unnecessarily.
- 2.54 JBIL does not oppose PC26 as far as it relates to the Airport's own land. However, Mr Page submitted that in arriving at its own Master Plan as the basis for PC26, the Airport had not given thought to land use relationships beyond its boundaries, or the resource issues associated with effects of Airport activities on those properties. In particular, he contended that little or no thought had been given to the necessity for land adjoining the airport to either be maintained in a 'green-field state' or alternatively to be utilised for complementary or compatible Airport related activities. In his opinion, District Plan Objectives in relation to such matters need to be clarified as part of the PC26 process. JBIL accepts that activities sensitive to aircraft noise will not be appropriate on its land within the OCB and NNB.
- 2.55 JBIL also supports the aim of the Airport to protect the surrounding airspace in order to serve civil aviation requirements. There are however issues arising from some parts of the topography of Criffel Station breaching the OLS to the southeast of the main runway. Lengthy discussions had been held between JBIL and WAMC's consultants in an attempt to resolve these issues without needing to seek the WAMC's express permission on every occasion that JBIL intended to erect a structure of any kind within these areas. JBIL propose that a 'Terrain Shield' provision be incorporated into Designation 65, enabling structures to be constructed in locations that were effectively shielded from OLS penetration by intervening terrain. WAMC had commissioned survey work to be undertaken to indicate what areas of the JBIL land might benefit from the adoption of this approach.
- 2.56 Mr Bell presented evidence as a Director of JBIL. He confirmed that within the 1885ha of land that comprise Criffel Station, the majority is hilly terrain. However, the northern most part of the property consists of about 14.5ha of land at the corner of Mt Barker Road and SH6 opposite the Airport. The 'Have a Shot' business is located in that area on land leased from JBIL. Mr Bell considers that the flat area of land next to the road is of no significance to the rest of the property in terms of farm production. In his view, the Airport faces major growth constraints for airport related support facilities on its south west side. He is critical of PC26 and Designation 65 in that they do not identify other land outside the Airport that might well be suited to such purposes and

considers that the terrace land on his property is well suited to providing support for Airport related activities.

- 2.57 Mr Hoskin's evidence addressed the merits of the proposed changes to Designation 65 with specific reference to the Airport approach and OLS's. In his assessment of those both existing and now proposed, he noted significant existing penetrations on the south west side of the Airport where Mr Bell's property is located. He concluded that current and future planned aircraft operations were most likely to take place on the northeast side of the Airport. He had therefore recommended that the Designation be amended to permit structures up to 30m in height in those parts of the inner horizontal and conical OLS's located on the south west side of the Airport. In discussing that proposal with Mr Park, he indicated that they had both subsequently agreed that the adoption of a terrain shielding approach consistent with CAA requirements would be preferable in this instance.
- 2.58 Mr Brown's evidence provided an assessment of the PC26 and the proposed OCB and NNB as these impacted upon JBIL's land which is zoned 'Rural General' in the District Plan. Residential and visitor accommodation activities are enabled as 'discretionary activities' in this zone and he contended that there was therefore legitimate expectation that consent for such activities could at least be applied for. PC26 proposes that such activities within the OCB or NNB should now become 'prohibited activities', foreclosing the opportunities for consent to those to be sought on the JBIL land within those areas.
- 2.59 Mr Brown had prepared suggested amendments to address the above concerns and had then evaluated these against the requirements of s32 of the Act. In his opinion, the existing 'Objective 7 – Buffer Land for Airports' together with its attendant policies and methods were all currently inadequate in that they do not recognise opportunities for land uses in such areas other than 'green-fields'. While accepting that PC26 goes some way towards remedying this, he remained critical of the lack of identification in PC26 of specific locations for appropriate land uses compatible with and supportive of airport activities. In this regard, he cited the 14.5ha of JBIL land as being one such example of what he considered needed to be encouraged by further amendments to policy statements and methods in PC26.

#### **Section 42A Officer's report and responses**

- 2.60 Dr Read responded to the criticisms raised by Ms Noble and other submitters who rejected her recommendations in the s42A report that 'protection' was required of the view-shaft across the northeast side of the main runway (in the form of a 'no-build' rule). She referred to a number of recent decisions (e.g. 'Project Pure' and 'Roberts') agreeing with her concerns that this area represents a 'visual amenity landscape' worthy of protection. She considered that if further Airport related buildings eventually became necessary, they could be provided for off airport land, to the northwest.

- 2.61 Ms Robertson's report was taken as read and she confirmed that she adopted Dr Read's landscape recommendations. Having heard the views presented at the hearing she maintained her recommendations that the provisions for an NNB and engine testing should be removed from the NoR / PC26 and further that there should be no allowance for 'night-time' flights. In that context she also considered that further thought might be given to the necessity for flights during the hours of darkness (i.e. before 10.00pm) due to potential adverse effects on rural amenity values.
- 2.62 Ms Robertson considered that all land potentially affected by the OLS should be the subject of a 'Terrain-shield' provision in Designation 65 and PC26 indicating which land would be specifically affected. She rejected Mr Brown's contention that specific policies and land areas be identified beyond Airport land in order to enable consents to be sought for 'airport related/compatible' activities. In all other respects, Ms Robertson maintained her recommendations as previously circulated before the hearing.

**Applicant's 'right of reply'**

- 2.63 Ms Noble drew attention to the fact that the majority of submissions on these proposals were in support of the growth of the Wanaka Airport. She observed that while Mr Munroe had provided a comprehensive breakdown of the methods and data by which the Airbiz forecasts had been produced, the evidence provided by Mr Morgan simply addressed ANZ's aircraft movements. In addition the concerns about the interests of neighbours expressed by Ms Tree appeared to go beyond the matters raised in ANZ's original submission in Ms Noble's view. She further noted that no evidence in relation to International flights had been presented by any submitters and that to the contrary, Cr Overton had confirmed the WAMC's intention that future growth would be domestically based. She indicated that these proposals were not (and could not be) concerned with the provision for potential future land use activities beyond the airport. She indicated that the WAMC was prepared to accept the Terrain Shielding map covering Mr Bell's property as satisfying the requirements of Designation 65 without further approvals needed, but considered that it would be problematical to produce similar information for inclusion in the District Plan for all other properties potentially affected by the proposed OLS. In relation to the Umbers property she produced revised wording for rule (5.3.3.5.ii) which addressed some of these concerns and indicated that on-going discussions were proceeding with that submitter to avoid any further difficulties for her.

### **3.0 Assessment - Resource Management Issues**

- 3.1 We have discussed matters raised by submitters under the Issues used in the Planner's Report.

#### **Issue 1 – Growth**

- 3.2 As discussed above, Mr Munroe presented detailed evidence showing how the forecast flights up to 2036 had been estimated. This included separate predictions of domestic passengers on scheduled flights, charter flights, flightseeing, helicopters and other general aviation. In the absence of any alternative detailed evidence before us to the contrary, and although we note Mr Morgan's views on scheduled flights, we consider that Mr Munroe's forecasting methodology represents a reasonable basis for long-term planning of Wanaka Airport, and demonstrates a reasonable necessity need to plan for future growth at Wanaka Airport.
- 3.3 The predominant growth in scheduled passenger services up to 2036 would be from turboprop aircraft, with the possibility of a small number of domestic jet aircraft movements towards the end of that period.
- 3.4 Given the need for growth at Wanaka Airport, we also consider that Mr Munroe's predictions provide an appropriate basis for determining noise boundaries and consequential land-use controls around the airport.
- 3.5 Mr Morgan noted that for long-term predictions Air New Zealand typically assumes growth consistent with GDP, on which basis he estimated 40,000 passenger movements ('20,000 round trip passengers') at Wanaka Airport in 2036. This is below Mr Munroe's 'low' forecast of 46,800 passenger movements, but considering the possibility of other scheduled operators as well as Air New Zealand, then we view those forecasts as generally being within the same range.
- 3.6 The predictions for Wanaka Airport by Mr Munroe and Mr Morgan did not account for the proximity of Queenstown Airport. Mr Munroe contended that despite the relatively short distance, the characteristics of the road between Queenstown and Wanaka made it a significant barrier, and therefore growth at Wanaka should not be restrained by Queenstown Airport. Mr Morgan considered that there was likely to be an effect and a sophisticated forecasting program should be used to model this before the plan change and designations proceed. We accept that more refined modelling may show a reduction in the forecast scheduled flights at Wanaka Airport, but on the basis of Mr Munroe's evidence it would be unlikely to affect the overall programme for growth at this Airport. We do not consider that further modelling is therefore required for this plan change and designations to proceed.

- 3.7 Councillor Overton stated that general aviation is to remain an important component of operations at Wanaka Airport. As increasing general aviation movements are included as an integral part of the forecast flights up to 2036, we recommend rejecting the submission that general aviation will be displaced by scheduled services.
- 3.8 Neither Mr Munroe nor Councillor Overton considered that allowance should be made for international flights in this period to 2036. The Wanaka Chamber of Commerce and Mr Jaquiere submitted that an allowance for international flights should be made in terms of a longer and wider runway to accommodate aircraft such as the Boeing 737-800 without payload restrictions. As no evidence was provided showing any likely demand for international flights we recommend rejecting these submissions seeking allowance be made for a longer runway.
- 3.9 Witnesses for the QLDC/WAMC provided no evidence supporting the need for night flights after 2200h. Ms Noble noted that now Queenstown Airport has accepted a 2200h curfew there was no need for a nearby alternate airport. Mr Munroe suggested that allowing flights up to around 2200h is desirable, but did not provide any evidence supporting flights after 2200h. We discuss this further under Issue 3 below.
- 3.10 Air New Zealand submitted that the lapse period for the designations should be reduced from the 20 years sought to 10 years, which would provide more certainty over the proposed development. Legal submissions for Air New Zealand directed us to a state highway designation, which had been reduced from 20 years sought to 10 years by the Environment Court. However, we note that the designation was for a road that would be constructed as a single project. In the case of Wanaka Airport, the management plan sets out staged development over the period to 2036. The forecast flights would not support faster development, and the progressive investment in new facilities might not occur without certainty of the 20 year timeframe sought. We therefore accept the 20 year lapse period as sought.
- 3.11 Rising Star Ltd submitted that the proposed objectives and policies relating to Wanaka Airport provide a mandate for future growth irrespective of potential impacts on surrounding land. We consider that the proposed objectives and policies enable growth that is consistent with the reasonably foreseeable need we have discussed above, and the potential environmental impacts that have been assessed as part of this process. Such growth will be bounded by the projected 2036 noise contours and any increase to those contours would itself require a plan change through which further impacts would then need to be considered.

## **Issue 2 – Increased noise**

- 3.12 The only expert acoustics evidence presented to us was from Mr Peakall on behalf of QLDC/WAMC. He described modelling undertaken using the INM software to predict noise levels around the airport based on the aircraft types, numbers and flight paths determined by Mr Munroe.
- 3.13 On the evidence of Mr Peakall we recommend accepting the general methodology followed from NZS 6805. We accept the extent and location of the new Outer Control Boundary (OCB) resulting from the noise modelling in accordance with that standard. For reasons we will discuss under Issue 4, we consider that the Air Noise Boundary (ANB) proposed is for all practical purposes redundant in this instance and therefore recommend that it be deleted. Also, for the reasons set out under Issue 3 we do not accept the need for night flights and therefore recommend that the Night-time Noise Boundary (NNB) also be deleted.
- 3.14 If the boundaries are deleted, the proposed definitions for ANB and NNB are also no longer required. We recommend that the definition for 'Outer Control Boundary Wanaka' should be amended to be consistent with the definition for 'Outer Control Boundary Queenstown'. We note that the term 'Outer Control Boundary' and the acronym 'OCB' are used in rules for both Queenstown and Wanaka. However, we consider that the context used in rules is sufficient to avoid misinterpretation.
- 3.15 The noise contours predicted in 2036 have in places reduced in size from those already in the District Plan. While there have been increases in aircraft numbers and changes in flight paths, we understand that the main difference is the inclusion of terrain data in the current version of the modelling software. Flat ground had been assumed by previous modelling, but towards Luggate the ground drops away and the actual noise levels decrease, as shown by the updated modelling. Any future modelling can be undertaken using the current version of the INM or other software at that time, we recommend that the software version is not therefore specified by Designation 64.
- 3.16 On the basis of Mr Peakall's evidence, we recommend rejecting the submission that terrain effects have not been accounted for in the current modelling.
- 3.17 Mr Peakall explained how dedicated helicopter landing areas are subject to slightly different controls set out in NZS 6807. However, he showed the criteria from that standard to result in similar noise boundaries to those obtained considering all aircraft movements, including helicopters, using the general airport noise standard NZS 6805. We accept Mr Peakall's opinion that for practical monitoring and control the best option for Wanaka Airport is to apply NZS 6805 to all aircraft movements.
- 3.18 The noise contours include both possible future runway positions. We accept that this fractionally increases the size of the noise

contours, but we consider this appropriate given the staged development proposed in the WAMP.

- 3.19 A and U Staufenberg submitted that noise effects of aircraft are reducing worldwide. While we accept that there are continual developments in aircraft technology, the modelling to 2036 has been based on reasonably foreseeable estimates of the types of aircraft that may be operating during that period. We do not consider it reasonable to pre-empt or mandate the introduction of quieter global technology outside the control of the QLDC/WAMC.
- 3.20 Some submitters were concerned about noise effects beyond the OCB. We acknowledge that aircraft noise will be audible beyond the OCB and that there will be an adverse effect. However, we accept the evidence of Mr Peakall that beyond the OCB (55 dB Ldn) that effect would not be significant. Ms Noble described how a 50 dB Ldn contour had been investigated as an alternative to protect against such lesser effects, but that had been rejected due to the restrictions it would place on landowners over a significantly wider area.
- 3.21 In terms of adverse noise effects in the wider area, Mr Spencer-Bower described how the Wanaka Airport Users Group (WAUG) promotes flight paths avoiding built-up areas near the airport. Currently, the WAUG, which represents the creators of any aircraft noise issues, has also become the body that investigates and addresses complaints. Only one noise complaint has been received by the WAUG.
- 3.22 As part of Designation 64, we recommend that to manage the effects of the planned growth at the airport, a Wanaka Airport Liaison Committee ('WALC') should be established and that it should comprise an independent chair appointed by the airport operator and representatives of the: airport operator, Lakes Environmental Ltd, WAUG, commercial airlines, Airways Corporation and the Wanaka Community Board. This committee would then become the key interface for addressing any complaints or other issues that may arise from future growth of the Airport. The committee should meet at least twice a year, regardless of whether any complaints are received.
- 3.23 The ANB had been proposed as a trigger for noise monitoring required by Designation 64. As we have rejected the ANB as superfluous for land-use control purposes, we recommend triggering monitoring to take place at the OCB, which would have the same effect. Mr Peakall noted that the monitoring was often more practical when located close to the airport as it is subject to less contamination by other environmental sounds. We recommend that the actual monitoring position used should not be specified in Designation 64 so that the most appropriate position can be selected at the time of the monitoring. This may change for each survey.

- 3.24 The proposed changes to designation 64 are not consistent as to whether noise modelling should be conducted annually or biannually. We agree with Mr Peakall that for the scale of operations proposed biannual modelling would be appropriate.
- 3.25 The existing Designation 64 excludes aircraft using the airport in preparation for and participation in air shows from the noise contours. We accept the rationale for this exemption in the context of the biennial Wanaka Air Show, but as written this provides a potential loophole for aircraft 'preparing' months before the air show. When questioned, Ms Noble suggested restricting this to 5 days prior to an air show and 3 days afterwards. We accept this as an appropriate restriction.
- 3.26 Mr Peakall suggested the use of a noise management plan for the biennial air show. However, it is unclear to us what noise mitigation would be possible or whether any noise mitigation would be appropriate in the context of an air show. Mr Peakall confirmed that the main management measure would be effective communication with the community prior to the event. We accept that this is important, but understand that it does already occur, and do not consider that it appropriate to require a separate noise management plan for this purpose.
- 3.27 We note that the 2009 noise contours are in breach of the existing ANB in the District Plan. Therefore, if the plan change and Designation 64 do not proceed, the QLDC/WAMC would need to curtail existing operations. Current operations are also in breach of the restriction in the designation for scheduled commercial flights.

### **Issue 3 – Night flights**

- 3.28 As discussed in Issue 1, no evidence was provided supporting the introduction of night flights (between 10pm and 7am) and the witnesses for the QLDC/WAMC did not promote night flights at the hearing. Several written submissions raised noise from night flights as a particular concern. We therefore recommend that Designation 64 restricts the operation of Wanaka Airport to between 7am and 10pm, except as required for emergencies.
- 3.29 Ms Robertson noted that some submitters might not have appreciated the difference between flights in daylight as defined by the CAA and flights in daytime as defined by NZS 6805. The NZS 6805 'daytime' up to 10pm generally extends beyond the CAA daylight. There were no submissions on this issue, and the data presented for the airport noise contours is consistently based on the NZS 6805 definitions of day and night. We do not consider that a restriction to CAA daylight hours would be warranted.
- 3.30 For operations up to 10pm there would be airport lighting required in the evenings. This is already addressed by a condition in designation 64 requiring a lighting plan.
- 3.31 The NNB was proposed solely to address noise effects of night flights. As we have recommended rejecting night flights we

consequently recommend that the NNB be removed. Various submissions were made relating to the way in which the NNB had been defined and how it represents effects. We recommend accepting those submissions in part in that some effects beyond the NNB would have been expected from night flights.

- 3.32 In the NZS 6805 calculation method, night flights are penalised by 10 dB which increases the size of the OCB. By removing night flights the OCB could be redrawn. However, Mr Peakall stated that as there had only been a small percentage of movements predicted at night, their removal or rescheduling to daytime would have only a very minor effect. We therefore recommend retaining the OCB as proposed.
- 3.33 The NNB had been proposed on the basis of a Boeing B737-800, as the worst-case noisiest aircraft envisaged. There is only predicted to be a small number of jet aircraft movements by 2036. Of these only a small number might have been at night and then only some of those might potentially have been B737-800 movements. We also note that the proposed runway length of 1700 m is not sufficient for this aircraft type to operate in all weather conditions at full payload, making it less likely to be used at Wanaka. The equivalent night noise contour for a domestic Airbus A320, is significantly smaller such that it falls entirely within the OCB.
- 3.34 Although we do not recommend allowing night flights, the controls imposed now by the OCB for daytime flights will also retain a buffer suitable for some night operations such as a domestic Airbus A320, should a future alteration to the designation show them to be reasonably necessary. We reiterate that we do not consider that night flights have been shown to be reasonably necessary at this time, and this buffer provision only results as a side-effect of the provisions for day-time flights.

#### **Issue 4 – Effects/restrictions on land use activities**

- 3.35 The effects on land use activities can be clearly separated into those arising from Plan Change 26 and those arising from Designation 65.

##### Plan Change 26

- 3.36 NZS 6805 provides various methods for avoiding reverse sensitivity. For Wanaka Airport, the most stringent control has been proposed in that all 'Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise' ('ASAN') would be prohibited in the OCB. The only exception would be for houses on two existing consented building platforms and visitor accommodation in the Windermere Zone. In those cases new buildings would be subject to minimum sound insulation requirements.
- 3.37 We note that a definition of ASAN was added to the district plan by Plan Change 35 for Queenstown Airport, although that definition is subject to appeal. The definition now proposed for Wanaka Airport is similar to the definition resulting from Plan Change 35, but has confusing wording with an 'activity' defined

in part as various physical locations. We recommend that the same definition of ASAN should apply to both Queenstown and Wanaka Airports, and this should be based on Plan Change 35, with whatever modifications arise from the appeal. We therefore recommend that a new definition of ASAN should not be added as part of Plan Change 26.

- 3.38 Plan Change 26 also adds a definition of 'Critical Listening Environment' which is identical to a definition introduced by Plan Change 35. Again, we consider that the definition should be consistent for both Queenstown and Wanaka.
- 3.39 There were no submissions that ASAN should be allowed within the Wanaka OCB, and none of the affected landowners submitted objecting to the prohibition of ASAN. We accept the evidence of Mr Peakall that prohibition of ASAN is the only mechanism that avoids reverse sensitivity effects relating to outdoor living environments. We therefore recommend that ASAN should be prohibited in the OCB, other than on existing consented building platforms or in the Windermere Zone.
- 3.40 At other airports, the ANB is usually the boundary within which ASAN are prohibited. However, in this instance as ASAN are to be prohibited within the OCB, the ANB is superfluous. We note that the two existing consented building platforms and the Windermere Zone are outside the ANB, so again it would not serve any purpose in that respect. We recommend that the ANB be deleted.
- 3.41 Where ASAN are permitted in the OCB, Plan Change 26 introduces new sound insulation controls in proposed Appendix 14. It was not clear to us why these controls are more stringent than the equivalent controls at Queenstown Airport. Mr Peakall explained that the controls within the OCB at Wanaka had been increased so that they could be combined with the enhanced protection required in the NNB. As we recommend that the NNB be deleted, we also recommend that the sound insulation controls in the OCB be amended to be consistent with those at Queenstown Airport.
- 3.42 For both Queenstown and Wanaka airports we recommend that OCB sound insulation controls be consistent. Therefore we recommend that the proposed Appendix 14 be deleted and instead reference be made to Appendix 13, which was introduced by Plan Change 35. The heading to Appendix 13 should be changed to apply to Wanaka Airport as well as Queenstown Airport. The zone rules for sound insulation of ASAN in the Wanaka OCB should be reworded in line with the equivalent rules at Queenstown.
- 3.43 J&M Bell and Jeremy Bell Investments Ltd submitted that the land on the opposite side of State Highway 6 should be identified in new objectives and policies as suitable for development for airport related activities. No evidence was provided on the

suitability of this land for such use, other than comment on the proximity to the airport, Toy and Transport Museum and Windermere Zone. It was submitted that assessment of effects of any development would be subject to a future RMA process, but the current process should provide the appropriate policy framework. We accept that the location of the land may lend itself to airport related development. However, without any assessment of the effects we recommend that no pre-emptive policy framework encouraging such development should be provided by Plan Change 26.

- 3.44 J&M Bell and Jeremy Bell Investments Ltd also submitted that Objective 7 for Rural Areas could prejudice future RMA processes through the reference to a 'greenfields area'. We note that this is an existing provision. While the proposed amendments to the objective do mention other possible land-uses in airport buffer land, we accept that this could cause confusion. We recommend that Objective 7 be amended to simply promote the retention of a buffer area containing activities that are not sensitive to aircraft noise. This does not then prejudge consideration of whether any land use should be agriculture, industry or other activities not sensitive to aircraft noise.
- 3.45 As discussed above, we do not consider it appropriate to add policies which encourage plan changes for development in a particular area around the airport. Similarly, we do not consider it appropriate to add policies discouraging plan changes in the OCB. The proposed policies clearly state that ASAN should be prohibited in the OCB. Further policies discouraging plan changes that include ASAN in the OCB are simply repeating the same concept. We therefore recommend that the policies discouraging plan changes be deleted.
- 3.46 Air New Zealand submitted that the prohibition of ASAN should be extended to the Windermere Zone. Any development in this zone is likely to be related to the airport and we consider that the existing development rights should be maintained. We therefore recommend making allowance for ASAN subject to sound insulation (mechanical ventilation) controls.
- 3.47 J Umbers submitted that a drafting oversight in Plan Change 26 would prohibit the building of a dwelling on her existing consented building platform within the OCB. Ms Noble agreed that this was a drafting oversight. We recommend that the plan change be amended to allow building on existing consented building platforms in the OCB.
- 3.48 K Butson submitted that the plan change should not further restrict her land. With the removal of the NNB and the reduction in size of the OCB, her property which is partly affected by the existing OCB would now fall outside of all boundaries and would no longer face land use restrictions due to the airport. This land is also significantly below the OLS.

## **Designation 65**

- 3.49 The proposed amendment to the 'Obstacle Limitation Surfaces' ('OLS') only slightly increases the size of the existing OLS due to the repositioning of the runway. The take-off and approach surfaces are to be re-aligned with the runway to better accommodate future aircraft types. The physical extents of the OLS do not represent a major change to the existing designation.
- 3.50 The alteration to Designation 65 does have a major impact by removing an existing provision that allows structures within the OLS up to 10.7 m high. No evidence was provided to explain why there was a 10.7 m height allowance, but both aviation experts at the hearing, Mr Park and Mr Hoskin, confirmed that it is not consistent with CAA rules. We accept that the removal of the 10.7 m height allowance within the OLS is appropriate.
- 3.51 Structures within the OLS could still be built if they are either shielded by terrain, or by agreement with requiring authority and the CAA.
- 3.52 J&M Bell and Jeremy Bell Investments Ltd submitted that as their land penetrates the OLS they would require approval from QLDC/WAMC for any structures including fences. We understand that the WAMC and its experts have worked with these submitters and provided a terrain shielding drawing showing where structures could be built on this land without approval from the requiring authority. Both parties accepted the technical details of the terrain shield for this land. The submitters proposed that this figure should be included within Designation 65.
- 3.53 At the hearing we explored whether a terrain shielding diagram should be produced for all land within the OLS and included in the District Plan. We accept the view put forward by Ms Noble that the expense would be not be warranted given that much of the land would be unlikely to be developed. However, we consider that where a terrain shielding assessment is likely to be an issue for any specific site in future, such investigations should be at the expense of the requiring authority.
- 3.54 Designation 65 would allow for any landowners, who have a demonstrable terrain shield, to erect structures in the horizontal and conical surfaces in that shield without any further approvals from the requiring authority and CAA. We consider that this addresses the main concerns by J&M Bell and Jeremy Bell Investments Ltd.
- 3.55 J&M Bell and Jeremy Bell Investments Ltd also submitted that the flat terrace on the opposite side of State Highway 6 could be used for airport related developments such as hire car facilities, potentially in competition with facilities in the airport. This land is mainly below the transitional surface of the OLS, and there is still significant clearance allowing for construction of buildings and other structures without approval from the requiring authority. The

transitional surface strikes the top of the terrace behind this area, but the flat land remains below the surface. We do not consider that there are any issues of trade competition around the submitters seeking approvals in future, as there is sufficient clearance of this part of the submitters' land from the OLS.

- 3.56 J Umbers submitted that the 'prohibition' of structures within the take-off/approach and transitional surfaces of the OLS, would prevent her building on her existing consented platform. The unfortunate use of the word 'prohibited' in this context does not mean that an activity cannot occur in the same manner as the word 'prohibited' under the RMA. Ms Noble proposed alternative wording indicating that structures were allowed subject to approval by the requiring authority. We recommend that Designation 65 be amended to allow structures in the OLS subject to approval by the requiring authority. There are also CAA procedures required, which the requiring authority would oversee.
- 3.57 Like the noise contours, the OLS are slightly wider than necessary to accommodate both potential runway positions. Again, we consider this an appropriate approach, consistent with the WAMP.

#### **Issue 5 – Traffic**

- 3.58 This is focussed upon the potential for transport effects on the surrounding road network arising from the forecast increase in passengers using the Airport to 2036. The principal vehicular access to and from the Airport is via SH6 (a major arterial road in the District Plan) via a single uncontrolled T intersection vehicle crossing known as Lloyd Dunn Avenue, which currently complies with NZ Transport Agency requirements and those of the District Plan. In Mr Ashford's opinion, the Airport now has sufficient land to cater for all foreseeable parking and internal traffic movement needs associated with its proposed growth. In terms of the growth of traffic on the surrounding network stemming from predicted state highway and Airport growth, he predicted increases in traffic volumes would result in a minor increase in delay and queue lengths, as well as a minor decrease in level of service on SH6, with right-turn movement into the site being the most significant effect, however we accept his conclusion that the current 'T' intersection will continue to operate efficiently.
- 3.59 We understand that a 'Memorandum of Understanding' ('MoU') is being drafted between the Airport Authority and NZTA in order to progress on-going access improvements from properties fronting SH6 in this vicinity. Agreement to any such outcome will also be required between NZTA and other property owners in this vicinity and that will need to be pursued separately from this NoR process.

#### **Issue 6 – Rural amenity values**

- 3.60 The Albert Town Community Association submitted that flight paths should avoid Albert Town and the Clutha River. Part of its concern relates to night flights, and as previously discussed, we consider that a 10pm curfew is appropriate. With respect to daytime amenity, there will be an adverse effect resulting from

the intensification of activity at the Airport. As detailed under Issue 2, we accept that significant noise effects should be contained within the OCB, but we acknowledge that there is likely to be a change in amenity beyond that boundary. We heard from the Chamber of Commerce and the WAMC of the positive effects for the community resulting from Airport growth and increased flights. We consider that the gradual change in amenity over the wider area to 2036 would be balanced by gains for the wider community from such growth.

- 3.61 With respect to determining flight paths to avoid particular areas, we heard from Mr Park that this might not be practicable for larger scheduled aircraft. However, we consider that this is an issue that should be considered by the new WALC we have recommended, and we understand that this issue is being addressed for existing light aircraft movements by the WAUG.
- 3.62 Rising Star Ltd submitted that the reworded Objective 7 for the rural zone could be interpreted as promoting airport related activities in areas where they are not appropriate. This is to some extent the opposite argument to that raised by J&M Bell and Jeremy Bell Investments Ltd. As discussed above under Issue 4, we do not consider that it is appropriate for this plan change to pre-empt future development beyond the Airport's boundaries. We therefore recommend partly accepting the submission by Rising Star Ltd in that Objective 7 be amended to remain neutral on what type of future activities not sensitive to aircraft noise should be located in the OCB.
- 3.63 Dr Read for Lakes Environmental Ltd considers that the airport is in a Visual Amenity Landscape, and reference was made to important views from State Highway 6 across the airport. In the Planner's Report it was recommended that there should be no-build areas to ensure new buildings are developed in the existing cluster. At the hearing Dr Read accepted that for the proposed growth at the airport to occur it may be necessary to build on these areas, but it should be done with formal consideration of landscape issues.
- 3.64 Ms Noble noted a technicality that the security fence required for the airport could not be built if the no-build areas were imposed.
- 3.65 On the basis of the constraints detailed in the WAMP, to restrict building around the airport would prevent the predicted growth from occurring. Instead of no-build areas we recommend that designation 64 should set out the key landscape principles and require any new buildings, outside the existing cluster at the south west of the airport, to be subject to an outline plan of works, including a landscape assessment. On the basis of Dr Read's evidence we consider that the key principles are as far as practicable to:
- Utilise all space in the south west area before developing other parts of the airport,

- Maintain existing clear view-shafts from State Highway 6 towards the north,
- When developing the north side of the airport, buildings should be clustered together, and
- Buildings should comply with the QLDC Guide to Reducing Glare and Reflective Surfaces.

### **Issue 7 – Engine testing**

- 3.66 Mr Peakall proposed specific noise limits for engine testing, with more lenient limits for occasional unscheduled tests. The evidence presented did not demonstrate that helicopter and general aviation engine tests could not comply with the current noise limits in the District Plan. Justification was not provided for the proposed averaging of engine testing noise over the entire day. In particular, in his analysis Mr Peakall had applied the limits at a location where there is no dwelling, and had not included the screening effect of some of the airport buildings in the model. We recommend that Designation 64 should be altered so that all planned engine testing is subject to the standard District Plan noise limits for the protection of amenity in surrounding zones.
- 3.67 For the control of unplanned engine testing noise the Planner's Report suggests adopting the same provisions from Queenstown Airport. This testing occurs infrequently and often less than once a year at Queenstown. A test would normally be required following emergency maintenance when a scheduled flight has a bird strike or other issue on approach or landing. The aircraft would divert to an airport with permanent maintenance facilities if any issues arose earlier in the flight. Based on the lesser flight numbers, it seems likely that at Wanaka such unplanned tests would only occur once every few years on average.
- 3.68 The provisions for unplanned engine testing at Queenstown do not set a noise limit but require minimisation of the noise and reporting of reasons for the test and measures taken to control noise to the Airport Liaison Committee. We consider this provides a practical and effective control for these sporadic infrequent temporary events.
- 3.69 We recommend the same approach for unplanned engine testing at Queenstown Airport be adopted at Wanaka Airport. In Queenstown these details are included in the Noise Management Plan. There is not a Noise Management Plan for Wanaka, and we consider that effects of engine testing provisions could be managed by the new WALC without the need for a separate management plan.

### **Issue 8 – RMA Part 2 matters**

- 3.70 Many of the submissions on the issues discussed above related to considerations under section 5 of Part 2 of the Act. For the reasons we have given above, in general we consider that the proposals to allow for planned growth of Wanaka Airport do promote sustainable management of resources.

- 3.71 For the reasons given under Issue 3, we do not consider that allowing flights between the hours of 10pm and 7am at Wanaka Airport will achieve the principles and purpose of the RMA.
- 3.72 We are satisfied that there are no particular Matters of National Importance, neither are there issues of significance in relation to the Treaty of Waitangi in this case.
- 3.73 We have had regard to the other matters set out in section 7 of the Act and in particular sub-sections 7(b) the efficient use of natural and physical resources, 7(c) the protection and maintenance of the quality of the environment, and 7(f) the protection and maintenance of amenity values. Subject to the adoption of our recommended modifications to the wording of the provisions of PC26, together with Designations 64 and 65 we are satisfied that the requirements of the above elements of section 7 of the Act can be met.

**Issue 9 – Section 32 analysis**

- 3.74 Several submitters considered that the Section 32 analysis for Plan Change 26 was inadequate.
- 3.75 We consider that the Section 32 analysis and evidence presented at the hearing was adequate to determine the relative costs and benefits of the Plan Change. However, inadequate information was provided to determine the benefits of night flights.
- 3.76 The Planner's Report raised issues about the costs to build on J Umbers' consented platform resulting from the Plan Change. At the hearing it was established that there were no additional costs to building on this platform.

**Issue 10 – Alternatives**

- 3.77 J&M Bell and Jeremy Bell Investments Ltd submitted that alternative methods to the OLS provisions in designation 65 had not been considered. As discussed in Issue 4, a terrain shield for the submitters land has been provided and structures can be built within this area without any further process with respect to the OLS. As the submitter accepted the terrain shield, we do not consider that further consideration of alternatives is required. Likewise, the Planner's Report raises the issue of J Umbers' property which is addressed by the avoidance of the word 'prohibited' in the designation.

#### **4.0 Recommendations**

##### **Notice of Requirement – Designation 64**

- 4.1 For all of the foregoing reasons, we recommend that the Council amends its Notice of Requirement for Designation 64 to alter the wording to read as that indicated in the attached Appendix A, and amends Map 18a of the District Plan to show the updated outer boundary of the designation.

##### **Notice of Requirement – Designation 65**

- 4.2 For all of the foregoing reasons, we recommend that the Council amends its Notice of Requirement for Designation 65 to alter the wording to read as that indicated in the attached Appendix B, and makes consequential amendments to District Plan Maps Figures 3 and 4 to reflect those changes. Figures 3 and 4 should also be amended to show all potential terrain penetrations of the OLS as depicted on Sheet 3 (of 3) on drawing number 8/8934, as submitted by Ms Noble at the hearing, and text should be added to the figures referencing the designation number and section.

##### **Proposed Plan change 26**

- 4.3 For all of the foregoing reasons, we recommend that the Council adopt the provisions of Plan Change 26 to the Queenstown Lakes District Plan subject to the rewording as shown in the attached Appendix C.

##### **Submissions**

- 4.4 For all of the foregoing reasons we recommend that the Council alternatively accept, accept in part, or reject the submissions on Proposed Plan Change 26 as indicated in the attached Appendix D.



Hearing Commissioner Dr S. G. Chiles



Hearing Commissioner Mr R. W. Batty

Dated : 8<sup>th</sup> July 2011.

## APPENDIX A

### Recommended changes to conditions relating to Designation 64

The changes recommended are as follows. Additions are underlined. Deletions are struck through.

#### E WANAKA AIRPORT

The land area covered by the Aerodrome Purposes designation shall include the sites described below:

- Lot 2 DP 341605
- Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 DP 18824
- Lot 2 DP 368240
- Lot 1 DP 341605
- Lots 4 – 5 DP 340031
- Lot 6 DP 22636
- Lot 7 DP 22637
- Lots 2, 3, 4, 5 DP 23517
- Lots 10 and 11 DP 24410
- Lot 6 DP 24685
- Lots 1 and 2 DP 26239
- Section 1 Survey Office Plan 24776
- Legal Road
  
- ~~Lots 10 and 11 DP 24410~~
- ~~Lot 8 DP 22637~~
- ~~Lot 5 DP 23517~~
- ~~Lot 7 DP 22637~~
- ~~Lot 6 DP 22636~~
- ~~Lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 DP 18824~~
- ~~Lot 6 DP 24685~~
- ~~Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 DP 23517~~
- ~~Part Lot 1 DP 16921~~
- ~~Legal Road~~

#### E.1 AERODROME PURPOSES

This designation is defined to protect the operational capability of the airport, while at the same time minimising adverse environmental effects from aircraft noise.

##### Permitted Activities

The nature of the activities covered by this designation is described as follows:

- (a) aircraft operations, rotary wing aircraft operations, aircraft servicing, fuel storage and general aviation, navigational aids and lighting, aviation schools, facilities and activities associated with veteran, vintage and classic aircraft operations, aviation museums and aero recreation.
- (b) associated buildings and infrastructure, car parking, offices and cafeteria.
- (c) ~~a 197 metre extension of the main runway (11-29) in a north westerly direction to allow a maximum runway length of 1,397 m and a total runway strip length of 1,517 m with the 60 metre RESA included at each end and an extension of the main runway (11-29) of 550 metres to the north west to provide a runway length of 1,700 metres, plus a 50 metre starter extension.~~
- (d) an increase in width of the main runway strip to 150 metres.

- (e) the formation of runway end safety areas of 240 metres long by 90 metres wide at both ends of the main runway.
- (f) expansion of the main apron area.
- (g) helicopter aprons and associated touch-down and lift-off areas.
- (h) a new passenger terminal and control tower.
- (i) alterations to ancillary facilities.
- (j) realignment of the road to the south east of the airport.
- (k) provision for a new alternative runway 93 metres to the north of and parallel to the existing main runway. The alternative runway will be 1,700 metres long and 30 metres wide contained in a strip 2,300 metres long by 150 metres wide.

## **Restrictions on Aerodrome Purposes Activities**

### **Building Height**

- (a) Maximum height of any building shall not exceed 9.0 metres except that:
- (b) This restriction does not apply to the control tower, lighting towers or navigation and communication masts and aerials associated with airport operations.
- (c) No buildings, other than a control tower shall infringe the restrictions of the Landing Approach and Take off Land Use Controls designations.

### **Building Setback**

- (a) Minimum setback from all boundaries of the designation shall be 10.0 metres.
- (b) Minimum setback from the eastern side of the centre line of the proposed parallel runway shall be 124 200 metres.
- (c) Minimum setback from the western side of the centre line of the runway shall be 150 124 metres.

### **Building Location and Appearance**

- (a) All space should be utilised in the south west area of the Airport before buildings are constructed in other areas.
- (b) Buildings shall comply with the QLDC Guide to Reducing Glare and Reflective Surfaces.
- (c) Prior to construction of each new building outside the south west area of the Airport, an outline plan of works shall be submitted with a landscape and visual assessment demonstrating how:
  - (i) view-shafts from State Highway 6 towards the north are to be provided for as far as practicable, and
  - (ii) any buildings on the north side of the airport are clustered together.

### **Operations During Hours of Darkness and at Night**

The airport shall not be used for scheduled passenger services during the hours of darkness unless a suitable lighting plan is produced. No aircraft operations, other than emergency aircraft operations, shall occur between 10pm and 7am, and the 65 and 55 Ldn contours and associated Air Noise Boundary and Outer Control Boundary are reassessed.

## **Restrictions on Activities**

~~No scheduled commercial aircraft flights are to take place from the airport until such time that processes under the Resource Management Act 1991 are adopted to reassess and consider the effects of altering the Air Noise Boundary and Outer Control Boundary and to implement a noise monitoring programme.~~

## **Wanaka Airport Liaison Committee**

Within one year of this designation taking effect, the airport operator shall establish and maintain at its cost a Wanaka Airport Liaison Committee ('WALC'). The WALC shall include (but not be limited to) membership from:

- (a) an independent chair appointed by the airport operator,
- (b) the airport operator,
- (c) Lakes Environmental Ltd,
- (d) Wanaka Airport Users Group,
- (e) commercial airlines,
- (f) Airways Corporation, and
- (g) the Wanaka Community Board.

The WALC shall meet at least once every six months with a quorum of four members including the chair and at least one representative of each of the airport operator, Lakes Environmental Ltd and the Wanaka Community Board. The WALC shall:

- (a) Review any complaints or issues relating to the operation of the airport, and responses by the airport operator,
- (b) Assist the airport operator develop procedures to minimise adverse environmental effects on the community,
- (c) Assist the airport operator to communicate and engage with the community,
- (d) Develop noise management procedures for unplanned engine testing of aircraft for scheduled passenger services, and review any such occurrences,
- (e) Review progress on airport development and the master plan, and
- (f) Encourage parties to work together co-operatively, sharing information and making recommendations by consensus and agreement.

## **Airport Noise Monitoring**

Airport noise shall be measured, predicted and assessed in accordance with NZS 6805:1992 "Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning", by an acoustics specialist.

The Airport shall be managed so ~~airport the~~ noise does not exceed a day/night level of ~~65 dB outside the Air Noise Boundary and~~ 55 dB Ldn outside the Outer Control Boundary.

Compliance with the 55 dB Ldn noise limit at the OCB shall be determined every two years by the calculation of noise contours using an acoustics computer model and records of actual aircraft activity at the Airport. A report shall be provided every two years to the WALC, including the noise contour results and the methodology used in the preparation of the contours.

Once the calculated noise levels at any point on the Outer Control Boundary shown on the Planning Maps is 54 dB Ldn or greater, noise level measurements shall be carried out for a minimum of one month in the summer and one month in the

winter at each of two measurement locations every two years. The noise measurement locations should be selected to allow confirmation of compliance with the 55 dB Ldn limit at the OCB. The measurement locations do not need to be on the OCB. The difference between the measured sound level and the calculated sound level at a measurement location shall be added to the calculated sound level at the OCB to determine compliance. A report on the results of such monitoring shall be forwarded to the WALC within two months of the monitoring being undertaken.

Noise from the following Aircraft Operations shall be excluded from the compliance calculations set out above:

- (a)
  - (i) aircraft landing or taking off in an emergency; and
  - (ii) emergency flights required to rescue persons from life threatening situations or to transport patients, human organs or medical personnel in medical emergency, and
  - (iii) aircraft using the airport due to unforeseen circumstances as an essential alternative to landing at another scheduled airport, and
  - (iv) flights required to meet the needs of a national or civil defence emergency declared under the Civil Defence Act 1983, and
- (b) flights certified by the Minister of Defence as necessary for reasons of National Security in accordance with Section 4 of the Act; and
- (c) aircraft undertaking fire fighting duties;
- (d) aircraft using the airport in preparation for and participation in the biennial Warbirds Over Wanaka air shows (this applies 5 days prior to and 3 days after the air show).

### **Other Noise**

Sound from activities operating in this designation, which is outside the scope of NZS 6805:1992, shall comply with the District Plan noise limits set in the zone standards for each zone in which the sound is received. This requirement includes engine testing other than for essential unplanned engine testing of aircraft for scheduled passenger services.

No noise limits shall apply to essential unplanned engine testing of aircraft for scheduled passenger services. The WALC shall determine noise management practices for unplanned engine testing including preferred locations and times. Following each unplanned engine test the airport operator shall report to the next meeting of the WALC why the testing was required and what noise management practices were followed.

### **Proposed Parallel Runway**

- (a) Prior to the commencement of construction of the proposed parallel runway, and in conjunction with the outline plan of works required by Section 176A, a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to the Council for review and approval. The purpose of the Construction Management Plan shall be to:
  - (i) Describe the methods proposed for the construction of the runway;

- (ii) Describe what actions will be taken to manage the actual or potential effects of construction activities associated with the runway constructions;
  - (iii) Ensure compliance with the conditions of the designation as they relate to construction of the parallel runway.
- (b) The Construction Management Plan shall include the following information: Description of all the runway construction works including identification of fill sources, access roads and tracks, identification of areas for storing plant and machinery, mitigation measures, monitoring and reporting to be undertaken.
- (c) If fill is to be transported from off-site a Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be prepared in conjunction with the New Zealand Transport Agency and submitted to Council for approval. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall incorporate:
  - (i) Proposed construction haulage routes;
  - (ii) Construction traffic volumes over haulage routes.

## APPENDIX B

### Recommended changes to conditions relating to Designation 65

The changes recommended are as follows. Additions are underlined. Deletions are struck through.

#### E.2 AIRPORT APPROACH AND LAND USE CONTROLS

This designation applies in respect of the airspace in the vicinity of the Wanaka Airport. It defines essential airport protection measures, transitional slopes and surfaces, aircraft take off climb and approach slopes and airport height and obstacle clearances as defined below and as shown on District Plan Maps.

The objective of these restrictions is to limit any activity and the construction of any structure which may inhibit the safe and efficient operation of the Wanaka Airport. These restrictions directly relate to the main runway and runway extension specified in Designation 64 – Airport Purposes and the future alternative parallel runway. The strip and RESA end locations of the existing, extended and replacement runway are contained in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Location of strip and RESA ends

Location	Co-ordinates (NZMG)	
	X	Y
<u>Existing runway south east strip end</u>	<u>5602307.23</u>	<u>2213157.69</u>
<u>Extended runway south east RESA end</u>	<u>5602171.51</u>	<u>2213290.70</u>
<u>Existing runway north west strip end</u>	<u>5603250.88</u>	<u>2212232.91</u>
<u>Extended runway north west RESA end</u>	<u>5603815.09</u>	<u>2211679.99</u>
<u>Replacement runway south east RESA end</u>	<u>5602236.60</u>	<u>2213357.12</u>
<u>Replacement runway north west RESA end</u>	<u>5603880.18</u>	<u>2211746.41</u>

**Airport Protection** *[Delete all text from this point and replace with the following]*

The Airport protection surfaces are described as:

#### **(a) Take-off Climb and Approach Surfaces**

##### General

In order to provide the maximum flexibility for the existing and future development of the runway layout, the protection surfaces and associated height controls extend laterally to include the existing sealed runway as well as the proposed replacement sealed runway. This requires the length of the origin points of the OLS (referred to as the "inner edges") to be 243.0m being 121.5m either side of the inner edge centreline position defined in table 2 below.

For this reason the area that is covered by height controls is larger than would be the case with a single runway that was not planned to be extended or replaced.

The nominal centreline of this enlarged inner edge arrangement is 46.50m north east of the existing runway centreline and the ends of the inner edges are 121.50m either side of the centreline.

Table 2: Location of inner edge centre points

Inner edge	Co-ordinates (NZMG)	
	X	Y
south east end	<u>5602375.47</u>	<u>2213155.92</u>
north west end	<u>5603676.22</u>	<u>2211881.18</u>

The runway strip edges are 75m south west of and parallel to the existing runway centreline and 75m north east of and parallel to the future replacement runway centreline. For height control purposes the strip edges end where they intersect the inner edges of the approach surfaces.

#### South East End of Existing and Future Main Runways

##### (i) Inner edge location

The south east takeoff and approach surfaces are combined into a single takeoff/approach surface.

The takeoff and approach surfaces have the same inner edge location (as defined in table 2) and length of 243.0m.

The inner edge commences at a height of 339.4m AMSL at the south east end.

##### (ii) Takeoff/Approach Surface

The take-off/approach surface at the south eastern end commences at the inner edge and rises at a gradient of 2.0% with its centreline on a bearing of 135.6° grid. The surface continues on a bearing of 135.6° until a distance of 15,000m from the inner edge.

The edges of the approach surface commence at the inner edge end point locations and expand outward at 15% of the distance along the centreline until the end of the surface.

The final total width of the approach surface is 4743.0m at 15,000m from its inner edge.

#### North West End of Future Main Runway

##### (iii) Inner edge location

The north west takeoff and approach surfaces are combined into a single takeoff/approach surface.

The takeoff/approach surface inner edge location is defined in table 2 and its length is 243.0m.

The inner edge commences at a height of 347.84m ASML at the north west end.

(iv) Takeoff/approach Surface

The combined takeoff/approach surface at the north west end commences at the inner edge and rises at a gradient of 2.0% with its centreline on a bearing of 315.6° grid. The surface continues on a bearing of 315.6° until a distance of 4,780m from the inner edge. At that point the surface turns 195° north with a radius of 2400m and continues on a bearing of 150.6°.

The edges of the surface commence at the inner edge end point location and expand outward at 15% of the distance along the centreline until the end of the surface 15,000m from the inner edge.

The final total width of the surface is 4743.0m at 15,000m from its inner edge.

**(b) Transitional, Inner Horizontal and Conical Surfaces**

The transitional, inner horizontal and conical surfaces described below are based on the extremities of the runway strip edges for the combined existing and future parallel runways. The strip edge on the north east is 75m to the north east of and parallel to the proposed alternative runway centreline. The strip edge on the south west side is 75m to the south west of and parallel to the existing runway centreline.

For height control purposes the strip edges end where they meet the inner edges of the approach surfaces.

(i) Transitional Side Surfaces

The transitional side surfaces extend from the sides of the strip and the approach surfaces, upwards and outwards at a gradient of 1v:7h (14.3%) extending until they reach the inner horizontal surface.

(ii) Inner Horizontal Surface

The inner horizontal plane is located at a height of 393m AMSL (45m above the runway reference height) and extends out to a distance of 4000m measured from the periphery of the runway strip.

(iii) Conical Surface

The conical surface slopes upward and outward from the periphery of the inner horizontal surface rising at a gradient of 5% to a height of 498m AMSL (150m above the aerodrome reference height).

**Penetration of airport protection surfaces**

No object, including any building, structure, mast, pole or tree, but excluding a control tower, shall penetrate the takeoff/approach or transitional surfaces without prior approval of the requiring authority.

No object, including any building, structure, mast, pole or tree shall penetrate the horizontal and conical surfaces except with prior approval of the requiring authority, or where the object is determined to be shielded by an existing immovable object in accordance with recognised aeronautical practice.

If requested by a landowner affected by the airport protection surfaces, the requiring authority shall provide them with a terrain shielding drawing for their site.

The requiring authority shall be responsible for identifying whether any object existing at 20<sup>th</sup> Oct 2010 penetrates any of the obstacle limitation surfaces and is not shielded, and for advising the relevant landowner that such an object must be removed.

NOTE: any person proposing to construct or alter a structure that penetrates the airspace protection surfaces described in this designation is subject to the requirements of Part 77 of the Civil Aviation Rules and must notify the director of Civil Aviation 90 days before the proposed date of commencement of construction or alteration. Notification must be in the form specified in Rule 77-13 and be submitted at least 90 days before the proposed date of commencement of construction or alteration.

## APPENDIX C

### Recommended changes to the District Plan and Planning Maps

The changes recommended are as follows. Additions are underlined. Deletions are struck through. Notes are shown in square brackets.

#### 4. District Wide Issues

##### 4.9.3 Objectives and policies

#### Objective X – Wanaka Airport

Maintain and promote the on-going operation of the airport while managing reverse-sensitivity effects on surrounding land uses.

#### Policies

X.1 Ensure appropriate noise boundaries are established and maintained to enable operations at Wanaka Airport to continue and to expand over time.

X.2 To prohibit all new activity sensitive to aircraft noise within the Outer Control Boundary in the Rural General Zone around Wanaka Airport.

#### Implementation Methods

##### i District Plan

The provision of rules to prohibit or otherwise control activity sensitive to aircraft noise within the Outer Control Boundary around Wanaka Airport.

##### ii Other Methods

Consultation with Wanaka Airport on any Plan Change or other land use proposal affecting land within the Outer Control Boundary.

#### Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption

Some types of activity on land adjacent to the airport may give rise to issues of reverse sensitivity. It is essential for the current and future operation of Wanaka Airport that appropriate measures are taken in regard to noise sensitive activity in the vicinity of the Airport to ensure reverse sensitivity issues are avoided. Such land use management will also avoid the potential adverse effects on residential amenity (in particular indoor amenity) and community well-being by avoiding unnecessary exposure to higher than desirable levels of aircraft noise.

#### 5 Rural Areas

##### 5.2 Objectives and Policies

3.6 ~~To require acoustic insulation of buildings located within the airport Outer Control Boundary, that contain critical listening environments~~  
To prohibit all new activity sensitive to aircraft noise on any Rural zoned land within the Outer Control Boundary at Wanaka Airport to avoid adverse effects arising from aircraft operations on future activities sensitive to aircraft noise.

## Implementation Methods

*[This method is identical to one in PC35]*

(X) The NZS 6805:1992 – “Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning” will be used as the basis for establishing noise boundaries and associated rules in the District Plan in relation to controlling noise from airports in the District while also protecting those airports from the reverse sensitivity effects associated with activities which are sensitive to aircraft noise.

(X) The provision of rules to prohibit new activity sensitive to aircraft noise within the Outer Control Boundary of Wanaka Airport.

## Objective 7 - Buffer Land for Airports

~~**Retention of a greenfields area within an airport Outer Control Boundary to act as a buffer between airports and other land use activities. Retention of an area containing activities that are not sensitive to aircraft noise, within an airport's Outer Control Boundary, to act as a buffer between airports and activities sensitive to aircraft noise.**~~

### Policies

7.4 To prohibit the location of any new activity sensitive to aircraft noise on land within the Outer Control Boundary around Wanaka Airport.

## Implementation Methods

### i District Plan

(f) Provision of zone rules prohibiting activities sensitive to aircraft noise within the Outer Control Boundary shown on the planning maps around the Wanaka Airport.

5.3 Rural General and Ski Area Sub-Zone - Rules

5.3.1.1 Rural General Zone

The purpose of the Rural General Zone is to manage activities so they can be carried out in a way that:

...

- protects the on-going operations of Wanaka Airport.

5.3.3.2 Controlled Activities

### ~~vii Buildings within the Outer Control Boundary – Wanaka Airport~~

~~Buildings or part of a building to be used for residential activities, visitor accommodation or community activities on any land within the Outer Control Boundary as indicated on the District Plan Maps, in respect of the design, construction, orientation and location of the building to achieve adequate indoor sound insulation from aircraft noise.~~

5.3.3.5 Prohibited Activities

### ii **New Building Platforms and Activities within the Air Noise Boundary Outer Control Boundary - Wanaka Airport**

On any site located within the Outer Control Boundary, any new activity sensitive to aircraft noise or new building platform to be used

for an activity sensitive to aircraft noise (except an activity sensitive to aircraft noise located on a building platform approved before 20 October 2010) shall be a Prohibited Activity.

~~On any site located within the Air Noise Boundary, as indicated on the District Plan Maps, any new residential activities, visitor accommodation or community activities shall be Prohibited Activities.~~

### 5.3.5.2 Zone Standards

#### ~~viii~~ **Wanaka Airport Building Line**

~~No building shall be erected, constructed or relocated within the area defined by a line 150m on the western side of the centre line of the Wanaka Airport main runway, the Airport Purposes Designation boundary at either end of the main runway, and a line 200m on the eastern side of the centre line of the Wanaka Airport main runway.~~

#### ~~x~~ **Airport Noise - Building with the Outer Control Boundary – Wanaka Airport**

Alterations or additions to existing buildings, or construction of a building on a building platform approved before 20 October 2010 within the Outer Control Boundary, shall be designed to achieve an internal design sound level of 40 dB Ldn, based on the 2036 noise contours, at the same time as meeting the ventilation requirements in Appendix X. Compliance can either be demonstrated by submitting a certificate to Council from a person suitably qualified in acoustics stating that the proposed construction will achieve the internal design sound level, or by installation of mechanical ventilation to achieve the requirements in Appendix X.

~~(a) On any site within the Outer Control Boundary as indicated on the District Plan Maps, any buildings or part of a building to be used for residential activities, visitor accommodation or community activities shall be insulated from aircraft noise so as to meet an indoor design sound level of 40 dBA Ldn, except for non-critical listening environments where no special insulation is required.~~

~~(b) This control shall be met in either of the following two ways:~~

~~EITHER:~~

~~(i) By providing a certificate from a recognised acoustic engineer stating that the proposed construction will achieve the internal design noise level.~~

~~OR~~

~~(ii) The building shall be constructed and finished in accordance with the provisions of Table 1 in part 5.3.5.2.~~

<b>Building Element</b>	<b>Required Construction</b>
External Walls	<p><i>Exterior:</i> 20 mm timber or 6mm fibre cement</p> <p><i>Frame:</i> 100mm gap containing 100mm acoustic blanket (R2.2 Batts or similar)</p> <p>Two layers of 12.5mm gypsum plasterboard* (Or an equivalent combination of exterior and interior wall mass)</p>
Windows	<p>Up to 40% of wall area: Minimum thickness 6mm glazing**</p> <p>Up to 60% of wall area: Minimum thickness 8mm glazing**</p> <p>Up to 80% of wall area: Minimum thickness 8mm laminated glass or minimum 10mm double glazing**</p> <p>Aluminium framing with compression seals (or equivalent)</p>
Pitched Roof	<p><i>Cladding:</i> 0.5mm profiled steel or tiles or 6mm corrugated fibre cement</p> <p><i>Frame:</i> Timber truss with 100mm acoustic blanket (R 2.2 Batts or similar)</p> <p><i>Ceiling:</i> 12.5mm gypsum plaster board*</p>
Skillion Roof	<p><i>Cladding:</i> 0.5mm profiled steel or 6mm fibre cement</p> <p><i>Sarking:</i> 20mm particle board or plywood</p> <p><i>Frame:</i> 100mm gap containing 100mm acoustic blanket (R2.2 Batts or similar)</p> <p><i>Ceiling:</i> 2 layers of 9.5mm gypsum plasterboard*</p>
External Door	Solid core door (min. 24kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) with weather seals

**Table 1 – Acoustic Insulation of Buildings Containing Noise**

**— Sensitive Activities (except non-critical listening areas)**

\* Where exterior walls are of brick veneer or stucco plaster the internal linings need be no thicker than 9.5mm gypsum plasterboard.

\*\* Typical acoustic glazing usually involves thick single panes or laminated glass. Where two or more layers of glass are employed with an air gap between, total thickness of window glass may be calculated as the total of all glass layers (excluding air gap) provided that at least one glass layer shall be of a different thickness to the other layer(s).

5.4.2.3 Assessment Matters General

**ix — Controlled Activity — Addition or alteration to Buildings within the Outer Control Boundary — Queenstown Airport and Buildings within the Outer Control Boundary — Wanaka Airport**

Conditions may be imposed to ensure the design, construction, orientation and location of buildings for residential activities, visitor accommodation or community activities within Wanaka Airport's Outer Control Boundary, or the alteration or addition to an existing building or part of a building used for residential activities, visitor accommodation or community activities within Queenstown Airport's Outer Control Boundary is such to ensure the indoor design sound levels specified in Zone Standards 5.3.5.2(viii) and (x) are met.

## 12.3 Rural Visitor Zones

### 12.3.4 Objectives and Polices

- 6 Within the Windermere Rural Visitor Zone minimise the potential for reverse sensitivity effects on Wanaka Airport by: requiring compliance with an acoustic treatment performance standard for any new, altered or extended visitor accommodation or permanent residential accommodation approved within the Outer Control Boundary shown on the planning maps.
- ~~• Noise insulating buildings~~
  - ~~• Designing and orientating buildings to minimise exposure to noise~~
  - ~~• Encouraging noise sensitive activities to be located with maximum separation from the airport~~
  - ~~• Avoiding landscaping and development that may be hazardous to aircraft~~
  - Limited permanent residential accommodation

## 12.4 Rural Visitor Zone Rules

### 12.4.3.2 Controlled Activities

- ~~iii Windermere - the design, construction, orientation and location of the building to achieve adequate indoor sound insulation from aircraft noise.~~

#### vi Visitor Accommodation

Activities (v) and (vi) above are controlled in respect of the following matters:

~~(g) Windermere airport noise~~

### 12.4.5.2 Zone Standard

- vii **Airport Noise** - New buildings or alterations or additions to existing buildings within the Outer Control Boundary - Wanaka Airport  
The construction of, alteration, or addition to any building containing an activity sensitive to aircraft noise shall be designed to achieve an internal design sound level of 40 dB Ldn, based on the 2036 noise contours, at the same time as meeting the ventilation requirements in Appendix X. Compliance can either be demonstrated by submitting a certificate to Council from a person suitably qualified in acoustics stating that the proposed construction will achieve the internal design sound level, or by installation of mechanical ventilation to achieve the requirements in Appendix X.

~~On any site within the outer control boundary as indicated on the District Plan Maps, any building or part of a building to be used for Residential Activities, Visitor Accommodation Activities, Commercial Activities or Community Activities shall be insulated from aircraft noise so as to meet an indoor design sound level of 40dBA Ldn, except for non-critical listening environments where no special insulation is required.~~

## 12.5.2 Assessment Matters

~~x — **Windermere — the following assessment matters should be taken into account in addition to those listed for specific activities.**~~

- ~~{a) The design, construction, orientation and location of buildings and whether an indoor design sound level of 40 dBA Ldn, except for non-critical listening environments can be achieved.~~
- ~~{b) Whether noise sensitive activities are located with maximum separation from Wanaka Airport.~~
- ~~{c) Whether the location of activities is consistent with providing buffer from Airport activities, taking into account the air noise boundary and outer control boundary.~~
- ~~{d) Whether buildings, structures or activities are a hazard to aircraft.~~
- ~~{e) Provision of landscaping that mitigates the visual effects while ensuring that species that may be a hazard to aircraft are avoided.~~
- ~~{f) Whether the residential activity is for on-site custodial management purposes and the potential for adverse cumulative effects of residential development.~~

## 14. Transport

### 14.1.3 Objectives and Policies

- 8.1 To provide for appropriate growth and demand for air services for Queenstown and Wanaka.
- 8.4 To advocate a noise management regime at Queenstown airport and Wanaka Airport to help manage the environmental effects of aircraft noise through means available to the Queenstown Airport Corporation and the Wanaka Airport Operator but not available through the District Plan.

### **Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption**

The Queenstown and Wanaka airports are important physical resources, important to the social and economic well being of the community. Queenstown Airport's main function is for domestic, and international, passenger movements and freight and tourist operations. The Queenstown Airport is an important factor in the rate of growth in the District. In comparison, Wanaka Airport's main function is has been to providing recreational and tourist air services, including aviation museums but increasingly it is providing for scheduled air services and may in the future provide a complementary alternative to Queenstown Airport.

...

In relation to Wanaka Airport, activities sensitive to aircraft noise within the Outer Control Boundary will be prohibited. ~~will require a resource consent for a controlled activity. The~~ Any alterations or additions to existing buildings consent will be subject to adequate acoustic treatment insulation. The ~~insulation treatment~~ requirements will be in accordance with the NZ Building Code Standards and the rules of this Plan.

~~The Council is also of the view that rezoning land as a Residential Zone, or classifying new noise sensitive activities as permitted, controlled, discretionary or non-complying adjacent to an airport, gives a false impression that the land is suitable for noise sensitive activities.~~

...

The controls are intended to either prohibit, or require acoustic treatment insulation (as appropriate), for the full range of activities sensitive to aircraft noise sensitive activities. Reference is made to "community activities" in each of the relevant rules is defined in the district plan. The rules are intended to be inclusive; and to cover all activities which fall within the broad definition of community activity, whether or not such activities are separately defined.

## Definitions

<b><u>Outer Control Boundary Wanaka</u></b>	Means a boundary, <u>as shown on the District Plan Map 18A</u> , the location of which is based on <u>the predicted day/night sound levels of L<sub>dn</sub>-55 dBA L<sub>dn</sub> from future airport operations in 2036</u> . <del>The location of the boundary is shown in Figure 31a.</del>
<b><u>Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN)</u></b>	<u>Means any residential activity, visitor accommodation activity, community activity and day care facility activity, but excludes activity in police stations, fire stations, courthouses, probation and detention centres, government and local government offices.</u> <i>[This definition to be identical to one in PC35]</i>
<b><u>Airport Operator</u></b>	<u>Means the person or body that has the necessary statutory authority for the establishment, maintenance, operation or management of the airport.</u>
<b><u>Critical Listening Environment</u></b>	<u>Means any space that is regularly used for high quality listening or communication for example principle living areas, bedrooms and classrooms but excludes non critical living environments.</u> <i>[This definition to be identical to one in PC35]</i>
<b><u>Design Sound Level</u></b>	<u>Means 40 dB L<sub>dn</sub> in all Critical Listening Environments.</u> <i>[This definition to be identical to one in PC35]</i>

**Appendix X – Acoustic Insulation and Ventilation Requirements**

*[This appendix to be identical to one in PC35 (PC35 Table 1 is not relevant to PC26)]*

The following table sets out the ventilation requirements within the airport Outer Control Boundary (OCB) and Air Noise Boundary (ANB).

**Table X: Ventilation Requirements for Critical Listening Environments**

<b><u>Room Type</u></b>	<b><u>Outdoor Air Ventilation Rate</u></b> (Air Changes per Hour, ac/hr)	
	<u>Low Setting *</u>	<u>High Setting *</u>
<b><u>Bedrooms</u></b>	<u>1-2 ac/hr</u>	<u>Min. 5 ac/hr</u>
<b><u>Other critical listening environments</u></b>	<u>1-2 ac/hr</u>	<u>Min. 15 ac/hr</u>

Noise from ventilation systems shall not exceed 35 dB  $L_{Aeq}(1\ min)_z$  on High Setting and 30 dB  $L_{Aeq}(1\ min)_z$  on Low Setting. Noise levels shall be measured at a distance of 1 m to 2 m from any diffuser.

Each system must be able to be individually switched on and off and when on, be controlled across the range of ventilation rates by the occupant with a minimum of 3 stages.

Each system providing the low setting flow rates is to be provided with a heating system which, at any time required by the occupant, is able to provide the incoming air with an 18 degC heat rise when the airflow is set to the low setting. Each heating system is to have a minimum of 3 equal heating stages.

If air conditioning is provided to any space then the high setting ventilation requirement for that space is not required.

**Volume 3 District Plan Maps**

*[Amend district plan map 18a to update the outer control boundary and to remove the current air noise boundary]*

## APPENDIX D

### Recommendations on submissions

Name	Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	Recommendation
Air New Zealand Limited	Partly Support	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - Rural Visitor zone rule 12.4.3.5	Amend rule 12.4.3.5.ii should be amended to prohibit all new ASAN from locating within the air noise boundaries.	Accept
	Oppose	Designation 64 - aerodrome purposes - justification for additional land	Air New Zealand seeks the provision of additional information to justify: the need for additional land and the scope of the Aerodrome NoR an economic cost benefit analysis the timing of the potential works	Reject
	Oppose	Plan Change 26 - engine testing provisions	Remove the limit of 18 unscheduled engine testing exemptions per year	Accept
	Oppose	Designation 64 - aerodrome purposes - lapse period of designation	Justify the need for a 20 year lapse period and whether a shorter limit would be more appropriate.	Reject
	Partly Support	Designation 65 - Approach and land use controls	Adopt the designation subject to changes required as a result of amendments to the Plan Change or Aerodrome purposes NoR.	Accept in Part
	Partly Support	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - air noise boundaries	Approve new air noise boundaries	Accept in Part
	Partly Support	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - Prohibition of new ASAN in air noise boundaries within Rural General zone	Approve new rule 5.3.3.5.ii prohibiting all new ASAN or new building platforms located within air noise boundaries in the Rural General zone.	Accept
	Partly Support	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - Night Noise Boundary	Justify the need for a night noise boundary	Accept
	Partly Support	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport, Designation 64 - Aerodrome purposes and Designation 65 - Approach and land use controls	Any further or consequential amendments needed to the plan change or NoRs to give effect to this submission and to meet the requirements of Part II of the RMA.	Accept in Part
	Partly Support	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - definition of ASAN	Approve inclusion of a definition of Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN)	Accept

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Decision Requested</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Albert Town Community Association	Oppose	Designation 65 - Approach and land use controls	That the NoR be declined unless it can be ensured that Albert town residents will not be impacted by noise now and into the future which can best be achieved by ensuring flight paths avoid Albert town and the Clutha river completely.	Reject
	Oppose	Designation 64 - Aerodrome purposes	That the NoR be declined unless it can be ensured that Albert town residents will not be impacted by noise now and into the future which can best be achieved by ensuring flight paths avoid Albert town and the Clutha river completely. That night flights be prohibited completely. Any other relief that satisfies the matters raised in this submission.	Accept in Part
	Oppose	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport	That the plan change be withdrawn unless it can be ensured that Albert town residents will not be impacted by noise now and into the future which can best be achieved by ensuring flight paths avoid Albert town and the Clutha river completely. That night flights be prohibited completely. Any other relief that satisfies the matters raised in this submission.	Accept in Part
Butson, Kerry	Oppose	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - Noise and building restrictions	That the plan change will not affect the submitter financially or place any further restriction on future building activity in any way in the future.	Accept in Part
Heath, Nikki & Aaron	Oppose	Designation 64 - Aerodrome purposes - Entire NoR	That the NoR be refused, or the NoR be reconsidered and amended in light of the points raised in the submission, or any other relief that satisfies the points raised in submission	Reject
	Oppose	Designation 65 - Approach and land use controls - Entire NoR	That the NoR be refused, or the NoR be reconsidered and amended in light of the points raised in the submission, or any other relief that satisfies the points raised in submission	Reject
	Oppose	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport	That the plan change be refused, or the plan change be reconsidered and amended in light of the points raised in the submission, or any other relief that satisfies the points raised in submission	Accept in Part

Name	Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	Recommendation
Jacquierey, Mark	Partly Support	Designation 64 - Aerodrome purposes - Runway dimensions	Alter designation 64 to provide for: 1. RESA on the existing runway of 240m at both ends. 2. Increasing the current runway strip width to 150m to allow for aircraft over 22.7 tonne maximum certified take-off weight (MCTOW). 3. An extension to the north west of the existing runway of 1000m to allow for sealed runway up to 2200m in length. 4. A proposed future runway of up to 2200m in length with a strip width of 300m located to the north of existing runway	Reject
	Partly Support	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - Noise boundaries	Consequential changes to the noise boundary will be needed to reflect the changes proposed in submission on airport purposes designation. Effectively proposes movement of air nose boundaries approximately 1000m west.	Reject
Jeremy Bell Investments Ltd	Oppose	Designation 65 - Approach and land use controls	Withdraw NOR 65 or modify it	Accept in Part
	Oppose	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport	Withdraw Plan Change, or amend provisions to promote provisions to submitters akin to Queenstown Airport Mixed use zone, or to use the existing Queenstown Airport Mixed Use zone provisions with appropriate modifications to reflect Wanaka location and context.	Reject
	Oppose	Designation 64 - Aerodrome purposes	Withdraw designation 64 or modify it to better achieve the sustainable management of physical resources as sought by s5(a)-(c) and 7(b), (f) and (g).	Reject
JH & TK Bird Holdings Limited	Oppose	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport	Withdraw proposed Plan Change to extend noise boundary and proposed night time noise boundary.	Accept in Part
Neuendorff, Indira	Oppose	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport	Withdraw plan change	Reject
	Oppose	Designation 64 - Aerodrome purposes	Withdraw NoR	Reject
Neuendorff, Michael	Oppose	Designation 64 - Aerodrome purposes	Withdraw NoR	Reject
	Oppose	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport	Withdraw plan change	Reject

Name	Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	Recommendation
NZ Transport Agency	Partly Support	Designation 64 - Aerodrome purposes - Entire designation	<p>1. Undertake a more comprehensive transport assessment that considers the effects of the Wanaka Airport and how these effects are affected by the proximity of Mt Barker Road and the proposed access to the adjacent Transport and Toy museum and Pittaway Aviation park.</p> <p>2. Consider and promote options to improve existing Wanaka Airport access or consolidation of a number of accesses and intersection along the adjacent state highway. Options should consider internal connectivity to reduce use of the state highway for travel between the airport, Transport and Toy museum and Pittaway Aviation park.</p> <p>3. Enter into a memorandum of understanding with NZTA setting parameters for deciding on options for improving access to the aerodrome, and deciding on thresholds requiring improvements to be carried out.</p>	Accept
Pittaway Family Trust	Support	Designation 64 - Aerodrome purposes - Entire designation	Supports amendments to designation.	Accept in Part
	Support	Designation 65 - Approach and land use controls - Entire designation	Supports amendments to designation.	Accept in Part
	Support	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - Entire Plan Change	The trust supports the entire plan change, and in particular the amendments to Part 5 objectives, policies and rules that provide for land surrounding Wanaka airport to be used for airport related activities that are not sensitive to aircraft noise.	Accept in Part
Raymont, Paul & Bernadette	Oppose	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - Entire plan change	<p>Withdraw entire plan change and in particular:</p> <p>1. extended noise boundaries for airport operations</p> <p>2. provision of night time noise boundaries and proposals that allow night time operation of airport</p>	Accept in Part
Ricochet Amusement	Support	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - Entire plan change	That the plan change be accepted.	Accept in Part
Rising Star Limited	Oppose	Entire NOR for designation 64	Withdraw of cancel NOR for designation 64, or Amend plan change in manner to provide for the expansion of Wanaka Airport in a manner that is more controlled and better reflects the underlying rural values of the surrounding area and the submitter's property.	Reject

Name	Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	Recommendation
	Oppose	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw of cancel entire plan change, or amend plan change in manner to provide for the expansion of Wanaka Airport in a manner that is more controlled and better reflects the underlying rural values of the surrounding area and the submitters property.	Reject
Spencer Bower, Simon	Support	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - Entire plan change	Accept proposed plan change.	Accept in Part
	Support	Designation 65 - Approach and land use controls - Entire designation	Confirm notice of requirement	Accept in Part
	Support	Designation 64 - Aerodrome purposes - Entire designation	Confirm notice of requirement	Accept in Part
Staufenberg, Anke & Ulrich	Oppose	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - Entire plan change	Withdraw plan change.	Reject
Taylor, Francis (Meg)	Other	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - Entire Plan Change	Wants to know what restrictions are being placed on subject property and whether affected property owners are being offered compensation or benefits in exchange for restrictions being placed on their property.	Accept in Part
Umbers, Julie	Oppose	Designation 65 - Approach and land use controls - Entire NoR	Decline NoR	Reject
	Oppose	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - Entire plan change	Withdraw plan change	Reject
Wanaka Chamber of Commerce	Partly Support	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - New zone	That a zone based on the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use zone be created to allow for a greater range of activities, or alternatively, designation 64 be expanded to incorporate and enable a wider range of airport related uses. Any consequential changes as required to achieve submission, including Objective 9 in the District Wide Section.	Reject
	Partly Support	Designation 64 - Aerodrome purposes - Runway length	Designation 64 should be amended to allow for a runway length of at least 2200m	Reject
	Partly Support	Designation 65 - Approach and land use controls - Entire designation	That this designation be amended as required to provide for a runway length of 2200m as sought in the submission on designation 64.	Reject

Name	Position	Plan Provision	Decision Requested	Recommendation
	Partly Support	Plan change 26 - Wanaka Airport - Additional noise boundary	Create a 50 db Ldn with a restriction on residential development in the Rural General zone within this area below 4 ha as a non-complying activity and requiring any dwelling developed to meet noise insulation requirements. Any consequential changes as required to achieve submission, including Objective 9 in the District Wide Section.	Reject
	Partly Support	Designation 64 - Aerodrome purposes - Range of activities	That designation 64 be expanded to enable a wider range of airport related uses, including rental car facilities, tourism operations associated with using the airport, small scale commercial facilities (including retail and service station) associated with the use of the airport, and industrial activities associated with the airport.	Reject