

## Appendix I: Table of amended recommendations

| Submission Point | Submitter               | Support / Oppose | Decision requested  | Reasons   | Recommendation | Section of this report where the submission point is addressed |
|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|----------------|--|
| V26.1            | WEL Networks Limited    | Neutral          | Amend Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield as follows:<br>1 Introduction ... The Civil Aviation Authority of New Zealand has adopted specifications defining these surfaces about and above an Aerodrome which, in the interests of safe flight, should not be penetrated by new obstacles. These surfaces are known as obstacle limitation surfaces and are defined in terms of distances from the runway and heights relative to the runways for protection of aircraft in the vicinity of the aerodrome. Note that this appendix does not apply to lawfully established electricity distribution network poles and equipment [as at the date of notification of this variation]. | While WEL believes that its existing infrastructure within the OLS is protected under sections 22 and 23 of the Electricity Act 1992 and/or has existing use rights under section 10 of the RMA, WEL wishes to ensure that it is absolutely clear in the proposed variation that any height restrictions would apply to new buildings and structures only. This will ensure that WEL's purpose in delivering a safe and reliable power supply is not adversely affected by Variation 1. This approach will eliminate any future confusion when applying this height restriction in circumstances when routine maintenance and replacement is required for existing poles. | Accept in part | 5.1  |
| 823.1            | NZTE Operations Limited | Neutral / Amend  | Insert new Objective 9.2.3 – reverse sensitivity and relevant Policy 9.2.3.1.<br><u>Objective 9.2.3</u><br><i>The operational needs of Te Kowhai Airpark are not compromised by sensitive land use activities with the potential for reverse sensitivity conflict.</i><br><u>Policy 9.2.3.1</u><br><i>Manage reverse sensitivity risk by:</i><br><i>(i) ensuring that noise sensitive activities within the Te Kowhai Airpark Noise Control Boundaries are acoustically insulated to appropriate standards; and</i><br><i>(ii) ensuring that Te Kowhai aerodrome operates within the noise limits specified by the Te Kowhai Airpark Noise Control Boundaries</i>             | While Policy 9.2.1.6 partially addresses reverse sensitivity, a more specific objective and corresponding policy is required which recognises the importance of that issue in the context of existing infrastructure. The additional objective and policy proposed in Appendix A will ensure that the operational needs of the Airfield are not compromised by sensitive land use activities with the potential for reverse sensitivity conflict.   | Accept in part | 13.2   |
| FS1   25.1       | Silvia Fowler           | Oppose           | Oppose submission point 823.1.  | The airpark proposal allows for an increase from the current approximately 65 aircrafts based at the airfield to grow to approximately 200 aircrafts - a more than threefold increase   | Accept in part | 13.2   |

| Submission Point | Submitter | Support / Oppose | Decision requested | Reasons  | Recommendation | Section of this report where the submission point is addressed |
|------------------|-----------|------------------|--------------------|--|----------------|--|
|                  |           |                  |                    | <p>of flight movements compared to current numbers. The proposed submission fails to adequately address the negative impact the proposed development will have on existing and future property owners in the area surrounding the airfield and/or under and adjacent to the airfield's approach ways. Aircraft arrivals and departures are not subject to District Plan Rules, and are therefore noted as being outside the scope of the Acoustic Assessment, which focuses on the noise from taxiing aircraft and other on-site activities. Although a certain degree of overhead air traffic is an acceptable part of living close to a small rural airfield, developing the Te Kowhai Airfield into an airpark, with a projected threefold increase in the number of flight movements, would be far beyond what is currently an acceptable level of air traffic experienced in the area. It is stated that the proposed development will be limited to operating within the noise limits outlined in the Marshall Day Report. As per the Marshall Day Report: "Future noise contours have been calculated using the Integrated Noise Model (INM) version 7d for a future operating scenario prepared by NZTE. The noise contours are based on the Ld noise metric. This metric is the sum of the sound energy from all aircraft noise events averaged over 24 hours. The night weighting means that noise events that occur between 10pm and 7am are 'weighted' or penalised with an additional 10 decibels. For input to the noise model, an 'average day' of movements is calculated based on forecast future movements during the busiest three months of the year." It also refers to "average busy day" number of aircraft movements as 70/day during those busy 3 months, which has then been extrapolated to an annual average of 25538 movements. It does not give any indication as to how this "future operating scenario" compares with current levels. It also does not limit the airpark from operating to those "busy 3 month" limits throughout the entire year (ie: there is nothing preventing or limiting the currently "more quiet" periods of the year from becoming as busy as the projected "busiest three months"). Furthermore, as the calculations are based on "averages", it gives scope for the</p> |                |  |

| Submission Point | Submitter  | Support / Oppose | Decision requested | Reasons   | Recommendation | Section of this report where the submission point is addressed |
|------------------|--|------------------|--------------------|---|----------------|--|
|                  |  |                  |                    | <p>airpark to operate well outside these averages on some days. Eg: looking at an average limit of 490 movements over a 7 day period, there could potentially be 5 “quiet” week days with only 10 movements/day and then have 220 movements/day for the weekend. This would then still be within the required average limit. It has been proposed to impose strict regulations on new developments which fall within the airpark noise control boundaries in terms of acoustic insulation requirements at the expense to the home owner. Although this will protect home occupants from noise while inside the house (as long as all doors and windows are shut), it does not protect from noise while trying to enjoy the outdoor living areas. The effects of air traffic noise are felt well beyond the noted noise control boundaries of the Marshall Day Report. Given its close proximity to Te Kowhai Village and Te Kowhai School and also taking into account the predicted growth in residential property developments in the areas surrounding the airfield, developing the Te Kowhai Airfield into anything beyond its current status of small rural airfield would be inappropriate.</p> |                |  |
| FS1178.1         | <p>Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall &amp; Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson</p> | Oppose           | To be disallowed   | <p>The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them. Its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but</p>   | Accept in part | 8.2  |

| Submission Point | Submitter  | Support / Oppose | Decision requested   | Reasons  | Recommendation | Section of this report where the submission point is addressed |
|------------------|--|------------------|--|--|----------------|--|
|                  |  |                  |  | <i>not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.</i>  |                |  |
| <b>823.9</b>     | <b>NZTE Operations Limited</b>   | Neutral / Amend  | <p>Rule 20.3.3 PI amend to read:<br/> <i>Any</i> building, structure, <i>tree</i> or <i>other</i> vegetation must not protrude through any airport obstacle limitation surface identified in Appendix 9 Te Kowhai Airpark and as shown on the planning maps.</p> <p>DI amend to read<br/> <i>Any</i> building, structure, <i>tree</i> or <i>other</i> vegetation that does not comply with Rule 20.3.3 PI.</p> | The OLS (as notified) is necessary to ensure compliance with Civil Aviation Circular AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for Code I aerodromes operating on a VFR and an IFR (non-air transport) basis. The extent of the OLS is described in Chapter 29 – Appendix 9. Rules are also provided in the PWDP to protect the OLS from being breached by buildings, structures and vegetation. Although Rule 27.3.1 as notified correctly protects the proposed OLS from buildings, structures, trees and other vegetation, the corresponding height rules in other zones omits reference to 'trees'. It is critical that there is consistency amongst OLS provisions and that the provisions control 'trees' as well as buildings, structures and other vegetation. It is proposed that the relevant rules in each chapter are amended to align with the (correct) wording in Chapter 27, Rule 27.3.1. | Accept in part | 8.2  |
| FS1178.9         | <i>Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall &amp; Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson</i> | Oppose           | <i>To be disallowed.</i>   | <i>The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them Its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that</i>  | Accept in part | 8.2  |

| Submission Point | Submitter   | Support / Oppose | Decision requested  | Reasons   | Recommendation | Section of this report where the submission point is addressed |
|------------------|---|------------------|---|---|----------------|--|
|                  |   |                  |   | come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture. |                |  |
| 823.15           | NZTE Operations Limited   | Neutral / Amend  | <p><u>16.3.12 Noise Sensitive Activities</u></p> <p><u>PI – Construction, addition, or alteration to a building containing a Noise Sensitive Activity located between the Waikato Regional Airport or Te Kowhai Air Noise Boundary and the Outer Control Boundary must comply with Appendix I – Acoustic Insulation.</u></p> <p><u>RDI(a) Construction of, or addition, or alteration to a building that does not comply with a condition in Rule 16.3.12 PI.</u></p> <p><u>(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:</u></p> <p><u>(i) internal design sound levels;</u></p> <p><u>(ii) on-site amenity values; and</u></p> <p><u>(iv) Potential for reverse sensitivity effects.</u></p> | This change is a consequential amendment of introducing new Te Kowhai Airpark Airport Noise Control Boundaries. Chapter 16 Rule 16.3 does not provide for ANCB's as proposed by this submission. A new rule (16.3.12) is required to address ANB requirements.  | Accept in part | 8.2  |
| FS1178.15        | Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis | Oppose           | To be disallowed.   | The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them Its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed   | Accept in part | 8.2  |

| Submission Point | Submitter  | Support / Oppose | Decision requested  | Reasons   | Recommendation | Section of this report where the submission point is addressed |
|------------------|--|------------------|---|---|----------------|--|
|                  | <i>Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson</i> |                  |   | <i>requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.</i> |                |  |
| <b>831.22</b>    | <b>Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally</b>          | Oppose           | Amend Rule 16.2.1.1 P2 Noise - General, to apply the noise limits and time limits to activities affecting Residential Zones, such as airfields. | Raglan, particularly Raglan West, suffers from aircraft noise.  | Reject         | 6.1  |
| <i>FS1339.90</i> | <i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>                                 | <i>Oppose</i>    | <i>NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.</i>   | <i>This submission is opposed as there are rules in the PWDP that provide for aircraft noise. The submitter is seeking a generalised amendment to address a location-specific issue. The generalised solution sought would conflict with the specific provisions designed for Te Kowhai aerodrome, which include the revised Air Noise Control Boundaries produced by Marshall day in accordance with the NZ Standard NZS 6805:1992 Airport Noise Management. These are the recommended airport noise and land use controls.</i>  | <i>Accept</i>  | <i>6.1</i>   |

| Submission Point | Submitter                | Support / Oppose | Decision requested   | Reasons   | Recommendation    | Section of this report where the submission point is addressed |
|------------------|--------------------------|------------------|--|---|-------------------|--|
| 697.802          | Waikato District Council | Neutral / Amend  | Amend Rule 22.3.4.3 Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface PI to read as follows:<br><i>Any</i> building, structure or vegetation must not protrude through <del>any</del> <i>the</i> Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface as <del>shown</del> <i>identified</i> on the planning maps <i>and defined in Section E Designation N – Waikato Regional Airport.</i> | This rule relates only to the Waikato Regional Airport and needs to specifically identify this. Additional wording provides clarity to the rule.  | Accept            | 10.2   |
| FS1302.6         | Mercer Airport           | Oppose           | Mercer Airport do not support submission point 697.802 and seek that the submission point is disallowed.   | The submission point seeks to change Rule 22.3.4.3 (which relates to buildings, structures and vegetation within an Obstacle Limitation Surface) to only relate to the Waikato Regional OLS rather than 'any Airport OLS.' The Mercer Airport OLS extends over the Rural Zone, and therefore this rule should reference 'Mercer Airport OLS' in addition to Waikato Regional Airport OLS. | Reject            | 10.2   |
| 697.803          | Waikato District Council | Neutral / Amend  | Amend Rule 22.3.4.3 Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface NC1 to read as follows:<br><del>NC1 D1</del> <i>Any</i> building, structure or vegetation that does not comply with Rule 22.3.4.3 PI.   | Additional wording provides clarity to the rule. Activity status to be more consistent with other zone chapters.  | Accept and reject | 10.2   |
| FS1302.7         | Mercer Airport           | Support          | Mercer Airport seek to allow submission point 697.803.   | The submission point proposes to make buildings, structures and vegetation that protrude through the Waikato Regional Airport OLS a discretionary activity. Mercer support this submission point for the purpose of being involved in any future discussion regarding the activity status of buildings, structures, vegetation and trees within an OLS.                                   | Accept and reject | 10.2   |
| 697.808          | Waikato District Council | Neutral / Amend  | Amend Rule 22.3.7 Building setbacks to include Rules 22.3.7.3 and 22.3.7.4, as follows: (a) Rules 22.3.7.1 to 22.3.7.4 provide the permitted building setback distances for buildings from site boundaries, specific land use activities and environmental features. (b) Rule 22.3.7.1 Building setbacks – all boundaries provides   | Rules 22.3.7.3 and 22.3.7.4 are missing from the list of building setbacks and need to be included.   | Accept in part    | 14.2   |

| Submission Point | Submitter               | Support / Oppose | Decision requested  | Reasons  | Recommendation | Section of this report where the submission point is addressed |
|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|--|----------------|--|
|                  |                         |                  | <p>permitted building setback distances from all boundaries on any site within the Rural Zone. Different setback distances are applied based on the type of building and the site area. (c) Rule 22.3.7.2 Building setback sensitive land use provides permitted setback distances for any building containing a sensitive land use from specified land use activities. (d) Rule 22.3.7.3 – Building Te Kowhai Noise Buffer provides for permitted setbacks within the Te Kowhai Noise Buffer. (e) Rule 22.3.7.4 – Building – Noise Sensitive Activities provides setbacks for Noise Sensitive Activities (d) (f) Rule 22.3.7.35 Building setback – water bodies provides permitted setback distances from lakes, wetlands, rivers and the coast. (e) (g) Rule 22.3.7.46 Building setback - Environmental Protection Area provide specific setback distances from specified environmental features.</p> |  |                |  |
| FSI339.94        | NZTE Operations Limited | Oppose           | <p>NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed in part and disallowed in part.</p>   | <p>NZTE supports the need for setbacks for Noise Sensitive Activities and therefore supports the addition of 22.3.7(e) but opposes the addition of 22.3.7(d), as in accordance with point 823.16 of the NZTE Submission, Rule 22.3.7.3 should be deleted as the Taxiing Noise is now dealt within the Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day and sought in the NZTE submission.</p> | Accept in part | 14.2   |