

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
VI.1	Peter and Jackie Gore	Oppose	Amend Te Kowhai OLS map to reduce its size and consider natural contour, as shown in map attached to original submission.	A blanket OLS layer does not address issues with natural landform. There is no link between the District Plan and Plane safety requirements according to the CAA. The 2000m extent has been fit for purpose since 2018 as planes are still flying every day and appear unimpeded. Properties on the Western side of the hill should be excluded from this variation given there is a natural obstacle immediately adjacent.	Reject	9.4
VFS4002.41	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Reject	9.4
VFS4003.8	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Reject	
VFS4005.41	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation 1 was intended to correct an error in the planning maps, aligning the shape of the OLS with that described in the notified Appendix 9. The OLS shape and size is determined by CAA standards which determine that an OLS is to extend out horizontally 2,500m at a 45-metre height, regardless of terrain. The idea of a 4.5 metre inner horizontal surface is to control obstacles above a height of 45 metres, to ensure the safety of aircraft when manoeuvring in and around the vicinity of the Aerodrome. The approach and take off surfaces provide this control of obstacles through the 1:40 OLS gradient. The OLS ensures an enhanced level of flight safety from the existing OLS in the ODP in accordance with the CAA ACI 39-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. Individual properties cannot be excluded from an OLS as it must maintain a uniform shape to comply with relevant standards. The OLS notified in Variation 1 to the PDP is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Aerodrome while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. This will ensure safer operations for departing/arriving aircraft during inclement weather conditions by allowing the use of readily available GPS based navigational technology. This will improve the safety and efficiency of the Aerodrome for aircraft operation under IFR rules.	Accept	9.4
VI.2	Peter and Jackie Gore	Oppose	Amend Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield to consider mitigation of the effects of noise, with a 50dba noise restriction overlaid vertically to 300m for aeroplanes.	Submission raises concerns about noise, especially because extending the OLS to 2500m will attract increased flights, potentially larger planes and encouraging further development, negatively affecting property prices and the quiet enjoyment of the community. The “airport” should not be a permitted activity.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4002.42	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
VFS4003.9	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4005.42	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation 1 only concerns the correct shape and design of the OLS. The purpose of an OLS is to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. Mitigation or restrictions on noise for the Aerodrome are controlled by the proposed Air Noise Control Boundaries; therefore, this submission point is irrelevant to Variation 1.	Accept in part	10.3
VI.3	Peter and Jackie Gore	Oppose	Amend Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield so that existing vegetation over 45 metres in height can remain otherwise mitigate the effects of the loss of that vegetation.	The destruction of habitat over 45m is tantamount to environmental vandalism. The proposed variation offers no redress for loss of habitat, nor considers the impacts on wildlife, including grey heron, native wood pigeons, fantails, and owls. Exposed hills lead to erosion and potential slips when exposed to adverse weather events, and will adversely affect water quality through increased sedimentation. Landowners will incur costs and personal risks in removing vegetation.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.43	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.10	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.43	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. The OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. It is designed to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome and protect an existing piece of infrastructure that has been operational for over 50 years. The OLS is a specifically designed, invisible volume of airspace extending off the end of each runway, off the sides of the runway and above the Aerodrome. This must remain obstacle free in and around the aerodrome for the safety of aircraft operating under IFR as the pilot does not have visual reference to the ground initially during an approach to the runway and if circling visually around the Aerodrome during inclement weather. Therefore, there must be a greater safety margin or area than that required under VFR. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur.</i>		
V2.1	Sophia and Simon Yapp and Barnes	Oppose	Delete Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield – 3.3: Inner Horizontal Surfaces. OR Amend Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield – 3.3: Inner Horizontal Surfaces to remain at 2000m. OR Amend Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield – 3.3: Inner Horizontal Surfaces to allow all native trees to penetrate the height limit. OR Amend Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield – 3.3: Inner Horizontal Surfaces to exclude 90 Perkins Road.	We are concerned about effects of the OLS on indigenous vegetation on our land, especially Kahikatea trees which could penetrate the OLS. These trees provide habitat for native birds and bats. Reasons are given why these trees should be considered significant and protected. Trimming could be detrimental and kill a tree. Submitters provide images and maps of the areas of indigenous vegetation on their property. The Civil Aviation Authority allows surface penetration areas to be noted on airport height controls, e.g. Wanaka and Napier airports. The farm at 90 Perkins Rd should be omitted from the OLS area is just as surface penetration areas are marked on the Napier Airport map attached to submission. Te Kowhai does not need an airport instead of an airfield, because it is less than a half an hour to drive from Te Kowhai airfield to Hamilton airport. The growth of the airfield into an airport could mean the rise of two villages. WDC may ask for all houses under the approach areas to be removed, as it seems to be the recommendation by the CAA. The OLS (noted on LIMs) and low flying planes will depress property values. The cost to cut the top off one 45m high tree is potentially \$1,750, and much higher to cut the whole tree down. It is an unfair financial burden on the owners.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.44	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.11	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.44	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certified Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in Perkins Road. accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified and changed to fit in with individual needs. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p><i>the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code 1A+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. Various OLS exist throughout New Zealand, including over densely populated areas in Hamilton and Auckland. The OLS is a specifically designed, invisible volume of airspace extending off the end of each runway, off the sides of the runway and above the Aerodrome. This must remain obstacle free in and around the aerodrome for the safety of aircraft operating under IFR as the pilot does not have visual reference to the ground initially during an approach to the runway and if circling visually around the Aerodrome during inclement weather. Therefore, there must be a greater safety margin or area than that required under VFR. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur. NZTE does not propose to destroy habitats, only control the height when required to comply with the CAA requirements for the OLS.</i></p>		
V2.2	Sophia and Simon Yapp and Barnes	Oppose	Delete Figure I – Te Kowhai Airport OLS. OR Amend Figure I – Te Kowhai Airport OLS to remain at 2000m. OR Amend Figure I – Te Kowhai Airport OLS to exclude 90 Perkins Road.	<p>We are concerned about effects of the OLS on indigenous vegetation on our land, especially Kahikatea trees which could penetrate the OLS. These trees provide habitat for native birds and bats. Reasons are given why these trees should be considered significant and protected. Trimming could be detrimental and kill a tree. Submitters provide images and maps of the areas of indigenous vegetation on their property. The Civil Aviation Authority allows surface penetration areas to be noted on airport height controls, e.g. Wanaka and Napier airports. The farm at 90 Perkins Rd should be omitted from the OLS area as just as surface penetration areas are marked on the Napier Airport map attached to submission. Te Kowhai does not need an airport instead of an airfield, because it is less than a half an hour to drive from Te Kowhai airfield to Hamilton airport. The</p>	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				growth of the airfield into an airport could mean the rise of two villages. WDC may ask for all houses under the approach areas to be removed, as it seems to be the recommendation by the CAA. The OLS (noted on LIMs) and low flying planes will depress property values. The cost to cut the top off one 45m high tree is potentially \$1,750, and much higher to cut the whole tree down. It is an unfair financial burden on the owners.		
VFS4002.45	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.12	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation I to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.45	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified and changed to fit in with individual needs. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in C M AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code 1A+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport. Variation I intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. Not amending the maps in accordance with Figure 1 will mean the inconsistency between Appendix 9 and the maps remains. Various OLS exist throughout New Zealand, including over densely populated areas in Hamilton and Auckland. The OLS is a specifically designed, invisible volume of airspace extending off the end of each runway, off the sides of the runway and above the Aerodrome. This must remain obstacle free in and around the aerodrome for the safety of aircraft operating under IFR as the pilot does not have visual reference to the ground initially during an approach to the runway and if circling visually around the Aerodrome during inclement weather. Therefore, there must be a greater safety margin or area than that required under VFR. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Standards and Requirements (AC 139 -7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur. NZTE does not propose to destroy habitats, only control the height when required to comply with the CAA requirements for the OLS.</i>		
V3.I	Vela Holdings Limited	Oppose	Delete the extension in Variation I Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface.	The proposal fails to protect existing and future uses such as building heights and the height of vegetation, trees in particular. The submitter cultivates several forestry stands of both native and exotic species within its property, and the proposal fails to account for the favourable environmental impacts presented by these forestry stands.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.46	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.13	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation I to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.46	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation I intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. Variation I depicts the correct shape and design of the OLS on the maps to accord with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. We note that, as shown on Schedule 2, only a very small portion of the Vela Holdings Limited properties is affected by Variation I. Many of its land holdings sit outside the OLS.	Accept in part	9.4
V4.I	Kristine & Marshall Stead	Oppose	Amend Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport OLS to replace “Airport” with “Airfield” throughout Variation I.	These submitters oppose the use of the term “airport” in the s32 report, noting that the PWDP refers to it as an airfield and the operator is not an airport authority under the Airport Authorities Act 1966. These submitters are concerned about the authority and power that Te Kowhai airfield will have in the future as it will give NZTE a legally sound avenue to increase its intensity.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.47	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.48	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	Airfield is the correct dictionary description.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.47	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	Allow	NZTE supports this submission point. The PDP refers to the Aerodrome as the Te Kowhai Airfield, therefore support the use of the term Airfield for consistency and because it reflects the nature of the Aerodrome more accurately.	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
V4.2	Kristine & Marshall Stead	Oppose	Delete Variation I –Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface.	The amended OLS will have adverse effects on adjoining landowners from increased noise pollution and a decrease in amenity values for adjoining landowners. It will also affect the development potential of adjoining land. Loss of vegetation and loss of land also mentioned. The proposed OLS would be contrary to the purpose the Resource Management Act (the Act) (s5) and s5(c) It would be contrary to a local authority's obligation to have particular regard to the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values (s 7(c)). It is not in the interests of sustainable management to future proof an airfield while adversely affecting the interests of a significant section of the Te Kowhai community. The Visual Flight Rule (VFR) basis on which the Airfield is currently operating should be retained. There is no need for the PDP to include provisions allowing the Airfield to operate on an Instrument Flight-Rule (IFR) basis. These provisions include the lowered OLS which can enable night time flying and flying in Instrument metrological conditions. Keeping noise associated with the Airfield to a reasonable level has not been addressed. The lowered OLS will result in increased adverse noise effects. There is insufficient cost-benefit analysis and a failure to consider costs and benefits of the Variation. The s32 analysis is insufficient to evaluate whether Variation I is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. There would be significant adverse effects including loss of development potential, loss of amenity values and noise. Moving the airfield runway to the centre of the NZTE property will remove the negative effects of the proposed OLS on the submitter's property but will affect the development goals/yield of the air-park. No aeronautical study has been conducted to justify CAA approval for the proposed activities/uses outlined in the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone. It would be against sound resource management practice to adopt Variation I without one.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.48	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.49	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	VFR rules are satisfactory for current and airpark proposed users and plane types Comprehensive operating plans are required to be developed between community and NZTE with clearly understood volume and operating hours published and enforceable.	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
VFS4005.48	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submitter is not affected by Variation 1 in that OLS is the same as was notified over the submitters' property in Stage 1 of the PDP process and does not change the pre-existing status quo. The submitter, therefore, has no scope to request Variation 1 be deleted.	Accept in part	9.4
V4.3	Kristine & Marshall Stead	Oppose	Amend Variation 1 to include the best practicable options to control the emission of noise from the Airfield. Controls should include: number of aircraft movements; and hours of the Airfield's operation to limit night flying; and A Comprehensive Noise Management Plan prepared through consultation with affected landowners.	These measures will ensure that noise from the airfield and associated activities does not exceed a reasonable level.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4002.49	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4003.1	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	VFR rules are satisfactory for current and airpark proposed users and plane types Comprehensive operating plans are required to be developed between community and NZTE with clearly understood volume and operating hours published and enforceable.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4005.49	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submitter is not affected by Variation 1 in that the OLS is the same as was notified over the submitter's property in Stage 1 of the PDP process and does not change the pre-existing status quo. The location of the submitter's property is shown in Schedule 2. The submitter therefore has no scope to submit on Variation 1. In any respect, the Variation 1 only concerns the OLS and the OLS does not control aircraft noise. This is controlled through the proposed Air Noise Control Boundaries (ANCB) that this submitter has already further submitted on through the Stage 1 process.	Accept in part	10.3
V4.4	Kristine & Marshall Stead	Oppose	Amend Variation 1 – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface to adopt the existing Obstacle Limitation Surfaces from the Operative District Plan (2013).	This satisfies the requirements set out in the CAA Advisory Circular AC139-7 section 3.2 Day VFR Runway Existing trees in the OLS have existing use rights and there is case law and decisions of local authorities which confirm that a Council or private entity cannot compel landowners to trim/cut down trees that protrude through the OLS. The OLS in the Operative District Plan (Rule 25.49(c)) does not control the height of vegetation and trees.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.1	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
VFS4003.2	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	VFR rules are satisfactory for current and airpark proposed users and plane types Comprehensive operating plans are required to be developed between community and NZTE with clearly understood volume and operating hours published and enforceable.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.1	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	This submitter is not affected by Variation 1 in that the OLS is the same as was notified over the submitter's property in Stage 1 of the PDP process and does not change the pre-existing status quo. The location of the submitter's property is shown in Schedule 2. The submitter therefore has no scope to submit on Variation 1. Regardless, Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. Variation 1 depicts the correct shape of the OLS on the maps to accord with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. It is not within scope of Variation 1 to amend the OLS to the existing shape from the ODP.	Accept in part	9.4
V5.1	Stanley William Ranby	Oppose	Amend the Variation 1 – Te Kowhai Airport OLS extension to defer airpark and airfield development until adverse effects are addressed in relation to development potential of land, noise, safety, fuel dumping, and Te Kowhai country village lifestyle.	Submitter seeks restrictions on the number of planes, the schedule of planes and noise restrictions in place. The amendment to the OLS out to 2500m for the Te Kowhai Airfield directly and adversely affects the ability of my land to be developed or subdivided in the future. There is no proposal to limit noise levels nor limit or advise the schedules of planes. Planes below the OLS recommended height cause significant noise and a severe hazard risk. The environmental factors of the dumping of fuel from planes must also be considered. Te Kowhai country village lifestyle should be given priority over airfield development.	Reject	9.4
VFS4002.2	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Reject	9.4
VFS4003.14	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Reject	9.4
VFS4004.1	Graham & Di McBride on behalf of Persons from the western precinct of Te Kowhai West as attached to the original submission	Support	Allow	We agree to place a limit on the number of planes and noise standards.	Reject	9.4
VFS4005.2	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submitter is not affected by Variation 1 in that the OLS is the same as was notified over the PDP process and does not change the pre-existing status quo. The location of the submitter's property is shown in Schedule 2. The submitter therefore has no scope to submit on	Accept	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Variation 1. Regardless, Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. This submission is not relevant to Variation 1.</i>		
V6.1	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	Retain Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface as proposed.	The map in Variation 1 correctly shows the OLS in accordance with Civil Aviation Circular AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements. The amendments made to Appendix 9 clarify the description and function of the OLS. The Submitter owns the Te Kowhai aerodrome (the Aerodrome) and surrounding land located off Limmer Road, near the settlement of Te Kowhai. The Airfield and surrounding land are proposed to be zoned Te Kowhai Airpark Zone (TKAZ) under the Proposed District Plan. The Aerodrome operates separately as an existing piece of infrastructure and, while being part of the TKAZ, needs to be protected through the provision of appropriate development controls to ensure that safe operation, growth and reverse sensitivity effects are adequately managed. The rules as notified (including the Variation 1 amendments) seek to future proof the Aerodrome in order for it to operate on an Instrument Flight Rule (IFR) basis, as well as a VFR basis. This will necessitate changes to the OLS and transitional side surfaces, which are reflected in Variation 1. The OLS is necessary to ensure compliance with Civil Aviation Circular AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements. The extent of the OLS is described in Chapter 29 - Appendix 9. Rules are also provided in the Proposed District Plan to protect the OLS from being breached by buildings, structures, trees and vegetation. The dimensions of the OLS were incorrectly notified in the planning maps of the Proposed District Plan, yet correctly described in the text of Chapter 29 - Appendix 9. Variation 1 is not an expansion of the notified proposed OLS on the planning maps, but a reflection of what is described in Chapter 29 - Appendix 9.	Reject	9.4
VFS4000.1	Vikki Michelle Madgwick	Oppose	Disallow	<i>The submitter's property is in the proposed expansion of the OLS transitional zone. As well as farming and dwelling infrastructure, the submitter has their personal retirement investment stand of future milling trees. All are threatened by NZTE's future proof plan. The submitter's future living should not be affected by NZTE's plan. Self describing as an aerodrome misrepresents the real airfield facility. The first map provided by the council and NZTE excluded the submitter's property from the OLS zone. The submitter expresses</i>	Accept	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				concern that there is a strong possibility of low flying and night flight aircraft crash landing. The submitter questions why both they and stock are at risk of suffering the consequences of a crash landing. There is only one submission supporting the airfield becoming an airport so it is questioned why the initial proposal is still considered. The number of submissions received shows that the airfield is not a welcome addition to the majority of Te Kowhai people and the surrounding area.		
VFS4001.1	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Disallow	The amended OLS will have adverse effects on adjoining landowners.	Accept	9.4
VFS4002.3	Roger Ranby	Oppose	Disallow	The reasons given by the submitter do not justify the changes to the District Plan that are proposed through Variation 1. The airfield should not be expanded unless appropriate controls on expansion and operations are included in the District Plan. Expansion of the OLS is inappropriate.	Accept	9.4
VFS4003.64	Kit Maxwell	Oppose	Disallow and introduce a notified process to allow proper assessment and professional advice and appraisal for the future airfield operations	The expanded OLS will directly and adversely affect more than 1000 residents living in the 33sqkms area with noise and increased movements and night flying. The ILS is not required for an airfield or for the airpark. NZTE have not offered any community communications or voluntary limits on activities.	Accept	9.4
VFS4004.4	Graham & Di McBride on behalf of Persons from the western precinct of Te Kowhai West as attached to the original submission	Support	Disallow	'NZTE wish to future proof operations' ... including IFR & VFR. We oppose this on the basis that 'future proofing' indicates 'blank cheque' approval for NZTE, with no consultation or discussion with the affected community on the extent and scale of that approval (including aircraft numbers, noise, duration, timing, hours of operation etc.). IFR is not necessary, does not sit within Existing Use Rights under the RMA and WDC/NZTE has made no effort to mitigate the consequences of excessive and negative effects.	Accept	9.4
V7.1	Kane Lee	Oppose	Delete Variation I –Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface AND Delete Objective 9.2.1.	Property values within the OLS are likely to be affected and no consideration has been made for this. Allowing a large commercial operation in a rural/lifestyle area will severely affect local lifestyle. Economic and social benefits as described only take into account benefits for the airfield – no consideration has been given to properties affected. Development potential for properties within the OLS is likely to be adversely affected. Tension is likely to increase between the airfield and the community. Students at Te Kowhai School would have their concentration levels adversely affected by frequent aircraft take offs and landings. There would be significant environmental and aesthetic impacts on many trees at or close to the OLS height.	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				The cost of removing/trimming trees should not be on property owners. Long tailed native bats will be adversely affected. The airport should remain as a small non-commercial operation to avoid effects of excessive flights. Global warming and climate affects need to be considered, due to the excessive number of extra flights. Airfield users will increase traffic volume on an already busy stretch of highway, with adverse effects on road safety.		
VFS4002.4	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
FS4003.15	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.3	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	Disallow	The proposed OLS notified in the PDP is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Aerodrome while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified or changed to fit in with individual needs. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. Deleting Variation 1 would mean that disparity in the PDP would continue to exist. Variation 1 only concerns the correct shape of the OLS, not the Policies in Chapter 9, therefore the request to delete Objective 9.2.1 is out of scope of the Variation. Further, as shown in Schedule 2, this submitter is not affected by Variation 1 in that the OLS is the same as was notified over the submitter's property in Stage 1 of the PDP process. The submitter therefore has no scope to submit on Variation 1.	Accept in part	9.4
V8.1	Diane Patricia & Graham McBride	Oppose	Delete Te Kowhai Airport OLS from the PDP. AND Delete Te Kowhai Airport OLS from the ODP.	Submitters are averse to another Council-supported extension of the OLS. The proposed OLS is unworkable in its implementation. To include provisions in a District Plan which do not have to be complied with or will not be enforced causes uncertainty and is not in the interests of sustainable management.	Reject	9.4
VFS4003.41	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	The submission correctly identifies topographical land dangers and native vegetation removals normally disallowed, and community impacts e.g. noise or night flights intrusions within the OLS zone. Variation 1 changes are not reviewed due to the lack of notification process.	Reject	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
VFS4005.4	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It is not another extension to the OLS but a correction of an error to the planning maps. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The notified Appendix 9 and Variation 1 OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Aerodrome while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. Therefore, deleting the OLS from the PDP and ODP would be a breach of CAA regulations and render the Aerodrome unusable and function as an existing activity and piece of infrastructure that has been operating for over 50 years.	Accept	9.4
V8.2	Diane Patricia & Graham McBride	Oppose	Amend Variation 1 – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface to replace “Airport” with “Airfield” throughout Variation 1.	The submitter opposes the use of the term “airport” in the s32 report, noting that the PWDP refers to it as an airfield and the operator is not an airport authority under the Airport Authorities Act 1966.	Accept in part	9.4
FS4003.42	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	The submission correctly identifies topographical land dangers and native vegetation removals normally disallowed, and community impacts e.g. noise or night flights intrusions within the OLS zone. Variation 1 changes are not reviewed due to the lack of notification process.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.5	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	Allow	NZTE supports this submission point. The PDP refers to the Aerodrome as the Te Kowhai Airfield, therefore support the use of the term Airfield for consistency and because it reflects the nature of the Aerodrome more accurately.	Accept in part	9.4
V8.3	Diane Patricia & Graham McBride	Oppose	Delete Variation 1 – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface.	No Aeronautical Study has been conducted to justify CAA approval for the proposed activities /uses outlined in the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone. It would be against sound resource management practice to adopt Variation 1 without one. If the proposed OLS is unsafe or does not meet the requirements of CAA rules, then there is no point in including the OLS in the PDP.	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
VFS4002.5	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
FS4003.43	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	The submission correctly identifies topographical land dangers and native vegetation removals normally disallowed, and community impacts e.g. noise or night flights intrusions within the OLS zone. Variation 1 changes are not reviewed due to the lack of notification process.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.6	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It is not another extension to the OLS but a correction of an error to the planning maps. A full assessment of the OLS has been undertaken as part of the section 32 process for Stage 1 of the PDP. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The CAA does require an Aeronautical Part 157 Study when an aerodrome has been constructed, altered, activated or de-activated. The OLS notified in Appendix 9 and shown in Variation 1 accords with CAA requirements. At this stage, a Part 157 Study is not required to be undertaken by the Aerodrome but will be carried out at the appropriate time when required by the CAA. That is a separate process to the PDP.	Accept in part	9.4
V8.4	Diane Patricia & Graham McBride	Oppose	Delete Variation 1 – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface.	The OLS is unsafe because of the height of hills, structures and trees with existing use rights. These rise above the level of the OLS, particularly at the western end. The height data available has not been reconciled with the OLS proposal.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.6	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.44	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	The submission correctly identifies topographical land dangers and native vegetation removals normally disallowed, and community impacts e.g. noise or night flights intrusions within the OLS zone. Variation 1 changes are not reviewed due to the lack of notification process.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.7	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The OLS shape and size is determined by CAA standards which determine that an OLS is to extend out horizontally 2,500m at a 45-metre height, regardless of terrain. The idea of a 4 5 metre inner horizontal surface is to control obstacles above a height of 45 metres, to ensure the safety of aircraft when manoeuvring in and around the vicinity of the Aerodrome. The approach and take off surfaces provide this control of obstacles through the 1:40 OLS gradient. An OLS is	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles, but any natural topography that breaches the OLS is noted for pilots. The purpose of the OLS is to identify and where possible, ensure those hazards do not protrude.</i>		
V8.5	Diane Patricia & Graham McBride	Oppose	Delete Variation I Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface.	Insufficient cost-benefit analysis of the proposals was undertaken. Costs to residents and community have not been taken into account, including loss of opportunity to plant trees over significant areas for amenity, erosion control, fodder, carbon credits, shade and shelter benefits. Submitters land value will be reduced. It is not in the interests of sustainable management to future proof an airfield while adversely affecting the interests of the community. The Visual Flight Rule (VFR) basis on which the Airfield is currently operating should be retained instead of the proposed Instrument Flight Rule (IFR) basis, which can enable night-time flying.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.7	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
FS4003.45	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	The submission correctly identifies topographical land dangers and native vegetation removals normally disallowed, and community impacts e.g. noise or night flights intrusions within the OLS zone. Variation I changes are not reviewed due to the lack of notification process.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.8	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The proposed OLS in the PDP is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. This will ensure safer operations for departing/arriving aircraft during inclement weather conditions by allowing the use of readily available GPS based navigational technology. This will improve the safety and efficiency of the Aerodrome for aircraft operation under IFR rules. It will also allow the sustainable management and use of a recognised and existing piece of infrastructure in the Waikato District, The Aerodrome is to remain a non- certificated Aerodrome (CM Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS as notified in the PDP through its design and implementation ensures an enhanced level of flight safety from the existing OLS in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. A full assessment of the OLS has been undertaken as part of the section 32 process for Stage 1 of the PDP and a section 32 process was undertaken in the decision to proceed with Variation 1. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9 in Stage 1 of the PDP process. Without Variation 1 there is an inconsistency within the PDP that will remain.</i>		
8.6	Diane Patricia & Graham McBride	Oppose	Delete Variation 1 Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface.	Adoption of Variation 1 would be contrary to s16 RMA, which imposes a duty on council to adopt the best practicable option to ensure the emission of noise does not exceed a reasonable level. The inner and outer noise boundaries give no noise relief to western residents. Aircraft operations already cause a noise nuisance, especially, repetitive circuits and simulated engine failures are examples. The amended OLS will result in increased adverse noise effects. CAA does not regulate noise, leaving it to councils.	Accept in part	10.3
FS4002.8	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
FS4003.46	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	The submission correctly identifies topographical land dangers and native vegetation removals normally disallowed, and community impacts e.g. noise or night flights intrusions within the OLS zone. Variation 1 changes are not reviewed due to the lack of notification process.	Accept in part	10.3
FS4005.9	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. It does not control aircraft noise. That is controlled through the proposed ANCB's which are not part of the Variation 1 process. Therefore, this submission is not relevant to Variation 1.	Accept in part	10.3
V8.7	Diane Patricia & Graham McBride	Oppose	Amend Chapter 27: Te Kowhai Airpark Zone to include the following measures; Hours of operation to limit night flying; Require the Airfield to operate under a Comprehensive Noise Management Plan prepared through consultation with affected landowners, Prescribe noise limits on aircraft engine noise, Restrict aircraft movement to an agreed number,	NZTE has not been required to apply for resource consent – if they had, these issues would have been considered. Council has not acted impartially in including the proposals in PWDP. NZTE should have been required to apply for resource consent to ensure they address negative effects and concerns of affected parties. WDC were unable to confirm the submitters calculations relating to the proposed OLS and the effects of the Approach Surface and the Inner Horizontal Surface on their hills and existing structures/trees. Better and wider ranging consultation	Accept in part	10.3

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			arrived at by consultation with the community. Prohibit 'simulated engine failures' at Te Kowhai Airfield Prohibit IFR flying Prohibit Commercial flight training/school, and That Inner Noise and Outer Noise Boundaries provisions and absolute upper limits, or their equivalent, be mandatory for the protection of residents under the Approach Surface and the Variation I OLS. OR Amend Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface to include the previous measures.	should have been undertaken. IFR is unnecessary. The Visual Flight Rule (VFR) basis on which the Airfield is currently operating should be retained.		
VFS4002.9	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4003.47	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	The submission correctly identifies topographical land dangers and native vegetation removals normally disallowed, and community impacts e.g. noise or night flights intrusions within the OLS zone. Variation I changes are not reviewed due to the lack of notification process.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4005.10	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation I intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. It does not control aircraft noise. That is controlled through the proposed ANCB's which are not part of the Variation I process. Therefore, this submission is not relevant to Variation I.	Accept in part	10.3
9.1	Imogen & Phoebe Barnes	Oppose	Delete Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield, Section 3.3, Inner Horizontal Surfaces. OR Amend Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield, Section 3.3, Inner Horizontal Surfaces by deleting "2500m" and replacing it with "2000m". OR Amend Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield, Section 3.3, Inner Horizontal Surfaces to allow all existing native trees to penetrate this height limit. OR Amend Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield, Section 3.3, Inner	The submitter would like to retain the mature Kahikatea trees at 90 Perkins Road. Rule 22.2.8: Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area is in place to protect our trees. The submitters have a sentimental connection to the land and trees.	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Horizontal Surfaces to exclude the farm at 90 Perkins Road.			
FS4002.10	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
FS4003.16	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
FS4005.11	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified changed to fit in with individual needs. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code 1A+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. Various OLS exist throughout New Zealand, including over densely populated areas in Hamilton and Auckland. The OLS is a specifically designed, invisible volume of airspace extending off the end of each runway, off the sides of the runway and above the Aerodrome. This must remain obstacle free in and around the aerodrome for the safety of aircraft operating under IFP. as the pilot does not have visual reference to the ground initially during an approach to the runway and if circling visually around the Aerodrome during inclement weather. Therefore, there must be a greater safety margin or area than that required under VFR. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC 139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur. NZTE does not	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>propose to destroy habitats, only control obstacle height when required to comply with the CAA requirements for the OLS.</i>		
9.2	Imogen & Phoebe Barnes	Oppose	Delete Figure 1 Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) (2020). OR Amend Figure 1 Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) (2020) to remain at 2000m. OR Amend Figure 1 Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) (2020) to exclude the farm at 90 Perkins Road.	The submitter would like to retain the mature Kahikatea Trees at 90 Perkins Road, which provide bat habitat. Rule 22.2.8: Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area is in place to protect our trees. The submitters have a sentimental connection to the land and trees.	Accept in part	9.3
VFS4002.11	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.17	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.12	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified or changed to fit in with individual needs. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial air transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code 1A+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. Not amending the maps in accordance with Figure 1 will mean the inconsistency between Appendix 9 and the maps remains. Various OLS exist throughout New Zealand, including over densely populated areas in Hamilton and Auckland. The OLS is a specifically designed, invisible volume of airspace extending off the end of each runway, off the sides of the runway and above the Aerodrome. This must remain obstacle free in and around the aerodrome for the safety of aircraft operating under IFR as the pilot does not have visual reference to the ground initially during an approach to the runway and if circling visually around the Aerodrome during inclement weather. Therefore, there must be a greater safety margin or area than that required under VFR. The	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur. NZTE does not propose to destroy habitats, only control obstacle height when required to comply with the CAA requirements for the OLS.</i>		
10.1	Jordan Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport OLS to replace “Airport” with “Airfield” throughout Variation I.	The submitter opposes the use of the term “airport” in the s32 report, noting that the PWDP refers to it as an airfield and the operator is not an airport authority under the Airport Authorities Act 1966.	Accept in part	9.4
FS4002.12	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
FS4003.3	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	It implies essential infrastructure exists which is not the case	Accept in part	9.4
FS4005.13	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	Allow	NZTE supports this submission point. The PDP refers to the Aerodrome as the Te Kowhai Airfield, therefore support the use of the term Airfield for consistency and because it reflects the nature of the Aerodrome more accurately.	Accept in part	9.4
10.2	Jordan Metcalfe	Oppose	Delete Figure 2: Areas potentially affected by Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) (2020).	The 10m threshold shown in Figure 2 does not consider that different PDP height limits will apply in different zones within the OLS (i.e. rural, village and residential) and that there are different PDP height limits for frost fan blades, wind turbines, meteorological structures and amateur radio aerials. Figure 2 does not identify where there could be implications on existing trees and vegetation.	Accept	9.4
FS4002.13	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept	9.4
FS4003.4	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	NZTE must establish enforceable operating conditions together with the council and community	Accept	9.4
FS4005.14	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	This submitter is not affected by Variation I in that the OLS is the same as was notified over the submitter's property in Stage 1 of the PDP process and does not change the pre-existing status quo. The location of the submitter's property can be seen on Schedule 2. The submitter therefore has no scope to request Figure 2 be deleted. Regardless, Figure 2 is not proposed to be part of the PDP and is	Reject	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>intended as a guidance document to help inform submitters as to the extent of the OLS over their properties.</i>		
10.3	Jordan Metcalfe	Oppose	Delete Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface.	<p>The amended OLS will have adverse effects on adjoining landowners from increased noise pollution and a decrease in amenity values for adjoining landowners. It will also affect the development potential of adjoining land. The proposed OLS would be contrary to the purpose of the Resource Management Act (the Act) (s 5) and s 5(c). It would be contrary to a local authority's obligation to have particular regard to the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values (s 7(c)). It is not in the interests of sustainable management to future proof an airfield while adversely affecting the interests of a significant section of the Te Kowhai community. The Visual Flight Rule (VFR) basis on which the Airfield is currently operating should be retained. There is no need for the PDP to include provisions allowing the Airfield to operate on an Instrument Flight- Rule (IFR) basis. These provisions include the lowered OLS which can enable night time flying. Variation I would be contrary to s 16 of the RMA, which imposes a duty on local authorities to adopt the best practicable option to ensure that emission of noise does not exceed a reasonable level. Keeping noise associated with the Airfield to a reasonable level has not been addressed. The lowered OLS will result in increased adverse noise effects. There is insufficient cost-benefit analysis and a failure to consider costs and benefits of the Variation. The s32 analysis is insufficient to evaluate whether Variation I is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. There would be significant adverse effects including loss of development potential, loss of amenity values, and noise. No Aeronautical Study has been conducted to justify CAA approval for the proposed activities / uses outlined in the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone. It would be against sound resource management practice to adopt Variation I without one.</p>	Accept in part	10.3
FS4002.14	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
FS4003.5	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	NZTE must establish enforceable operating conditions together with the council and community	Accept in part	10.3
FS4005.15	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	This submitter is not affected by Variation I in that the OLS is the same as was notified over the submitter's property in Stage I of the	Accept in part	10.3

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>PDP process and does not change the pre-existing status quo. The location of the submitter's property can be seen on Schedule 2. The submitter therefore has no scope to request Variation 1 be deleted.</i>		
10.4	Jordan Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Variation 1 to include the best practicable options to control the emission of noise from the Airfield. Controls should include: maximum of 21,000 aircraft movements hours of the Airfield's operation to limit night flying; and an Airpark Management Plan and a Comprehensive Noise Management Plan prepared through consultation with affected landowners.	These measures will ensure that noise from the airfield and associated activities does not exceed a reasonable level.	Accept in part	10.3
FS4002.15	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
FS4003.6	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	NZTE must establish enforceable operating conditions together with the council and community	Accept in part	10.3
FS4004.2	Graham & Di McBride on behalf of Persons from the western precinct of Te Kowhai West as attached to the original submission	Oppose	Disallow	There has been no unsubstantiated data presented which indicates '21,000 maximum aircraft movement per annum' has any historical relevance to the airfield's past operations, nor any justification for such numbers. Te Kowhai community in general appears unaware of the significance of that number and the consequences on amenity values. While we support this submission, we oppose the specific comment of accepting '21,000 aircraft movements' as a maximum figure.	Accept in part	10.3
FS4005.16	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	This submitter is not affected by Variation 1 in that the OLS is the same as was notified over the submitter's property in Stage 1 of the PDP process and does not change the pre-existing status quo. The location of the submitter's property can be seen on Schedule 2. The submitter therefore has no scope to request Variation 1 be amended. In any respect, the Variation 1 only concerns the correct shape of the OLS and the OLS does not control aircraft noise or aircraft movements. Aircraft noise and movements, including night flying, are controlled through the proposed ANCB's that this submitter has already further submitted on through the Stage 1 process.	Accept in part	10.3
10.5	Jordan Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Variation 1 – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface to adopt the existing Obstacle Limitation Surfaces from the Operative District Plan (2013).	This satisfies the requirements set out in the CAA Advisory Circular AC139-7 section 3.2 Day VFR Runway. Existing trees in the OLS have existing use rights and there is case law and decisions of local authorities which confirm that a Council or private entity cannot compel landowners to trim/cut down trees	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				that protrude through the OLS. The OLS in the Operative District Plan Rule 25.49(c) does not control the height of vegetation and trees.		
FS4002.16	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
FS4003.7	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	NZTE must establish enforceable operating conditions together with the council and community	Accept in part	9.4
FS4005.17	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	This submitter is not affected by Variation 1 in that the OLS is the same as was notified over the submitter's property in Stage 1 of the PDP process and does not change the pre-existing status quo. The location of the submitter's property can be seen on Schedule 2. The submitter therefore has no scope to request Variation 1 be amended. Regardless, Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. Variation 1 depicts the correct shape of the OLS on the maps to accord with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. It is not within scope of Variation 1 to amend the OLS to the existing shape from the ODP.	Accept in part	9.4
11.1	Amanda & Jack Schaake	Support	Retain Variation 1 – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface.	Submitter wishes for this to be sorted out. The airfield is needed and makes Te Kowhai stand out.	Reject	9.4
FS4001.2	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Disallow	The amended OLS will have adverse effects on adjoining landowners.	Accept	9.4
FS4003.65	Kit Maxwell	Oppose	Disallow	Having Te Kowhai Village airfield changed to an airport and possibly dominated by fly schools and night flying will negatively impact and change the current village identity. Opposing this will retain the unique village living atmosphere and community hobby flying (VFR) use of the airfield.	Accept	9.4
FS4005.18	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	Allow	NZTE agrees with the reasoning of the submitter.	Reject	9.4
V12.1	Keneth Malcom Anderson	Oppose	Delete Variation 1 – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface AND Delete Objective 9.2.1.	Property values within the OLS are likely to be affected and no consideration has been made for this. Allowing a large commercial operation in a rural / lifestyle area will severely affect local lifestyle. Economic benefits as described only take into account benefits for the airfield - no consideration has been given to properties affected. Development potential for properties within the OLS is likely to be adversely affected. There would be significant environmental and aesthetic impacts on many trees at or close to the OLS height. The cost of removing/trimming trees should not be on property owners. Long tailed native bats will be adversely affected. The airport should remain as a small non-	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				commercial operation to avoid effects of excessive flights. Global warming and climate affects need to be considered, due to the excessive number of extra flights.		
VFS4002.17	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.18	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.19	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The proposed OLS notified in the PDP is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Aerodrome while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA ACI 39-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be chopped and changed to fit in with individual needs. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. Deleting Variation 1 would mean that disparity in the PDP would continue to exist. Variation 1 only concerns the OLS, not the Policies in Chapter 9. Therefore, the request to delete Objective 9.2.1 is out of scope of the Variation. Further, as shown in Schedule 2, the vast majority of this submitter's land is not affected by Variation 1 in that the OLS is exactly the same as was notified over most of the submitter's property in Stage 1 of the PDP process and does not fundamentally change the pre-existing status quo. This submission should therefore be taken in that context.	Accept in part	9.4
V13.1	David Barnes	Oppose	Delete Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield, Section 3.3, Inner Horizontal Surfaces.	There are Kahikatea remnants on this submitters property that are 150 years old and should be protected. (Photos attached to submission.) The submitter has fenced the trees and undertakes predator trapping to protect the New Zealand Parakeets known to be in the area. The proposed restrictions would be added to a LIM and devalue the submitters property. The current noise levels of the planes circling higher is not so bad, they circle every few minutes but at lower levels the submitter considers that the noise will drive them mad.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.18	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.19	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
VFS4005.20	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	<p>The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified or changed to fit in with individual needs. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code 1A+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. Various OLS exist throughout New Zealand, including over densely populated areas in Hamilton and Auckland. The OLS is a specifically designed, invisible volume of airspace extending off the end of each runway, off the sides of the runway and above the Aerodrome. This must remain obstacle free in and around the aerodrome for the safety of aircraft operating under IFR as the pilot does not have visual reference to the ground initially during an approach to the runway and if circling visually around the Aerodrome during inclement weather. Therefore, there must be a greater safety margin or area than that required under VFR. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur. NZTE does not propose to destroy habitats, only control obstacle height when required to comply with the CAA requirements for the OLS.</p>	Accept in part	9.4
V14.1	Roger Ranby	Oppose	Delete Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface.	The airstrip and airport related activities should not be expanded or increased. The proposed changes to the provisions already in the PWDP should not be made.	Reject	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
VFS4002.19	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Reject	9.4
VFS4003.20	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Reject	9.4
VFS4005.21	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submitter is not affected by Variation 1 in that the OLS is the same as was notified over the submitter's property in Stage 1 of the PDP process and does not change the pre-existing status quo. The location of the submitter's property is shown in Schedule 2. The submitter therefore has no scope to request Variation 1 be deleted. Variation 1 seeks to amend the maps to align with the notified text in Appendix 9 to depict the correct shape of the OLS and accord with the relevant CAA requirements.	Accept	9.4
V15.1	GP Young Family Trust	Oppose	Delete Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield – 3 Obstacle Limitation Surfaces AND Delete Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield – 3.3: Inner Horizontal Surfaces.	The proposed amendments pose a potential threat to remaining mature native vegetation – this is in contravention to Rule 22.2.8: Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area. It would “be a travesty” to ask landowners to clear native trees, especially those that predate the Treaty of Waitangi. Exotic trees should be topped and sculpted by a qualified arborist at the expense of the airfield operator as a priority over tree removal, unless the landowner agrees to removal, which should also be at the cost of the airfield operator.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.21	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.22	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified or changed to fit in with individual needs. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code 1A+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. Various OLS exist throughout New Zealand,	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				including over densely populated areas in Hamilton and Auckland. The OLS is a specifically designed, invisible volume of airspace extending off the end of each runway, off the sides of the runway and above the Aerodrome. This must remain obstacle free in and around the aerodrome for the safety of aircraft operating under IFR as the pilot does not have visual reference to the ground initially during an approach to the runway and if circling visually around the Aerodrome during inclement weather. Therefore, there must be a greater safety margin or area than that required under VFR. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur. NZTE does not propose to destroy habitats, only control obstacle height when required to comply with the CAA requirements for the OLS.		
V16.1	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Variation 1 – Te Kowhai Airport OLS to replace “Airport” with “Airfield” throughout Variation 1.	The submitter opposes the use of the term “airport” in the s32 report, noting that the PWDP refers to it as an airfield and the operator is not an airport authority under the Airport Authorities Act 1966.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.20	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.22	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.23	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	Allow	NZTE supports this submission point. The PDP refers to the Aerodrome as the Te Kowhai Airfield, therefore support the use of the term Airfield for consistency and because it reflects the nature of the Aerodrome more accurately.	Accept in part	9.4
V16.2	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Delete Figure 2: Areas potentially affected by Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) (2020).	The 10m threshold shown in Figure 2 does not consider that different PDP height limits will apply in different zones within the OLS (i.e. rural, village and residential) and that there are different PDP height limits for frost fan blades, wind turbines, meteorological structures and amateur radio aerials. Figure 2 does not identify where there could be implications on existing trees and vegetation.	Accept	9.4
FS4002.22	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS4003.23	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept	9.4
FS4005.24	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submitter is not affected by Variation 1 in that the OLS is the same as was notified over the submitter's property in Stage 1 of the PDP process and does not change the pre-existing status quo. The location of the submitter's property is shown in Schedule 2. The submitter therefore has no scope to request Figure 2 be deleted. Regardless, Figure 2 is not proposed to be part of the PDP and is intended as a guidance document to help inform submitters as to the extent of the OLS over their properties.	Reject	9.4
16.3	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Delete Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface.	The amended OLS will have adverse effects on adjoining landowners from increased noise pollution and a decrease in amenity values for adjoining landowners. It will also affect the development potential of adjoining land. The proposed OLS would be contrary to the purpose of the Resource Management Act (the Act) (s 5) and s 5(c). It would be contrary to a local authority's obligation to have particular regard to the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values (s 7(c)). It is not in the interests of sustainable management to future proof an airfield while adversely affecting the interests of a significant section of the Te Kowhai community. The Visual Flight Rule (VFR) basis on which the Airfield is currently operating should be retained. There is no need for the PDP to include provisions allowing the Airfield to operate on an Instrument Flight Rule (IFR) basis. These provisions include the lowered OLS which can enable night time flying. Variation 1 would be contrary to s 16 of the RMA, which imposes a duty on local authorities to adopt the best practicable option to ensure that emission of noise does not exceed a reasonable level. Keeping noise associated with the Airfield to a reasonable level has not been addressed. The lowered OLS will result in increased adverse noise effects. There is insufficient cost-benefit analysis and a failure to consider costs and benefits of the Variation. The s32 analysis is insufficient to evaluate whether Variation 1 is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. There would be significant adverse effects including loss of development potential, loss of amenity values and noise. No Aeronautical Study has been conducted to justify CAA approval for the proposed activities/uses outlined in the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone. It would	Accept in part	10.3

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				be against sound resource management practice to adopt Variation I without one.		
VFS4002.23	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4003.24	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation I to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4005.25	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submitter is not affected by Variation I in that the OLS is the same as was notified over the submitter's property in Stage 1 of the PDP process and does not change the pre-existing status quo. The location of the submitter's property is shown in Schedule 2. The submitter therefore has no scope to request Variation I be deleted.	Accept in part	10.3
V16.4	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Variation I to include the best practicable options to control the emission of noise from the Airfield. Controls should include: maximum of 21,000 aircraft movements hours of the Airfield's operation to limit night flying; and an Airpark Management Plan and a Comprehensive Noise Management Plan prepared through consultation with affected landowners.	These measures will ensure that noise from the airfield and associated activities does not exceed a reasonable level.	Accept in part	10.3
FS4002.24	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
FS4003.25	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation I to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
FS4004.3	Graham & Di McBride on behalf of Persons from the western precinct of Te Kowhai West as attached to the original submission	Oppose	Disallow	There has been no unsubstantiated data presented which indicates '21,000 maximum aircraft movement per annum' has any historical relevance to the airfield's past operations, nor any justification for such numbers. Te Kowhai community in general appears unaware of the significance of that number and the consequences on amenity values. While we support this submission, we oppose the specific comment of accepting '21,000 aircraft movements' as a maximum figure.	Accept in part	10.3
FS4005.26	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submitter is not affected by Variation I in that the OLS is the same as was notified over the submitter's property in Stage 1 of the PDP process and does not change the pre-existing status quo. The location of the submitter's property is shown in Schedule 2. The submitter therefore has no scope to request Variation I be amended. In any respect, the Variation I only concerns the OLS and the OLS does not control aircraft noise or aircraft movements. Aircraft noise and	Accept in part	10.3

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>movements, including night flying, are controlled through the proposed Air Noise Control Boundaries that this submitter on through the Stage 1 process.</i>		
V16.5	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface to adopt the existing Obstacle Limitation Surfaces from the Operative District Plan (2013).	This satisfies the requirements set out in the CAA Advisory Circular AC139-7 section 3.2 Day VFR Runway. Existing trees in the OLS have existing use rights and there is case law and decisions of local authorities which confirm that a Council or private entity cannot compel landowners to trim/cut down trees that protrude through the OLS. The OLS in the Operative District Plan Rule 25.49(c) does not control the height of vegetation and trees.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.25	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.26	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.27	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submitter is not affected by Variation 1 in that the OLS is the same as was notified over the submitter's property in Stage 1 of the PDP process and does not change the pre-existing status quo. The location of the submitter's property is shown on Schedule 2. The submitter therefore has no scope to request Variation 1 be amended. Regardless, Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. Variation 1 depicts the correct shape of the OLS on the maps to accord with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. It is not within scope of Variation 1 to amend the OLS to the existing shape from the ODP.	Accept in part	9.4
V17.1	Lloyd Davis	Oppose	Delete Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface.	The amended OLS will have adverse effects on adjoining landowners from increased noise pollution and a decrease in amenity values for adjoining landowners. It will also affect the development potential of adjoining land. It will affect the development potential of the submitter's land, market desirability and price resulting in financial disadvantage. The proposed OLS would be contrary to the purpose of the Resource Management Act (the Act) (s 5) and s 5(c)). It would be contrary to a local authority's obligation to have particular regard to the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values (s 7(c)). It is not in the interests of sustainable management to future proof an airfield while adversely affecting the interests of a significant section of the Te Kowhai community. The Visual Flight Rule	Accept in part	10.3

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				(VFR) basis on which the Airfield is currently operating should be retained. There is no need for the PDP to include provisions allowing the Airfield to operate on an Instrument Flight Rule (IFR) basis. These provisions include the lowered OLS which can enable night time flying. There is insufficient cost-benefit analysis and a failure to consider costs and benefits of the Variation. The s32 analysis is insufficient to evaluate whether Variation I is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. There would be significant adverse effects including loss of development potential, loss of amenity values, and noise. No Aeronautical Study has been conducted to justify CAA approval for the proposed activities/uses outlined in the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone. It would be against sound resource management practice to adopt Variation I without one.		
VFS4002.26	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4003.27	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation I to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4005.28	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submitter is not affected by Variation I in that the OLS is the same as was notified over the submitter's property in Stage 1 of the PDP process and does not change the pre-existing status quo. The location of the submitter's property is shown on Schedule 2. The submitter therefore has no scope to request Variation I be amended. Regardless, Variation I intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. Variation I depicts the correct shape of the OLS on the maps to accord with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. It is not within scope of Variation I to amend the OLS to the existing shape from the ODP.	Accept in part	10.3
V17.2	Lloyd Davis	Oppose	Amend Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport OLS to replace "Airport" with "Airfield" throughout Variation I.	The submitter opposes the use of the term "airport" in the s32 report, noting that the PWDP refers to it as an airfield and the operator is not an airport authority under the Airport Authorities Act 1966.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.27	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.28	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation I to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.29	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	Allow	NZTE supports this submission point. The PDP refers to the Aerodrome as the Te Kowhai Airfield, therefore support the use of the term Airfield	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>for consistency and because it reflects the nature of the Aerodrome more accurately.</i>		
V18.1	Peter Mark & Silvia Fowler	Oppose	Amend Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface to adopt the existing Obstacle Limitation Surfaces from the Operative District Plan (2013).	The proposal would adversely and unfairly affect property owners within the proposed OLS, with the costs of compliance. The OLS would be noted in the LIM report of affected properties, which could dissuade buyers, resulting in loss of property value. There are economic, social and environmental impacts which favour the airfield users, and costs to the local community and property owners. The intended future level of operations at the airfield, would still be able to take place under the operative OLS. The proposal could lead to commercial intensification and an increase in air traffic that is largely opposed by the local community, and it would not fit in well with the future development of the residential and country living zones in the area.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4002.28	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4003.29	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation I to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4005.30	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation I intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. Variation I depicts the correct shape of the OLS on the maps to accord with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. It is not within scope of Variation I to amend the OLS to the existing shape from the ODP.	Accept in part	10.3
V18.2	Peter Mark & Silvia Fowler	Oppose	Amend Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport OLS to replace “Airport” with “Airfield” throughout.	Variation I contains conflicting wording; some documents refer to “Te Kowhai Airfield” and others to “Te Kowhai Airport”. There are different legal implications associated with either terminology.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.29	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.30	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation I to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.31	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	Allow	NZTE supports this submission point. The PDP refers to the Aerodrome as the Te Kowhai Airfield, therefore support the use of the term Airfield for consistency and because it reflects the nature of the Aerodrome more accurately.	Accept in part	9.4
V19.1	Kathleen Anne Young	Oppose	Amend Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield, Section 3.3, Inner Horizontal Surfaces to	Kahikatea remnants are important assets of the area and should be protected by Council. Rule 22.2.8 restricts Indigenous	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			exclude existing indigenous trees from the height control.	vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area. Topping of the trees should be done by a professional arborist and not at the landowner's expense. Landowners have committed significant time and money to protect the trees.		
VFS4002.30	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.31	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.32	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certified Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in Perkins Road, accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified and changed to fit in with individual needs. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code 1A+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. Various OLS exist throughout New Zealand, including over densely populated areas in Hamilton and Auckland. The OLS is a specifically designed, invisible volume of airspace extending off the end of each runway, off the sides of the runway and above the Aerodrome. This must remain obstacle free in and around the aerodrome for the safety of aircraft operating under IFR as the pilot does not have visual reference to the ground initially during an approach to the runway and if circling visually around the Aerodrome during inclement weather. Therefore, there must be a greater safety margin or area than that required under VFR. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings,	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur. NZTE does not propose to destroy habitats, only control the height when required to comply with the CAA requirements for the OLS.		
19.2	Kathleen Anne Young	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.3.3 Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface to exclude existing indigenous trees from the height control.	Kahikatea remnants are important assets of the area and should be protected by Council. Rule 22.2.8 restricts Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area. Topping of the trees should be done by a professional arborist and not at the landowner's expense. Landowners have committed significant time and money to protect the trees.	Accept in part	10.3
FS4002.31	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
FS4003.32	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
FS4005.33	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. Various OLS exist throughout New Zealand, including over densely populated areas in Hamilton and Auckland. The OLS is a specifically designed, invisible volume of airspace extending off the end of each runway, off the sides of the runway and above the Aerodrome. This must remain obstacle free in and around the aerodrome for the safety of aircraft operating under IFR as the pilot does not have visual reference to the ground initially during an approach to the runway and if circling visually around the Aerodrome during inclement weather. Therefore, there must be a greater safety margin or area than that required under VFR. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur.	Accept in part	10.3
V19.3	Kathleen Anne Young	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.3.1.2 Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface to	Kahikatea remnants are important assets of the area and should be protected by Council. Rule 22.2.8 restricts Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area. Topping of the trees should be done by a professional arborist	Accept in part	10.3

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			exclude existing indigenous trees from the height control.	and not at the landowner's expense. Landowners have committed significant time and money to protect the trees.		
VFS4002.32	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4003.33	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4005.34	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9 in Stage 1 of the PDP process. It does not provide scope for rules in other chapters to be amended. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the Aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. It is designed to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome and protect an existing piece of infrastructure that has been operational for over 50 years. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur.	Accept in part	10.3
V19.4	Kathleen Anne Young	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.3.3 Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface to exclude existing indigenous trees from the height control.	Kahikatea remnants are important assets of the area and should be protected by Council. Rule 22.2.8 restricts Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area. Topping of the trees should be done by a professional arborist and not at the landowner's expense. Landowners have committed significant time and money to protect the trees.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4002.33	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4003.34	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4005.35	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety	Accept in part	10.3

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the Aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. It is designed to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome and protect an existing piece of infrastructure that has been operational for over 50 years. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur.		
V19.5	Kathleen Anne Young	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.4.3 Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface to exclude existing indigenous trees from the height control.	Kahikatea remnants are important assets of the area and should be protected by Council. Rule 22.2.8 restricts Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area. Topping of the trees should be done by a professional arborist and not at the landowner's expense. Landowners have committed significant time and money to protect the trees.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4002.34	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4003.35	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4005.36	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the Aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. It is designed to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome and protect an existing piece of infrastructure that has been operational for over 50 years. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements	Accept in part	10.3

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>(AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur.</i>		
V19.6	Kathleen Anne Young	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.3.4.2 Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface to exclude existing indigenous trees from the height control.	Kahikatea remnants are important assets of the area and should be protected by Council. Rule 22.2.8 restricts Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area. Topping of the trees should be done by a professional arborist and not at the landowner's expense. Landowners have committed significant time and money to protect the trees.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4002.35	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
FVS4003.36	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4005.37	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the Aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. It is designed to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome and protect an existing piece of infrastructure that has been operational for over 50 years. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur.	Accept in part	10.3
19.7	Kathleen Anne Young	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.3.3.2 Height - Buildings, structures or vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface to exclude existing indigenous trees from the height control.	Kahikatea remnants are important assets of the area and should be protected by Council. Rule 22.2.8 restricts Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area. Topping of the trees should be done by a professional arborist	Accept in part	10.3

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				and not at the landowner's expense. Landowners have committed significant time and money to protect the trees.		
FS4002.36	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
FS4003.37	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4005.38	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the Aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. It is designed to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome and protect an existing piece of infrastructure that has been operational for over 50 years. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur.	Accept in part	10.3
V19.8	Kathleen Anne Young	Oppose	Amend Rule 25.3.1.2 Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface to exclude existing indigenous trees from the height control.	Kahikatea remnants are important assets of the area and should be protected by Council. Rule 22.2.8 restricts Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area. Topping of the trees should be done by a professional arborist and not at the landowner's expense. Landowners have committed significant time and money to protect the trees.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4002.37	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4003.38	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4005.39	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety	Accept in part	10.3

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				while maneuvering at low altitude in the vicinity of the Aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. It is designed to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome and protect an existing piece of infrastructure that has been operational for over 50 years. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur.		
V19.9	Kathleen Anne Young	Oppose	Amend Rule 27.3.1 Height of buildings, structures, trees and other vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface to exclude existing indigenous trees from the height control.	Kahikatea remnants are important assets of the area and should be protected by Council. Rule 22.2.8 restricts Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area. Topping of the trees should be done by a professional arborist and not at the landowner's expense. Landowners have committed significant time and money to protect the trees.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4002.38	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4003.39	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
FS4005.40	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the Aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. It is designed to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome and protect an existing piece of infrastructure that has been operational for over 50 years. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements	Accept in part	10.3

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>(AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur.</i>		
V21.1	Nardene Berry	Oppose	Amend Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface to not apply to properties with existing native vegetation OR Amend Rule 22.3.4.3 Height – Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface to not apply to existing native vegetation.	Rules regarding kahikatea fragments within the 2.5km affected zone conflict. Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area protects kahikatea trees, requiring a resource consent for removal. Rule 22.3.4.3 Height – buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface requires resource consent to keep trees if they breach the height restriction. The kahikatea trees are likely over 100 years old, while the airport was established in 1967 – so it becomes a case of reverse sensitivity. The trees are not in the way of the runway, so the trees should not pose a problem in terms of visibility. Kahikatea trees have been depleted and have ecological value – potentially habitat for endemic bats and provide steppingstones for native birds across the productive landscape.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4002.39	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4003.40	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation I to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4005.50	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	It is not clear from the submission where the submitter's land is located. Variation I intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the Aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. It is designed to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome and protect an existing piece of infrastructure that has been operational for over 50 years. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an	Accept in part	10.3

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur. NZTE does not propose to destroy habitats, only control obstacle height when required to comply with the CAA requirements for the OLS.</i>		
V22.1	Thetford Farming Limited	Oppose	Delete Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield – 3 Obstacle Limitation Surfaces AND Delete Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield – 3.3: Inner Horizontal Surfaces.	The proposed amendments pose a potential threat to remaining mature native vegetation – this is in contravention to Rule 22.2.8: Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area. It would “be a travesty” to ask landowners to clear native trees, especially those that predate the Treaty of Waitangi. Exotic trees should be topped and sculpted by a qualified arborist at the expense of the airfield operator as a priority over tree removal, unless the landowner agrees to removal, which should also be at the cost of the airfield operator.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.40	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.50	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.51	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified or changed to fit in with individual needs. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code 1A+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. Various OLS exist throughout New Zealand, including over densely populated areas in Hamilton and Auckland. The OLS is a specifically designed, invisible volume of airspace extending off the end of each runway, off the sides of the runway and above the Aerodrome. This must remain obstacle free in and around	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				the aerodrome for the safety of aircraft operating under IFR as the pilot does not have visual reference to the ground initially during an approach to the runway and if circling visually around the Aerodrome during inclement weather. Therefore, there must be a greater safety margin or area than that required under VFR. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur. NZTE does not propose to destroy habitats, only control obstacle height when required to comply with the CAA requirements for the OLS. The location of the submitter's property is shown on Schedule 2. NZTE notes that only a small portion of its landholders are affected by Variation 1 and the OLS meaning there will be little to no impact on vegetation on the submitter's land.		
V23.1	Bruce Edward Begbie	Oppose	Delete Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield – 3.3: Inner Horizontal Surfaces.	The submitter has planted trees on their family farm and does not see why those trees should be put in jeopardy. The Kahikatea trees hold personal value. I thought Council protects our native kahikatea trees within the rules (22.2.8).	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.50	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.51	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.52	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational Hamilton. technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified or changed to fit in with individual needs. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code 1A+, being a significant lower level of categorisation than that	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				for Waikato Regional Airport. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9, it does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. Various OLS exist throughout New Zealand, including over densely populated areas in Hamilton and Auckland. The OLS is a specifically designed, invisible volume of airspace extending off the end of each runway, off the sides of the runway and above the Aerodrome. This must remain obstacle free in and around the aerodrome for the safety of aircraft operating under IFR as the pilot does not have visual reference to the ground initially during an approach to the runway and if circling visually around the Aerodrome during inclement weather. Therefore, there must be a greater safety margin or area than that required under VFR. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur. NZTE does not propose to destroy habitats, only control obstacle height when required to comply with the CAA requirements for the OLS.		
V23.2	Bruce Edward Begbie	Oppose	Delete Figure 1: Proposed changes to Te Kowhai Airport OLS.	The submitter has planted trees on their family farm and does not see why those trees should be put in jeopardy. The Kahikatea trees hold personal value. I thought Council protects our native kahikatea trees within the rules (22.2.8).	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.51	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.52	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.53	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational Hamilton technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified or changed to fit in with individual needs. Aerodrome	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p><i>Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code IA+, being a significant lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9, it does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. Not mending the maps in accordance with Figure 1 will mean the inconsistency between Appendix 9 and the maps remains. Various OLS exist throughout New Zealand, including over densely populated areas in Hamilton and Auckland. The OLS is a specifically designed, invisible volume of airspace extending off the end of each runway, off the sides of the runway and above the Aerodrome. This must remain obstacle free in and around the aerodrome for the safety of aircraft operating under IFR as the pilot does not have visual reference to the ground initially during an approach to the runway and if circling visually around the Aerodrome during inclement weather. Therefore, there must be a greater safety margin or area than that required under VFR. The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in many district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur. NZTE does not propose to destroy habitats, only control obstacle height when required to comply with the CAA requirements for the OLS.</i></p>		
24.1	Vikki Michelle Madgwick	Oppose	Amend Figure 1 Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface to install a northward bend in the western landing surface to exclude this submitters property from the surface zone.	The variation includes submitters property in the Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) expanded zone. Submitters property is a high elevation property with residence and trees and grazing animals within the 10m zone. Their grazing animals become panicked by low flyers risking damage to fences and animals.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.52	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.53	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
VFS4005.54	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation 1 was intended to correct an error in the planning maps, aligning the shape of the OLS with that described in the notified Appendix 9. The OLS shape and size is determined by CAA standards which determine that an OLS is to extend out horizontally 2,500m at a 45-metre height, regardless of terrain. The idea of a 4.5 metre inner horizontal surface is to control obstacles above a height of 45 metres, to ensure the safety of aircraft when manoeuvring in and around the vicinity of the Aerodrome. The approach and take off surfaces provide this control of obstacles through the 1:40 OLS gradient. The OLS ensures an enhanced level of flight safety from the existing OLS in the ODP in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. Individual properties cannot be excluded from an OLS as it must maintain a uniform shape to comply with relevant standards. The OLS notified in Variation 1 to the PDP is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Aerodrome while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. This will ensure safer operations for departing/arriving aircraft during inclement weather conditions by allowing the use of readily available GPS based navigational technology. This will improve the safety and efficiency of the Aerodrome for aircraft operation under IFR rules. NZTE notes that no change to the aircraft flight path is to occur with the proposed OLS implementation.	Accept in part	9.4
V24.2	Vikki Michelle Madgwick	Oppose	Delete the changes to Figure 1 Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface.	Submitters residence is close to the 10m clearance zone and the variation will impact planned renovations to the dwelling.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.53	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.54	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.55	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Aerodrome while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified or changed to fit in with individual needs. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9 to align correctly with the CAA standards, therefore the OLS needs to be the shape in the PDP as depicted in Figure 1. The submitter states	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>their property is close to the 10-metre zone shown in Figure 2 that might affect renovations to their dwelling. The permitted rural zone height limit for buildings is 10 metres; therefore, as the submitter is outside the identified area then there should minimal effect on any renovation. Any proposal to build over 10 metres will require resource consent. The location of the submitter's property is shown in Schedule 2.</i>		
V24.3	Vikki Michelle Madgwick	Oppose	Delete Figure 2 Areas potentially affected by the Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS)(2020).	Submitters residence is close to the 10m clearance zone and the variation will impact planned renovations to the dwelling.	Accept	9.4
VFS4002.54	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept	9.4
VFS4003.55	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept	9.4
VFS4005.56	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Aerodrome while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified or changed to fit in with individual needs. Figure 2 is not proposed to be part of the PDP and is intended as a guidance document to help inform submitters as to the extent of the OLS over their properties. The submitter states their property is close to the 10 metres zone shown in Figure 2 that might affect renovations to their dwelling. The permitted rural zone height limit for buildings is 10 metres; therefore, as the submitter is outside the identified area then there should minimal effect on any renovation. Any proposal to build over 10 metres will require resource consent. The location of the submitter's property is shown on Schedule 2.	Reject	9.4
V24.4	Vikki Michelle Madgwick	Oppose	Delete the changes to Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield, Section 3, Obstacle Limitation Surfaces.	Submitter was not affected by the previous proposed WDP and was not informed of the effects of the total Airfield proposed changes. Submitter asks to be informed on the plans and how this affects them.	Accept in part	9.4
FS4002.55	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
FS4003.56	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
VFS4005.57	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Aerodrome while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified or changed to fit in with individual needs. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9 to align correctly with the CAA standards. The subsequent amendments to the text in Appendix 9 sought to clarify the description of the OLS. The text as notified correctly detailed the 2,500m Inner Horizontal Surface and Traditional Side Surface. Deleting the changes to Appendix 9 will not alter that the OLS was correctly notified in Appendix 9.	Accept in part	9.4
V25.1	Kit Robson Maxwell	Oppose	Amend Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport OLS to the correct text description of “airfield”.	The correct description of 'AIRFIELD' matches the NZTE facility as a grass runway without a passenger terminal building. The 'AIRPORT' description indicates a passenger terminal and concrete runway and possible infrastructure facilities and is incorrect.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.56	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.57	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.58	Sam Hutchings for Greenwood Roche on behalf of NZTE Operations Limited	Support	Allow	NZTE supports this submission point. The PDP refers to the Aerodrome as the Te Kowhai Airfield, therefore support the use of the term Airfield for consistency and because it reflects the nature of the Aerodrome more accurately.	Accept in part	9.4
V25.2	Kit Robson Maxwell	Oppose	Delete Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport OLS AND Amend Appendix 9 to revert to the existing VFR OLS of map reference NZTE 22/02/18.	The variation devalues all Te Kowhai properties by different percentages depending on their proximity to the airfield. Real Estate agents estimate a devaluation range from 5% to 20% dependant on the individual properties' proximity location.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.57	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.58	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.59	Sam Hutchings for Greenwood Roche on	Oppose	Disallow	The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Aerodrome while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	<i>behalf of NZTE Operations Limited</i>			<i>certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified or changed to fit in with individual needs. Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9. It does not provide scope for the text in Appendix 9 to be amended to reduce or change the scope of the OLS. Various OLS exist throughout New Zealand, including over densely populated areas in Hamilton and Auckland.</i>		
V25.3	Kit Robson Maxwell	Oppose	Delete Variation 1 – Te Kowhai Airport OLS to remain as a village airfield and review in 10 years' time.	The Te Kowhai community will become a downgraded living community with the expanded OLS covering 33 sq.km. 80% of village residences will become LIM encumbered.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.58	<i>Roger Ranby</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Allow</i>	<i>As set out in the original submission</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>9.4</i>
VFS4003.59	<i>Kit Maxwell</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Allow</i>	<i>All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>9.4</i>
VFS4005.60	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Disallow</i>	<i>The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Aerodrome while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. NZTE notes that no change to the aircraft flight path is to occur with the proposed OLS implementation.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>9.4</i>
V25.4	Kit Robson Maxwell	Oppose	Amend Variation 1 to include Airfield Rules to impose a night flying curfew at 9.00pm or dark whichever is sooner.	The social effects are huge and community disruption resulting from late night flying activities. 80% of Te Kowhai residents will be affected	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4002.59	<i>Roger Ranby</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Allow</i>	<i>As set out in the original submission</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>10.3</i>
VFS4003.60	<i>Kit Maxwell</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Allow</i>	<i>All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>10.3</i>
VFS4005.61	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Disallow</i>	<i>Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9 in Stage 1 of the PDP process. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the Aerodrome. It does not control types of flying or commercial activities. Those aspects are dealt with through the proposed ANCB's designed by Marshall Day</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>10.3</i>

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>and sought in the NZTE submission, which require the Airfield operator to manage the type and frequency of aircraft movements used for any activity in order to comply. The proposed Marshall Day noise thresholds adequately control aircraft used for any activity.</i>		
V25.5	Kit Robson Maxwell	Oppose	Amend the Airfield rules to ban EFATO activity within the OLS and to limit flying schools and itinerant flyer activities to a weekly count by a fair and open movements monitoring system.	The EFATO [engine failure on take-off] activity is invasive on residents and it causes community fear when they think the idling plane is about to crash. Overhead full power engine recovery is so close and noisy, it overpowers all conversations at residences. See attachment to submission for the NZTE written response which is item 2 of appendix 1. Submitter asks for airfield flying rules to be amended.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4002.60	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4003.61	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	10.3
VFS4005.62	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Variation 1 intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9 in Stage 1 of the PDP process. The relief sought not part of the Variation 1 process. Therefore, this submission is not relevant to Variation 1. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the Aerodrome. It does not control types of flying or commercial activities. Those aspects are dealt with through the proposed ANCB's designed by Marshall Day and sought in the NZTE submission, which require the Airfield operator to manage the type and frequency of aircraft movements used for any activity in order to comply. The proposed Marshall Day noise thresholds adequately control aircraft used for any activity.	Accept in part	10.3
V25.6	Kit Robson Maxwell	Oppose	Delete all OLS proposed changes AND remain as VFR airfield	Submitters property is at the western extremity of the OLS zone. NZTE told submitter their OLS height is 39 metres. We have mature trees' which are already near this height. Submitter believes this OLS height is misrepresented by NZTE. See attachment to submission for full details appendix 1 item 1.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.61	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.62	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation 1 to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.63	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The proposed	Accept in part	9.4

VARIATION I – Table of Submission Points						
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Aerodrome while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft that will ensure safer operations for departing/arriving aircraft during inclement weather conditions by allowing the use of readily available GPS based navigational technology. This will improve the safety and efficiency of the Aerodrome for aircraft operation under IFR rules. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS as notified in the PDP through its design and implementation ensures an enhanced level of flight safety from the existing OLS in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The notified OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. The proposed OLS is necessary to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome. It will provide pilots with more flexibility to use and utilise advancements in navigational GPS based IFR technologies which were once cost prohibitive for smaller general aviation aircraft.</i>		
V25.7	Kit Robson Maxwell	Oppose	Amend Variation I – Te Kowhai Airport OLS to exclude the submitters properties from any LIM encumbrance	Variation I changes the start point of the OLS. The wording on Variation I, paragraph 3, changes "runway" to "runway strip". This changes the OLS start point to be different to that advised on 4th July 2019. See attachment to submission for full details of NZTE/Astral report.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4002.62	Roger Ranby	Support	Allow	As set out in the original submission	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4003.63	Kit Maxwell	Support	Allow	All opposing submissions intelligently explain that the majority of community wish for variation I to be rejected.	Accept in part	9.4
VFS4005.64	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Disallow	<i>The proposed OLS is to recognise and protect the existing activity the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS is a shape and size in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5,700Kg. The OLS cannot be modified or changed to fit in with individual needs. Variation I intends to amend the maps to accord with the text in notified Appendix 9.</i>	Accept in part	9.4