To Hearing 17 Section 42a report

Evidence lodged 15th Feb 2021

From Vikki Madgwick, Submitter number VFS4002

I support the following WDC recommendations of the section 42a report as follows;

- 1. Section 42a paragraph 346-355 page 90 –adopt OLS of current operative district plan.
- 2. Sec 42a para 784; Set operating hours as recommended as Paragraph 784 section 14.
- 3. Sec 42a para 156-163; Pilot training and circuit training are controlled activities Accept the recommended aircraft annual movements level.

Reason

This is because even though we have asked, we have never been advised of the OLS height at our property. Only now from the section 42a report can we assume that we have 0 to 6 metres clearance which indicates that all our above ground assets are penetrating the proposed OLS. We therefore can probably lose farm buildings and our 25 year old tree plantation which is our own future superannuation. This withholding of information is untenable, as is our stress caused by not knowing our own future income situation.

After receiving a non specific circular letter from 18th November 2020 we (In December 2020) questioned NZTE on our OLS situation. Their 25/01/2021 response quotes again they cannot calculate our total OLS height including our plantation, but may try to manage our plantation, which is only an undefined possibility with no surety for us.

EVIDENCE;

Letter to NZTE

NZTE Operations Ltd

172 Limmer Rd

<u>Te Kowhai</u>

17 December 2020

Ref: Your letter of 18th November.

Dan,

We seek further explanations and wish to register our disagreement with the duplicity and misleading statements in your letter of the 18th November.

1) Tree removal or modification in 10-meter zone

In and near the 10-meter zone of our (265) property we have a commercial tree plantation of 25 years standing. This is planted for our future retirement income. Our investment and future-proofing will be damaged or rendered worthless for your self promoted future-proofing right to demand us to trim our trees. We reject your letter's duplicitous statement of "Limited Effects" but then claiming your right to order our tree modification.

2) Pilot Air Space

You claim that pilots will remain clear from our 2400 metre distance outer edge location. This is not the case and is deceiving. In your letter (June 2019) concerning pilot EFATO flying (descending to ground proximity) you suggest, that this is only done by itinerant Te Kowhai airfield using pilots. We disagree with your suggestion that we need to accept this invasive activity. Flying schools and circuit training should be banned from this village based airfield. Also, if you collect landing fees, you, therefore should agree to manage and control your own air space users.

Appeal to commissioners.

Please adopt the recommendation that fly schools and circuit training activities and overall calendar year movements become consented activities.

Please retain the ODP OLS as this satisfactorily covers all planes stationed at NZTE and NZTE state that they do not currently have flying schools and do not propose future multiple fly schools, and do not have ILS equipped planes .

Thank you Vikki Madgwick 265 Collie Rd Te Kowhai E; vikki.madgwick@acc.co.nz

From:	<u>kmaxwell</u>
To:	<u>DistrictPlan</u>
Subject:	FW: Te Kowhai Aerodrome-OLS
Date:	Friday, 19 February 2021 9:23:39 am

Attn Emma and Fletcher, For Vikki Madgwick of 265 Collie Road,

The following email was missed from yesterday's send and is the last email to NZTE for which their reply was sent to you.

From: Dan Readman [mailto:dan@nzte.net.nz] Sent: Thursday, 4 February 2021 11:10 p.m. To: kmaxwell Subject: Re: Te Kowhai Aerodrome-OLS

Hi Kit

No problem.

Reply Sent to WDC 18/02/21 Kind regards

Dan.

Dan Readman Director

NZTE Operations Limited Te Kowhai Airfield 172 Limmer Rd, RD8 Hamilton 3288; New Zealand Mob:021681991

On 4/02/2021, at 20:52, kmaxwell <kmaxwell@xtra.co.nz> wrote:

Hello Dan,

Thank you for your response email of 25^{th} January. We acknowledge your confirmation that for our 247 Collie Rd location we have the OLS to ground clearance correctly calculated at +/- 68 metres .

Also, in our letter of 17th December to you requesting information I wish to correct my wording for item 3 should read existing airfield OLS and not the 'application' OLS. Apologies.

Vikki Madgwick (property 265 Collie Rd), will respond after further consideration.

Regards Kit Maxwell 247 Collie Rd Tel 0210534611 From: Dan Readman [mailto:dan@nzte.net.nz] Sent: Tuesday, 26 January 2021 10:38 a.m. To: Kit Maxwell Subject: Re: Te Kowhai Aerodrome-OLS

Hi Kit

There's no need to respond unless something remains unclear.

From Vikki's property perspective I am confident that the tree plantation and your future investments can be managed in such a way that the OLS inill have a very limited effect if any.

Kind regards

Dan.

We are just

Dan Readman Director

NZTE Operations Limited Te Kowhai Airfield <u>172 Limmer Road</u>, RD8 Hamilton 3288, New Zealand Mob: 021681991

On 26/01/2021, at 10:17, Kit Maxwell <kmaxwell@xtra.co.nz> wrote:

Hello Dan,

Thank you for your reply of 25th January. I will meet with Vikki and refer back to you after our discussions.

Kit Maxwell

Hi Fletcher and Emma,

Ref 265 Collie Rd, Vikki Madgwick

We first assisted Vikki Madgwick in July 2020 to prepare and lodge her submissions,

- 1. Our next letter from NZTE was the generic letter of 18th November providing little relevant information for our OLS. (see PDF attachment in my email 18th Feb)
- 2. Our letter of December 17th re Tree removal in 10metre zone. (see PDF attachment in my email 18th Feb)
- 3. NZTE response email 25th January 2021 (see PDF attachment in my email 18th Feb)
- NZTE unsolicited response of 4th February to our OLS calculation of 25th Jan being finally confirmed as correct. (see below)
 Regards
 Kit Maxwell for Vikki Madgwick
 265 Collie Road
 Te Kowhai
 Te 078297632 or 0210534611

From: Dan Readman [mailto:dan@nzte.net.nz] Sent: Thursday, 4 February 2021 11:10 p.m. To: kmaxwell Subject: Re: Te Kowhai Aerodrome-OLS

Hi Kit

No problem.

I have read some of the Councils recent section 42A report from Emma Ensor (Senior Planner) and it is disappointing to see she still does not understand the application of the OLS.

She has stated that aircraft would fly lower to the ground which is completely incorrect. There is virtually no change to aircraft operations, in fact if an aircraft was operating under IFR rules using the proposed OLS and approach design procedure to the Aerodrome an aircraft would actually be higher and omit less noise because they are following a pre-designed flight path from a higher commencement altitude as they approach the aerodrome to ensure they avoid obstacles.

As I said because IFR rules are based on navigation by instruments and usually GPS position and not by visual reference to the ground being VFR (looking out the aeroplane window) the Civil Aviation Authority simply required a greater safety margin by stipulating a greater separation distance between an aircraft in flight and obstacles being terrain or tress and vegetation.

Because an aeroplane is at it lowest point approaching the runway this is why properties in the take off and approach OLS path mainly near the runways ends are more critical to control

obstacles but the inner horizontal surface is not always as critical and can me managed with approach design and limitations for aircraft.

The obvious question is how can an aeroplane fly into Queenstown if the OLS has mountains penetrating through it? This is possible however there are different levels of technology used for aircraft to operate into Queenstown.

I can't stress enough that IFR or the OLS will not significantly change the operation of the Aerodrome or change the aircraft movements. It will simply allow a safer option for aeroplanes that visit or operate from the aeroplane to use the navigational technology that is now available to them to operate in a safer manner during inclement weather conditions. This prevents aircraft operating at lower levels in deteriorating or unexpected weather conditions operating under VFR to remain visual, clear of cloud and insight of the ground at all times to reach its destination.

This only increases noise, potentially induces lower flying of aircraft and has contributed to many fatal aircraft accidents in New Zealand and should have been discussed with the community at the Councils Public workshops. This was not explained or made clear to the community by the Council and our offer of assistance to provide further information for the community was declined by the the Council which contributed to a general lack of understanding including the Senior Planner Emma Ensor who does not understanding this herself.

This will become apparent in the hearings.

Kind regards

Dan.

Dan Readman Director

From: DistrictPlan [mailto:districtplan@waidc.govt.nz] Sent: Tuesday, 16 February 2021 8:25 a.m. To: kmaxwell Subject: RE: RE:Re Hearing 17 - Te Kowhai Airpark

HI Kit,

Thank you for this,

could you please send through the emails from NZTE for both Vikki Madgwicks and yourself.

Nga Mihi | Kind regards

Fletcher Bell

District Plan Administrator / Hearings Coordinator - Resource Management Policy Team

Waikato District Council

P 07 824 8633 | F 07 824 8091 | Call Free 0800 492 452 **M** 027 214 8052 Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia 3742 <u>www.waikatodistrict.govt.nz</u>

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: kmaxwell <kmaxwell@xtra.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, 15 February 2021 2:13 pm
To: DistrictPlan <districtplan@waidc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE:Re Hearing 17 - Te Kowhai Airpark

Dear Emma.

This email is sent by me for Mrs Madgwick, whom does not have an operable computer at her home. I have also been asked to speak to the hearing on her behalf. Please email me if you need copies sent for the NZTE emails quoted. Thank you Kit Maxwell for Vikki Madgwick of 265 Collie Rd., Te Kowhai

From: DistrictPlan [mailto:districtplan@waidc.govt.nz] Sent: Tuesday, 9 February 2021 9:14 a.m. Subject: Friendly Reminder - Hearing 17 - Te Kowhai Airpark

Dear Submitters,

Scanned by **Trustwave SEG** - Trustwave's comprehensive email content security solution. Download a free evaluation of Trustwave SEG at <u>www.trustwave.com</u>