

**RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY COUNCIL AT MEETING OF 30 AUGUST 2011**

1. ***That the report: Report and Recommendations of the Hearing Panel on Proposed Plan Change 26, and the Notices of Requirement for Designations 64 and 65 in the Queenstown Lakes District Plan, dated 8 July 2011 be received***
2. ***That the Council adopt the recommendation of the Hearing Panel on Plan Change 26 – Wanaka Airport as a Council decision and direct staff to notify the decision in accordance with the 1st schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 and modify the District Plan accordingly.***
3. ***That the Council modify the recommendation of the Hearing Panel on Notice of Requirement for Designation 64 Aerodrome Purposes in response to the changes sought by the WAMC as follows:***

**Change 1:** The following text is to be added immediately after the fourth paragraph under the heading 'Airport Noise'.

*"Note: This designation does not provide for an Air Noise Boundary at the 65 dB Ldn contour as the provisions and extent of the OCB render this unnecessary at Wanaka Airport at this time."*

**Change 2:** The following amendment is to be made to the text in the third paragraph under the heading 'Airport Noise'.

*"Compliance with the 55 dB Ldn noise limit at the OCB shall be determined every two years by the calculation of noise contours using the IMNv7b an acoustics computer model and records of actual aircraft activity at the Airport."*

**Change 3:** Condition (c) under the heading 'Building Location and Appearance' is to be deleted and replaced with the following.

*"(c) Before buildings are constructed on the northern side of the runway the airport operator will undertake a visual impact assessment of development in this area. The purpose of this assessment will be to serve as the guide to future development through the identification of view shafts or other mitigation methods to be implemented through the outline plan process as development occurs."*

4. ***That the Council modify the recommendation of the Hearing Panel on the Notice of Requirement for Designation 65 Airport Approach and Land Use in response to the changes sought by the WAMC as follows:***

**Change 4:** Amend the third paragraph under the heading 'Penetration of airport protection surfaces' as follows:

*"If requested by a landowner with a site specific development proposal affected by the airport protection surfaces, the requiring authority shall provide them with a terrain shielding drawing for that portion of their site."*

**Change 5:** Delete the fourth paragraph under the heading 'Penetration of airport protection surfaces'.

5. ***That staff be directed to notify the decisions on the Notices of Requirement and modify the District Plan in accordance with Section 175 of the Act.***

## **DECISION OF REQUIRING AUTHORITY - REASONS FOR DECISIONS TO MODIFY RECOMMENDATION OF HEARING PANEL UNDER RMA S172(3)**

### **Change 1:**

The following text is to be added immediately after the fourth paragraph under the heading 'Airport Noise'.

*"Note: This designation does not provide for an Air Noise Boundary at the 65 dB Ldn contour as the provisions and extent of the OCB render this unnecessary at Wanaka Airport at this time."*

### **Reasons:**

The Commissioners deleted the Air Noise Boundary (ANB) from Designation 64 as there would be no distinction between the rules in the ANB and the new rules for the Outer Control Boundary (OCB), thus making the ANB superfluous. The generally reason for having both an ANB and an OCB is there is a distinction between the rules applied within each boundary. Although most airports have both an ANB and an OCB there is actually little consistency in rules actually applied within them.

From the perspective of creating a simple and clear District Plan, having additional features included in the District Plan and on District Plan maps that have no function is likely to cause greater confusion to plan users and administrators than not including an ANB.

During discussions on this decision Council decided that adding the advice note proposed would be sufficient to address any potential uncertainty regarding the absence of an ANB.

### **Change 2:**

The following amendment is to be made to the text in the third paragraph under the heading 'Airport Noise'.

*"Compliance with the 55 dB Ldn noise limit at the OCB shall be determined every two years by the calculation of noise contours using the IMNv7b an acoustics computer model and records of actual aircraft activity at the Airport."*

### **Reasons:**

Noise contours are generated through the use of noise models which calculate the noise output from different aircraft types. These models are updated to reflect new aircraft and improved understanding of noise generated by particular aircraft types. Identifying a specific standard (eg INMv7b model) will require a plan change before the standard could be updated. Consequently more models that reflect more accurate measurement of noise may not be adopted easily for monitoring purposes.

The Commissioner's recommendation is that the most recent noise model be used for monitoring purposes to reflect the best practise in monitoring at the time in which it is undertaken. However the concern reflected by the WAMC is that, as these models underpin the generation of the noise contours, this could result in the use of a model which would effectively result in a different contour but which would not match that on which our District Plan rules are based on.

During discussions on this decision Council determined that greater certainty would be provided by specifying future monitoring is to be undertaken using the version of the noise model that was originally used to generate the contours.

### **Change 3:**

Condition (c) under the heading 'Building Location and Appearance' is to be deleted and replaced with the following.

“(c) Before buildings are constructed on the northern side of the runway the airport operator will undertake a visual impact assessment of development in this area. The purpose of this assessment will be to serve as the guide to future development through the identification of view shafts or other mitigation methods to be implemented through the outline plan process as development occurs.”

**Reasons:**

The Commissioners included specific conditions to require consideration of effects on landscape and view shafts when developing particular areas as a result of landscape evidence presented at the hearing, however the practical application of provisions proposed was not a matter that was covered in the hearing itself. The proposed change would result in the removal of specific reference to these conditions and would rely upon landscape issues to be raised and readdressed at the time of each outline plan approval.

A third option open to Council would be to impose a condition on the designation requiring the airport operator to undertake a visual impact assessment of development in these areas and identifying potential view shaft prior to development occurring on the northern side of the runway.

During discussions on this decision Council determined that undertaking one landscape assessment as the guide for future development in this area would be a more robust outcome than undertaking smaller scale assessments for each building.

**Change 4:**

Amend the third paragraph under the heading 'Penetration of airport protection surfaces' as follows:

“If requested by a landowner with a site specific development proposal affected by the airport protection surfaces, the requiring authority shall provide them with a terrain shielding drawing for that portion of their site.”

**Reasons:**

The Commissioners declined submissions seeking that all areas of terrain shielding be mapped at this point as the substantial cost of this was not warranted by the likelihood of actual development throughout this wide an area, but indicated that where a terrain shielding assessment is likely to be an issue for any specific site in future, such investigations should be at the expense of the requiring authority benefiting from the restriction.

During discussions on this decision Council concluded that as the authority benefiting from these restrictions it was appropriate that it bore some of the cost of investigations associated determining whether a development would be affected by them but only where these where they could be linked to a specific development proposal and for the part of the site affected by such a proposal.

**Change 5:**

Delete the fourth paragraph under the heading 'Penetration of airport protection surfaces'.

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

**Reasons:**

Not all objects within the OLS need to be removed for safety reasons and some objects may have existing use rights as they have been erected under the existing obstacle limitation surface. Regular audits of objects around the airport are undertaken by CAA and the airport authority to identify objects that pose a risk to aircraft and how to deal with them

Further this provision would also effectively require that the airport operator undertake the comprehensive modelling of terrain shielding that the Commissioners deemed inappropriate at this point as discussed under Change 4 above.