

Attachment 2 - a copy of the relevant parts of the Decision

QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Hearing of Submissions on Proposed District Plan

Report 4A

Report and Recommendations of Independent Commissioners Regarding
Chapter 21, Chapter 22, Chapter 23, Chapter 33 and Chapter 34

Commissioners

Denis Nugent (Chair)

Brad Coombs

Mark St Clair

4.35 Objective 21.2.11

365. As notified, Objective 21.2.11 read as follows;

Manage the location, scale and intensity of informal airports.

366. Submissions on this objective provided conditional support subject to other relief sought to policies and rules, including location and frequency controls⁴²⁵, or sought amendments to provide for new informal airports and protect existing informal airports from incompatible land uses.⁴²⁶ One submission also sought clarification in relation to its application to commercial ballooning in the district.⁴²⁷
367. In the Section 42A Report, Mr Barr expressed the view that the definition of aircraft included hot air balloons and therefore a site on which a balloon lands or launches from is an informal airport.⁴²⁸
368. Mr Barr did not recommend any amendments to the objective and associated policies for informal airports in the Section 42A Report. Rather, Mr Barr addressed details of the permitted activity standards governing setbacks, frequency of flights, standards for Department of Conservation operational activities and other matters.⁴²⁹
369. In the Council's memorandum on revising the objectives to be more outcome focused⁴³⁰, Mr Barr recommended rewording of the objective as follows;

⁴²⁵ Submissions 571, 723, 730, 732, 734, 736, 738, 739, 760, 843

⁴²⁶ Submission 607

⁴²⁷ Submission 217

⁴²⁸ C Barr, Section 42 Report, Page 76, Para 16.36

⁴²⁹ C Barr, Section 42 Report, Pages 69 - 78

⁴³⁰ Council Memoranda dated 13 April 2016

The location, scale and intensity of informal airports is managed.

370. Mr Dent, in evidence for Totally Tourism⁴³¹, considered that the objective was poorly worded and should be amended to indicate that informal airports are desired within the Rural Zone, but should be subject to their effects on amenity being managed.⁴³² Mr Dent recommended the objective be reworded as follows;

The operation of informal airports in the Rural Zone is enabled subject to the management of their location, scale and intensity.

371. Mr Farrell in evidence for Te Anau Developments⁴³³, supported the submitter's request for new informal airports to be "provided for" in the objective protection of existing informal airports from incompatible land uses. Mr Farrell expressed the view that existing "... informal airports face operational risks from potential reverse sensitivity effects associated with noise sensitive activities, which is an operational risk, and could result in unnecessary costs, to tourism operators."⁴³⁴

372. In reply, Mr Barr, agreed and accepted the intent of Mr Dent's recommended amendment to the objective⁴³⁵. Mr Barr also agreed with Mr Farrell that a policy protecting existing informal airports from incompatible land uses was warranted, but not at expense of a policy that protects amenity from airports⁴³⁶. Mr Barr recommended alternative wording for the objective and set out a brief section 32AA analysis⁴³⁷.

373. An objective that sets out that something is to be managed, but does not specify to what purpose or end result, does not take one very far. We agree with Mr Dent that it is the effects of informal airports that should be managed, but consider that his suggestion of 'enabling' goes too far. We found Mr Farrell's reasoning as to operational risks a little difficult to follow and the amended wording of the objective he supported unsatisfactory because it failed to address amenity effects. In conclusion, we prefer Mr Barr's reply version, which did address our concerns as to purpose, as being the most appropriate in terms of the alternatives available to us and in achieving the purposes of the Act.

374. Accordingly, we recommend that the wording of Objective 21.2.11 should be as follows:

The location, scale and intensity of informal airports is managed to maintain amenity values while protecting informal airports from incompatible land uses.

4.36 Policy 21.2.11.1

375. Policy 21.2.11.1 as notified read as follows:

Recognise that informal airports are an appropriate activity within the rural environment, provided the informal airport is located, operated and managed so as to minimise adverse effects on the surrounding rural amenity.

⁴³¹ Submission 571

⁴³² S Dent, Evidence, Page 4, Paras 17 - 18

⁴³³ Submission 607

⁴³⁴ C Barr, Evidence, Page 24, Para 110

⁴³⁵ C Barr, Reply, Page 28, Para 9.19

⁴³⁶ C Barr, Reply, Page 27, Para 9.14

⁴³⁷ C Barr, Reply, Page 5, Appendix 2

376. Submissions on this policy ranged from conditional support subject to other relief sought to policies and rules including location and frequency controls⁴³⁸; or sought amendment to the words after 'managed' to insert 'in accordance with CAA regulations'⁴³⁹; amendment to replace 'minimise' with 'avoid, remedy mitigate' and limit to existing rural amenity values⁴⁴⁰; amendment to apply to existing informal airports and to protect them from surrounding rural amenity⁴⁴¹; and finally amendment to include reference to flight path locations of fixed wing aircraft and their protection from surrounding rural amenity.⁴⁴²
377. As noted above, Mr Barr did not recommend any amendments to the policies for informal airports in the Section 42A Report.
378. Ms Macdonald, counsel for Skydive Queenstown Limited⁴⁴³, suggested an amendment to the relief sought by the submitter, recognising that a function of a territorial authority was management of the effects of land use and that objectives, policies and rules could be prepared to that end. The amended relief was as follows:
- Recognise that informal airports are an appropriate activity within the rural environment, provided the informal airport is located, operated and managed so as to minimise adverse effects on the surrounding rural amenity, and in accordance with Civil Aviation Act requirements.*⁴⁴⁴
379. Mr Farrell's evidence for Te Anau Developments supporting the submitter's requested change was based on the same reasoning as we set out in relation to Objective 21.2.11 above.
380. Mr Dent in evidence for Totally Tourism considered that the policies (21.2.11.1 and 21.2.11.2) did not provide a credible course of action to implement the objective and set out recommended rewording.⁴⁴⁵
381. Mr Barr, in reply concurred with Mr Dent, and recommended similar changes to those proposed by Mr Dent.⁴⁴⁶
382. As noted in the reasons for the submission from Skydive Queenstown Limited, a territorial authority has no particular expertise in CAA matters. We therefore find that it is not effective and efficient for the policy to include requirements of CAA regulations that are for the CAA to administer.
383. On Mr Farrell's evidence in support of the relief sought by Te Anau Developments we reach a similar finding as for Objective 21.2.11 above. We also find that the protection of informal airports from incompatible uses could potentially be a separate policy and we address that matter in detail below. For present purposes, we find that that that issue should not be

⁴³⁸ Submissions 723, 730, 732, 734, 736, 738, 739, 760, 843

⁴³⁹ Submission 122

⁴⁴⁰ Submission 607

⁴⁴¹ Submission 385

⁴⁴² Submissions 285, 288

⁴⁴³ Submission 122

⁴⁴⁴ J Macdonald, Legal Submissions, Page 3, Para 5

⁴⁴⁵ S Dent, Evidence, Pages 4-5, Paras 19 - 20

⁴⁴⁶ C Barr, Reply, Page 29, 9.20

referenced in this policy. Similarly we think that the wording recommend by Mr Barr is effective and efficient in its alignment with the objective.

384. Accordingly we recommend that Policy 21.2.11.1 be reworded as follows;

Ensure informal airports are located, operated and managed so as to maintain the surrounding rural amenity.

4.37 Policy 21.2.11.2

385. Policy 21.2.11.2 as notified read as follows:

Protect rural amenity values, and amenity of other zones from the adverse effects that can arise from informal airports.

386. Submissions on this policy ranged from conditional support subject to other relief sought to policies and rules including location and frequency controls⁴⁴⁷ or sought amendment to protect informal airports and flight path locations of fixed wing aircraft from surrounding rural amenity⁴⁴⁸.

387. As we have already noted, Mr Barr did not recommend any amendments to the policies for informal airports in the Section 42A Report.

388. Similarly we addressed the evidence of Mr Farrell and Mr Dent, as well as Mr Barr's response in reply, under Policy 21.2.11.1 above. Again, we think that protection of informal airports should be addressed separately. Taking account of our recommended amendment to Policy 21.2.11.1, we find that a policy to address the adverse effects in non-rural zones from informal airports is required. Otherwise a policy gap would be remain.

389. Accordingly, we find that Policy 21.2.11.2 should remain as notified.

4.38 Additional Policy – Informal Airports

390. We observed above that there appeared to be a case to protect informal airports from incompatible activities. Considering the issues identified to us by a number of recreational pilots at the hearing and the evidence of Mr Dent, Mr Farrell and Mr Barr, we agree that a policy addressing that matter is appropriate in achieving the stated objective. Mr Barr, in reply, proposed the following wording of such an additional policy as follows;

*21.2.11.3 Protect legally established and permitted informal airports from the establishment of incompatible activities.*⁴⁴⁹

391. In reaching this view, Mr Barr did not recommend that the new policy flow through to a new rule to the same effect, given the administrative difficulties in identifying existing informal airport locations and noting that Objective 21.2.4 and associated policies already sought to protect permitted and legally established activities.⁴⁵⁰ We tested the potential identification of informal airports with some of the recreational pilots at the hearings⁴⁵¹ and reached the conclusion that such a method would not be efficient. Mr Barr's proposed new policy refers to

⁴⁴⁷ Submissions 723, 730, 732, 734, 736, 738, 739, 760, 843

⁴⁴⁸ Submission 285, 288, 385, 607

⁴⁴⁹ C Barr, Reply, Appendix 1

⁴⁵⁰ C Barr, Reply, Pages 27-28, Paras 9.14 – 9.15

⁴⁵¹ Mr Tapper and Mr Carlton

“legally established” informal airports. To our mind, consistent with the wording in the Act, we think that *“lawfully established”* is more correct.

392. We also consider that some qualification of reference to permitted informal airports is required. While Mr Barr is correct that Objective 21.2.4 and the related policies provide for permitted activities these are “anticipated” permitted activities. It would not be efficient to constrain land uses on the basis that they are incompatible with informal airports at all locations where the airports would meet the permitted activity standards. We also consider that it should only be the establishment incompatible activities in the immediate vicinity that the policy addresses.

393. We therefore recommend the inclusion of a new policy (21.2.11.3) worded as follows;

Protect lawfully established and anticipated permitted informal airports from the establishment of incompatible activities in the immediate vicinity.

4.39 New Objective and Policies – Informal Airports

394. Two submissions sought objectives and policies to *“enable the assessment of proposals that exceed the occasional /infrequent limitations”*⁴⁵². The submission reasons identified that this relief was sought as the Plan is *“silent on how applications to exceed Standards 21.5.26.1 and 21.5.26.2 will be assessed and considered”*.

395. We did not receive specific evidence on this matter. No specific wording of the objectives or policies were put before us. In the absence of evidence providing and/or justifying such objectives and policies, we recommend that these submissions be rejected.

452 Submissions 660, 662

453 Submission 356, 600, 758

454 Submission 339, 706

455 Submission 307

456 Submission 621

457 Submission 766

6.23 Rule 21.4.25 – Informal Airports

675. As notified, Rule 21.4.25, provided for:

“Informal airports that comply with Table 6.”

as a permitted activity.

676. The submissions on this rule are linked to the Rules 21.5.25 and 21.5.26, being the standards applying to informal airports. It is appropriate to deal with those two rules at the same time as considering Rule 21.4.25.

677. As notified, the standards for informal airport Rules 21.5.25 and 21.5.26 (Table 6) read as follows;

	Table 6 - Standards for Informal Airports	Non-Compliance
21.5.25	<p>Informal Airports Located on Public Conservation and Crown Pastoral Land</p> <p>Informal airports that comply with the following standards shall be permitted activities:</p> <p>21.5.25.1 Informal airports located on Public Conservation Land where the operator of the aircraft is operating in accordance with a Concession issued pursuant to Section 17 of the Conservation Act 1987;</p> <p>21.5.25.2 Informal airports located on Crown Pastoral Land where the operator of the aircraft is operating in accordance with a Recreation Permit issued pursuant to Section 66A of the Land Act 1948;</p> <p>21.5.25.3 Informal airports for emergency landings, rescues, fire-fighting and activities ancillary to farming activities;</p> <p>21.5.25.4 In relation to points (21.5.25.1) and (21.5.25.2), the informal airport shall be located a minimum</p>	D

	Table 6 - Standards for Informal Airports	Non-Compliance
	distance of 500 metres from any formed legal road or the notional boundary of any residential unit or approved building platform not located on the same site.	
21.5.26	<p>Informal Airports Located on other Rural Zoned Land</p> <p>Informal Airports that comply with the following standards shall be permitted activities:</p> <p>21.5.26.1 Informal airports on any site that do not exceed a frequency of use of 3 flights* per week;</p> <p>21.5.26.2 Informal airports for emergency landings, rescues, fire-fighting and activities ancillary to farming activities;</p> <p>21.5.26.3 In relation to point (21.5.26.1), the informal airport shall be located a minimum distance of 500 metres from any formed legal road or the notional boundary of any residential unit of building platform not located on the same site.</p> <p>* note for the purposes of this Rule a flight includes two aircraft movements i.e. an arrival and departure.</p>	D

678. There were eleven submissions that sought that Rule 21.4.25 be retained⁶⁵⁴, and six submissions that sought it be deleted⁶⁵⁵ for various reasons including seeking the retention of ODP rules.

679. For Rule 21.5.25, submissions variously ranged from:

- Retain as notified⁶⁵⁶
- Delete provision⁶⁵⁷
- Delete or amend (reduce) set back distances in 21.5.25.4
- Amend permitted activities list 21.5.25.3 to include operational requirements of Department of Conservation⁶⁵⁸

680. For Rule 21.5.26, submissions variously ranged from:

- Retain as notified⁶⁵⁹
- Delete provision⁶⁶⁰
- Delete or amend (increase) number of flights in 21.5.26.1⁶⁶¹
- Delete or amend (reduce) set back distances in 21.5.26.3⁶⁶²
- Amend permitted activities list 21.5.26.2 to only to emergency and farming⁶⁶³, or amend to include private fixed wing operations and flight currency requirements⁶⁶⁴

⁶⁵⁴ Submissions 563, 573, 608, 723, 730, 732, 734, 736, 738, 739, 760, 843

⁶⁵⁵ Submission 109, 143, 209, 213, 500, 833

⁶⁵⁶ Submissions 315, 571, 713

⁶⁵⁷ Submissions 105, 135, 162, 211, 500, 385

⁶⁵⁸ Submission 373

⁶⁵⁹ Submissions 571, 600

⁶⁶⁰ Submissions 93, 105, 162, 209, 211, 385, 883

⁶⁶¹ Submissions 122, 138, 221, 224, 265, 405, 423, 660, 662

⁶⁶² Submissions 106, 137, 138, 174, 221, 265, 382, 405, 423, 660, 723, 730, 732, 734, 736, 738, 739, 760, 784, 843

⁶⁶³ Submission 9

⁶⁶⁴ Submission 373

- f. Amend 21.5.26.1 to read as follows “Informal Airports where sound levels do not exceed limits prescribed in Rule 36.5.14”.
681. In the Section 42A Report, Mr Barr recorded that the change from the system under the ODP where all informal airports required resource consents, to permitted activity status under the PDP was motivated in part by a desire to reduce the duplication of authorisations that were already required from the Department of Conservation or Commissioner of Lands and that details were set out in the Section 32 Report.⁶⁶⁵ Mr Barr also recorded that noise standards were not part of this Chapter, but were rather considered under the Hearing Stream 5 (District Wide Provisions).⁶⁶⁶
682. Our understanding of the combined rules was assisted by the evidence of Dr Chiles. He explained the difficulty in comprehensively quantifying the noise effects from infrequently used airports. We understood that the two New Zealand Standards for airport noise (NZ6805 and NZS6807) required averaging of aircraft sound levels over periods of time that would not adequately represent noise effects from sporadic aircraft movements that are usually associated with informal airports.
683. Dr Chiles explained that the separation distance of 500m required by Rules 21.5.25.4 and 21.5.26.3 should result in compliance with a 50 DB L_{dn} criterion for common helicopter flights unless there were more than approximately 10 flights per day.⁶⁶⁷ Dr Chiles was also satisfied that for fixed wing aircraft, at 500m to the side of the runway there would be compliance with 55 dB L_{dn} and 95 dB L_{AE} for up to 10 flights per day. However, he noted, compliance off the end of the runway may not be achieved until approximately 1 kilometre away.⁶⁶⁸
684. For those occasions where compliance with the noise criteria referred to above could not be achieved, Dr Chiles concluded that the relevant rules in Chapter 36 (recommended Rules 36.5.10 and 36.5.11) would apply. As we understood his evidence, the purpose of the informal airport rules in this zone are to provide a level of usage as a permitted activity that could be expected to comply with the rules in Chapter 36, but compliance would be expected nonetheless.
685. Mr Barr reviewed all the evidence provided in his Reply Statement and recommended amendments to the rules:
- a. providing for Department of Conservation operations on Conservation or Crown Pastoral Land;
 - b. requiring 500m separation from zone boundaries, but not road boundaries; and
 - c. providing for informal airports on land other than Conservation or Crown Pastoral Land to have up to 2 flights per day (instead of 3 per week).
686. We agree that the provision of some level of permitted informal activity in the Rural Zone is appropriate, as opposed to the ODP regime where all informal airports require consent. While we heard from submitters who considered more activity should be allowed as of right, and others who considered no activity should be allowed, we consider Mr Barr and Dr Chiles have proposed a regime that will facilitate the use of rural land by aircraft while protecting rural amenity values. Consequently, we recommend that Rule 21.4.25 be renumbered and amended

⁶⁶⁵ C Barr, Section 42A Report, Page 71, Paras 16.6 – 16.7

⁶⁶⁶ C Barr, Section 42A Report, Pages 70 – 71, Paras 16.3 – 16.4

⁶⁶⁷ Dr S Chiles, EIC, paragraph 5.1

⁶⁶⁸ *ibid*, paragraph 5.2

to refer to the standards in Table 7, and that Rules 21.5.25 and 21.5.26 be renumbered and revised to read:

	Table 7 - Standards for Informal Airports	Non-Compliance
21.10.1	<p>Informal Airports Located on Public Conservation and Crown Pastoral Land</p> <p>Informal airports that comply with the following standards shall be permitted activities:</p> <p>21.10.1.1 Informal airports located on Public Conservation Land where the operator of the aircraft is operating in accordance with a Concession issued pursuant to Section 17 of the Conservation Act 1987;</p> <p>21.10.1.2 Informal airports located on Crown Pastoral Land where the operator of the aircraft is operating in accordance with a Recreation Permit issued pursuant to Section 66A of the Land Act 1948;</p> <p>21.10.1.3 Informal airports for emergency landings, rescues, fire-fighting and activities ancillary to farming activities, or the Department of Conservation or its agents;</p> <p>21.10.1.4 In relation to Rules 21.10.1.1 and 21.10.1.2, the informal airport shall be located a minimum distance of 500 metres from any other zone or the notional boundary of any residential unit or approved building platform not located on the same site.</p>	D
21.10.2	<p>Informal Airports Located on other Rural Zoned Land</p> <p>Informal Airports that comply with the following standards shall be permitted activities:</p> <p>21.10.2.1 Informal airports on any site that do not exceed a frequency of use of 2 flights* per day;</p> <p>21.10.2.2 Informal airports for emergency landings, rescues, fire-fighting and activities ancillary to farming activities;</p> <p>21.10.2.3 In relation to rule 21.10.2.1, the informal airport shall be located a minimum distance of 500 metres from any other zone or the notional boundary of any residential unit of building platform not located on the same site.</p> <p>* note for the purposes of this Rule a flight includes two aircraft movements i.e. an arrival and departure.</p>	D

27.12 Rules 22.4.13 and 22.4.14

1157. As notified, Rule 22.4.13 provided for informal airports to be a discretionary activity, and Rule 22.4.14 provided for informal airports for emergency landings, rescues, fire-fighting and activities ancillary to farming as permitted activities.
1158. Two submissions¹⁰²⁸ sought that informal airports under Rule 22.4.13 be a prohibited activity, one¹⁰²⁹ sought that they be a non-complying activity, and one submission¹⁰³⁰ sought that strong assessment standards be applied under both rules.
1159. Mr Barr considered discretionary activity status under Rule 22.4.13 appropriate as informal airports could be acceptable depending upon the location, scale and intensity of the activity¹⁰³¹. Mr Vivian, in evidence presented on behalf of J and R Hadley, disagreed with Mr Barr's assessment in respect of the Rural Residential Zone. It was Mr Vivian's opinion that anticipated size of allotments in the Rural Residential Zone (4,000m²) meant that informal airports would have a significant potential to affect character and amenity due to noise and privacy effects¹⁰³².
1160. We note that in the Rural Zone informal airports are permitted subject to standards that require them to be located a minimum distance of 500 metres from any other zone or the notional boundary of any residential unit or building platform not located on the same site. As we have discussed earlier in this report when considering informal airports in the Rural Zone, this limitation combined with the low frequency of flights, is designed to ensure the noise impact of such airports was acceptable on adjacent sites. We would not expect a lesser standard to be applied in these zones.
1161. In our view, Mr Vivian was correct to point out the relatively small site sizes of sites in the Rural Residential Zone. We doubt the practicality of informal airports complying with setbacks similar to those applied in the Rural Zone in the Rural Residential Zone. We do not have the same concern with the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Consequently, we recommend that the discretionary activity for informal airports only apply to the Rural Lifestyle Zone.
1162. There was no evidence in relation to Rule 22.4.14. We agree that it is appropriate that the exceptional circumstances provided for in this rule be allowed as permitted activities. We do, however, consider the rule should be moved up the table to sit with other permitted activities making it Rule 22.4.8.
1163. We also consider that Rule 22.4.13 should exclude those informal airports permitted by Rule 22.4.8. Therefore, we recommend that Rule 22.4.13 be renumbered and reworded to read:

Informal airports in the Rural Lifestyle Zone, except as provided for by Rule 22.4.8.

¹⁰²⁸ Submissions 243 (opposed by FS1224) and 811 (opposed by FS1150, FS1224, FS1325)

¹⁰²⁹ Submission 126

¹⁰³⁰ Submission 674, supported by FS1050, FS1082, FS1089, FS1146

¹⁰³¹ C Barr, Section 42A Report, paragraph 10.1

¹⁰³² C Vivian, EIC, paragraphs 9.36 to 9.39

QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Hearing of Submissions on Proposed District Plan

Report 8

Report and Recommendations of Independent Commissioners Regarding
Chapter 30, Chapter 35 and Chapter 36

Commissioners

Denis Nugent (Chair)

Calum MacLeod

Mark St Clair

8.

9.

1.4. **Procedural Steps and Issues**

10. The hearing of Stream 5 proceeded on the basis of the pre-hearing general directions made in the Panel's Minutes summarised in Report 1²².
11. Specific to the Stream 5 hearing, Counsel for Lake Hayes Cellar Limited (LHC)²³ lodged a Memorandum dated 23 August 2016 seeking clarification as to whether the submissions points of LHC on Chapter 36 would be heard or deferred consistent with the Chair's Minute of 17 June 2016. By way of a Minute dated 24 August 2016, the Chair confirmed the deferment of LHC's submission to the mapping hearings.
12. The Chair issued a Minute on 26 August 2016 confirming that the submissions lodged by Mr Manners-Wood²⁴ were not relevant to Chapter 36 and, consequently, that he would not be heard in Stream 5.
13. By way of a Memorandum dated 30 August 2016, counsel for the Council sought that one full day be allocated for the Council opening on 12 September 2016. Provision was duly made for the Council to have that amount of hearing time.

13 Submission 179 and Further Submission 1208
14 Submission 191 and Further Submission 1253
15 Submission 781 and Further Submission 1106
16 Submission 571
17 Submission 574
18 Submission 805
19 Submission 251 and Further Submission 1259
20 Submission 600 and Further Submission 1132
21 Submission 1365
22 Report 1, Section 1.5
23 Submission 767
24 Submissions 213 and 220

639.

640.

17.6.
641.

642.

643.

17.7. **Rule 36.5.13**

644. This rule set the standard for noise from helicopters. Three submitters⁴⁴⁴ supported this rule.

Other submissions sought:

- a. Delete the rule⁴⁴⁵;
- b. Measure L_{\max} rather than L_{dn} ⁴⁴⁶;
- c. Delete the L_{dn} measurement⁴⁴⁷;
- d. Make non-compliance a discretionary activity⁴⁴⁸.

645. In addition, one submission sought the introduction of a separate rule for helicopters landing near the top of Skyline Access Road⁴⁴⁹.

646. It was Dr Chiles' evidence⁴⁵⁰ that the adverse effects of helicopters are related to both the sound level of individual helicopter movements, and also the frequency of movements. He noted that while there were some limitations with the use of an L_{dn} noise limit, it would control both factors. On the other hand, while a $L_{AF\max}$ noise level would control the sound level, it would not control the number of movements. He also noted that there can be difficulty in obtaining reliable assessments of helicopter noise using the $L_{AF\max}$ limit.

647. Dr Chiles also explained why he considered the L_{dn} control for helicopter noise in this rule, coupled with the additional controls on movement numbers in the Rural Zone, sets an appropriate noise limit to manage adverse noise effects. While he agreed that there was

⁴⁴² Submission 649

⁴⁴³ EiC, Section 12

⁴⁴⁴ Submissions 143 (opposed by FS1093), 433 (opposed by FS1097, FS1117) and 571

⁴⁴⁵ Submission 475, opposed by FS1245

⁴⁴⁶ Submissions 607, 626, 660, 713

⁴⁴⁷ Submission 243, opposed by FS1224, FS1245

⁴⁴⁸ Submission 607

⁴⁴⁹ Submission 574, opposed by FS1063

⁴⁵⁰ EiC, Section 13

justification for applying the noise limits recommended for commercial areas by NZS6807 to commercial areas in the PDP, as sought in Submission 574, he considered that limit not to be appropriate in the area specified in that submission. He advised us that a recent Environment Court decision⁴⁵¹ found that the commercial area noise limit from NZ6807 was not appropriate in that location. He advised us that in considering that application, the Court found that a helicopter noise limit of 60 dB L_{dn} in conjunction with a limit of four helicopter flights a day to be appropriate. He was unaware of justification to insert specific and different noise limits for this location into the PDP.

648. Mr Dent appeared in support of Submission 574. It was his opinion that NZ6807 was the appropriate standard for measuring helicopter noise. He explained that the ODP rules effectively have no applicable noise rules for helicopters. Turning to the specific issue of the Skyline helicopter pad, he considered there was value in making provision for a helicopter pad to locate in the vicinity of Bobs Peak with a noise limit of 60 dB L_{dn} (less than the 65 dB L_{dn} sought in the submission).
649. In response to this evidence, Ms Evans proffered the opinion that if the Council were to include specific controls for a specific consented activity, the PDP would be littered with such special provisions. She also advised that the Environment Court only granted consent for 5 years, to enable review, whereas if it became a rule in the PDP then it would not be subject to review until the PDP were reviewed, and would, potentially, be there for the life of the activity⁴⁵².
650. There are three issues for us to deal with in regard to this rule:
- a. Whether helicopter noise limits be set using NZS6807 or in the same manner as other noise is generally controlled in the District;
 - b. The activity status of a resource consent for non-compliance; and
 - c. Whether special provision should be made for helicopter landing at Skyline.
651. All the expert evidence we heard advised us that NZS6807 is the appropriate standard to use of the assessment and control of helicopter noise. As that standard is specifically designed to deal with helicopter noise, that is unsurprising. Mr Dent assisted us by setting out a number of local consent hearings where the hearing commissioners had agreed with expert noise evidence that concluded the ODP noise rules were ineffective, or unable to control, helicopter noise. We accept all that evidence and conclude that Rule 36.5.13 as notified is fundamentally sound. We also agree with Ms Evans' recommendation that the Advice Note should specify Queenstown and Wanaka Airports.
652. Our views on the non-compliance status of any breach of this rule is consistent with those we gave above in respect of Rule 36.5.3 above. As it was, we heard no evidence on this from the submitter.
653. The Stream 10 Hearing Panel has recommended that the final clause in the notified definition of noise in Chapter be inserted in this rule. We agree that is a more appropriate location and is a non-substantive change under Clause 16(2).
654. For those reasons we recommend that Rule 36.5.13 (renumbered 36.5.10) be adopted as notified, with the addition of the phrase from Chapter 2 and a minor amendment to the advice note.

⁴⁵¹ ZJV (NZ) Limited v Queenstown Lakes District Council & Skyline Enterprises Limited [2015] NZEnvC 205

⁴⁵² Ruth Evans, Reply Statement, Section 9

655. We also note that, in addition to this rule, other rules in the Rural Zone relating to informal airports restrict the frequency of flights and impose setback requirements in certain situations. The combination of those rules should go some way to address the concerns of those submitters who sought the deletion or modification of this rule.

656. Turning to the Skyline issue, we agree with Ms Evans that turning a resource consent into district plan rules, when that consent is subject to a time limitation because of the potential adverse effects, is fraught with issues. We consider it would be poor resource management practice to create such a rule as it would restrict the Council's ability to adjust the terms of the activity if monitoring disclosed adverse environmental effects beyond those foreseen. In our view, if Skyline wishes to choose a better site for helicopter landing, and it requires a resource consent, then they should follow that process. We recommend that

17.8. submission be rejected. [Rule 36.5.14](#)

657. This rule sets noise limits for fixed wing aircraft using NZS6805 as the means of measuring and assessing aircraft noise. One submission⁴⁵³ sought the retention of this rule, while two submissions⁴⁵⁴ sought its replacement with an L_{max} limit and changing the non-compliance status to discretionary.

658. Again this issue is whether a standard specifically designed to measure and assess aircraft noise (NZS6805) should be used as the basis for setting the limits in this rule, or the general provisions used elsewhere in the District. We heard no evidence in support of the submissions seeking to amend this rule and see no reason to for there to be a different approach to setting noise limits for fixed wing aircraft from that used for setting noise limits for helicopters.

659. We recommend that Rule 36.5.14 (renumbered 36.5.11) be adopted as notified, and the advice note be amended to specify Queenstown and Wanaka Airports.

17.9.

660.

661.

662.

663.

⁴⁵³ Submission 433, supported by FS1345 and opposed by FS1097, FS1117

⁴⁵⁴ Submissions 607 and 621

⁴⁵⁵ Submission 649

⁴⁵⁶ Submission 243, opposed by FS1224, FS1245

⁴⁵⁷ Submission 621

⁴⁵⁸ Submission 758