

Hearing Notes

My submission's primary purpose was to offer a solution to the perceived incompatibility of building height and airport noise. (although I see the two matters as not being directly connected).

My family and I have been resident in the district for now 6 generations, particularly the Frankton area.

My family trust has owned the site in McBride St since 2010 after purchasing from my aunty who owned it since 2001. (My parents live in Stewart St in my late Grandmothers house.) The property is currently rented to the Central Lakes Family Service. I now reside in Quail Rise. We have seen first-hand the rapid urbanisation of the Frankton area over a relatively short space of time.

The most noticeable and dominant activity adjoining the McBride St property is the Frankton Bus Hub, the main bus interchange for public transport in the Wakatipu.

Nearby, at 1 Hansen Road, in the same Zone, the EPA approved worker accommodation buildings that exceed the current 10m limit (varying heights of between 3 & 6 storeys between 11.4m & 16.4m high). The EPA also found that acoustic attenuation and non-complaints covenants were suitable mitigation for noise sensitivity. Those buildings meeting the overwhelming need for more accommodation in the district in a compact built form.

My view is that is that if the height limit in Frankton LSCZ is not increased to 14 metres along with other LSCZ would be a missed opportunity. This location in Frankton, in my view, is where the demand for intensification is the arguably the greatest and is an appropriate location for building height to be achieved. The main advantages being proximity to public transport and the Frankton commercial centres.

My understanding is that although the site is within the airport approach surfaces, those surfaces are ~45m high, well above any building proposed and pose no operational safety issues. I understand other buildings in Frankton, with height limit breaches, within the airport surfaces, have been approved. The only issue from the s42a was that of reverse sensitivity.

When I was asked if I considered the mitigations appropriate, I confirmed no issue with acoustic attenuation as a good practical measure. While I can see the purpose of the no complaints covenant, I appreciate human nature may determine how practical and successful that mitigation may be.

I appreciate the Airport will have a view on this during their submission later in the hearings process.