

1. Submitter details

above:

Full name of submitter:

Contact name if different from

Waipā District Plan Private Plan Change 20 Further Submission Form

Form 6

Clause 8 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991

To: Waipa District Council, Private Bag 2402, Te Awamutu 3840 | Phone: 0800 924 723 | Online: www.waipadc.govt.nz/planchanges | Email: districtplan@waipadc.govt.nz

Mark Morgan – Chief Executive of Hamilton Airport;

or Ben Langley - Group General Manager - Airport Operations

Waikato Regional Airport Ltd (WRAL)

Please attach additional sheets if there is not enough space for your submissions. If you do not wish to use this form, please ensure that the same information required by this form is covered in your submission.

COUNCIL USE ONLY

Date received

Document ref:

Note: You must fill in **ALL** sections of this form. Submissions close **5pm Friday, 25th November 2022**

Contact phone number(s)	Mark Morgan: 027 5623351
contact phone number(3)	Ben Langley: 021 2086363
	Kathryn Drew: 027 2510009
Email address:	mark@hamiltonairport.co.nz
Email address.	ben.langley@hamiltonairport.co.nz
	kdrew@bbo.co.nz
Postal address:	C/- Kathryn Drew
(required if no email address is	Bloxam Burnett & Olliver
provided)	PO Box 9041, Hamilton, 3240
provided)	
2. In accordance with clause 8(1)	of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act (select one of the following):
☐ I represent a relevant aspect	of the public interest.
X I have an interest in the prop	posed plan change greater than the interest that the general public has.
My reason(s) are:	
WRAL is the operator of the Hami	ton Airport that directly adjoins the Northern Precinct.
WRAL is the operator of the Hami	ton Airport that directly adjoins the Northern Precinct.
WRAL is the operator of the Hami 3. Attendance at Council hearing	ton Airport that directly adjoins the Northern Precinct.
3. Attendance at Council hearing	ton Airport that directly adjoins the Northern Precinct. to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission.
3. Attendance at Council hearing (a) I wish X OR do not wish	□ to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission.
3. Attendance at Council hearing (a) I wish OR do not wish (b) If others make a similar submis	
3. Attendance at Council hearing (a) I wish X OR do not wish	□ to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission.
3. Attendance at Council hearing (a) I wish \times OR do not wish (b) If others make a similar submis Yes \times OR No \square	□ to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission. ssion, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.
3. Attendance at Council hearing (a) I wish \times OR do not wish (b) If others make a similar submis Yes \times OR No \square	□ to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of my submission.



Note to person making submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the Council.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the consent authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious;
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
- It contains offensive language;
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Personal Information

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991. The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, will be made available for inspection at all Council service centres and libraries in accordance with the requirements of the Act. It may also be made available on the Council's website. A document summarising all submissions, including names and contact details of submitters will be posted on the Council's website.

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential please contact the processing planner for this application.



Submission Point (e.g. 20/1)	Name of Submitter	Support	Oppose ✓	Reason: (Tell us <u>WHY</u> you support or oppose this submission. These reasons will help us to understand your further submission.)	I/We seek the following decision(s) from the Council
20.2		~	~	The submitter states in paragraph 3, footnote 2 that the PC20 site includes "the existing, undeveloped Airport Business Zone and the proposed Northern Precinct". This statement is incorrect, and would if adopted mean that the controls sought would apply to other portions of the Airport Business Zone that are yet to be fully developed to their potential i.e. Central or Southern Precincts.	Specifically confine any the PC20 to that described in th AEE supporting the plan change and not the wider Airport Business Zone or Hamilton Airport.
				WRAL consequently oppose the definition of the site adopted by DOC and the suggestion that bespoke lighting provisions should apply to the wider Airport Business Zone and/or Hamilton Airport.	
				If the DOC site definition was adopted, it could lead to lighting controls on portions of the Airport Business Zone that are not currently subject to such controls.	
				Furthermore, it needs to be recognised that the Hamilton Airport, by its very nature needs lighting to facilitate its aeronautical operations. Any lighting controls should be factored against that existing environment.	
07.2	Royal Forest and Bird		~	Each of these submissions in some way or another has requested protection and/or provision for bat corridors. WRAL as operator of Hamilton Airport is concerned that the protection and/or creation of bat corridors may have	Disallow the submissions, or alternative relief that does not adversely affect the aeronautical operations of Hamilton Airport.



11.3	Waikato Regional Council	~	There are two aeronautical risks for Hamilton Airport with rating of 'medium', one of those being birds. Although birds and resulting bird strikes are a low probability, the consequences of a bird strike could be catastrophic/high consequence i.e. bird striking critical surfaces of the aircraft causing loss of flight control. For these reasons, there is an onus on the Hamilton Airport, from a health and safety
20.1	Director General of Conservation/Department of Conservation	~	perspective, to mitigate risk from any hazardous wildlife and in particular bird life that may cause a threat to aeronautical activities. Airports also operate under certification ¹ , that specifies that an aerodrome operator must, if any wildlife presents a hazard to aircraft operations, establish an
23.10	Hamilton City Council	~	environmental management programme for minimising or eliminating the wildlife hazards. In this respect the airport undertakes the following: - Bird patrols associated with pre-landing and take-offs — including delays in approaches or take-offs in the event birds are identified.
25.1	GHA (Gerry) Kessels		 Wildlife management programmes to control bird population, including an Authority under the Wildlife Act 1953² to disturb and kill protected wildlife under s54 of the Wildlife Act 1953, that is subject to specific conditions. A pasture management programme within the operational area of the Hamilton Airport i.e. highendophyte grass. Monitoring of all bird activity, recording of all bird events i.e. bird strike and near miss.
			Hamilton Airport recording of bird events, as noted above, has identified that in the past 12 months there has been a 100% increase in bird activity compared to the pervious two years.

¹ Under Civil Aviation Rule Part 139 and specifically Part 139.71

 $^{^{\}rm 2}$ This permit commenced on 1 July 2016 and goes through to 30 June 2026.



		We draw the submitters and Council's attention to the fact that the Northern Precinct is located directly adjacent to the Hamilton Airport, being a high noise generator in the locality associated with its aeronautical operations, so noise from industrial activities needs to be considered against this baseline. This is confirmed in section 3.1 of the Marshall Day Acoustic Assessment in support PC20, where by it states: "Aircraft approaching, departing, and manoeuvring about the	
10.2	James and Marie Snowball Rex Allan Mason	These two submission points relates to concerns with noise levels within the Northern Precinct and specifically lack of mitigation for noise levels from the proposed activities within the Northern Precinct.	Disallow the submission Disallow the submission
		In the last month alone it recorded 13 events, 9 of which were near misses. This increase is a genuine concern for the Hamilton Airport and is resulting in tightening bird management mitigations and controls to manage any risk and further increases of that risk. An increase in events may also impact on the Hamilton Airport's scheduling by Air New Zealand in that they may chose to prefer alternative locations for specific routes, over Hamilton, if there is a marked increase in bird events. This situation needs to be avoided as it goes to the heart of the viability of the Airport. WRAL is consequently concerned that bat corridors/bat buffer zones may also have unintended consequences of funnelling birds or increasing bird activity near the airport through increased habitat and feeding opportunities, giving rise to reverse sensitivity effects. For this reason, any bat corridors/bat habitat and future SNAs that are identified within or near the PC20 footprint need to ensure that they are moving both birds and bats away from the airport environs.	



airport will form a significant features of the existing environment". WRAL's concern with these submissions is that any additional noise controls (over that proposed in PC20), on uses within the Northern Precinct, such as curfews on night-time operations or restrictions on engine testing or noise generated by aircraft (for example), may indirectly affect the operation and use of Hamilton Airport. For example, such noise controls may affect how and when airside land (land with direct access to and from the runway) can be used to the detriment of the Hamilton Airport and its operations.	
It should also be noted that the Hamilton Airport already operates under a Noise Management Plan³ (NMP) and engages with a Community Liaison Group in relation to the NMP. The NMP describes the policies, standards and procedures used to manage noise generated by airport activities. The NMP being the appropriate tool to control noise from Hamilton Airport operations, not controls relating to uses in the Northern Precinct that curtail use of the adjacent Hamilton Airport infrastructure.	



³A copy of the Noise Management Plan is available on the Airport website: https://www.hamiltonairport.co.nz/site files/23413/upload files/NMPFinalJuly2021Final.pdf?dl=1