

# Submission on Notified Proposal for Plan, Change or Variation

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Timaru District Council

Name of submitter:

- Cessna 180/185 Group – website [www.cessna180185.org.nz/](http://www.cessna180185.org.nz/)
- Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association – website [www.aopa.co.nz/](http://www.aopa.co.nz/)
- Sports Aircraft Association – website [www.saa.org.nz/](http://www.saa.org.nz/)
- Recreational Backcountry Pilots Association – no website. See descriptor below.

These 4 organisations are collectively termed in this submission as “the submitters”.  
[State full name]

This is a submission on the following proposed plan *or* on a change proposed to the following plan *or* on the following proposed variation to a proposed plan *or* on the following proposed variation to a change to an existing plan) (the ‘proposal’):

## Proposed Timaru District Plan

[State the name of proposed or existing plan and (where applicable) change or variation].

I ~~could~~/could not\* gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.  
[\*Select one.]

~~\*I am/am not† directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that—  
(a) adversely affects the environment; and  
(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.~~

[\*Delete or strike through entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.] [†Select one.]

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are: [Give details]

..... GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites.

..... PER-2 – 2. the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback greater than 1,000m from:

- a. any Residential zone; and
- b. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity, not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site;

.....PER-3

Take offs or landings must not exceed 10 per month; and the airstrip or landing site is setback a minimum of 500m from:

1. any Residential zone; and
2. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site

**My submission is:** [Include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended; and reasons for your views]

[If your submission relates to a proposed plan prepared or changed using the collaborative planning process, you must indicate the following:

- Where you consider that the proposed plan or change fails to give effect to a consensus position and therefore how it should be modified; or

- *In the case that your submission addresses a point on which the collaborative group did not reach a consensus position, how that provision in the plan should be modified.]*

The submitters include the Recreational Backcountry Pilots Association (RBPA). RBPA was formed in August 2012 with the specific objectives of advocating for recreational back country flying and facilitating its members' compliance with the Conservation Act. RBPA consists of a maximum of 200 members throughout New Zealand who regularly land registered fixed-wing aircraft on the public conservation estate for recreational purposes. RBPA have formed into their constitutions a triple mission statement:

1. To promote aviation safety through sharing experiences and disseminating information.
2. To preserve access to New Zealand's historic back country landing strips through member involvement in land use issues, and volunteering time and resources toward conservation issues relating to back country flying and ancillary activities.
3. To protect the environment by promoting "leave no trace" camping and "tread lightly" disciplines and activities in the back country.

Most submitters' members are current or retired farmers, or professionals, and have extensive knowledge of land management, conservation, fire control and biosecurity practices. They regard flying in rural areas and conservation lands as a legitimate bona fide recreational activity, similar to jetboating or four wheel driving. This has been backed up by statements from the Minister of Conservation in 2012, who agreed that recreational landings were a legitimate bona fide recreational activity which should be catered for on Conservation lands. This culminated in a nationwide concession being granted to RBPA for recreational landings on over 100 remote airstrips on Conservation land.

Aircraft landings in rural areas have minimal effect on conservation, landscape or wilderness values in those areas where fixed-winged aircraft can be landed. Noise effects are already adequately managed in the current District Plan, as mentioned by the Stage 2 Noise and Vibration report by Malcolm Hunt and Associates (Page 14), which states:

*Overall however, the existing district plans are considered a sufficient deterrent. ... no significant changes to the overall approach to land use controls in aircraft noise-affected areas are considered necessary*

Rule GRUZ-R14 is unnecessarily onerous and unduly penalises recreational aircraft owners. It provides arbitrary rules which are not correlated to noise effects. There is no reference to where these rules come from, or what triggered their "necessity" to be included in the District Plan. The supporting information on the TDC website, most notably the Stage 1 Noise and Vibration report by Malcolm Hunt and Associates, makes no mention of the need for these rules.

The submitters are **OPPOSED** to Rule **PER-2 – 2(b) as worded**. This Rule should be changed to: *the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity not owned or occupied by the airstrip or helicopter landing site operator*

This would allow private airstrip owners to use their airstrip at any time and under any circumstances, if their airstrip was nearby a dwelling (or noise sensitive activity) operated by the same private owner or occupier.

The submitters are also **OPPOSED** to Rule **PER 3 as worded**. The "10 landings per month Rule" is arbitrary and should be deleted. It has no basis in fact. There is no supporting information provided which relate it to effective noise management. It is unduly onerous on recreational aircraft owners who hangar their aircraft on their own properties.

In addition to opposing the “10 landings per month Rule”. **PER 3 (2)** also needs to be changed in the same way as PER 2 – (b). i.e.

*the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity not owned or occupied by the airstrip or helicopter landing site operator*

2

**I seek the following decision from the local authority:** *[Give precise details as this is the only part of your submission that will be summarised in the summary of decisions requested]*

1. Change Rule **PER-2 – 2(b)** as follows:

*... the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity not owned or occupied by the airstrip or helicopter landing site operator*

2. Replace Rule **PER 3** with a new **Rule PER 3** as follows:

*For activities not associated with Rule PER-2 above, the airstrip or landing site is setback a minimum of 500m from:*

- 1. any Residential zone; and*
- 2. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity not owned or occupied by the airstrip or helicopter landing site operator*

**I wish ~~(or do not wish)~~ † to be heard in support of my submission.**

*[\*In the case of a submission made on a proposed planning instrument that is subject to a streamlined planning process, you need only indicate whether you wish to be heard if the direction specifies that a hearing will be held.]*

*[†Select one.]*

**\*If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.**

*[\*Delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case.]*

**Signature of submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)**

*[A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means]*

**Date** ....7<sup>th</sup> December 2022

**Electronic address for service of submitter:** [bill@chisholm.co.nz](mailto:bill@chisholm.co.nz)

**Telephone:** 027 2214739

**Postal address (or alternative method of service under s352 of the Act):** PO Box 125, Manapouri 9643

**Contact person:** *[name and designation, if applicable]*.....**Mr W.P (Bill) Chisholm (consultant)**

**Note to person making submission**

- If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use form 16B. If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the 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 specialist knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Doc# 636102