

WAIPA DISTRICT COUNCIL, WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL & HAMILTON CITY COUNCIL

Submission:

Hamilton Airport Runway Extension &
Changes to Noise Boundaries & Obstacle
Limitation Surfaces

SUBMITTER

Name: Grace Margaret Wilcock

Postal address: 117 Windmill Road, RD3, Hamilton 3283

Email: rogmag@xtra.co.nz

Telephone (Day): [07] 8567633

(Mobile): N/A

PRESENTATION

Do you wish to present your comments to the Council in person? YES

Parts of proposal submission relates to:

Financial Feasibility, Acoustic Requirements, Noise Management Plan, Air Pollution, Ventilation Systems, Subdivision & Consultation Process.

My submission

BUILDING REGULATIONS, NOISE, ACOUSTICS

Building Regulations that will be incorporated into the relevant Council's District Plans. The Airport is imposing many extra requirements on buildings with the OCB, yet these factors have not been made obvious in the Public Notifications and therefore the majority of affected people will not be aware until they come to use the new imposed building codes. Yet nowhere is there a list of consequences for the Airport if they contravene the rules of operation.

For example one key night-time noise issue is landing aircraft coming in on 'full throttle' instead of the required 'glide approach'. Who monitors this and ensures it does not occur and if it does the relevant airline is penalised?

EITHER change wording of requirement "it is RECOMMENDED that buildings incorporate then list out building codes or actual requirement such as double glazing OR delete requirement for acoustic engineer design and the ventilation clause.

FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY

Volume 1, Section 2.4.8 states that the Airport “will not invest speculatively”.

As the Airport has already had to be aided by the public purse what confidence can the rate payers have that future Airport Executive “will not invest speculatively”?

2.4.2 includes flights to Sydney exist from Hamilton to Sydney but this is not the case please correct this item.

CHANGE: “will not invest speculatively” to a more definite statement.

NOISE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Appendix 8.3.1, bullet 3 has a reference to the avoidance of training flights between 10pm & 7am “where possible”. What would be permissible exceptions?

No mention is made in the plan for agricultural spraying aircraft and the old NZAF plane that I believe does a monthly test run. However the latter is more a pollutant problem and I see no mention of this in any section of the documents.

Section 4 of this appendix has several errors with reference to the Tamahere Community Committee (TCC) and I would like these corrected.

CHANGE:

Add in to 8.3.1; ‘If training at night is to occur then it is NOT to take place on Saturday or Sunday nights’.

Airport to look into ‘muffler’ system for small aircraft (similar to that introduced for racing cars in the 80/90s) especially when they are low flying.

Airport to work with NZAF in order remove the problem of severe air pollutants for this flight.

TCC corresponded with the Liaison Group and received no reply; they then organised for Liaison Group representatives to attend some of their monthly meetings; which duly happened. Discussions included CTC circuits, noise complaint procedures, subdivision, the widening of the OCB, financial feasibility and how to get information to the general populace re this new group. Information was put on the website along with the complaint form and ongoing dialogue was to follow.

GROWTH

Section 7.2.6 & 9 contain references to the Southern Sector Study as being implemented; this study has not been accepted by all Councils. In addition the growth of the Airport’s surrounding infrastructure is compromised by the Narrows Bridge. How are the Airport, NZTA and the Southern Links & Southern Sector Study dealing with this issue? This issue also impacts on the future financial feasibility of the Airports expansion.

CHANGE

Revise section 7 to reflect true status of Southern Sector Study.

CONSULTATION

Section 8.6 states that the “open day demonstrated support for the proposed reduction in the existing OCB”. Naturally many people support this reduction as it impacts on their ability to sub-divide.

CHANGE

Revise 8.6 to reflect reason for the support of the reduction in the OCB.

SUB-DIVISION

Section 4 covers this aspect of the Airport changes but this section includes some anomalies. 4.2.9/10 covers the original change worked out between the Airport & “group of Tamahere land owners” but this agreement did not involve those residents who had previously been outside the OCB but who would now be inside the OCB. 4.2.9/10 & 12/13 identify that the OCB will be wider and shorter. However as the change is only a narrow strip then the application of the 1.1 hectare size requirement for sub-division is not justified; especially as only 11 properties have the potential to sub-divide in that narrow strip so the 5000m² rule will apply. The democracy of past and present the proposal seems odd as some properties are completely surrounded by small sections yet will have to use the 1.1 rule.

CHANGE

Airport to review the logic of the CLZ relative to the OCB changes and make a more logical decision on those who can or cannot sub-divide down to 5000m².