

Decisions on the Submissions and Further Submissions

The below decisions are grouped according to subject matter in the same manner the submissions were analysed and recommendations made on decisions in the Council's section 42A RMA report.

DECISIONS

Show the main runway strip in its actual location on the planning maps

1. All submitters and further submitters support the correct representation of the runway strip on the planning maps.
2. Submitter 25 (Whitianga Waterways Ltd) (**WWL**) requests the runway to be shown according to Airey Map (dated March 2017).
3. Submitter 23 (Keith Vernon) additionally seeks extension of the main runway transitional side upslope to a height of 45m. The next part of these decisions, which deals with the Obstacle Limitation Surface (**OLS**) addresses this matter.

Decision

4. **R 1.1:** *Runway is to be shown in its correct location according to a Council created Map 17D showing the correct OLS.*
5. **Reasons**
 - a) *Both the Operative Plan and the Plan showed the runway incorrectly located on the planning maps.*
 - b) *The Airey Map does not show the correct OLS.*
 - c) *The correct plan is attached to the decision report (Attachment 3) associated with these decisions.*

Submitter Further submitter	Point # FS Point #	Submission topic	Accept/ Reject	Decision	Reason
David Cranna	1.1	Main runway strip shown in correct location	Accept	R 1.1	a)
Whitianga Waterways Ltd – support	FS 25	<i>But according to the Airey Consultants Ltd Plan</i>	Accept in part	R 1.1	a)b)
Keith Vernon-Support	FS 23	<i>But KV seeks extension of OLS to inner horizontal edge at a height of 45m</i>	Accept	R 1.1	a)b)
Grant Biel	6.1	Main runway strip shown in correct location	Accept	R 1.1	a)

<i>Keith Vernon - partly oppose and partly support</i>	<i>FS 23</i>	<i>with amendments as per KV submission</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>R 1.1</i>	<i>a)</i>
Mercury Bay Aero Club - support	9.1	Main runway strip shown in correct location	<i>Accept</i>	<i>R 1.1</i>	<i>a)</i>
<i>John Hart - support</i>	<i>FS 2</i>		<i>Accept</i>	<i>Ditto for all below</i>	<i>Ditto for all below</i>
<i>Kevin Paulsen - support</i>	<i>FS 3</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Philip Hart - support</i>	<i>FS 4</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Peter Armstrong - support</i>	<i>FS 5</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Leanne Butler - support</i>	<i>FS 7</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Kevin Rintoul - support</i>	<i>FS 8</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Peter D Scandrett - support</i>	<i>FS 10</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Wallace Pendray - support</i>	<i>FS 13</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Richard Hood - support</i>	<i>FS 15</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Anthea H Austin - support</i>	<i>FS 17</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Peter L Austin - support</i>	<i>FS 18</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Douglas A St George - support</i>	<i>FS 19</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Harold Abrahamson - support</i>	<i>FS 20</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Steve Brown Douglas - support</i>	<i>FS 21</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Brian H Wigley - support</i>	<i>FS 22</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Keith Vernon - partly oppose and partly support</i>	<i>FS 23</i>		<i>Accept in part</i>		
<i>Stephen J Chilcott - support</i>	<i>FS 24</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Rachel Ervine - support</i>	<i>FS 27</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Stephan Bosman - support</i>	<i>FS 29</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Christine Rabarts - support</i>	<i>FS 30</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Geoff Cooper (Fly DC3 NZ Inc.) - support</i>	<i>FS 31</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Gavin Magill – support</i>	<i>FS 32</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Keith Vernon-support</i>	<i>FS 23</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
John Stephenson -support	16.1	Main runway strip shown in correct location	<i>Accept</i>	<i>R 1.1</i>	<i>a)b)c)</i>
<i>Keith Vernon – support</i>	<i>FS 23</i>		<i>Accept</i>	<i>R 1.1</i>	<i>a)b)c)</i>
<i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd - support in part</i>	<i>FS 25</i>	<i>Needs to be shown according to Airey Consultants Ltd plan (dated March 2017)</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>R 1.1</i>	<i>a)b)c)</i>
<i>Ross L Walker – support</i>	<i>FS 26</i>		<i>Accept</i>	<i>R 1.1</i>	<i>a)b)c)</i>
Whitianga Waterways Ltd	25.1	Main runway strip shown in correct location	<i>Reject</i>	<i>R 1.1</i>	<i>a)b)</i>
<i>Keith Vernon – support</i>	<i>FS 23</i>	<i>Subject to other KV points</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>R 1.1</i>	<i>a)b)</i>

Amend main runway transitional surfaces (OLS) from 1:7 to 1:5

6. Most submitters and further submitters support the change of the OLS from 1:7 to 1:5. Submitter 23, Keith Vernon, seeks an extension of the 1:5 OLS upslope to 45 m in accordance with AC139-6. The Council expert (Mr Dave Park, aviation consultant) confirmed that Mr Vernon is correct in pointing out that the Map 17D needs to show the 1:5 OLS upslope to 45m.
7. Submitter Alan Hopping (for 'The Lost Spring') opposes all changes to the Operative District Plan including the change from 1:7 to 1:5. In the same vein Mr Hopping supports all points made by the Mercury Bay Aero Club (**MBAC**). A fair assumption can be made that Mr Hopping's opposition to the 1:5 OLS might be due to an error when filling in the submission form. In any case the retention of a 1:7 OLS is not supported by the Council's reporting planner.

Decision

8. **R 1.2:** *OLS to be shown as 1:5 for main runway strip with the transitional upslope extending for a distance of 75 m from the runway edge.*
9. **Reasons**
 - a) *The 1:7 OLS would unnecessarily restrict development on sites adjacent to the airfield.*
 - b) *Existing dwellings would not be able to comply with the 1:7 OLS.*
 - c) *Given the surrounding topography there is no realistic prospect of the airfield ever expanding its scope of operation to justify a 1:7 OLS.*
 - d) *Showing the transitional upslope extending for a distance of 75m provides for a building height of 15m which is more than reasonable for activities in a residential area, apart from being more than is provided for by the zoning for the land.*

Submitter <i>Further submitter</i>	Point # <i>FS Point #</i>	Submission topic	Accept/ Reject	Decision	Reason
David Cranna <i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd – support Keith Vernon -support</i>	1.2 <i>FS 25 FS 23</i>	Change 1:7 to 1:5	Accept Accept Accept	R 1.2 R 1.2 R 1.2	a)b)c) a)b)c) a)b)c)d)
Grant Biel <i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd – support Keith Vernon -support</i>	6.2 <i>FS 25 FS 23</i>	Change 1:7 to 1:5 <i>+1:5 supported subject to OLS extending to inner horizontal edge at 45m.</i>	Accept Accept Accept	R 1.2 R 1.2 R 1.2	a)b)c) a)b)c) a)b)c)d)
Ken Heslin	11.2	Change 1:7 to 1:5	Accept	R 1.2	a)b)c)

<i>Keith Vernon – support</i>	<i>FS 23</i>		<i>Accept</i>	R 1.2	a)b)c)d)
John Stephenson <i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd - support</i> <i>Ross L Walker – support</i> <i>Keith Vernon - support</i>	16.2 <i>FS 25</i> <i>FS 26</i> <i>FS 23</i>	Change 1:7 to 1:5 <i>+ inner horizontal at height 45m</i>	<i>Accept</i> <i>Accept</i> <i>Accept</i> <i>Accept</i>	R 1.2 R 1.2 R 1.2 R 1.2	a)b)c) a)b)c) a)b)c) a)b)c)d)
Keith Vernon <i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd - oppose¹</i>	23.1 <i>FS 25</i>	Show main runway OLS 1:5 extending to inner horizontal height of 45 m in accordance with AC 139-6 (22m from outer edge of runway width of 80m).	<i>Reject</i> <i>Accept</i>	R 1.2 R 1.2	d) d)
Whitianga Waterways Ltd <i>Keith Vernon – support</i>	25.2 <i>FS 23</i>	Change 1:7 to 1:5 <i>The transitional surface of 1:5 to a height of 45 m above airfield height datum</i> <i>Subject to inner horizontal edge at a height of 45 m</i>	<i>Accept in part</i> <i>Accept in part</i>	R 1.2 R 1.2	a)b)c)d) a)b)c)d)

Restriction on aircraft greater than 5700 kg using the airfield

10. All submitters and further submitters (except Submitter 23, Keith Vernon) oppose a weight restriction. The Council expert is not concerned about lifting the weight limit in particular since this would allow the DC3 at a weight of 14,100kg. The DC3 is a Code 3 aircraft, however the Council expert believes that it is for the operator of the aircraft to address any operational issues arising. The Council expert further notes that the Aeronautical Information Publications (AIP) already contain a maximum all up weight (MAUW) restriction of less than 5700 kg (based on single wheel load of 1270 kg) specified by the airfield operator.
11. Further submitter 23 (Keith Vernon) supports that weight restrictions remain in Table 1 and argues that the maximum certified take-off weight (MCTOW) is a critical design/operational parameter.
12. Submitter 16 (John Henry Stephenson) says in his submission opposing the weight restriction that Whitianga is a strategically large airfield on the eastern seaboard of the peninsula and that it would play a key role in any potential Civil Defence emergency. To place a weight restriction on the airfield would seriously limit its usefulness. The Council’s reporting planner

¹ It is noted that it seems that in this instance Mr Vernon and WWL are seeking the same relief though.

agreed with Mr Stephenson’s view and added that Mr Stephenson’s position is of overall importance when considering whether to restrict the airfield’s operational scope. The potential use of the airfield as an alternative transport asset in emergencies needs to be considered for all design parameters including the 1:40 upslope.

13. MBAC and a number of further submitters argue that the Whitianga airfield has become a popular destination for the DC3 for charters and weekend visits and is a valuable source of income for the Club and the local community. The Council’s reporting planner does not agree with provisions that would restrict the use of the DC3 on the Whitianga airfield and that go beyond what the Council’s role is in this process. The reporting planner also notes that the 1:40 upslope surface on both ends of the main runway is vital to enable the DC3 to use the Whitianga airfield.
14. Further submitter 30 (Christine Rabarts, owner of the Bread&Butter Gallery Whitianga), supports all MBAC submission points and states that the DC3 flights are a key means of transportation for her clients, making Whitianga accessible as a day event outing for groups of people. The further submitter adds that the DC3 is operated voluntarily by pilots and crew which comes to huge yearly costs. The regular ‘Bread&Butter flights’ help making DC3 maintenance and operation financially viable and available for the whole of New Zealand to enjoy. These are valid arguments in support of retaining the airfield’s accessibility for a variety of aircraft which is consistent with Objective 5 in Section 18 of the District Plan.

Decision

15. **R 1.4** *Lift restrictions on maximum landing weight in Table 1, Section 28 1.1.*
16. **Reasons**
 - a) *Restrictions on landing weight are an operational issue to be addressed by the airfield owner and the operator of an aircraft.*
 - b) *Allow for the continued operation of the DC3 on the Whitianga airfield.*
 - c) *Allow for potential emergency operations on the airfield without weight restrictions.*

Submitter <i>Further submitter</i>	Point # <i>FS Point #</i>	Submission topic	Accept/ Reject	Decision	Reason
David Cranna – oppose <i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd - support</i> <i>Keith Vernon oppose</i>	1.4 <i>FS 25</i> <i>FS 23</i>	Restriction of MCTOW	<i>Accept</i> <i>Accept</i> <i>Reject</i>	R 1.4 R 1.4 R 1.4	a)b)c) a)b)c) a)b)c)
Grant Biel support <i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd – support</i> <i>Keith Vernon oppose</i>	6.4 <i>FS 25</i> <i>FS 23</i>	Lift Restriction of MCTOW	<i>Accept</i> <i>Accept</i> <i>Reject</i>	R 1.4 R 1.4 R 1.4	a)b)c) a)b)c) a)b)c)
Mercury Bay Aero Club	9.4	Lift Restriction of MCTOW	<i>Accept</i>	R 1.4	a)b)c)

<i>John Hart - support</i>	<i>FS 2</i>		<i>Accept</i>	<i>Ditto for</i>	<i>Ditto for</i>
<i>Kevin Paulsen - support</i>	<i>FS 3</i>		<i>Accept</i>	<i>all</i>	<i>all below</i>
<i>Philip Hart - support</i>	<i>FS 4</i>		<i>Accept</i>	<i>below</i>	
<i>Peter Armstrong - support</i>	<i>FS 5</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Leanne Butler - support</i>	<i>FS 7</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Kevin Rintoul - support</i>	<i>FS 8</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Peter D Scandrett - support</i>	<i>FS 10</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Wallace Pendray - support</i>	<i>FS 13</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Richard Hood - support</i>	<i>FS 15</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Anthea H Austin - support</i>	<i>FS 17</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Peter L Austin - support</i>	<i>FS 18</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Douglas A St George - support</i>	<i>FS 19</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Harold Abrahamson - support</i>	<i>FS 20</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Steve Brown Douglas - support</i>	<i>FS 21</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Brian H Wigley - support</i>	<i>FS 22</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Stephen J Chilcott - support</i>	<i>FS 24</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd - support</i>	<i>FS 25</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Rachel Ervine - support</i>	<i>FS 27</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Stephan Bosman - support</i>	<i>FS 29</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Christine Rabarts - support</i>	<i>FS 30</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>The Lost Spring - oppose</i>	<i>FS 28</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Geoff Cooper (Fly DC3 NZ Inc.) - support</i>	<i>FS 31</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Gavin Magill – support</i>	<i>FS 32</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Keith Vernon-oppose</i>	<i>FS 23</i>	Limit should be around 4000kg max	<i>Reject</i>	R 1.4	a)b)c)
Ken Heslin	11.5	Lift Restriction of MCTOW	<i>Accept</i>	R 1.4	a)b)c)
<i>Keith Vernon – oppose</i>	<i>FS 23</i>		<i>Reject</i>	R 1.4	a)b)c)
<i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd - support</i>	<i>FS 25</i>		<i>Accept</i>	R 1.4	a)b)c)
Jan Kenny - oppose	12.2	Restrictions of MCTOW	<i>Accept</i>	R 1.4	a)b)c)
<i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd - support in part</i>	<i>FS 25</i>	<i>Supports change to Table 1</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	R 1.4	a)b)c)
<i>Keith Vernon - support</i>	<i>FS23</i>		<i>Reject</i>	R 1.4	a)b)c)
John Stephenson -support	16.6	Lift Restrictions of MCTOW	<i>Accept</i>	R 1.4	a)b)c)
<i>Ross L Walker – support</i>	<i>FS 26</i>		<i>Accept</i>	R 1.4	a)b)c)
<i>Keith Vernon -oppose</i>	<i>FS 23</i>		<i>Reject</i>	R 1.4	a)b)c)
Whitianga Waterways Ltd	25.4	Lift Restrictions of MAUW	<i>Support</i>	R 1.4	a)b)c)
<i>Keith Vernon -oppose</i>	<i>FS 23</i>		<i>Reject</i>	R 1.4	a)b)c)

Reduction in main runway length

17. Variation 2 Attachment 3 Map 17D depicts the main runway at 1265x80m catering for Code 1 and Code 2 aircraft. Code 2 covers most (but not all) 19 seat air transport aircraft including the Beech 1900D (Air NZ), the Jetstream 31 and the Bombardier (now Viking) Twin Otter (both operated previously in New Zealand). It also covers the modern generation of single engine pressurised air transport aircraft such as the Pilatus PC12 operated by Sounds Air. Code 2 also includes some versions of the De Havilland Dash 8-100 and -300 (up to 50 seats), also previously operated by several NZ airlines, and the 50 seat ATR42 (a smaller version of the ATR72 operated by Air New Zealand). It does not cover the ATR72 (68 seats) as this is Code 3. The main runway 04-22 is technically a Code 3 runway as it is > 1200m long. Code 1 is up to 800m, Code 2 is 800-1200m, Code 3 1200-1800m. However, the runway is currently unsealed with no lighting or fixed wing aircraft instrument approach procedures which limits the types of aircraft and operations possible.
18. All submitters (except Submitter 23, Keith Vernon) and further submitters oppose a reduction of the runway length and support the map that Airey Consultants drafted (**the Airey Map**) in support of submission 25 (WWL) and submission 9 (MBAC). The key reason provided by submitters for opposing a reduced runway length is their desire to allow for an optimal flexibility of the airfield's use. Another important concern that submitters and further submitters bring forward is the continued ability of the DC3 to land in Whitianga.
19. Submitter 23, Keith Vernon, seeks the main runway length of 1427m to be shown with 1:40 upslope and clearance from the State Highway at the 04 end. The Council expert commented as follows: *"There is no intention to reduce the maximum runway length available below that applicable to a 1:20 take-off and approach OLS and the airfield can be configured in this way if the airfield operator wishes and the CAA agree. However small twin engined commuter aircraft, and the DC3, cannot realistically comply with a 1:20 climb-out gradient in the event of engine failure on take-off, therefore distances for 1:40 gradient (which can more easily be complied with) should be provided in the AIP by the airfield operator and the flight path past the road at each end of the runway should be protected in the Plan to 1:40 gradient to better ensure those aircraft can operate now and in the future."* In response to Mr Vernon's relief point to keep the runway at a length of 1427m, the Council expert explains that a slight reduction is necessary to achieve adequate vehicle clearance of the highway at the SW runway end.
20. Submitter 16 (John Henry Stephenson) points out in his submission, which opposes a reduction of the operational runway length, that although Code 2 only requires a minimum of 1200m runway, additional length is better because it provides a 'starter extension' and a runway over-run area. These are very tangible safety features particularly in bad weather. The Council expert concurs with this view and there is no intention to reduce the operational length of the runway. The actual reduction of the runway's operational length is triggered by a conceptual road on private land adjacent to the airfield as represented on the Airey Map and by providing the correct clearance over the road at the SW end.

21. While the Council supports the retention of the Whitianga airfield as a key strategic transport asset, it is noted that the Airey Map shows that the runway – represented at 1526m on the official CAA aerodrome chart – is reduced to 1351m at 1:20 due to a conceptual road for a future subdivision on adjacent land. This has the effect of pushing the fan origin further south west along the runway. According to the Council expert’s advice, the runway length with the 1:40 upslope allows for a greater variability of aircraft including the DC3 than the option presented by the Airey Map with the 1:20 upslope. Securing additional runway length is supported, if this is achievable within MBAC owned land.

Decision

22. **R 1.5:** *Change Map 17D as per the Council expert’s recommendations with a 1:40 upslope (Attachment 2 and 3).*

23. Reasons

- a) *The decision on how the MBAC chooses to use the actual operational length of the runway should be left with MBAC without any Council imposed restrictions.*
- b) *Amended Map 17D (Attachment 3) shows the runway at 1434m with a 1:40 upslope. These dimensions are based on the latest on the ground survey (done by WWL) and the outcomes of consultation with the MBAC and WWL. It has been amended at the SW end because the 1:40 upslope origin point does not allow the required clearance over the highway at that end, and at the NE end to reflect the restriction imposed by the future road sought by WWL.*
- c) *It allows for a variety of passenger planes to safely use the airfield including safe operation of the DC3.*

Map 17D (Attachment 3) does not determine the operational length of the airfield; the airfield can still be operated as a 1:20 should MBAC wish. However, providing for the 1:40 surface gradient in the Plan ensures protection of the take-off and approach paths for small commuter aircraft and DC3 operations.

Submitter <i>Further submitter</i>	Point # <i>FS Point #</i>	Submission topic	Accept/ Reject	Decision	Reason
David Cranna – oppose <i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd support in part Keith Vernon support</i>	1.5 <i>FS 25</i> <i>FS 23</i>	Reduction of runway length <i>Specifics from KV as per other submission points</i>	<i>Accept</i> <i>Reject</i> <i>Accept</i>	R 1.5	a)b)c)d) a)b)c) a)b)c)
Grant Biel oppose <i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd - support in part Keith Vernon -support</i>	6.5 <i>FS 25</i> <i>FS 23</i>	No Reduction of runway length <i>Runway to be shown as 1265 m inner edge to inner edge Specifics from KV as per other submission points</i>	<i>Accept</i> <i>Reject</i> <i>Accept</i>	R 1.5	a)b)c)d) a)b)c)d) a)b)c)
Mercury Bay Aero Club <i>John Hart - support Kevin Paulsen - support</i>	9.6 <i>FS 2</i> <i>FS 3</i>	No Reduction of Runway Length	<i>Accept</i> <i>Accept</i> <i>Accept</i>	R 1.5 Ditto for all	a)b)c) Ditto for all below

<i>Philip Hart - support</i>	<i>FS 4</i>		<i>Accept</i>	<i>below</i>	
<i>Peter Armstrong - support</i>	<i>FS 5</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Leanne Butler - support</i>	<i>FS 7</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Kevin Rintoul - support</i>	<i>FS 8</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Peter D Scandrett - support</i>	<i>FS 10</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Wallace Pendray - support</i>	<i>FS 13</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Richard Hood - support</i>	<i>FS 15</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Anthea H Austin - support</i>	<i>FS 17</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Peter L Austin - support</i>	<i>FS 18</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Douglas A St George - support</i>	<i>FS 19</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Harold Abrahamson - support</i>	<i>FS 20</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Steve Brown Douglas - support</i>	<i>FS 21</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Brian H Wigley - support</i>	<i>FS 22</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Stephen J Chilcott - support</i>	<i>FS 24</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd - oppose in part</i>	<i>FS 25</i>		<i>Reject</i>		
<i>Rachel Ervine - support</i>	<i>FS 27</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Stephan Bosman - support</i>	<i>FS 29</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Christine Rabarts - support</i>	<i>FS 30</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>The Lost Spring - oppose</i>	<i>FS 28</i>		<i>Reject</i>		
<i>Geoff Cooper (Fly DC3 NZ Inc.) - support</i>	<i>FS 31</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Gavin Magill - support</i>	<i>FS 32</i>		<i>Accept</i>		
<i>Keith Vernon - support</i>	<i>FS 23</i>	<i>With further amendments to Map 17D</i>	<i>Accept</i>		
Ken Heslin – support	11.5	No Reduction of Runway Length	<i>Accept</i>	R 1.5	a)b)c)
<i>Keith Vernon – support</i>	<i>FS 23</i>	<i>With further amendments to Map 17D</i>	<i>Accept</i>	R 1.5	a)b)c)
John Stephenson	16.5	No Reduction of Runway Length	<i>Accept</i>	R 1.5	a)b)c)
<i>Ross L Walker - support</i>	<i>FS 26</i>		<i>Accept</i>	R 1.5	a)b)c)
<i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd - oppose in part</i>	<i>FS 25</i>	<i>Main runway to be shown as 1265m from inner edge to inner edge</i>	<i>Reject</i>		d)
<i>Keith Vernon -support</i>	<i>FS 23</i>		<i>Accept</i>		a)b)c)
Keith Vernon	23.2	Show main runway length as 1427m and positioned to ensure 1:40 upslope at the 04 end clear the road adequately.	<i>Accept</i>	R 1.5	a)b)c)
<i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd - oppose</i>	<i>FS 25</i>		<i>Reject</i>		d)

Fan at both ends of main runway are shown as 1:40 surface gradient on planning map

24. All submitters and further submitters oppose the change of the surface gradient from 1:30 (as per the Operative District Plan) to 1:40 and support a 1:20 surface gradient (as per the Airey Map) on both ends of the runway.
25. Submission 23 (Keith Vernon) seeks the main runway to be shown at a length of 1427m with 1:40 upslope gradients, the upslope gradient at the 04 end being of particular importance to allow for clearance over the highway.
26. The Council expert's advice is that the 1:20 is a minimum standard and a number of aircraft cannot achieve that climb gradient in the engine inoperative situation on take-off, in particular the DC3 (which is actually a Code 3 aircraft) is unable to do this. This is a requirement under their operating rules and applies day or night. Therefore, with a 1:20 gradient OLS these aircraft could be substantially penalised on take-off weight or not be able to operate at all. This would be contrary to Objective 5 of Section 18.3 Transport.
27. The Council expert further notes that there is no objection to the airfield being laid out as a 1:20 on the ground. The Council expert notes that this is a CAA issue for the operator to address. The Council's reporting planner agrees and recommended it be left to the airfield operator to layout its runway length as it chooses.
28. What the expert is more concerned about is protecting the flight paths away from the airfield, specifically across and beyond the roads at each end so the 1:40 is not encroached for the future. This is not an operational issue but a planning issue under the Resource Management Act 1991. Whitianga aerodrome is the only facility on the east Coromandel Coast north of Tauranga that can accommodate larger air transport aircraft. It cannot be replaced as a piece of the Region's air transport infrastructure.
29. The MBAC is relying on Plan provisions to enforce height controls hence the Council needs to have a say on what the level of control should be, especially as MBAC are asking the Council to relax the existing 1:30 (planning) control in the Operative District Plan. Height controls do not result in any financial obligations for the MBAC and do not interfere with the current goals the MBAC has set itself in terms of how it wants to operate the airfield. While acknowledging that the airfield is in private ownership and has been successfully operated privately for the last 50 years, the Council has an obligation to secure a realistic level of protection on surrounding land to safeguard the airfield's continued successful operation under changing circumstances.
30. The Council expert's view is that: *"The 1:20 OLS would adversely affect the ability for twin engine commuter type aircraft to operate at the airfield. This is because these aircraft are not capable of safely operating at 1:20 on approach or take-off."*
31. The Council expert believes it would be possible to set up thresholds based on the 1:40 upslope which would be 70m further out than the Airey Map 1:20 thresholds at the north

east (22) end (after removal of the future road constraint) and 125m at the south west (04) end. These reduced thresholds he believes would still give 1170m for landing.

Decision

32. **R 1.3:** *Retain the transitional surface gradient of 1:40 on both ends of the runway on Planning Map 17D.*

33. Reasons

- a) *The 1:20 is a minimum standard for Code 2 aircraft and a number of aircraft cannot achieve that climb gradient in the engine inoperative situation on take-off, in particular the DC3 (which is actually a Code 3 aircraft) is unable to do this.*
- b) *The change from 1:30 (as per Operative District Plan) to 1:20 has been justified by MBAC and WWL as a consequence of restricting the airfield operation to daylight/non-instrument only. It has not been considered that a number of planes would be penalised by this lack of protection and might not be able to use the airfield in the future.*
- c) *Whitianga aerodrome is the only facility on the east Coromandel Coast north of Tauranga that can accommodate larger air transport aircraft. It cannot be replaced as a piece of the Region's air transport infrastructure.*
- d) *While acknowledging that the airfield is in private ownership and has been successfully operated privately for the last 50 years, the Council has an obligation to secure a realistic level of protection on surrounding land for the airfield's continued successful operation under changing circumstances.*
- e) *The airfield can be operated at a 1:20 upslope gradient, the 1:40 protection is a purely planning related concern to protect the airfield from height encroachment on neighbouring properties.*

Submitter <i>Further submitter</i>	Point # <i>FS Point #</i>	Submission topic	Accept/ Reject	Decision	Reason
David Cranna-oppose <i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd - support in part Keith Vernon support</i>	1.3 <i>FS 25</i>	1:40 upslope <i>However, Runway shown as 1265m inner edge to inner edge. If daylight operations only</i>	<i>Reject</i> <i>Reject</i> <i>Reject</i>	R 1.3 R 1.3	a)b)c)d)e) a)b)c)d)e) a)b)c)d)e)
Grant Biel - support <i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd – support Keith Vernon support</i>	6.3 <i>FS 25</i> <i>FS 23</i>	Change 1:40 gradient to 1:20 <i>1:5 (KV suggests 45m extension to inner horizontal edge)</i>	<i>Reject</i> <i>Reject</i> <i>Reject</i>	R 1.3 R 1.3 R 1.3	a)b)c)d)e) a)b)c)d)e) a)b)c)d)e)
Mercury Bay Aero Club <i>John Hart - support</i>	9.2 <i>FS 2</i>	Change 1:40 gradient to 1:20	<i>Reject</i> <i>Reject</i>	R 1.3 Ditto for	a)b)c)d)e) Ditto for

Kevin Paulsen - support	FS 3		Reject	all	all below
Philip Hart - support	FS 4		Reject	below	
Peter Armstrong - support	FS 5		Reject		
Leanne Butler - support	FS 7		Reject		
Kevin Rintoul - support	FS 8		Reject		
Peter D Scandrett - support	FS 10		Reject		
Wallace Pendray - support	FS 13		Reject		
Richard Hood - support	FS 15		Reject		
Anthea H Austin - support	FS 17		Reject		
Peter L Austin - support	FS 18		Reject		
Douglas A St George - support	FS 19		Reject		
Harold Abrahamson - support	FS 20		Reject		
Steve Brown Douglas - support	FS 21		Reject		
Brian H Wigley - support	FS 22		Reject		
Stephen J Chilcott - support	FS 24		Reject		
Whitianga Waterways Ltd - support	FS 25		Reject		
Rachel Ervine - support	FS 27				
Stephan Bosman - support	FS 29		Reject		
Christine Rabarts - support	FS 30		Reject		
The Lost Spring - oppose	FS 28		Reject		
The Lost Spring - oppose	FS 31		Reject		
Geoff Cooper (Fly DC3 NZ Inc.) - support	FS 32		Reject		
Gavin Magill – support	FS 23	Subject to extending inner horizontal at a height of 45 m	Reject		
Keith Vernon-support			Reject		
Ken Heslin	11.3	Change 1:40 to 1:20	Reject	R 1.3	a)b)c)d)e)
Keith Vernon -support	FS 23	If only for daylight operations	Reject	R 1.3	a)b)c)d)e)
John Stephenson -support	16.3	Change 1:40 to 1:20	Reject	R 1.3	a)b)c)d)e)
Whitianga Waterways Ltd - support	FS 25		Reject	R 1.3	a)b)c)d)e)
Ross L Walker – support	FS 26				
Keith Vernon – support	FS 23		Reject	R 1.3	a)b)c)d)e)
Whitianga Waterways Ltd	25.3	Change 1:40 to 2:20	Reject	R 1.3	a)b)c)d)e)
Keith Vernon -- support	FS 23	For daylight only	Reject	R 1.3	a)b)c)d)e)

Restrictions on Night/Instrument Flying

34. The MBAC opposes future-proofing the airfield for Code 2 night operations on the grounds of:

- High Terrain adjacent to and surrounding the airfield
- The slim likelihood of any practical demand for night operations during winter
- The cost of installing and maintaining runway and 'lead-in ' lighting

- The cost of installing and maintaining an instrument approach system
 - Opposition by the community to noise arising from night operations
35. MBAC supports maintaining the airfield for day only VFR which in their view would reduce restrictions on the airfield infrastructure and assist in relaxing conditions on surrounding land development. MBAC's reasoning for opposing future-proofing of the airfield for night operations is considered by the Council's reporting planner to be conclusive and should be accommodated for by changing Table 4 to exclude night operations. It is noted here that it is the Council expert's view that fore-closure of instrument/night operations is a short-sighted decision within the context of the sparsity of flat land available on the eastern seaboard. It is however important in this context to understand that the 1:40 upslope OLS is not only important for potential night operations, it is essential for operating small twin-engine commuter aircraft.
36. Submitter 16 (John Henry Stephenson) argues against night-time commercial operations on the grounds of community noise considerations. Further submitter 26 (Rachel Ervine) supports all points made in the submission 16 by Mr Stephenson. Mr Stephenson's argument is aligned with the Council expert's view. The reporting planner's views on this issue are mainly based on the the airfield being privately operated and if the MBAC does not receive substantial financial support, the operators will be unable to upgrade the airfield.
37. Submitter 28 (Stephen John Chilcot) argues that it is short-sighted to limit instrument flights from the airfield since in the future small airlines may choose to operate a scheduled all-weather service. The reporting planner concurs with Mr Chilcot's concerns, but notes how the Council intends to leave operational decisions to the MBAC and there being conclusive arguments against the necessity to protect for future instrument operations.

Decision

38. **R 9.5:** *Allow for daylight only/non instrument flying on the Whitianga airfield by changing Table 1 of Section 28.1.1 to this effect.*

39. Reasons

- a) *High Terrain adjacent to and surrounding the airfield*
- b) *The slim likelihood of any practical demand for night operations during winter*
- c) *The cost of installing and maintaining runway and 'lead-in' lighting*
- d) *The cost of in installing and maintaining an Instrument Approach System*
- e) *Opposition by the community to noise arising from night operation.*

Submitter <i>Further submitter</i>	Point # <i>FS Point #</i>	Submission topic	Accept/ Reject	Decision	Reason
Mercury Bay Aero Club <i>Whitianga Waterways Ltd - support</i>	9.5 <i>FS 25</i>	Delete night and instrument flying	Accept Accept	R 9.5 Ditto for all	a)-e) Ditto for all below

Rachel Ervine - support Stephan Bosman - support Christine Rabarts - support Geoff Cooper (Fly DC3 NZ Inc.) - support Gavin Magill – support Keith Vernon - support	FS 27 FS 28 FS 30 FS 31 FS 32 FS 23		Accept Accept Accept Accept Accept Accept	below	
Jan Kenny - support Whitianga Waterways Ltd – support Keith Vernon - support	12.4 FS 25 FS 23	Daylight only operations	Accept Accept Accept	R 9.5 R 9.5 R 9.5	a)-e) a)-e) a)-e)
John Stephenson -support Whitianga Waterways Ltd - support Ross L Walker – support Keith Vernon -support	16.4 FS 25 FS 26 FS 23	Daylight only operations	Accept Accept Accept Accept	R 9.5 R 9.5 R 9.5 R 9.5	a)-e) a)-e) a)-e) a)-e)
Keith Vernon Whitianga Waterways Ltd – oppose	23.3 FS 25	Either include night curfew or allow for daylight only and adjust OLS accordingly.	Reject Accept	R 9.5 R 9.5	a)-e) a)-e)
Whitianga Waterways Ltd Keith Vernon - support	25.5 FS 23	Daylight only operations	Accept Accept	R 9.5 R 9.5	a)-e) a)-e)

Other Matters

40. Submitter 23 (Keith Vernon) comments that the wording in Table 1 of section 28.3 ‘...until the maximum building height standard of the underlying zone is reached’ is confusing because the slope extends over more than one zone.

41. Decision

R 23.1 Change wording in Table 1, Section 28.3 Airfield Height as it refers to the Whitianga main runway to: 1:5 for 75m. Refer to Map 17D for additional OLS constraints on both ends of main runway.

42. Reasons

43. The amendment will remove the confusion highlighted by the submitter.