

Appendix IA: Table of submission points for Notified PDP (Stage I)

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
206.1	David Horton	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The submitter considers that the objectives and policies for Te Kowhai Airpark as notified should be retained as it will ensure that the aerodrome will be self-sufficient and will remain the GA satellite for Hamilton airport just as Ardmore is for Auckland airport. Airparks are highly successful in America and this will be an exciting first for New Zealand.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.5	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
206.2	David Horton	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The submitter considers that the rules for Te Kowhai Airpark as notified should be retained as it will ensure that the aerodrome will be self-sufficient and will remain the GA satellite for Hamilton airport just as Ardmore is for Auckland airport. Airparks are highly successful in America and this will be an existing first for New Zealand.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.104	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
208.1	Bruce Belfield	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark as notified.	The Policy Framework recognises the significance of the existing aerodrome to the Aviation community. The objectives and policies will safeguard the future needs of the aviation community. The policy framework allows for a mix of residential and commercial opportunities, making use of existing infrastructure and which cannot easily be replicated elsewhere. Development of the airpark represents a practical use of a limited and scarce resource.	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1339.6	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
208.2	Bruce Belfield	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone as notified.	The provisions provide for flexibility of landuse activity that is needed for sustainable use of the aerodrome. The proposed OLS will enhance the safety and function regardless of residential uptake in the airpark. The airpark meets the niche requirement of the aviation community including the provision of hangars and the ability to taxi from home to hangar. Chapter 27 provisions recognise that the airpark is distinct from conventional residential development and is an extremely scarce physical resource reliant on proximity to an airfield without the opportunities and protection afforded by the airpark zone provisions, the ongoing operational needs of the aerodrome could not be guaranteed. Rezoning the aerodrome from the Rural to Airpark Zone is totally appropriate.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.105	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
211.1	Tony Knowing	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2: Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Submitter concurs with the application being sought.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.7	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
211.2	Tony Knowing	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark zone, as notified.	Submitter concurs with the application being sought.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.106	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
216.1	Scott Montagu	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2: Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Supporting this increasingly scarce community asset. Rezoning in support of an airpark would be an excellent asset to the aviation and local community. This would	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				feed the local community with assets and venues.		
FS1386.228	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.2
FS1339.4	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1379.50	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the Te Kowhai Airpark as notified, for the reasons set out in its original submission.	Accept in part	4.3
216.2	Scott Montagu	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Supporting this increasingly scarce community and regional asset. Rezoning in support of an airport would be an excellent asset to the aviation and local community. This would feed the local community with assets and venues.	Accept in part	
FS1386.229	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and	Reject	3.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1339.103	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1379.51	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the Te Kowhai Air Park as notified, for the reasons set out in its original submission.	Accept in part	7.3
219.1	Bruce Cooke	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	The proposal will meet a demand from sport flyers for residential properties that suit the aviation lifestyle and provide additional specialist housing. It will create a community and become a key regional asset. The airfield is a critical facility for the sport flying movement in the Waikato and greater NZ. In order to be viable and secure on an ongoing basis, the proposed development must proceed.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.8	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
219.2	Bruce Cooke	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	The proposal will meet a demand from sport flyers for residential properties that suit the aviation lifestyle and provide additional specialist housing. It will create a community and become a key regional asset. The airfield is a critical facility for the sport flying movement in the Waikato and greater NZ. In order to be viable and secure on an ongoing basis, the proposed development must proceed.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.107	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
220.1	Peter Jackson for Jackson Property Group and La Valla	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	The development of Te Kowhai Airfield & Park is one of the better developments of the area. Considering the trials authorities have unreasonably thrust upon them, the result is rewarding to all of us who have benefited	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Functions			from the property. The aerodrome is very important to both aviation people. The submitter recommends Council recognise this and therefore be encouraging as well as supportive for its growth and permanent existence.		
FS1339.9	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
220.2	Peter Jackson for Jackson Property Group and La Valla Functions	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The development of Te Kowhai airfield & park is one of the better developments of the area. Considering the trials authorities have unreasonably thrust upon them, the result is rewarding to all of us who have benefited from the property. The aerodrome is very important to both aviation people. Submitter recommends Council recognise this and therefore be encouraging as well as supportive for its growth and permanent existence.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.108	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
221.1	Sport Aviation Corp Ltd	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	NZTE aerodrome is an essential resource that should be protected. The O.L.S changes are necessary for future sustainability aviation operations.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.10	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
221.2	Sport Aviation Corp Ltd	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	NZTE aerodrome is an essential resource that should be protected. The O.L.S changes are necessary for future sustainability of aviation operations.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.109	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
222.1	Sport Aviation Corp	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	The "Obstacle Limitation Surface" (height above runway in metres) must be upgraded to allow for future aviation	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Ltd			operations. The development of the AirPark is also essential to allow aviation minded people to live close by. The NZTE Aerodrome has been in operation for over forty years and must be protected for the long term.		
<i>FS1339.11</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>4.3</i>
222.2	Sport Aviation Corp Ltd	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The NZTE Aerodrome has been in operation for over forty years and must be protected for the long term. The "Obstacle Limitation Surface" (height above runway in metres) must be upgraded to allow for future aviation operations. The development of the AirPark is also essential to allow aviation minded people to live close by.	Accept in part	7.3
<i>FS1339.110</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>7.3</i>
224.1	Peter Armstrong	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Enhances the community value to all of the local community if adopted as requested.	Accept in part	4.3
<i>FS1339.12</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>4.3</i>
224.2	Peter Armstrong	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Enhances the community value to all of the local community if adopted as requested.	Accept in part	7.3
<i>FS1339.111</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>7.3</i>
225.1	Steve Gunn	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Due to the ongoing developments within the aviation industry, Te Kowhai airfield needs to continually develop to keep pace with evolving requirements. Future plans to develop the airfield and enhance capabilities are driven by safety and demand from current users. Enhancements such as VFR and IFR Arrival and Departure procedures are needed to ensure safety and order is maintained in all	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				weather conditions. The submitter has operated out of many airparks around the world and Te Kowhai has the potential to be recognised as a world class privately owned airpark. The submitter currently owns and operates their aircraft from Te Kowhai.		
FS1339.13	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
225.2	Steve Gunn	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Due to the ongoing developments within the aviation industry, Te Kowhai airfield needs to continually develop to keep pace with evolving requirements. Future plans to develop the airfield and enhance capabilities are driven by safety and demand from current users. Enhancements such as VFR and IFR Arrival and Departure procedures are needed to ensure safety and order is maintained in all weather conditions. The submitter has operated out of many airparks around the world and Te Kowhai has the potential to be recognised as a world class privately owned airpark. The submitter currently owns and operates their aircraft from Te Kowhai.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.112	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
226.1	Mike Griffiths	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The submitter owns a hangar and aircraft at Te Kowhai Aerodrome. It is an excellent, well run and operated facility. The submitter would be interested in living at the airpark. It is an excellent meeting place for likeminded people and is proving an asset to the local community e.g. market days, vintage car groups and so on.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.14	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
226.2	Mike Griffiths	Support	Retain Chapter 27 - Te Kowhai Airpark Zone as notified.	The submitter owns a hangar and aircraft at Te Kowhai Aerodrome. It is an excellent, well run and operated	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				facility. The submitter would be interested in living at the airpark. It is an excellent meeting place for likeminded people and is proving an asset to the local community e.g. market days, vintage car groups and so on.		
FS1339.113	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
227.1	Geoffrey Gatenby	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The airpark is essential for residential housing for the growth of the area. Changes to the Obstacle Limitation Surface are essential to allow for future aviation operations and development.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.15	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
227.2	Geoffrey Gatenby	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The airpark is essential for residential housing for the growth of the area. Changes to the Obstacle Limitation Surface are essential to allow for future aviation operations and development.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.114	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
229.1	Stuart Parker	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The submitter is a regular user of the airfield facilities. It provides a easily accessible 'hub' for pilots in the Hamilton area. The submitter would not want to see it whittled away by urban development encroaching around it. It is a jewel in the aviation world - very few places like it to fly into.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.16	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
229.2	Stuart Parker	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The submitter is a regular user of the airfield facilities. It provides a easily accessible 'hub' for pilots in the Hamilton area. The submitter would not want to see it	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				whittled away by urban development encroaching around it. It is a jewel in the aviation world - very few places like it to fly into.		
FS1339.115	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
237.1	Recreational Aircraft Association (RAANZ)	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The Recreational Aircraft Association NZ represents 750 microlight pilots from around NZ. Te Kowhai airfield is a key hub for pilots transiting through the Waikato and has a long history in microlight aviation. The Submitter wishes to preserve it as an aviation centre and avoid any restrictions due to urban encroachment.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1035.100	Pareoranga Te Kata	Oppose	Do not support unprotective safety piloting.	Te Kowhai Airfield transit to Waikato including micro light Aviation has encroached rural and urban residents in the Waikato Tainui area.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.17	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
237.2	Stuart Parker for Recreational Aircraft Association (RAANZ)	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The Recreational Aircraft Association NZ represents 750 microlight pilots from around NZ. Te Kowhai airfield is a key hub for pilots transiting through the Waikato and has a long history in microlight aviation. The Submitter wishes to preserve it as an aviation centre and avoid any restrictions due to urban encroachment.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1035.101	Pareoranga Te Kata	Oppose	Do not support unprotective safety piloting.	Te Kowhai Airfield transit to Waikato including micro light Aviation has encroached rural and urban residents in the Waikato Tainui area.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.116	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
277.1	Anthony Gurr	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Aviation serves the wider community as a whole, and with the option of living as part of an aviation community, it will help go a long way to bringing more people and	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				move diversity to a community.		
FS1339.18	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
277.2	Anthony Gurr	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	This is somewhere the submitter would look to retire later in life, somewhere they can be close to two major centers and still own and operate an aircraft from the comfort of home. The submitter also believes that this will bring an influx of people to and business to Te Kowhai.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.117	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
285.1	Anatoly Chernyshev	Support	Retain Section 9.2 - Te Kowhai Airpark as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.19	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
285.2	Anatoly Chernyshev	Support	Retain Chapter 27 - Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.118	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
304.1	Graham Taylor	Neutral /Amend	Amend Rule 27.2.6 Noise - Other than Taxiways to include a night curfew on general aviation and recreational flying between 10pm and 7am.	There are many dwellings in close proximity to the airfield and aircraft movements at night would have serious adverse effects on residents.	Accept in part	13.2.3
FS1339.189	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	Oppose the amendments sought to rules 27.2.6 and 27.2.7 - Noise. The Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day Acoustics and included in the submission of NZTE adequately manage airpark noise effects. Total aircraft noise would be limited at the Air Noise Control Boundaries	Accept in part	13.2.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>which effectively limits aircraft movements.</i>		
304.2	Graham Taylor	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 27.2.7 Noise - Taxiways to include a night curfew on general aviation and recreational flying between 10pm and 7am.	There are many dwellings in close proximity to the airfield and aircraft movements at night would have serious adverse effects on residents.	Accept in part	13.1.3
<i>FS1339.190</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.</i>	<i>Oppose the amendments sought to rules 27.2.6 and 27.2.7 - Noise. The Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day Acoustics and included in the submission of NZTE adequately manage airpark noise effects. Total aircraft noise would be limited at the Air Noise Control Boundaries which effectively limits aircraft movements.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>13.1.3</i>
369.1	S W Ranby	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark.	The range of activities proposed within Precincts A and B of Te Kowhai Airpark will facilitate an increase in aircraft movements (projected to be in the vicinity of 57 aircraft movements per day, or 21,000 per annum). Aircraft arrivals and departures are not subject to District Plan Rules and are therefore noted as being outside the scope of the Acoustic Assessment, which focuses on the noise from taxiing aircraft and other on-site activities. If increased aircraft movements are facilitated or supported by the Objectives and Policies of the Plan then there will be an increase in the frequency that neighboring properties experience the noise of arrivals and departures. This has not been adequately considered in terms of the adverse effect on neighboring properties, and is an effect that is impossible for the Airpark to internalise. The Summary Assessment of Environmental Effects for the Section 32 Report for Te Kowhai Airpark Zone compares future aircraft movements with earlier data of aircraft movements experienced in the early 2000's, however the Section 32 Report also acknowledges that the Operative District Plan (ODP) contains no objectives, rules, or other methods that are specifically applicable to airparks and that aircraft movements are currently unrestricted by the ODP (being	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>controlled only by the existing air noise boundary). The inability of the Operative District Plan to manage air traffic using the Te Kowhai runway is being used as justification of the current proposal, when the noise effects of air traffic and the impact on amenity values in this area have not been fully considered. Proposed Policy 9.2.1.6 refers to airspace protection via an increased Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS). This would introduce a new height restriction on the Ranby property that is lower than the current permitted height in the Rural zone, including restrictions on vegetation / tree height that will result in obligations that do not currently exist, and resultant financial obligations on property owners within the OLS. In terms of buildings, the OLS intrudes 78.5m into the Ranby property before the District Plan height limit of 10m matches the restrictions of the OLS. The objectives and policies seem strongly aimed at supporting the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the aviation sector without considering the short and long term effects outside the Airpark.</p>		
FS1339.69	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	<p>NZTE opposes this submission. The OLS gradient over the Ranby property has a minimal height limitation of approximately 2.5 metres below the current Rural building height limit of 10 metres. Construction of any dwelling or structure in this area would not be recommended for safety reasons due to the existing and future flight path of arriving or departing aircraft and their actions in the event of an emergency. NZTE notes that no change to the aircraft flight path is to occur with the proposed OLS implementation. The Ranby property is proposed to retain its existing Rural zoning under the pWDP, because residential development is not provided for in the Future Proof settlement pattern. In the event of long-term rezoning of the Ranby property, NZTE do not consider that the imposition of the OLS to be onerous because it would have a limited effect, if any, on the development capability of the Ranby property. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of</p>	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The proposed OLS notified in the pWDP is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. This will ensure safer operations for departing/arriving aircraft during inclement weather conditions by allowing the use of readily available GPS based navigational technology. This will improve the safety and efficiency of the Aerodrome for aircraft operation under IFR rules. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS as notified in the pWDP through its design and implementation ensures an enhanced level of flight safety from the existing OLS in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5700Kg. The notified OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. The proposed OLS is necessary to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome because it will provide pilots with more flexibility to use and utilise advancements in navigational GPS based IFR technologies which were once cost prohibitive for smaller general aviation aircraft. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restrict aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code 1A+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport. The Proposed OLS will not result in aircraft flying lower.</p>		
FS1347.1	GL & DP McBride	Support	Null	<p>Submitter 369 opposes the Airfield changes, noting that increase in aircraft movements will have adverse effects to those under the OLS, that the policies and objectives of the PDP seemed aimed at supporting the wellbeing of the aviation section, without considering the short and long term effects</p>	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>outside the residents of the airpark. This submission concurs.</i>		
369.2	S W Ranby	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark.	<p>The range of activities proposed within Precincts A and B of Te Kowhai Airpark will facilitate an increase in aircraft movements (projected to be in the vicinity of 57 aircraft movements per day, or 21,000 per annum). Aircraft arrivals and departures are not subject to District Plan Rules, and are therefore noted as being outside the scope of the Acoustic Assessment, which focuses on the noise from taxiing aircraft and other on-site activities. If increased aircraft movements are facilitated or supported by the Objectives and Policies of the Plan then there will be an increase in the frequency that neighbouring properties experience the noise of arrivals and departures. This has not been adequately considered in terms of the adverse effect on neighbouring properties, and is an effect that is impossible for the Airpark to internalise⁶⁰. The Summary Assessment of Environmental Effects for the Section 32 Report for Te Kowhai Airpark Zone compares future aircraft movements with earlier data of aircraft movements experienced in the early 2000's, however the Section 32 Report also acknowledges that the Operative District Plan (ODP) contains no objectives, rules, or other methods that are specifically applicable to airparks and that aircraft movements are currently unrestricted by the ODP (being controlled only by the existing air noise boundary). The inability of the Operative District Plan to manage air traffic using the Te Kowhai runway is being used as justification of the current proposal, when the noise effects of air traffic and the impact on amenity values in this area have not been fully considered. Proposed Policy 9.2.1.6 refers to airspace protection via an increased Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS). This would introduce a new height restriction on the Ranby property that is lower than the current permitted height in the Rural zone, including restrictions on vegetation / tree height that will result in obligations that do not</p>	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>currently exist, and resultant financial obligations on property owners within the OLS. In terms of buildings, the OLS intrudes 78.5m into the Ranby property before the District Plan height limit of 10m matches the restrictions of the OLS. The objectives and policies seem strongly aimed at supporting the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the aviation sector without considering the short and long term effects outside the Airpark. The land use activities provided for a range of activities that are not adequately controlled by the proposed rules. Aircraft arrivals and departures are already clearly heard from the existing residential dwelling on the Ranby property. Rule 27.1 serves to exacerbate that effect by allowing general aviation as an unfettered permitted activity, with no limits on aircraft numbers, and therefore no restriction on the noise emitted from aircraft arrival and departure, i.e. noise from overhead aircraft outside of the Airpark. The Acoustic Report notes that there is potential for a twin engine aircraft and/or small jets to be domiciled at Te Kowhai Airpark, and that if that was proposed, it should be specifically assessed. However the Proposed District Plan contains no rules that limit the type of aircraft that can use the Airpark, with 'General Aviation' being a permitted activity in Precincts A and B. Residential subdivision is proposed to be provided for as a restricted discretionary activity in Precincts B - D and residential development as a permitted activity in Precincts C and D upon high class soils (New Zealand Land Resource Inventory Land Use Capability Unit 2w2), which is at odds with other strategies for the District.</p>		
FS1339.194	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	<p>The Airfield is an existing piece of infrastructure that has operated for approximately 50 years with varying levels of aviation and currently has no controls on the number of aircraft movements or on noise levels beyond the runway footprint. NZTE has proposed to introduce Air Noise Control Boundaries developed by Marshall Day Acoustics through its</p>	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				submission on the PWDP that will adequately manage airpark noise effects. Total aircraft noise would be limited at the Air Noise Control Boundaries which effectively limits aircraft movements. This will provide a much greater level of certainty for nearby landowners in terms of managing noise effects. The TKAZ is aimed at utilising this unique resource in the Waikato District to develop an Airpark for aviation enthusiasts to live at the Airpark and utilise its facilities. It is not a typical residential development therefore requires a targeted bespoke approach to development.		
FS1347.2	GL & DP McBride	Support	Null	Submitter 369 opposes the Airfield changes, noting that increase in aircraft movements will have adverse effects to those under the OLS, that the policies and objectives of the PDP seemed aimed at supporting the wellbeing of the aviation section, without considering the short and long term effects outside the residents of the airpark. This submission concurs.	Accept in part	7.3
378.5	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral / Amend	Retain Policy 9.2.1.2 Servicing, as it requires development to be adequately serviced for essential services, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 9.2.1.2 (a) Servicing, as follows: (a) Development is to be adequately serviced with respect to essential service, water supply (including for fire fighting purposes), wastewater treatment and disposal and stormwater treatment and disposal. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports the policy in part as it requires that development is to be adequately serviced with respect to essential services such as water supply, however Fire and Emergency New Zealand seeks that the provision for water supply is adequate for firefighting purposes.	Accept	22.3
FS1035.110	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept	22.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1302.19	Chris Dawson on behalf of Mercer Airport	Support	Null	Null	Accept	22.3
FS1339.68	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE supports the amendment sought by Fire and Emergency on the grounds that water supply for firefighting purposes is appropriate at an airpark development. This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept	22.3
FS1388.17	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	22.3
378.56	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 27.2.6 Noise - Other than Taxiways.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Rule 27.2.6 as it permits noise generated by emergency sirens. This exemption appropriately provides for the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency New Zealand and enables them to meet its statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the on-going health and safety of people and communities.	Accept	13.2.3
FS1035.163	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept	13.2.3
FS1339.173	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed as amended in accordance with submission point 823.27.	NZTE agrees that this Rule should be retained but submits that the title of the Rule should be amended to read Noise - Other than Aircraft Operations in accordance with 823.27 of	Accept	13.2.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				NZTE's submission. This amendment will not affect the submission of Fire and Emergency.		
378.76	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	<p>Retain Rule 27.4.2 Subdivision allotment size, as subdivision is a restricted discretionary activity, except for the amendments sought below AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 27.4.2 Subdivision allotment size, as follows: (a) Subdivision within PRECINCT B. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:... (x) Proposed lots must be connected to public-reticulated water supply or water supply sufficient for firefighting purposes. (a) Subdivision within PRECINCT C AND D where:... (x) Proposed lots must be connected to public-reticulated water supply or water supply sufficient for firefighting purposes. Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:... (x) Provision of infrastructure, including water supply for firefighting purposes. AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand requires proposed lots to be connected to public-reticulated water supply or water supply sufficient for firefighting purposes. Subdivision that does not comply is a Discretionary Activity. The changes sought promotes consistency across all zones in the District Plan.	Accept in part	23.3
FSI035.183	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept in part	23.3
FSI339.172	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission point be allowed.	This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	23.3
429.1	Olivia Henwood	Support	Retain Chapter 9 Te Kowhai Airpark as notified.	Te Kowhai is an asset to the aviation community. As the surrounding area is facing big development, it is vital to secure the aerodrome for the future. The proposal will	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				allow the aerodrome to evolve and adapt to technological changes.		
FS1339.20	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
429.2	Olivia Henwood	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone as notified.	Te Kowhai Aerodrome is an asset to the aviation community. As the surrounding area is facing big development, it is vital to secure the aerodrome for the future. The proposal will allow the aerodrome to evolve and adopt to technological changes.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.119	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
471.52	Andrew Wood for CKL	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.3.3 D1 Height- Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface to be a restricted discretionary activity as follows: D1RDI A building, structure or vegetation that does not comply with Rule 16.3.3.3 P1. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	Activities failing a permitted standard should be a restricted discretionary activity, not a discretionary activity.	Reject	10.3
FS1253.2	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	Applicants should be discouraged from constructing buildings or structures which protrude above the Airport Obstacle Limitations Surfaces (AOLS) to ensure the continued safe operation of the airport. On this basis, it is requested that this activity remain as a Discretionary Activity as opposed to a Restricted Discretionary Activity. If council accepts this submission, then aspects of discretion need to be identified to ensure that the AOLS is protected.	Accept	10.3
FS1269.129	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	10.3
FS1308.181	The Surveying Company	Oppose		Discretionary Activity status is too restrictive for minor infringements listed in submission points 471.52.	Reject	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
473.1	James Walker	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Supports the proposed changes in the Waikato District Plan. Te Kowhai Aerodrome is a very unique facility supporting aviation enthusiasts and local community activities. The future of the airstrip is reliant on the proposed changes to advance in the future.	Accept in part	4.3
<i>FS1339.21</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>4.3</i>
473.2	James Walker	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Supports the proposed changes in the Waikato District Plan. Te Kowhai Aerodrome is a very unique facility supporting aviation enthusiasts and local community activities. The future of the airstrip is reliant on the proposed changes to advance in the future.	Accept in part	7.3
<i>FS1339.120</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>7.3</i>
475.1	David Reid	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Te Kowhai Airfield is an amazing resource that should be future proofed as well as grown. It is unique in the Waikato and nationally. It will make aviation more accessible, attainable and affordable as Hamilton Airport becomes more expensive and less user friendly.	Accept in part	4.3
<i>FS1339.22</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>4.3</i>
475.2	David Reid	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Te Kowhai Airfield is an amazing resource that should be future proofed as well as grown. It is unique in the Waikato and nationally. It will make aviation more accessible, attainable and affordable as Hamilton Airport becomes more expensive and less user friendly.	Accept in part	7.3
<i>FS1339.121</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>7.3</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
476.1	Ventura Inn and Suites	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	The policy framework recognises the significance of the current airfield asset. The airfield can be developed in a unique and sustainable way for the benefit of the local community, businesses and aviators. The Proposed Obstacle Limitation Surface will help to future proof VFR/IFR operations, safety and the functionality of airpark residences. Aligns zoning with the substantial investment that has yet to realise its full potential.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.23	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
476.2	Ventura Inn and Suites	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The policy framework recognises the significance of the current airfield asset which can be developed in a unique and sustainable way for the benefit of the local community, businesses and aviators. The Proposed Obstacle Limitation Surface will help to future proof VFR/IFR operations, safety and the functionality of airpark residences. Aligns zoning with the substantial investment that has yet to realise its full potential.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.122	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
477.1	Ben Meyer	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	This submitter is a pilot who regularly uses Te Kowhai Airfield.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.24	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
477.2	Ben Meyer	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	This submitter is a pilot that regularly uses Te Kowhai Airfield.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.123	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
478.1	Mike Tubbs	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.25	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
478.2	Mike Tubbs	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.124	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
490.1	Altus Intelligence	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	The submitter is a local who works on and uses the airfield.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.26	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
490.2	Altus Intelligence	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The submitter is a local who works on and uses the airfield.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.125	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
491.1	Altus Intelligence	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	The submitter is interested in the development of the airfield, both commercially and residentially.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.27	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
491.2	Altus Intelligence	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The submitter is interested in the development of the airfield, both commercially and residentially.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.126	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
492.1	Altus UAS	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	The submitter is a local resident with local interest.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.28	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
492.2	Altus UAS	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The submitter is a local resident with local interest.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.127	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
494.1	Derek Tate	Oppose	Delete the Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface Overlay from the property at 219 Woolrich Road, Te Kowhai.	Council staff do not have a clear understanding as to how this change was decided e.g. using what methodology. Council staff do not have an understanding as to why the Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface is on the property. Council staff do not know how the overlay will affect the property, as some of it is the airfield's height. Height restrictions are in place under the Operative District Plan.	Reject	9.4
FS1339.206	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The proposed OLS notified in the PWDP is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. This will ensure safer operations for departing/arriving aircraft during inclement weather conditions by allowing the use of readily available GPS based navigational technology. This will improve the safety and efficiency of the Aerodrome for aircraft operation under IFR rules. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS as notified in the pWDP through its design and implementation ensures an enhanced level of flight safety from the existing OLS in accordance with the CAA	Accept	9.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5700Kg. The notified OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. The proposed OLS is necessary to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome. It will provide pilots with more flexibility to use and utilise advancements in navigational GPS based IFR technologies which were once cost prohibitive for smaller general aviation aircraft. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code 1A+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport.</i>		
497.1	Shane Smart	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	The submitter is a local plane owner and a local resident.	Accept in part	4.3
<i>FS1339.29</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	4.3
497.2	Shane Smart	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark zone, as notified.	The submitter is a local plane owner and a local resident.	Accept in part	7.3
<i>FS1339.128</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	7.3
500.1	Andrea Cadwallader	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark as notified.	The submitter is a local resident. Professional interest in airfield.	Accept in part	4.3
<i>FS1339.30</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	4.3
500.2	Andrea Cadwallader	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The submitter is a local resident. Professional interest in airfield.	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1339.129	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
528.1	Internal Communications NZ Ltd	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Submitter supports the proposed development as they considered it will be good for the Te Kowhai community. Te Kowhai Airfield has been an integral and valuable contributing community group. The submitter is keen to see a unique and valuable asset of an airpark in the community.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1126.1	Amanda Schaake	Support	Support submission point 528.1.	Having met with many community members, community group members and monitored social media (Facebook, Neighbourly) over the year, the overarching view of the community is that people are supportive of the airpark development. Its important that we take into account the wider community view and not just those who shout the loudest.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.31	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
528.2	Internal Communications NZ Ltd	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Submitter supports the proposed development as they considered it will be good for the Te Kowhai community. Te Kowhai Airfield has been an integral and valuable contributing community group. The submitter is keen to see a unique and valuable asset of an airpark in the community.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1126.2	Amanda Schaake	Support	Support submission point 528.2.	I have seen the presentation Te Kowhai Airfield made to the community and read the supporting documents from Astral Aviation Consultants and Marshall Day Acoustics. I remain committed to the progress of the airfield, bringing it in line with the minimum safety requirements and protecting not only the village asset but the community and the pilots. As Marshall Day's report states: 'The revised noise boundaries, noise limits and acoustic insulation requirements have been proposed to bring the rules for Te Kowhai Airfield in line with	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				NZS 6805:1992.' 'Te Kowhai Airpark has not sought to prohibit new dwellings inside the ANB but to make them a "non-complying" activity which would require a resource consent. Therefore, new development within the ANB could be possible if resource consent was granted. Acoustic insulation and ventilation is likely to be required if consent were granted.' I live underneath the flight path, the take off and landing path for the airfield and have absolutely no problem at all with these rules being applied to safeguard the community and the pilots.		
FS1339.130	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.2
535.82	Hamilton City Council	Neutral /Amend	Amend Rule 27.1.1 P31 and P32 Activity Status Table, to ensure commercial zoning at the airpark does not increase in scale and risk impacting on established commercial centres within Hamilton City. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Cafes and Restaurants, and Retail (up to 300m ² within the four precincts), are provided for as a permitted activity in this zone on the outskirts of Hamilton. The submitter questions how this commercial hub fits within Waikato District's own aspirations for the main village of Te Kowhai and how well integrated these will be with the existing community. The submitter has concerns about the impact the Commercial zoning at the airpark will have on the nearby established commercial centres, particularly in relation to the permitted activity status of retail in the Airpark. It is also not immediately clear whether this is 300m ² in total spread between the 4 precincts, or whether it is 1200m ² of retail. Nevertheless, both of the quantum are questioned, but most particularly the larger one. Te Kowhai is not a major commercial centre, and any commercial activities proposed should be of a scale to serve the community within which it is located.	Accept in part	8.3
FS1339.187	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	The Airfield and proposed Airpark is a unique development with nothing similar in the Waikato Region. The small amount of permitted commercial activity is intended to complement the Airpark and the residents living within the TKAZ and will not undermine the viability of commercial nodes within	Accept in part	8.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Hamilton City. NZTE is concerned that Hamilton City Council's opposition to a small amount of commercial activity designed to support an Airpark in a neighbouring district is based trade competition. Hamilton City Council does not appear to have given any thought to trade competition. Indeed, Hamilton City Council's submission fails to confirm that it could not gain an economic advantage through its submission on commercial activities within the TKAZ.</i>		
535.83	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Amend Rule 27.4.2 Subdivision Allotment Size, to simplify the subdivision framework and clarify what the infrastructure implications are, what quantum of development can occur and what effects are anticipated from subdivision within this zone. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	As this area is located very close to the boundary of Hamilton any subdivision increasing the number of urban lots has a strong potential for cross boundary impacts, particularly to Hamilton's roading, waters and community infrastructures. The proposal to allow a range of allotment sizes, ranging in size from 450m ² , to 1000m ² to 2500m ² and 800m ² (depending on the reticulation available, and the location within the precincts) indicates an intensity that may prove unacceptable when there is difficulty in providing all necessary services to the future intended residential of the area. There is no clear way to determine the overall maximum allotment number or what infrastructure would be provided.	Accept in part	23.3
<i>FS/339.188</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.</i>	<i>The TKAZ represents a unique, site specific, residential Airpark intended to utilise the Airfield facilities as part of a key piece of infrastructure in the Waikato District. The subdivision sizes have been developed accordingly in order to cater for such a development. The subdivision rules recognise the complexity of airparks and provide for a variety of scenarios, depending on the availability of infrastructure.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>23.3</i>
538.1	Paul Brydon	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2: Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The provisions provide for and safeguard the needs of the aviation community. The aerodrome will be safer. Recognises the amount of aviation infrastructure that already exists. Future-proofs the aerodrome.	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1339.32	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
538.2	Paul Brydon	Support	Retain Chapter 27: Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The provisions provide for and safeguard the needs of the aviation community. The aerodrome will be safer. Recognises the amount of aviation infrastructure that already exists. Future-proofs the aerodrome.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.132	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
541.1	Jack Schaake	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	This submitter owns a hangar and aircraft based at Te Kowhai. The provisions will keep the aerodrome in operation as a unique feature of Te Kowhai. The Obstacle Surface Limitation is important for safety reasons.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.33	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
541.2	Jack Schaake	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	This submitter owns a hangar and aircraft based at Te Kowhai. The provisions will keep the aerodrome in operation. It is a unique feature of Te Kowhai. The Obstacle Surface Limitation is important for safety reasons.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.133	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
547.1	Dargaville Aero Club	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark as notified.	Dargaville Aero Club recognises the significance of Te Kowhai Airfield for recreational aircraft and the Aviation community.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.34	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
547.2	Dargaville Aero Club	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone as notified.	Dargaville Aero Club recognises the significance of Te Kowhai Airfield for recreational aircraft and the Aviation community.	Accept in part	7.3
<i>FS1339.134</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>7.3</i>
549.1	Matamata Aero Club	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Restricting housing heights and locations in the Te Kowhai Aerodrome area will help maintain the safety of both the pilots and residents.	Accept in part	4.3
<i>FS1339.35</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>4.3</i>
549.2	Matamata Aero Club	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Restricting housing heights and locations in the Te Kowhai Aerodrome area will help maintain the safety of both the pilots and residents.	Accept in part	7.3
<i>FS1339.135</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>7.3</i>
560.1	Te Kowhai Aerodrome	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Airparks are becoming popular overseas and in New Zealand i.e. Pauanui, Whitianga and Kaipara Flats. Good way to build houses close to airfields for people who are not likely to make noise complaints.	Accept in part	4.3
<i>FS1339.37</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>4.3</i>
560.2	Te Kowhai Aerodrome	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Airparks are becoming popular overseas and in New Zealand i.e. Pauanui, Whitianga and Kaipara Flats. Good way to build houses close to airfields for people who are not likely to make noise complaints.	Accept in part	7.3
<i>FS1339.136</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>7.3</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
566.1	Dave Etchells	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 - Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	The upgrade/enhancement to the facility is fantastic for the community in general. It provides interest and opportunity. The aviation community would be thrilled with the vision for airfield after 30 years of a mediocre facility.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.38	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
566.2	Dave Etchells	Support	Retain Chapter 27 - Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The upgrade/enhancement to the facility is fantastic for the community in general. It provides interest and opportunity. The aviation community would be thrilled with the vision for airfield after 30 years of a mediocre facility.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.137	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
582.1	Sarah Clark	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	As part owner of an aircraft currently being built, we require facilities to house aircraft. Te Kowhai is well located and it has a good community that uses the current facilities. It would be good to see this expand for private pilots/owners who would like to live nearer to the hangar and facilities.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.39	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
582.2	Sarah Clark	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	As part owner of an aircraft currently being built, we require facilities to house aircraft. Te Kowhai is well located and it has a good community that uses the current facilities. It would be good to see this expand for private pilots/owners who would like to live nearer to the hangar and facilities.	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1339.138	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
586.1	West Auckland Airport, Parakai	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	The airport is a valuable asset to the NZ aviation community. Additional protections of the OLS as sought by Te Kowhai Airport will ensure the airports needs are able to be met well into the future.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.40	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
586.2	West Auckland Airport, Parakai	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The airport is a valuable asset to the NZ aviation community. Additional protections of the OLS as sought by Te Kowhai Airport will ensure the airports needs are able to be met well into the future.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.139	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
602.2	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	24.3.3.2 Amend as follows: PI A building, structure, or vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surface as identified in Appendix 9 Te Kowhai Airpark and as shown on the planning maps. DI A building, structure, or vegetation that does not comply with Rule 24.3.3.2 PI. OR: PI A building, structure, or vegetation <i>not already existing at 18 July 2018</i> must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surface as identified in Appendix 9 Te Kowhai Airpark and as shown on the planning maps. AND: Any consequential amendments to	Rule 25.49 (c) in the Operative Waikato District Plan only controls the height of buildings in the airport obstacle limitation surface (AOLS), not vegetation. The property legally described as Lot 2 DP 456538 (CFR 590290) contains a large number of trees that will breach the proposed AOLS but will benefits from existing use rights in terms of section 10 of the Resource Management Act. While consultation between the submitter and Te Kowhai Airpark landowners is ongoing, there is not yet any understanding or agreement as to how breaches of the proposed AOLS will be managed.	Accept in part	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			24.3.3			
FS1339.97	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	<p>The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in the majority of district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur.</p> <p>The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7), therefore certain vegetation cannot be precluded from compliance.</p> <p>An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome.</p> <p>The OLS is a specifically designed, invisible volume of airspace extending off the end of each runway, off the sides of the runway and above the aerodrome. This must remain obstacle free in and around the aerodrome for the safety of aircraft operating under IFR (instrument flying rules). as the Pilot does not have visual reference to the ground initially during an approach to the runway or circling manoeuvre during inclement weather. Therefore, there must be a greater safety margin or area than that required under VFR (visual flight rules).</p>	Accept in part	10.3
FS1347.5	GL and DP McBride	Support	Null	Null	Accept in part	10.3
FS1388.1026	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null823.13	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is	Accept in part	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p><i>appropriate from a risk exposure.</i></p> <p><i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i></p>		
602.4	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.3.7 PI Building - Airport Noise Outer Control Boundary, as follows: PI Construction, addition to or alteration of a dwelling within the Airport Noise Outer Control Boundary must achieve the internal design sounds levels specified in Appendix I - Acoustic Insulation, Section 3 Table 6. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	This rule should only apply to dwellings located within the identified Airport Noise Outer Control Boundary.	Accept in part	12.3
FS1253.39	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	The wording set out in response to submission 823.20 is preferred over that sought in this submission.	Accept in part	12.3
602.9	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	<p>Add the following activities to Rule 27.1.1 Activity Status Table: Flight training school - Non-complying activity in all precincts Circuit training - Non-complying activity in all precincts AND</p> <p>Add definitions for these terms to Chapter 13 Definitions. AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	Pilot training associated with a flight training school based at Te Kowhai Airpark or another airfield that uses Te Kowhai Airpark as a de facto training runway could lead to increases in noise and neighbour irritation/anxiety.	Accept in part	8.3
FS1339.175	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	NZTE opposes the inclusion flight training school and circuit training as non-complying activities in Rule 27.1.1. A circuit is	Accept in part	8.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>an operationally recognised procedure used by pilots to arrive and depart, to ensure aerodrome safely to maintain adequate separation from other aircraft traffic and provide sufficient spacing between aircraft. A circuit is also the procedure used by pilots to maintain compliance with the CAA Rules Part 61.37 to ensure a Pilot has the required recent flight experience to be in command of an aircraft. The Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day and sought in the NZTE submission require the Airfield operator to manage the type and frequency of aircraft movements used for any activity in order to comply. The proposed Marshall Day noise thresholds adequately control aircraft used for any activity, irrespective of whether it is a training flight or a circuit.</i>		
<i>FS1347.6</i>	<i>GL & DP McBride</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>		<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>8.3</i>
602.10	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 27.2 Land Use - Effects, by inserting appropriate standards for "general aviation" and "recreational flying" so that these activities are carried out in accordance with "Fly Neighbourly" principles to avoid adverse impacts on neighbours. These standards should include, but not be limited to: A requirement to adhere to an "Airpark Management Plan" prepared in consultation with neighbours and Te Kowhai community. A stipulation on the hours of operation to limit night flying. A stipulation on the maximum of aircraft movements being 21,000 per annum. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Adherence to 'Fly Neighbourly' principles will ensure that the type of, and repetitive nature of, noise from aircraft operations is managed in and around noise-sensitive areas. Further reading can be found in the NZ Aviation Industry Association Environmental Code of Practice and the Helicopter Association International (HAI) "Fly Neighbourly Guide".	Accept in part	14.3
<i>FS1154.2</i>	<i>Marshall Stead on behalf of Lloyd Davis Jason Strangwick</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>As per Greg Metcalfe submission.</i>	<i>As per Greg Metcalfe submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>14.3</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Kylie Davis-Strangwick Nicola Thompson and Kerry Thompson Marshall Stead Kristine Stead					
FS1347.7	GL & DP McBride	Support	Null	Null	Accept in part	14.3
FS1339.176	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	NZTE oppose the amendments sought to Policy 9.2.2.1 – Airpark Standards as the Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day Acoustics and included in the submission of NZTE would adequately manage airpark noise effects. Total aircraft noise would be limited at the Air Noise Control Boundaries which effectively limits aircraft movements. NZTE does not oppose the “Fly Neighbourly” principles but considers that they are appropriately managed by the CAA provisions discussed below. The Aerodrome operates in accordance with the information provided to CAA NZAIP (Aeronautical Information Publication), which is a procedural and descriptive document for pilots intending to use an aerodrome. This document outlines the operational procedures for all pilots and is specified by a delegated Aerodrome Operator. These procedures may include the establishment an Operational Safety and Management Working Group to operate as a community liaison. These operating procedures also cover flight path tracking restrictions, specific arrival and departure procedures including any warnings or cautions, which acts as a aviation sanctioned method of establishing the “Fly Neighbourly” principles to appropriately manage the submitters concerns.	Accept in part	14.3
602.11	Greig Metcalfe	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 27.2.6 P1 (a) and P2 Noise - Other than Taxiways, as follows: P1 (a) Noise from any activity in PRECINCT B must not exceed the following noise limits when measured at the notional boundary of a site within the Rural Zone or Village Zone P2 (a) Noise from any activity in PRECINCTS C OR D must not exceed the	The Village Zone is located near Te Kowhai Airpark and should therefore be included in this noise rule.	Reject	13.2.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>following noise limits when measured at the notional boundary of any site in the Rural zone or Village Zone outside of the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone ... AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>			
FS1339.177	NZTE Operation Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE agrees that it is appropriate for the Village Zone to be referred to in Rule 27.2.6 P1(a) and P2.	Reject	13.2.3
FS1347.8	GL & DP McBride	Support	Null		Reject	13.2.3
602.12	Greig Metcalfe	Support	<p>Amend Rule 27.2.7 P1 (a)(ii) Noise - Taxiways, as follows: (ii) When measured at the notional boundary of any other site in the Rural Zone or Village Zone ... AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	The Village Zone is near Te Kowhai Airpark and should therefore be included in this noise rule.	Reject	13.1.3
FS1339.178	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE agrees that it is appropriate for the Village Zone to be referred to in Rule 27.2.7 P1(a) and P2.	Reject	13.1.3
602.13	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	<p>Amend Appendix 9: Te Kowhai Airfield, so that it carries over the existing Obstacle Limitation Surfaces in the Operative Waikato District Plan, which satisfies the requirement in the CAA Advisory Circular Ac 139-7 Section 3.2 Day VFR Runway.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	The Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS) in the Operative Waikato District Plan satisfy the Civil Aviation Authority's Advisory Circular AC 139-7 section 3.2 Day VFR Runway. Lot 2 DP 456538 (CRF 590290) is affected by the proposal to lower the OLS to satisfy the Civil Aviation Authority's Advisory Circular AC 139-7 section 3.3 Night or instrument approach runway. This means a reduction in the potential building height (i.e. where the OSL is lower than the zone limit of 7.5m) and a large number of trees that breach the proposed OSL, notwithstanding that they would have existing use rights under section 10 of the Resource Management Act. While consultation between this submitter and Te	Accept in part	9.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Kowhai Airpark landowners is on-going, there is not yet any understanding or agreement as to how these breaches would be managed in the future.		
FSI 154.3	Marshall Stead on behalf of Lloyd Davis, Jason Strangwick, Kylie Davis-Strangwick, Nicola Thompson and Kerry Thompson, Marshall Stead, Kristine Stead	Support	As per Greg Metcalfe submission	Due to the possibility of an OLS forever being imposed over the community. If the IFR OLS is granted but is not utilized within 1 year. It should fall back to the Day VFR OLS as per the current District plan.	Accept in part	9.4
FSI 339.200	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The proposed OLS notified in the PWDP is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft that will ensure safer operations for departing/arriving aircraft during inclement weather conditions by allowing the use of readily available GPS based navigational technology. This will improve the safety and efficiency of the Aerodrome for aircraft operation under IFR rules. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS as notified in the pWDP through its design and implementation ensures an enhanced level of flight safety from the existing OLS in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5700Kg. The notified OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. The proposed OLS is necessary to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome. It will provide pilots with more flexibility to use and utilise advancements in navigational GPS based IFR technologies which were once cost prohibitive for smaller general aviation aircraft. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air	Accept in part	9.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code IA+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport.</i>		
<i>FS1347.9</i>	<i>GL & DP McBride</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>		<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>9.4</i>
602.33	Greig Metcalf	<i>Oppose</i>	Add the following terms and definitions to Chapter 13 Definitions: Identified Area Boundary adjustment Wastewater treatment plant General aviation Recreational flying Flight training school Circuit training Community scale wastewater system Wastewater treatment plant Real estate header sign AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Not having definitions for these terms leads to ambiguity and uncertainty.	Accept in part	8.3
<i>FS1339.73</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed in part.</i>	<i>NZTE is only concerned with the proposed definitions of Wastewater Treatment Plant, General Aviation, Recreational Flying, Flight Training School and Circuit training. NZTE opposes the inclusion of these proposed definitions as the Rules provided for in Chapter 27 and the Air Noise Control Boundaries proposed in NZTE's submission means that these specific definitions are not required to be added to the PWDP. The Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day and sought in the NZTE submission require the Airfield operator to manage the type and frequency of aircraft movements used for any activity in order to comply. The proposed Marshall Day noise thresholds adequately control aircraft used for any activity, irrespective of whether it is a training flight or a circuit.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>8.3</i>
<i>FS1388.1041</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	<i>Oppose</i>		<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>3.2</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
602.37	Greig Metcalfe	Support	Add clauses to Policies 9.2.2.1 - Airpark standards as follows: (a) Manage adverse airpark effects through the application of general and airpark-specific performance standards including: (i) Noise (ii) Hazardous substances; (iii) Building setbacks; (iv) Minimum site areas; and (v) Subdivision allotment size; (vi) Management Plan based on Fly Neighbourly principles; (vii) Hours of operation; and (viii) Maximum aircraft movements. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Adherence to 'Fly Neighbourly' principles will ensure that the operation of aircraft recognises the issues with flying in and around noise-sensitive areas. A proactive approach should be taken by managing the type of, and repetitive nature of, aircraft noise. Further reading can be found in the NZ Aviation Industry Association Environmental Code of Practice and the Helicopter Association International (HAI) 'Fly Neighbourly Guide'.	Accept in part	14.3
FS1339.74	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	NZTE oppose the amendments sought to Policy 9.2.2.1 - Airpark Standards as the Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day Acoustics and included in the submission of NZTE would adequately manage airpark noise effects. Total aircraft noise would be limited at the Air Noise Control Boundaries which effectively limits aircraft movements. NZTE does not oppose the "Fly Neighbourly" principles but considers that they are appropriately managed by the CAA provisions discussed below. The Aerodrome operates in accordance with the information provided to CAA NZAIP (Aeronautical Information Publication), which is a procedural	Accept in part	14.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>and descriptive document for pilots intending to use an aerodrome. This document outlines the operational procedures for all pilots and is specified by a delegated Aerodrome Operator. These procedures may include the establishment of an Operational Safety and Management Working Group to operate as a community liaison. These operating procedures also cover flight path tracking restrictions, specific arrival and departure procedures (including any warnings or cautions), which act as an aviation sanctioned method of establishing the "Fly Neighbourly" principles to appropriately manage the submitters concerns.</i>		
FS1347.10	GL & DP McBride	Support	Null		Accept in part	14.3
602.56	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 27.2.12 P3 (a) Signs - general as follows: (a) Any real estate 'for sale' sign relating to the site on which it is located must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) There is no more than 1 sign per agency measuring 600mm x 900mm per road frontage of the site to which the sign relates; (ii) There is no more than 1 sign measuring 1800mm x 1200mm per site to which the sign relates; (iii) There is no more than 1 real estate header sign measuring 1800mm x 1200mm on one other site; (ii) (iv) The sign is not illuminated; (ii) (v) The sign does not contain any moving parts, fluorescent, flashing or revolving lights or reflective materials; (iv) (vi) The sign does not project into or over road reserve. (vii) Any real estate sign shall be removed from display within 60 days of sale/lease or upon settlement, whichever is the earliest. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the	The notified rules for real estate signs are too restrictive. Corner sites should be able to have additional sign opportunities without adversely affecting residential character and amenity. Allowance should be made for feature signs which are commonly used for properties going to auction or tender. Header signs should be able to be established on another sign (often on a high volume road) to direct purchasers to the site which is for sale (often on a low volume road).	Accept in part	17.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			matters raised in the submission.			
FS1339.179	NZTE Operations Limited	Not stated	NZTE does not support or oppose this submission.	NZTE is neutral to the extent that any relief arising from the submission is consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	17.3
613.1	Kiwi Balloon Company	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Policy framework recognizes the significance of the existing aerodrome to the aviation community. Objectives and policies align with the sustainability principles of the RMA. Development represents a practical use of a scarce and limited resource. Objectives and policies safeguard the future needs of the aviation community. Policy framework provides for a diversity of residential and commercial opportunities. Makes use of existing infrastructure, which cannot be easily replicated elsewhere. Te Kowhai Airpark is and will remain a strategic site associated with hot air ballooning.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.41	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
613.2	Kiwi Balloon Company	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Provisions allow for flexibility of land use activity. Proposed obstacle limitation surface (OLS) enables use of aerodrome for both VFR and IFR non-air transport operations. Proposed obstacle limitation surface (OLS) enhances safety and functionality of Te Kowhai aerodrome. Proposed zoning gives an opportunity to establish an integrated and unique airpark, able to take advantage of existing critical infrastructure and proximity to Hamilton. Proposed airpark meets the niche requirements of the aviation community. Provisions of Chapter 27 recognizes the distinct nature of the proposed airpark and its extreme scarcity as a physical resource. Without such provisions, ongoing operational needs of the aerodrome would not be met. Rezoning of Te Kowhai Aerodrome from 'Rural' to 'Airpark zone' is entirely appropriate. Te Kowhai Airpark is and will	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				remain a strategic site associated with hot air ballooning.		
FS1339.140	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
621.1	Peter Varga	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	The airpark development will provide a unique environment which will allow like-minded people the opportunity to live and dream their passions. With this one-off special area, aviation will stay alive for generations to come.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.42	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
621.2	Peter Varga	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	The airpark development will provide a unique environment which will allow like-minded people the opportunity to live and dream their passions. With this one-off special area, aviation will stay alive for generations to come.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.141	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
631.1	Allan Dennis	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark as notified.	Secure a future for the Light Aviation Fraternity. Allow for the expansion of existing facilities.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.43	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
631.2	Allan Dennis	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone as notified.	Secure a future for the Light Aviation Fraternity. Allow for the expansion of existing facilities.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.142	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
635.1	Neroli Henwood	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2- Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Te Kowhai airfield is an important community asset with a long history for both the aviation community and the	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Waikato area. For a viable future, the airfield needs to be able to develop into a sustainable area. Changes will protect and fulfill the needs of airpark's users.		
FS1339.44	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
635.2	Neroli Henwood	Support	Retain Chapter 27-Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Te Kowhai airfield is an important community asset with a long history for both the aviation community and the Waikato area. For a viable future, the airfield needs to be able to develop into a sustainable area. Changes will protect and fulfill the needs of airpark's users.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.143	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
649.1	Progress Partners Ltd	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark zone, as notified.	Te Kowhai Airpark is a valuable asset to the aviation community.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.45	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
649.2	Progress Partners Ltd	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark zone, as notified.	Te Kowhai Airpark is a valuable asset to the aviation community.	Accept in apart	7.3
FS1339.144	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
650.1	Jacob Stead	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark zone, as notified.	Airfield has been around longer than most residents and it should therefore be allowed to grow in line with the village image. Hearing the aircraft above Te Kowhai brings a happy atmosphere. Caution should be taken regarding how long an aircraft may loiter, achievable through New Zealand Aeronautical Information Publication (NZAIP).	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1339.46	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
650.2	Jacob Stead	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark zone, as notified.	Airfield has been around longer than most residents and it should therefore be allowed to grow inline with the village image. Hearing the aircraft above Te Kowhai brings a happy atmosphere. Caution should be taken regarding how long an aircraft may loiter, achievable through NZAIP.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.145	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
664.1	Waikato Regional Airport Limited	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark.	Objects to the proposal due to aeronautical safety considerations. Supports aspects of the proposal that facilitate recreational aviation in the region. Activities that have the potential to intensify aeronautical activity to a commercial scale in close proximity to Hamilton Airport and their airspace represent a greatly increased threat to users of the airport. Have not been provided with the results of any aeronautical safety study. Modifying the obstacle limitation surface at Te Kowhai to permit traffic at night or under instrument flight rules compromises safety by encouraging faster, more high performance aircraft to operate in the vicinity of Hamilton Airport.	Reject	4.3
FS1339.66	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	The proposed OLS will not have an impact on the commercial operations of Hamilton Airport. All aircraft operating under IFR rules at the aerodrome will be for private operations only. Waikato Regional Airport Limited has submitted that it could gain an advantage in trade competition through its submission. NZTE seeks that this submission is limited in accordance with clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991. OLS implementation is likely to increase safety for Hamilton airport by reducing smaller general aviation traffic congestion with	Accept	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>larger scheduled commercial operators using Hamilton Airport. (eg Air NZ). An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The proposed OLS notified in the pWDP is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. This will ensure safer operations for departing/arriving aircraft during inclement weather conditions by allowing the use of readily available GPS based navigational technology. This will improve the safety and efficiency of the Aerodrome for aircraft operation under IFR rules. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS as notified in the pWDP through its design and implementation ensures an enhanced level of flight safety from the existing OLS in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5700Kg. The notified OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. The proposed OLS is necessary to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome because it will provide pilots with more flexibility to use and utilise advancements in navigational GPS based IFR technologies which were once cost prohibitive for smaller general aviation aircraft. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restrict aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules. The design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code IA+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport.</p>		
664.2	Waikato Regional Airport Limited	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark.	Objects to the proposal due to aeronautical safety considerations. Supports aspects of the proposal that facilitate recreational aviation in the region. Activities that have the potential to intensify aeronautical activity to	Reject	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				a commercial scale in close proximity to Hamilton Airport and our airspace represent a greatly increased threat to users of the airport. Have not been provided with the results of any aeronautical safety study. Modifying the obstacle limitation surface at Te Kowhai to permit traffic at night or under instrument flight rules compromises safety by encouraging faster, more high performance aircraft to operate in the vicinity of Hamilton Airport.		
FS1339.197	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	OLS implementation is likely to increase safety for Hamilton airport by reducing smaller general aviation traffic congestion with larger scheduled commercial operators using Hamilton Airport (e.g. Air NZ). The proposed OLS will not have an impact on the commercial operations of Hamilton Airport due to all aircraft operating under IFR rules being for private operations only. Waikato Regional Airport Limited has submitted that it could gain an advantage in trade competition through its submission. NZTE seeks that this submission is limited in accordance with clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991. The Rules proposed in Chapter 27 TKAZ represents a unique, site specific, residential airpark that is intended to utilise the Airfield facilities as part of the residents' day to day living environment. The OLS and proposed Air Noise Control Boundaries will ensure the safe and efficient operation of the Airpark. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The proposed OLS notified in the pWDP is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft that will ensure safer operations for departing/arriving aircraft during inclement weather conditions by allowing the use of readily available GPS based navigational technology. This will improve the safety and efficiency of the Aerodrome for aircraft operation under IFR rules. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA	Accept	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS as notified in the pWDP through its design and implementation ensures an enhanced level of flight safety from the existing OLS in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5700Kg. The notified OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. The proposed OLS is necessary to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome. It will provide pilots with more flexibility to use and utilise advancements in navigational GPS based IFR technologies which were once cost prohibitive for smaller general aviation aircraft. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code 1A+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport.		
666.1	William Henwood	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Ensures that Te Kowhai Aerodrome remains as a vibrant and useful part of the community.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.47	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
666.2	William Henwood	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Ensures that Te Kowhai Aerodrome remains as a vibrant and useful part of the community.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.146	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
697.131	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.3.3 PI Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface as follows: <u>Any</u> building, structure or vegetation must not protrude through <u>any</u> the airport obstacle	This rule applies to both the Te Kowhai Airfield and the Waikato Regional Airport so needs to be specified. Additional wording provides clarity to the rule.	Accept	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			limitation surface <i>as</i> identified <i>on the planning maps and</i> in Appendix 9 - Te Kowhai Airfieldpark and <i>defined in Section E, Designation N – Waikato Regional Airport as shown on the planning maps.</i>			
FS1253.3	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that this submission be allowed, subject to the following changes: P1- Any building, structure, tree or other vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surface as identified on the planning maps and in Appendix 9- Te Kowhai Airfield park and defined in Section E, Designation N- Waikato Regional Hamilton Airport. D1- Any building, structure, tree or other vegetation that does not comply with Rule 16.3.3.3 P1.	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule, subject to the suggested changes I have proposed. Reference to Waikato Regional Airport needs to be amended to be Hamilton Airport as per the original submission from Waikato Regional Airport Ltd. The amended wording provided also incorporates the changes from submissions 697.132 and 823.7, as set out below.	Accept	10.3
FS1339.87	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE supports the clarification of the OLS Height rules in the PWDP and Residential Chapter and also seeks that the rules be amended in accordance with point number 823.7 in NZTE's submission on the PWDP for the OLS rule to include a tree or other vegetation.	Accept	10.3
697.132	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.3.3 D1 Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface to read as follows: <i>Any</i> building, structure or vegetation that does not comply with Rule 16.3.3.3 P1.	Additional wording provides clarity to the rule.	Accept	10.3
FS1253.4	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that the whole part of this submission be allowed, subject to the changes set out in response to submission 697.131.		Accept	10.3
FS1339.88	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE supports the clarification of the OLS Height rules in the PWDP and Residential Chapter and also seeks that the rules be amended in accordance with point number 823.7 in NZTE's submission on the PWDP for the OLS rule to include	Accept	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>a tree or other vegetation.</i>		
697.140	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Add new rule after Rule 16.3.10 Building - Horotiu Acoustic Area as follows: 16.3.10A Building – Te Kowhai Noise Buffer PI Construction of, or addition, or alteration to, a dwelling within the Te Kowhai Noise Buffer that is designed and constructed to achieve the internal design sound levels specified in Section 3.2 of Appendix I (Acoustic Insulation). RD1 (a) Construction of, or addition, or alteration to, a dwelling that does not comply with Rule 16.3.10A PI (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) on-site amenity values; (ii) noise levels received at the notional boundary of the dwelling; (iii) timing and duration of noise received at the notional boundary of the dwelling; (iv) potential for reverse sensitivity effects.	There is Residential Zoned land in close proximity to the Te Kowhai Airfield and therefore there needs to be a rule managing internal noise limits in dwellings in the Residential Zone.	Reject	12.3
FS1339.89	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	NZTE supports the inclusion of a rule managing noise limits in dwellings and noise sensitive activities in the Residential Zone but opposes Rule 16.3.10A and the relevant Restricted Discretionary Rule as the Te Kowhai Noise Buffer is no longer required as taxiing noise is now dealt within the Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day and sought in the NZTE submission. Point 823.25 of the NZTE Submission seeks to have Rule 3.2 in Appendix I deleted. Internal noise levels in the Residential Zone are sought to be controlled in accordance with point 823.15 of NZTE's submission which seeks new Rule 16.3.12 PI and RD1 Noise Sensitive Activities (as set out in the submission) as it is drafted to reflect the Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day and sought in the NZTE submission.	Accept	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.201	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.1.2 PI Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: Any building, structure or vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surfaces as shown <u>identified</u> on the planning maps <u>and in Appendix 9 – Te Kowhai Airfield, and defined in Section E Designation N Waikato Regional Airport.</u>	Amend rule for additional clarity.	Accept	10.3
FS1253.7	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that this submission be allowed in part, subject to the following changes: PI: Any building, structure, tree or other vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surface as identified on the planning maps and in Appendix 9- Te Kowhai Airfield Park and defined Section E, Designation N- Waikato Regional Hamilton Airport.	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule however the wording needs to align with that which applies to the Residential Zone.	Accept	10.3
FS1339.91	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE supports the clarification of the OLS Height rules in the PWDP and supports the inclusion of a calculation to determine a permitted height in the OLS. NZTE also seeks that Rules 17.3.1.2 PI and 17.3.1.2 DI be amended in accordance with point number 823.8 in NZTE's submission on the PWDP for the OLS rule to include a tree or other vegetation.	Accept	10.3
697.210	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Insert new rule after 17.3.5, as follows: <u>17.3.5A Building – Te Kowhai Noise Buffer</u> <u>PI Construction of, or addition, or alteration to, a dwelling within the Te Kowhai Noise Buffer that is designed and constructed to achieve the internal design sound levels specified in Section 3.2 of Appendix 1 (Acoustic Insulation).</u> <u>RDI</u> <u>(a) Construction of, or addition, or</u>	The Business Zone does not currently have a rule relating to the Te Kowhai noise buffer, but there is Business Zoned land within close proximity to Te Kowhai Airpark. There is a possibility that residential units could be proposed on this site so there needs to be a noise insulation rule.	Reject	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>alteration to a dwelling that does not comply with Rule 17.3.5A P1</u></p> <p><u>(b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters:</u></p> <p><u>(i) on-site amenity values;</u></p> <p><u>(ii) noise levels received at the notional boundary of the dwelling;</u></p> <p><u>(iii) timing and duration of noise received at the notional boundary of the dwelling;</u></p> <p><u>(iv) potential for reverse sensitivity effects</u></p>			
FS1339.93	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed with amendments.	NZTE supports the inclusion of a rule managing noise limits in dwellings and noise sensitive activities in the Business Zone but opposes the Rule 17.3.5A and the relevant Restricted Discretionary Rule as the Te Kowhai Noise Buffer is no longer required as Taxiing Noise is now dealt within the Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day and sought in the NZTE submission. Point 823.25 of the NZTE Submission seeks to have Rule 3.2 in Appendix 1 deleted. NZTE submits that internal noise levels in the Business Zone would be better controlled by the insertion of a new Rule 17.3.9 P1 and RD1 Noise Sensitive Activities drafted in accordance with a similar rule for the Residential Zone in point 823.15 of NZTE's submission (as set out in the submission) as it is drafted to reflect the Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day and sought in the NZTE submission.	Accept	12.3
697.305	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.1.2 Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, to include a calculation to determine the permitted height with the airport obstacle limitation surface.	This rule needs to be able to be clearly interpreted by customers in relation to the Waikato Regional Airport.	Reject	10.3
FS1253.8	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	The clarification/calculation sought is provided for already in Appendix N of the Proposed District Plan. Using the defined coordinates and elevations from this Appendix architects, draft person etc can work out whether the development is within or	Accept	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				outside the OLS.		
FS1339.92	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE supports the clarification of the OLS Height rules in the PWDP and supports the inclusion of a calculation to determine a permitted height in the OLS. NZTE also seeks that Rules 17.3.1.2 PI and 17.3.1.2 DI be amended in accordance with point number 823.8 in NZTE's submission on the PWDP for the OLS rule to include a tree or other vegetation.	Reject	10.3
697.317	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Appendix 1 (Acoustic Insulation) as follows: Appendix 1 - Acoustic Insulation - Section 3 (Te Kowhai Airpark). Te Kowhai Airpark acoustic standards for outer control noise boundary and the noise buffer apply to any building containing a noise sensitive activity.	To ensure consistency and to avoid confusion to the plan reader. These provisions need to be broader to ensure all activities are captured.	Accept in part	12.3
FS1339.199	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed in part to the extent sought in submission point 823.25.	NZTE supports that Appendix 1 - Section 3 should apply to any building containing a noise sensitive activity but submits that the Appendix 1 - Section 3 should be amended in accordance with NZTE submission point 823.25 which seeks the same outcome.	Accept in part	12.3
697.409	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 25.3.1.2 Height - Building, structures, vegetation, and objects within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: PI <u>Any</u> building, structure or vegetation must not protrude through <u>any</u> <u>the</u> airport obstacle limitation surface <u>identified on the planning maps and</u> in Appendix 9 – Te Kowhai Airfield, and defined in Section E Designation N Waikato Regional Airport. NI DI <u>Any</u> building, structure or vegetation that does not comply with Rule 25.3.1.2 PI.	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters.	Accept and Reject	10.3
FS1339.102	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE supports the clarification of the OLS Height rules in the	Accept and Reject	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>PWDP. NZTE also seeks that Rules 25.3.1.2 PI and 24.3.3.2 DI be amended in accordance with point 823.13 in NZTE's submission on the PWDP for the OLS rule to include a tree or other vegetation.</i>		
697.451	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 19.3.2 Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, to include a calculation to determine the permitted height with the airport obstacle limitation surface.	This rule needs to be able to be clearly interpreted by customers in relation to the Waikato Regional Airport.	Reject	10.3
<i>FS1253.10</i>	<i>Waikato Regional Airport Ltd</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.</i>	<i>The clarification/calculation sought is provided for already in Appendix N of the Proposed District Plan. Using the defined coordinates and elevations from this Appendix architects, draft person etc can work out whether the development is within or outside of the OLS.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>10.3</i>
697.452	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.3 Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, to include a calculation to determine the permitted height with the airport obstacle limitation surface.	This rule needs to be able to be clearly interpreted by customers in relation to the Waikato Regional Airport.	Reject	10.3
<i>FS1253.13</i>	<i>Waikato Regional Airport Ltd</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.</i>	<i>The clarification/calculation sought is provided for already in Appendix N of the Proposed District Plan. Using the defined coordinates and elevations from this Appendix architects, draft person etc. can work out whether the development is within or outside of the OLS.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>10.3</i>
697.453	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.4.3 Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, to include a calculation to determine the permitted height with the airport obstacle limitation surface.	This rule needs to be able to be clearly interpreted by customers in relation to the Waikato Regional Airport.	Reject	10.3
<i>FS1253.16</i>	<i>Waikato Regional Airport Ltd</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.</i>	<i>The clarification/calculation sought is provided for already in Appendix N of the Proposed District Plan. Using the defined coordinates and elevations from this Appendix architects, draft person etc. can work out whether the development is within or</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>10.3</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				outside of the OLS.		
697.454	Waikato District Council	<i>Neutral / Amend</i>	Amend Rule 23.3.4.2 Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, to include a calculation to determine the permitted height with the airport obstacle limitation surface.	This rule needs to be able to be clearly interpreted by customers relation to the Waikato Regional Airport.	Reject	10.3
<i>FS1253.22</i>	<i>Waikato Regional Airport Ltd</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.</i>	<i>The clarification/calculation sought is provided for already in Appendix N of the Proposed Plan. Using the defined coordinates and elevations from this Appendix architects, draft person etc. can work out whether the development is within or outside of the OLS.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>10.3</i>
697.455	Waikato District Council	<i>Neutral / Amend</i>	Amend Rule 24.3.3.2 Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, to include a calculation to determine the permitted height with the airport obstacle limitation surface.	This rule needs to be able to be clearly interpreted by customers in relation to the Waikato Regional Airport.	Reject	10.3
<i>FS1253.34</i>	<i>Waikato Regional Airport Ltd</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.</i>	<i>The clarification/calculation sought is provided for already in Appendix N of the Proposed District Plan. Using the defined coordinates and elevations from this Appendix architects, draft person etc. can work out whether the development is within or outside of the OLS.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>10.3</i>
<i>FS1339.98</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports the clarification of the OLS Height rules in the PWDP and supports the inclusion of a calculation to determine a permitted height in the OLS. NZTE also seeks that Rules 24.3.3.2 PI and 24.3.3.2 DI be amended in accordance with point 823.12 in NZTE's submission on the PWDP for the OLS rule to include a tree or other vegetation.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>10.3</i>
697.568	Waikato District Council	<i>Neutral / Amend</i>	Amend Policy 9.2.2.1(b) Airpark standards as follows: (b) Te e Ensure that bulk and location...	This would provide clarity around the wording of this policy.	Accept	14.3
<i>FS1339.72</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.</i>	<i>Agree that the amendment provides clarity to the policy.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>14.3</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.597	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend the heading to Rule 19.3.2 Buildings, structures, vegetation and objects within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: Buildings, structures; <i>and</i> vegetation and objects within an airport obstacle limitation surface.	Amend the title to match the rule.	Accept	10.3
FS1253.11	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that part of this submission be allowed, subject to the wording of Rule 19.3.2 being amended to be consistent with that set out in submission points 697.131 and 697.201 for the Residential and Business Zones.	The word 'objects' capture all things outside of the definition of buildings and structures. Whilst it could be provided for, our preference is that the rule (and heading for the rule) aligns with that suggested for Rule 16.3.3.3 and 17.3.1.2, as they all relate to the same issues, just for differing zones. There needs to be consistency between the zones for the same rules.	Accept	10.3
697.598	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 19.3.2 PI Buildings, structures, vegetation and objects within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: Any building, structure or vegetation must not protrude through any airport obstacle limitation surface as shown <i>identified</i> on the planning maps <i>and defined in Section E Designation N Waikato Regional Airport</i> .	Amend rule for additional clarity.	Accept	10.3
FS1253.12	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that this submission be allowed, subject to the following changes: PI- Any building, structure, tree or other vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surface as identified on the planning maps and in Appendix 9- Te Kowhai Airfield park and defined in Section E, Designation N- Waikato Regional Hamilton Airport.	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule, subject to the suggested changes we have proposed which ensures that the wording aligns with that proposed for the Residential and Business Zones. Reference to Waikato Regional Airport needs to be amended to be Hamilton Airport as per the original submission from Waikato Regional Airport Ltd.	Accept	10.3
697.642	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.3 PI Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport	This rule relates only to the Waikato Regional Airport and needs to specifically identify this. Additional wording	Accept	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			obstacle limitation surface, to read as follows: <i>Any</i> building, structure or vegetation must not protrude through an <u>the</u> airport obstacle limitation surface as shown <u>identified</u> on the planning maps and <u>defined in Section E Designation N - Waikato Regional Airport</u> .	provides clarity to the rule.		
FS1253.14	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that this submission be allowed, subject to the following changes: P1- Any building, structure, tree or other vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surface as identified on the planning maps and in Appendix 9- Te Kowhai Airfield park and defined in Section E Designation N- Waikato Regional Hamilton Airport.	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule, subject to the suggested changes we have proposed which ensures that the wording aligns with that proposed for the Residential and Business Zones. Reference to Waikato Regional Airport needs to be amended to be Hamilton Airport as per the original submission from Waikato Regional Airport Ltd.	Accept	10.3
697.643	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 20.3.3 Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, NCI to be DI read as follows: NCI DI <i>Any</i> building, structure or vegetation that does not comply with Rule 20.3.3. P1	Additional wording provides clarity to the rule. Activity status to be more consistent with other zone chapters.	Accept and Reject	10.3
FS1253.15	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that the whole part of this submission be allowed.	It is important that people are discourage from undertaking any activities that will result in a building, structure or other object from protruding above the AOLS to ensure the continue safe operation of the airport. That being said, the activity status proposed for all other zones is Discretionary. As such, it makes sense that the activity status is consistent throughout the plan for breaches in the same rule, albeit a differing zone.	Accept and Reject	10.3
697.802	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.4.3 Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle	This rule relates only to the Waikato Regional Airport and needs to specifically identify this. Additional wording	Accept	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			limitation surface PI to read as follows: <i>Any</i> building, structure or vegetation must not protrude through any <i>the</i> Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface as shown <i>identified</i> on the planning maps <i>and defined in Section E Designation N – Waikato Regional Airport.</i>	provides clarity to the rule.		
FS1253.18	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that the submission be allowed, subject to the following changes: PI Any building, structure, tree or other vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surface as identified on the planning maps and in Appendix 9- Te Kowhai Airfield Park and defined in Section E, Designation N- Waikato Regional Hamilton Airport.	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule, subject to the suggested changes we have proposed which ensures that the wording aligns with that proposed for the Residential and Business Zones. Reference to Waikato Regional Airport needs to be amended to be Hamilton Airport as per the original submission from Waikato Regional Airport Ltd.	Accept	10.3
697.803	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.4.3 Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface NC1 to read as follows: NC1 DI <i>Any</i> building, structure or vegetation that does not comply with Rule 22.3.4.3 PI.	Additional wording provides clarity to the rule. Activity status to be more consistent with other zone chapters.	Accept and Reject	10.3
FS1253.19	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that the whole part of this submission be allowed.	It is important that people are discouraged from undertaking any activities that will result in a building, structure or other object from protruding above the AOLS to ensure the continued safe operation of the airport. That being said, the activity status proposed for all other zones is Discretionary. As such, it makes sense that the activity status is consistent throughout the plan for breaches in the same rule, albeit in a differing zone.	Accept and Reject	10.3
697.894	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.4.2 PI Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: Any building, structure or vegetation that does <i>must</i> not protrude through any <i>the</i> airport	This rule applies to both the Te Kowhai Airfield and the Waikato Regional Airport so needs to be specified. The additional wording provides clarity to the rule.	Accept	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			obstacle limitation surface as shown <u>identified</u> on the planning maps in <u>Appendix 9 – Te Kowhai Airfield, and defined in Section E, Designation N – Waikato Regional Airport.</u>			
FS1253.24	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that this submission be allowed, subject to the following changes: <i>PI Any building, structure, tree or other vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surface as identified on the planning maps and in Appendix 9- Te Kowhai Airfield Park and defined in Section E, Designation N- Waikato Regional Hamilton Airport.</i>	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule, subject to the suggested changes we have proposed which ensures that the wording aligns with that proposed for other zones. Reference to Waikato Regional Airport needs to be amended to be Hamilton Airport as per the original submission from Waikato Regional Airport Ltd.	Accept	10.3
FS1339.96	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE supports the clarification of the OLS Height rules in the PWDP for consistency with other chapters and also seeks that the Rules be amended in accordance with point 823.11 in NZTE's submission on the PWDP for the OLS rule to include a tree or other vegetation.	Accept	10.3
697.895	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.4.2 NCI Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface to be a Discretionary activity rather than a non complying activity as follows: NCI DI <u>Any</u> building, structure or vegetation that does not comply with Rule 23.3.4.2 PI.	This additional wording provides clarity to the rule. Non-compliance with the permitted activity standards is more appropriate as a discretionary activity.	Accept and Reject	10.3
FS1253.25	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that the whole part of this submission be allowed.	It is important that people are discouraged from undertaking any activities that will result in a building, structure or other object form protruding above the AOLS to ensure the continued safe operation of the airport. That being said, the activity status proposed for all other zones is Discretionary. As such, it makes sense that the activity is consistent throughout the plan for breaches in the same rule, albeit a differing zone.	Accept and Reject	10.3
697.907	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Insert the following rule after Rule 23.3.8:	An area of Country Living Zone lies in close proximity to the Te Kowhai Airpark. In order to manage internal	Reject	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>23.3.8B Building – Te Kowhai Noise Buffer</u> <u>PI Construction of, or addition, or alteration to, a dwelling within the Te Kowhai Noise Buffer that is designed and constructed to achieve the internal design sound levels specified in Section 3.2 of Appendix I (Acoustic Insulation).</u></p> <p><u>RDI</u> <u>(a) Construction of, or addition, or alteration to, a dwelling that does not comply with Rule 23.3.8B PI</u> <u>(b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters:</u> <u>(i) on-site amenity values;</u> <u>(ii) noise levels received at the notional boundary of the dwelling;</u> <u>(iii) timing and duration of noise received at the notional boundary of the dwelling;</u> <u>(iv) potential for reverse sensitivity effects.</u></p>	noise levels, the rule regarding noise buffers needs to be inserted in Chapter 23.		
FS1339.95	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed with amendments.	NZTE supports the inclusion of a rule managing noise limits in dwellings and noise sensitive activities in the Country Living Zone but opposes the new rule 23.8.8B as, in accordance with point 823.25 of the NZTE Submission, Rule 3.2 in Appendix I should be deleted. Taxiing noise is now managed via the Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day and sought in the NZTE submission, meaning there is no longer a need for the Te Kowhai Noise Buffer. NZTE submits that internal noise levels in the Country Living Zone would be better controlled by the insertion of a new Rule 23.3.10 PI and RDI Noise Sensitive Activities, drafted in accordance with a similar rule for the Residential Zone in point 823.15 of NZTE's submission (as set out in the submission), as it is drafted to reflect the Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day and sought in the NZTE submission.	Accept	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.730	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	3.2
697.979	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.3.2 PI Height-Buildings structures or vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: <i>Any</i> building, structure or vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surface <i>as identified on the planning maps and defined</i> in Appendix 9 - Te Kowhai Airpark and as shown on the planning maps.	This rule relates only to the Te Kowhai Airpark and needs to specifically identify this. Additional wording provides clarity to the rule.	Accept	10.3
FS1253.35	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that this submission be allowed, subject to the following changes: <i>PI Any building, structure, tree or other vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surface as identified on the planning maps and in Appendix 9- Te Kowhai Airfield Park and defined in Section E, Designation N- Waikato Regional Hamilton Airport.</i>	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule, subject to the suggested changes we have proposed which ensures that the wording aligns with that proposed for other zones.	Accept	10.3
FS1339.99	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE supports the clarification of the OLS Height rules in the PWDP and supports the inclusion of a calculation to determine a permitted height in the OLS. NZTE also seeks that Rules 24.3.3.2 PI and 24.3.3.2 DI be amended in accordance with point 823.12 in NZTE's submission on the	Accept	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>PWDP for the OLS rule to include a tree or other vegetation.</i>		
697.980	Waikato District Council	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.3.2 D1 Height - Buildings structures or vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: <i>Any</i> building, structure or vegetation that does not comply with Rule 24.3.3.2 P1.	Additional wording provides clarity to the rule.	Accept	10.3
<i>FS1253.36</i>	<i>Waikato Regional Airport Ltd</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seek that the whole part of this submission be allowed.</i>	<i>The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule.</i>	Accept	10.3
<i>FS1339.100</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports the clarification of the OLS Height rules in the PWDP and supports the inclusion of a calculation to determine a permitted height in the OLS. NZTE also seeks that Rules 24.3.3.2 P1 and 24.3.3.2 D1 be amended in accordance with point 823.12 in NZTE's submission on the PWDP for the OLS rule to include a tree or other vegetation.</i>	Accept	10.3
700.1	Waikato Aviation	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The continued use of this airfield will keep people's interest in aviation, as well as promoting aviation for the next generation.	Accept in part	4.3
<i>FS1339.48</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.</i>	Accept in part	4.3
700.2	Waikato Aviation	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The continued use of this airfield will keep people's interest in aviation, as well as promoting aviation for the next generation.	Accept in part	7.3
<i>FS1339.147</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.</i>	Accept in part	7.3
702.1	Aerosport Aviation Ltd	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Te Kowhai Airpark is a great asset to the aviation community, it creates a community feel. It is a positive place where people who are interested in aviation can continually learn, update their flying skills and enjoy flying in the surrounding environment. It is a social, positive environment run by a group of caring, astute, like-minded	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				individuals.		
FS1339.49	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
702.2	Aerosport Aviation Ltd	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Te Kowhai Airpark is a great asset to the aviation community. It creates a community feel. It is a positive place where people who are interested in aviation can continually learn, update their flying skills and enjoy flying in the surrounding environment. It is a social, positive environment run by a group of caring, astute, like-minded individuals.	Accept in part	4.3
708.1	Neil McHugh	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.50	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
708.2	Neil McHugh	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.148	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
725.1	Laurence Harris	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	We need to keep as many airfields as possible.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.51	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
725.2	Laurence Harris	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	We need to keep as many airfields as possible.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.149	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.</i>		
727.1	James Schmidt	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 for the Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	To help protect an important aviation asset for the community.	Accept in part	4.3
<i>FS1339.52</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>4.3</i>
734.1	Richard Neave and Sue Campbell	Support	Retain the whole of Chapter 9.2 (Objectives and Policies for Te Kowhai Airpark Zone), as notified.	The airfield represents a scarce resource for the aviation community. The proposed use is a way of ensuring longevity. The airfield operators are community minded, sharing this resource in a way which includes local residents as well as aviation enthusiasts. There is a need to keep as many airfields as possible.	Accept in part	4.3
<i>FS1339.53</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>4.3</i>
734.2	Richard Neave and Sue Campbell	Support	Retain the whole of Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark, Zone as notified.	The airfield represents a scarce resource for the aviation community. The proposed use is a way of ensuring longevity. The airfield operators are community minded, sharing this resource in a way which includes local residents as well as aviation enthusiasts. There is a need to keep as many airfields as possible.	Accept in part	7.3
<i>FS1339.150</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>7.3</i>
736.1	Ian Chapman	Support	Retain the whole of Chapter 9.2 (Objectives and policies for Te Kowhai Airpark zone), as notified.	Te Kowhai airfield is a fantastic facility that deserves to be secure for the future.	Accept in part	4.3
<i>FS1339.54</i>	<i>NZTE Operations Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>4.3</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
736.2	Ian Chapman	Support	Retain the whole of Chapter 27 (Te Kowhai Airpark Zone), as notified.	Te Kowhai airfield is a fantastic facility that deserves to be secure for the future.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.151	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
742.67	New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral / Amend	Retain Policy 9.2.1.1 Development, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 9.2.1.1(b) Development as follows: Develop Te Kowhai Airpark in accordance with the Te Kowhai Airpark Framework Plan in Appendix 9. AND Clarify whether it is the Framework Plan or the entirety of Appendix 9 which should be referred to in Policy 9.2.1.1(b). AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission	The submitter supports the development of Te Kowhai Airpark. Policy 9.2.1.1 refers to the Te Kowhai Airpark Framework Plan - later provisions cross-reference Appendix 9. It would be useful to make the same cross-reference in this part of the Plan. The submitter further questions whether it is just the Framework Plan or the entirety of Appendix 9 which should be referred to.	Accept	5.3
FS1339.67	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE supports the amendment to create consistency within the PWDP.	Accept	5.3
742.174	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 27.2.9 PI Glare and Lighting as notified. AND Retain Rule 27.2.9 RDI Glare and Lighting as notified.	The submitter supports all rules in this section.	Accept	15.3
FS1339.164	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission point be allowed.	NZTE supports the submission point and the amendments as proposed to Rule 27.2.13 P1(a)(iv), Rule 27.2.13RDI(b)(ii) and Rule 27.2.14RDI(b)(iv).	Accept	15.3
742.175	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 27.2.12 P1 Signs as notified. AND Retain Rule 27.2.12 P2 Signs as notified	The submitter supports the proposed sign rules as the conditions ensure there will be no adverse effects on the transport network.	Accept	17.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Retain Rule 27.2.12 P4 Signs as notified. AND Retain Rule 27.2.12 RD1 Signs as notified.			
FS1339.165	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission point be allowed.	NZTE supports the submission point and the amendments as proposed to Rule 27.2.13 PI(a)(iv), Rule 27.2.13RD1(b)(ii) and Rule 27.2.14RD1(b)(iv).	Accept	17.3
742.176	New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral / Amend	Retain Rule 27.2.13 PI Signs- effects on traffic, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 27.2.13 PI(a)(iv) Signs - effects on traffic as follows: Contain maximum no more than 40 characters and a maximum no more than 6 words, symbols or graphics; AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the intent of Rule 27.2.13 PI but seeks amendment to provide clarification on the maximum amount of words permitted. This will ensure that signage erected does not cause unnecessary visual clutter or affect the efficient, safe and effective functioning of the transport network.	Accept in part	18.3
FS1339.166	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission point be allowed.	NZTE supports the submission point and the amendments as proposed to Rule 27.2.13 PI(a)(iv), Rule 27.2.13RD1(b)(ii) and Rule 27.2.14RD1(b)(iv).	Accept in part	18.3
742.177	New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral / Amend	Retain Rule 27.2.13 RD1 Signs- effects on traffic, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 27.2.13 RD1(b)(ii) Signs - effects on traffic as follows: Effects on the safe and efficient operation of the road land transport network; AND Request any consequential changes	The submitter supports Council retaining discretion over effects on safety and efficiency with minor amendment.	Accept	18.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.			
FS1339.167	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission point be allowed.	NZTE supports the submission point and the amendments as proposed to Rule 27.2.13 PI(a)(iv), Rule 27.2.13RDI(b)(ii) and Rule 27.2.14RDi(b)(iv).	Accept	18.3
742.178	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 27.2.14 PI Temporary Events as notified.	The submitter supports no direct access from a national route or regional arterial road. Temporary events are subject to Rule 14.12.1.4 which would ensure that for events exceeding a certain size, any effects on the transport network could be addressed.	Accept	19.3
FS1339.168	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission point be allowed.	NZTE supports the submission point and the amendments as proposed to Rule 27.2.13 PI(a)(iv), Rule 27.2.13RDI(b)(ii) and Rule 27.2.14RDi(b)(iv).	Reject	19.3
742.179	New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral / Amend	Retain Rule 27.2.14 RDI Temporary Events, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 27.2.14 RDI(b)(iv) Temporary Events as follows: Traffic and road safety effects Effects on the safe and efficient operation of the land transport network. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports Council retaining discretion on traffic and road safety effects but seeks minor amendment for consistency.	Accept	19.3
FS1339.169	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission point be allowed.	NZTE supports the submission point and the amendments as proposed to Rule 27.2.13 PI(a)(iv), Rule 27.2.13RDI(b)(ii) and Rule 27.2.14RDi(b)(iv).	Accept	19.3
742.180	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 27.3.7 PI Building setback from a state highway as notified.	The submitter supports a 15m setback as it will avoid adverse effects on the state highway.	Accept	20.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1339.170	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission point be allowed.	NZTE supports the submission point and the amendments as proposed to Rule 27.2.13 P1(a)(iv), Rule 27.2.13RDI(b)(ii) and Rule 27.2.14RDi(b)(iv).	Accept	20.3
742.181	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 27.4.5 RDI Road access as notified. AND Retain Rule 27.4.5 DI Road access as notified.	The submitter supports Rules 27.4.5 RDI and DI and the requirement to be in general accordance with Appendix 9 (Te Kowhai Airfield precinct zoning).	Accept	24.3
FS1339.171	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission point be allowed.	The submitter supports Rules 27.4.5 RDI and DI and the requirement to be in general accordance with Appendix 9 (Te Kowhai Airfield precinct zoning).	Accept	24.3
752.1	McGowan-Weake Limited	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2- Objectives and policies for Te Kowhai Airpark zone (whole of chapter), as notified.	Is going to add to the community. Is going to add to the region. Submission is in full support of proposal.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.55	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
752.2	McGowan-Weake Limited	Support	Retain Chapter 27- Te Kowhai Airpark Zone (whole of chapter), as notified.	Is going to add to the community. Is going to add to the region. Submission is in full support of proposal.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.152	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
753.1	Gavin Brown	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2- Objectives and policies for Te Kowhai Airpark zone (whole of chapter), as notified.	Te Kowhai airfield is a valuable resource to the aviation community both locally and nationally. Hamilton historically has been a hub for aviation innovation and Te Kowhai airfield is an important part of this. The Airfield offers exceptional facilities and opportunities for those presently in aviation and for pilots of the future. Proposed changes will ensure the airfield is able to provide the services required to facilitate the advancement of aviation.	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1339.56	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
753.2	Gavin Brown	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark zone (whole of chapter), as notified.	Te Kowhai airfield is a valuable resource to the aviation community both locally and nationally. Hamilton historically has been a hub for aviation innovation and Te Kowhai airfield is an important part of this. The Airfield offers exceptional facilities and opportunities for those presently in aviation and for pilots of the future. Proposed changes will ensure the airfield is able to provide the services required to facilitate the advancement of aviation.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.153	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
767.1	Simon Clark	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.57	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
767.2	Simon Clark	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.154	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
770.1	Gordon Sanders	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Te Kowhai Aerodrome provides a safe emergency landing option, convenient refueling place, recreation and educational resources, safe training airfield. Development as a residential airpark would provide a valuable community amenity similar to popular overseas developments, create additional income for local businesses and rates for Council and show that the district is concentrating on increasing quality of life.	Accept in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1339.58	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
770.2	Gordon Sanders	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Te Kowhai Aerodrome provides a safe emergency landing option, convenient refueling place, recreation and educational resources, safe training airfield. Development as a residential airpark would provide a valuable community amenity similar to popular overseas developments, create additional income for local businesses and rates for Council and show that the district is concentrating on increasing quality of life.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.155	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
773.1	Michael Hayman	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Te Kowhai Airpark would be a valuable asset for the community.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.59	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
773.2	Michael Hayman	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Te Kowhai Airpark would be a valuable asset for the community.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.156	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
781.6	Ministry of Education	Neutral / Amend	Add a new policy to Chapter 9: Specific Zones that provides for education facilities in Specific Zones as follows: Policy - Education Facilities and Specific Zones Allow activities which are compatible with the role, function and predominant character of Specific Zones, while managing the effects of the activities on the environment in the following zones: (i) Hampton Downs motor sport and recreation (ii) Te Kowhai Airpark	There are no policies that currently provide for education facilities in Specific Zones. Education facilities such as schools, community education, early childhood education, tertiary education institutions, work skills training centres, outdoor education centres and sports training establishments located in various areas are essential social infrastructure to support district growth. Examples include: driver training (including motor racing) pilot training schools tertiary education work skills training centres	Accept in part	8.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			(iii) Rangitahi Peninsula; and (iv) Business Zone Tamahere			
FS1118.3	Gary Bogart / Meremere Dragway inc for Brookfields Lawyers	Support	Conditionally support - Providing for educational facilities in Specific Zones is both a commercial opportunity and an opportunity for further education (in a variety of disciplines) throughout the District. Driver training is already provided for under Meremere Dragway's resource consent and the Proposed District Plan should reflect this and also provide further educational opportunities.	Meremere Dragway seeks that the submission point be allowed, subject to the acceptance of Meremere Dragway's submission that the "Drag Way Park Specific Area" be inserted as a specific zone in the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in part	8.3
FS1208.10	Rangitahi Limited	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Education facilities consistent with the role, function and character of the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone should be provided for if their effects are appropriately managed.	Accept in part	8.3
FS1304.12	Gary Bogart / Meremere Dragway Inc.	Support	Meremere Dragway seeks that the submission point be allowed, subject to the acceptance of Meremere Dragway's submission that the "Drag Way Park Specific Area" be inserted as a specific zone in the Proposed District Plan.	Providing for educational facilities in Specific zones is both a commercial opportunity and an opportunity for further education (in a variety of disciplines) throughout the District. Driver training is already provided for under Meremere Dragway's resource consent and the Proposed District Plan should reflect this and also provide further educational opportunities.	Accept in part	8.3
FS1339.2	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE supports the addition of an education facility policy as teaching facilities are an anticipated activity in the TKAZ. NZTE agrees that such facilities form part of the essential social infrastructure required to support district growth. This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	8.3
781.19	Ministry of Education	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 27.1.1 Activity Status Table as follows: 27.1.1 Activity Status Table Teaching and Conference Education Facilities Precinct A: Non-complying Restricted Discretionary Precinct B: Permitted Precinct C: Discretionary Restricted Discretionary Precinct D: Discretionary Restricted Discretionary AND Add the following matters of discretion to Rule 27.1 Land Use Activities as follows:	Opposes the activity status for education facilities. Teaching facilities such as tertiary education institutions, work skills training centres, flight schools and early childhood education centres may need to be located within the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone for the convenience of parents and students. The submitter requests consistency with their requested definition of 'Education facilities'.	Accept in part	8.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			27.1.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities (1) The activities listed below are restricted discretionary activities (2) Discretion to grant or decline consent and impose conditions is restricted to the matters of discretion set out in the following table: Activity RDI Education facilities Matters of discretion a. The extent to which it is necessary to locate the activity in the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone b. Reverse sensitivity effects of adjacent activities c. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network d. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the streetscape e. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the noise environment			
FS1339.163	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed.	NZTE supports the addition of an education facility policy as teaching facilities form part of the anticipated activity in the TKAZ. NZTE agrees that such facilities are an essential social infrastructure required to support district growth. This submission is supported to the extent that it is consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	8.3
808.1	Gyrate International Ltd	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	The submitter flies from this airfield on a regular basis It provides a vital service to both the aviation sector and the local community. The proposal should be approved and encouraged.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.60	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
808.2	Gyrate International Ltd	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	The submitter flies from this airfield on a regular basis It provides a vital service to both the aviation sector and the local community. The proposal should be approved	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				and encouraged.		
FS1339.157	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
809.1	Gordon H L Swan	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	For many years the submitter held the position of President of the Auckland Regional Microlight Club Inc. and during those years a sustainable aviation airfield dedicated to the lighter aircraft gave hours of safe flying, good instruction and was where many of today's pilots learnt to fly. This airfield gives another airfield close to Auckland City and hospitals in emergencies. The submitter sees this same situation in the Te Kowhai Airfield. The aerodrome is an asset that can afford much pleasure to all the public area but in times of emergency, it can give the council and authorities a much-needed second option. The Te Kowhai airfield would have a sustainable future. The Te Kowhai airfield is an asset that must not end up disappearing like a lot of other small airfields around the country.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.61	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
809.2	Gordon H L Swan	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	For many years the submitter held the position of President of the Auckland Regional Microlight Club Inc. and during those years a sustainable aviation airfield dedicated to the lighter aircraft gave hours of safe flying, good instruction and was where many of today's pilots learnt to fly. This airfield gives another airfield close to Auckland City and hospitals in emergencies. The submitter sees this same situation in the Te Kowhai Airfield. The aerodrome is an asset that can afford much pleasure to all the public area but in times of emergency, it can give the council and authorities a much-needed second option. The Te Kowhai airfield would have a sustainable future. The Te Kowhai airfield is an asset that	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				must not end up disappearing like a lot of other small airfields around the country.		
FS1339.158	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
810.1	Phil North	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.62	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
810.2	Phil North	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.159	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
811.1	Martyn Seay	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Will protect the future of the airfield, which is a scarce resource becoming increasingly rare. Small airfields suitable for microlight aircraft are closing up all over New Zealand and few are left. Microlight aviation is far more affordable and accessible than other aviation activity and is prevented from using most other airfields due to changes in aviation law.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.63	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
811.2	Martyn Seay	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	It will protect the future of the airfield, which is a scarce resource becoming increasingly rare. Small airfields suitable for microlight aircraft are closing up all over New Zealand and few are left. Microlight aviation is far more affordable and accessible than other aviation activity and is prevented from using most other airfields due to changes in aviation law.	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1339.160	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
823.1	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	<p>Insert new Objective 9.2.3 – reverse sensitivity and relevant Policy 9.2.3.1.</p> <p><u>Objective 9.2.3</u></p> <p><u>The operational needs of Te Kowhai Airpark are not compromised by sensitive land use activities with the potential for reverse sensitivity conflict.</u></p> <p><u>Policy 9.2.3.1</u></p> <p><u>Manage reverse sensitivity risk by:</u></p> <p><u>(i) ensuring that noise sensitive activities within the Te Kowhai Airpark Noise Control Boundaries are acoustically insulated to appropriate standards; and</u></p> <p><u>(ii) ensuring that Te Kowhai aerodrome operates within the noise limits specified by the Te Kowhai Airpark Noise Control Boundaries</u></p>	While Policy 9.2.1.6 partially addresses reverse sensitivity, a more specific objective and corresponding policy is required which recognises the importance of that issue in the context of existing infrastructure. The additional objective and policy proposed in Appendix A will ensure that the operational needs of the Airfield are not compromised by sensitive land use activities with the potential for reverse sensitivity conflict.	Accept in part	11.4
823.5	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	<p>Delete Rule 27.2.14 (d) - Temporary Events.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.</p>	Rule 27.2.14(d) does not allow direct site access from a 'national route' or 'regional arterial' road for Temporary Events as a permitted activity. The terminology is not in accord with the One Network Road Classification used by the New Zealand Transport Agency. The One Network Road Classification for Limmer Road (State Highway 39) is 'Arterial'. Currently, the only vehicular access into the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone is off State Highway 39, meaning that there is effectively no permitted activity status for temporary events. Submission notes that this appears to be a carry-over from the Operative District Plan Rural Zone rules.	Reject	19.3
FS1178.5	Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick,	Oppose	To be disallowed.	The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they	Accept	19.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Nicola and Kerry Thompson.			are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.		
823.6	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral /Amend	Amend the Zoning Plan in Chapter 29 – Appendix 9 - Te Kowhai Airfield precincts zoning, to read "Te Kowhai Airpark Zone" rather than "Special Activity Zone Te Kowhai Airpark" to align with the terminology in Chapter 27. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	The Zoning Plan in Appendix 9 refers to 'Special Activity Zone Te Kowhai Airpark'. In the interests of consistency, the Zoning Plan should be changed to refer to the 'Te Kowhai Airpark Zone', which better aligns with the terminology in Chapter 27.	Accept	6.3
FS1178.6	Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick,	Oppose	To be disallowed.	The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed	Reject	6.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Nicola and Kerry Thompson.			<p>requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.</p>		
823.7	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	<p>Amend Rule 16.3.3.3 – Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: PI <i>Any</i> building, structure, <i>tree</i> or <i>other</i> vegetation must not protrude through any airport obstacle limitation surface identified in Appendix 9 Te Kowhai Airpark and as shown on the planning maps. DI <i>Any</i> building, structure, <i>tree</i> or <i>other</i> vegetation that does not comply with Rule 16.3.3.3 PI. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.</p>	<p>The OLS (as notified) is necessary to ensure compliance with Civil Aviation Circular AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for Code I aerodromes operating on a VFR and an IFR (non-air transport) basis. The extent of the OLS is described in Chapter 29 – Appendix 9. Rules are also provided in the PWDP to protect the OLS from being breached by buildings, structures and vegetation. Although Rule 27.3.1 as notified correctly protects the proposed OLS from buildings, structures, trees and other vegetation, the corresponding height rules in other zones omits reference to 'trees'. It is critical that there is consistency amongst OLS provisions and that the provisions control 'trees' as well as buildings, structures and other vegetation. It is proposed that the relevant rules in each chapter are amended to align with the (correct) wording</p>	Accept in part	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				in Chapter 27, Rule 27.3.1.		
FS1178.7	Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.	Oppose	To be disallowed.	The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them. It's costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have a damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.	Accept in part	10.3
FS1253.5	Waikato Regional Airport Limited	Support	Seek that the whole part of this submission be allowed, subject to the changes set out in response to submission point 697.131.	The inclusion of trees and other vegetation in the rule makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule.	Accept	10.3
823.8	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 17.3.1.2 – Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: PI Any building, structure, <u>tree or other</u> vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surfaces as shown	The OLS (as notified) is necessary to ensure compliance with Civil Aviation Circular AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for Code I aerodromes operating on a VFR and an IFR (non-air transport) basis. The extent of the OLS is described in Chapter 29 – Appendix 9. Rules are also provided in the PWDP to	Accept in part	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			on the planning maps. DI Any building, structure, <i>tree</i> or <i>other</i> vegetation that does not comply with Rule 17.3.1.2 PI. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	protect the OLS from being breached by buildings, structures and vegetation. Although Rule 27.3.1 as notified correctly protects the proposed OLS from buildings, structures, trees and other vegetation, the corresponding height rules in other zones omits reference to 'trees'. It is critical that there is consistency amongst OLS provisions and that the provisions control 'trees' as well as buildings, structures and other vegetation. It is proposed that the relevant rules in each chapter are amended to align with the (correct) wording in Chapter 27, Rule 27.3.1.		
FS1178.8	Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.	Oppose	To be disallowed.	<i>The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them Its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.</i>	Accept in part	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1253.9	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that the part of this submission be allowed, subject to the changes set out in response to submission point 697.201.	The inclusion of trees and other vegetation in the rule makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule.	Accept in part	10.3
823.9	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	Rule 20.3.3 PI amend to read: <i>Any</i> building, structure, <i>tree</i> or <i>other</i> vegetation must not protrude through any airport obstacle limitation surface identified in Appendix 9 Te Kowhai Airpark and as shown on the planning maps. DI amend to read <i>Any</i> building, structure, <i>tree</i> or <i>other</i> vegetation that does not comply with Rule 20.3.3 PI.	The OLS (as notified) is necessary to ensure compliance with Civil Aviation Circular AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for Code I aerodromes operating on a VFR and an IFR (non-air transport) basis. The extent of the OLS is described in Chapter 29 – Appendix 9. Rules are also provided in the PWDP to protect the OLS from being breached by buildings, structures and vegetation. Although Rule 27.3.1 as notified correctly protects the proposed OLS from buildings, structures, trees and other vegetation, the corresponding height rules in other zones omits reference to 'trees'. It is critical that there is consistency amongst OLS provisions and that the provisions control 'trees' as well as buildings, structures and other vegetation. It is proposed that the relevant rules in each chapter are amended to align with the (correct) wording in Chapter 27, Rule 27.3.1.	Accept in part	10.3
FS1253.16	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that the whole part of this submission be allowed. Changes should also be made to the rule so that Section E, Designation N- Hamilton Airport is referenced, as provided for in the Residential and Business Zones.	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule.	Accept in part	10.3
823.10	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.4.3 – Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle, as follows: PI <i>Any</i> building, structure, <i>tree</i> or <i>other</i> vegetation must not protrude through any Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface <i>identified in Appendix 9 Te Kowhai Airpark</i> and as shown on the planning maps. NCI <i>Any</i> building, structure, <i>tree</i> or <i>other</i> vegetation that does not comply with Rule 22.3.4.3 PI AND Amend the Proposed	The OLS (as notified) is necessary to ensure compliance with Civil Aviation Circular AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for Code I aerodromes operating on a VFR and an IFR (non-air transport) basis. The extent of the OLS is described in Chapter 29 – Appendix 9. Rules are also provided in the PWDP to protect the OLS from being breached by buildings, structures and vegetation. Although Rule 27.3.1 as notified correctly protects the proposed OLS from buildings, structures, trees and other vegetation, the	Accept in part	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	corresponding height rules in other zones omits reference to 'trees'. It is critical that there is consistency amongst OLS provisions and that the provisions control 'trees' as well as buildings, structures and other vegetation. It is proposed that the relevant rules in each chapter are amended to align with the (correct) wording in Chapter 27, Rule 27.3.1.		
FS1178.10	Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.	Oppose	To be disallowed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them •Its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. •Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. •We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. •Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. •NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. •They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. •We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture. 	Accept in part	10.3
FS1253.20	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that this submission be allowed, subject to the following changes: PI Any building, structure, tree or other vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule. The wording proposed seeks to ensure consistency between the zones.	Accept in part	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			surface as identified on the planning maps and in Appendix 9- Te Kowhai Airfield Park and defined in Section E, Designation N- Waikato Regional Hamilton Airport.			
FS1302.18	Mercer Airport	Support	Mercer Airport supports submission point 823.10 and seeks that the submission point is allowed.	It is important to make specific reference to trees to ensure they do not protrude through any Airport OLS and affect the operation and safety of airport activities.	Accept in part	10.3
823.11	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.4.2 – Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: P1 <u>Any</u> building, structure, <u>tree</u> or <u>other</u> vegetation must that does not protrude through any airport obstacle limitation surface <u>identified in Appendix 9 Te Kowhai Airpark</u> and as shown on the planning maps. NE DI <u>Any</u> building, structure, <u>tree</u> or <u>other</u> vegetation that does not comply with Rule 23.3.4.2 P1. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	The OLS (as notified) is necessary to ensure compliance with Civil Aviation Circular AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for Code I aerodromes operating on a VFR and an IFR (non-air transport) basis. The extent of the OLS is described in Chapter 29 – Appendix 9. Rules are also provided in the PWDP to protect the OLS from being breached by buildings, structures and vegetation. Although Rule 27.3.1 as notified correctly protects the proposed OLS from buildings, structures, trees and other vegetation, the corresponding height rules in other zones omits reference to 'trees'. It is critical that there is consistency amongst OLS provisions and that the provisions control 'trees' as well as buildings, structures and other vegetation. It is proposed that the relevant rules in each chapter are amended to align with the (correct) wording in Chapter 27, Rule 27.3.1.	Accept in part	10.3
FS1178.11	Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.	Oppose	To be disallowed.	The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them Its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that	Accept in part	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.		
FS1253.26	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that the submission be allowed, subject to the following changes: P1 Any building, structure, tree or other vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surface as identified on the planning maps and in Appendix 9- Te Kowhai Airfield Park and in Section E, Designation N-Hamilton Airport.	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule. The wording proposed seeks to ensure consistency between the zones.	Accept in part	10.3
823.12	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 24.3.3.2 –Height - Buildings, structures or vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: P1 <i>Any</i> building, structure, <i>tree</i> or <i>other</i> vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surface as identified in Appendix 9 - Te Kowhai Airpark and as shown on the planning maps. D1 <i>Any</i> building, structure, <i>tree</i> or <i>other</i> vegetation that does not comply with Rule 24.3.3.2 P1. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	The OLS (as notified) is necessary to ensure compliance with Civil Aviation Circular AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for Code I aerodromes operating on a VFR and an IFR (non-air transport) basis. The extent of the OLS is described in Chapter 29 – Appendix 9. Rules are also provided in the PWDP to protect the OLS from being breached by buildings, structures and vegetation. Although Rule 27.3.1 as notified correctly protects the proposed OLS from buildings, structures, trees and other vegetation, the corresponding height rules in other zones omits reference to 'trees'. It is critical that there is consistency amongst OLS provisions and that the provisions control 'trees' as well as buildings, structures and other vegetation. It is proposed that the relevant rules in each	Accept in part	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				chapter are amended to align with the (correct) wording in Chapter 27, Rule 27.3.1.		
FS1178.12	Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.	Oppose	To be disallowed.	The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them. Its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.	Accept in part	10.3
FS1253.37	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that the whole part of this submission be allowed, subject to the changes set out in response to submission point 697.979.	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule.	Accept in part	10.3
FS1335.11	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose		Under the Operative District Plan (Rule 25.49c) only the height of buildings and structures is controlled in the OSL, not vegetation or trees. The property legally described as Lot 2 DP 456538 (CFR 590290) contains a large number of trees that will breach the proposed OSL and will benefit from existing	Reject	10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>use rights pursuant to s10 of the RMA. While consultation between the submitter and the NZTE is ongoing, there is not yet and understanding or agreement as to how the existing tree infringements will be managed both now and in the future.</i>		
823.13	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 25.3.1.2 – Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, as follows: PI <i>Any</i> building, structure, <i>tree</i> or <i>other</i> vegetation must not protrude through any Airport Obstacle Limitation Surfaces as identified in Appendix 9 – Te Kowhai Airfield and defined in Section E, Designation N - Waikato Regional Airport. NC DI <i>Any</i> building, structure, <i>tree</i> or <i>other</i> vegetation that does not comply with Rule 25.3.1.2 PI. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	The OLS (as notified) is necessary to ensure compliance with Civil Aviation Circular AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for Code I aerodromes operating on a VFR and an IFR (non-air transport) basis. The extent of the OLS is described in Chapter 29 – Appendix 9. Rules are also provided in the PVDP to protect the OLS from being breached by buildings, structures and vegetation. Although Rule 27.3.1 as notified correctly protects the proposed OLS from buildings, structures, trees and other vegetation, the corresponding height rules in other zones omits reference to 'trees'. It is critical that there is consistency amongst OLS provisions and that the provisions control 'trees' as well as buildings, structures and other vegetation. It is proposed that the relevant rules in each chapter are amended to align with the (correct) wording in Chapter 27, Rule 27.3.1.	Accept in part	10.3
<i>FS1178.13</i>	<i>Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>To be disallowed.</i>	<i>The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them. Its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>10.3</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.</i>		
FS1253.40	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	<i>Seek that this submission be allowed, subject to the following changes: P1- Any building, structure, tree or other vegetation must not protrude through the airport obstacle limitation surface as identified on the planning maps and in Appendix 9- Te Kowhai Airfield park and in Section E, Designation N-Hamilton Airport.</i>	<i>The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule. The wording proposed seeks to ensure consistency between the zones.</i>	Accept in part	10.3
823.14	NZTE Operations Limited	Not Stated	Delete Rule 27.2.7- Noise- Taxiways. AND Add a new Rule 27.2.7- Noise- Aircraft Operations as follows: 27.2.7 Noise- Aircraft Operations Noise from aircraft operations in ALL PRECINCTS, including aircraft movements on taxiways, shall not exceed 65dB Ldn outside the Air Noise Boundary and 55dB Ldn outside the Outer Control Boundary as shown in the Planning Maps. These limits do not apply inside the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone. For the purpose of this control aircraft noise shall be assessed in accordance with NZS6805:1992 "Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning" and logarithmically averaged over a three month period. For the purposes of this Rule aircraft operations shall include aircraft taking-of, landing, taxiing and flying	This change is a consequential amendment of introducing new Te Kowhai Airpark Airport Noise Control Boundaries. Taxiing noise is not currently anticipated in the notified OCNB but is provided for through the Te Kowhai Buffer Zone and specific rules in Chapter 27 Rule 27.2.7. Taxiing noise is included in the proposed ANCB therefore Rule 27.2.7 needs to be deleted and replaced with wording to reflect this.	Accept in part	13.1.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>on circuit flight paths. The following operations are excluded from the calculation of noise for compliance with noise limits: Aircraft engine testing and maintenance Aircraft landing or taking off in an emergency Emergency flights required to rescue persons from life threatening situations or to transport patients, human vital organs or medical personnel in a medical emergency Flights required to meet the needs to a national or civil defence emergency declared under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 Aircraft using the airfield due to unforeseen circumstances as an essential alternative to landing at a scheduled airport elsewhere Aircraft undertaking firefighting duties Air Shows (for one air shows per year) Aircraft movements shall be recorded monthly and once the total movements in the busiest three month period reaches 4,500, noise contours for the purpose of assessing compliance with Rule 27.2.7 shall be calculated once every three years. When the calculated noise level is within 1 decibel of the limit, noise contours for the purpose of assessing compliance with Rule 27.2.7 shall be calculated annually and verified with infield monitoring once every three years.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.</p>			
FSI 178.14	Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis	Oppose	To be disallowed.	The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them Its costly to move the runway	Accept in part	13.1.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson			to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.		
823.15	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	<p>Insert new Rule 16.3.12 as follows:</p> <p><u>16.3.12 Noise Sensitive Activities</u></p> <p><u>PI – Construction, addition, or alteration to a building containing a Noise Sensitive Activity located between the Waikato Regional Airport or Te Kowhai Air Noise Boundary and the Outer Control Boundary must comply with Appendix I – Acoustic Insulation.</u></p> <p><u>RDI(a) Construction of, or addition, or alteration to a building that does not comply with a condition in Rule 16.3.12 PI.</u></p> <p><u>(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the</u></p>	This change is a consequential amendment of introducing new Te Kowhai Airpark Airport Noise Control Boundaries. Chapter 16 Rule 16.3 does not provide for ANCB's as proposed by this submission. A new rule (16.3.12) is required to address ANB requirements.	Accept in part	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>following matters:</p> <p>(i) internal design sound levels;</p> <p>(ii) on-site amenity values; and</p> <p>(iv) Potential for reverse sensitivity effects.</p>			
FS1253.6	Waikato Regional Airport Limited	Support	Seek that the whole part of this submission be allowed subject to the following changes: P1- Construction, addition, or alteration to a building containing a Noise Sensitive Activity located between within the Waikato Regional Hamilton Airport or Te Kowhai Air Noise SEL95 Boundary and the Outer Control Boundary must comply with Appendix 1- Acoustic Insulation.	The inclusion of this rule will provide certainty that noise sensitive activities within the Residential Zone are appropriately mitigated against potential noise effects from the Hamilton Airport. The suggested changes we have proposed ensure that the wording aligns with that proposed for other zones.	Accept in part	12.3
823.16	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.7.3– Building – Te Kowhai Noise Buffer. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	This change is a consequential amendment of introducing new Te Kowhai Airpark Airport Noise Control Boundaries. The Te Kowhai Noise Buffer is no longer required as the noise from Taxiing aircraft is proposed to be controlled by the new proposed Te Kowhai ANCB's, therefore Rule 22.3.7.3 can be deleted.	Accept	12.3
FS1178.16	Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.	Oppose	To be disallowed.	The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until	Reject	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.</i>		
823.17	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.5 Non-Complying Activities to include: <u>NC5 (a) Noise Sensitive Activities within the Te Kowhai Air Noise Boundary (Ldn 65), except this restriction does not apply to Noise Sensitive Activities associated with Te Kowhai Airpark Zone.</u> <u>NC56 Any other activity that is not listed as Prohibited, Permitted, Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary.</u>	This change is a consequential amendment of introducing new Te Kowhai Airpark Airport Noise Control Boundaries. Amendment is required to Rule 22.1.5 to clarify that noise sensitive activities within the ANB (inner control boundary) are a Non-Complying Activity unless the dwelling comprises part of Te Kowhai Airpark, in which case alternative site-specific noise management methods will be in place.	Accept	11.4
FS1178.17	<i>Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.</i>	Oppose	<i>To be disallowed.</i>	<i>The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until</i>	Reject	11.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.</i>		
823.18	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.4 PI (i) Building - Noise Sensitive Activities, as follows: (i) The Waikato Regional Airport and Te Kowhai Airpark Zone Air noise boundary and Airport Noise Outer Control boundary; AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	This change is a consequential amendment of introducing new Te Kowhai Airpark Airport Noise Control Boundaries. Rule 22.3.7.4 refers to the need for compliance with Appendix 1 (Acoustic Insulation) within 'The Airport Outer Control Boundary' but does not specify which airport is being referred to.	Accept in part	12.3
FS1178.18	<i>Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.</i>	Oppose	<i>To be disallowed.</i>	<i>The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them Its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this</i>	Accept in part	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.		
FS1523.21	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that the submission be allowed, subject to the following changes: The Waikato Regional Airport Hamilton Airport and....	The additional wording makes it clearer to the reader what applies to this rule. Reference to Waikato Regional Airport needs to be amended to be Hamilton Airport as per the original submission from Waikato Regional Airport Ltd.	Accept in part	12.3
823.19	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	Add an additional activity to Rule 24.1.3- Non-Complying Activities as follows: NC2 Noise Sensitive Activities within Te Kowhai Airpark Air Noise Boundary (Ldn 65), except this restriction does not apply to Noise Sensitive Activities within Te Kowhai Airpark. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	This change is a consequential amendment of introducing new Te Kowhai Airpark Airport Noise Control Boundaries. Rule 24.1.3 does not provide for the proposed ANCB as notified. Amendment is required to Rule 24.1.3 to clarify that noise sensitive activities within the ANB (inner control boundary) are a Non-Complying Activity unless the dwelling comprises part of Te Kowhai Airpark, in which case alternative site-specific noise management methods will be in place.	Accept	11.4
FS1178.19	Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.	Oppose	To be disallowed.	The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until	Reject	11.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.</i>		
823.20	NZTE Operations Ltd	Neutral / Amend	(Village Zone) Amend Rule 24.3.7 to read: Rule 24.3.7 Airport Noise Outer Control Boundary Noise Sensitive Activities PI Construction, addition to or alteration of a dwelling building containing a Noise Sensitive Activity located between the Te Kowhai Airpark Air Noise Boundary and the Outer Control Boundary must comply with Appendix I - Acoustic Insulation, Section 3 RDI (a) Construction, addition to or alteration to a dwelling building that does not comply with a condition in Rule 27.3.7 PI. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) On-site amenity values; (ii) Noise levels received at the notional boundary of the building dwelling ; (iii) Timing and duration of noise received at the notional boundary of the dwelling building ; and (iv) Potential for reverse sensitivity effects.	This change is a consequential amendment of introducing new Te Kowhai Airpark Airport Noise Control Boundaries. Rule 24.3.7 does not provide for the proposed ANCBs in Figure 3 of the Marshall Day Report, therefore it is required to be amended.	Accept in part	12.3
FS1178.20	Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis	Oppose	To be disallowed.	The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them Its costly to move the runway	Accept in part	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.			to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.		
FS1253.38	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that the whole part of this submission be allowed subject to the following changes: 24.3.7 Building- Airport Noise Outer Control Boundary Noise Sensitive Activities PI Construction, addition to or alteration of a building containing a Noise Sensitive Activity located between within the Hamilton Airport or Te Kowhai Airpark Air Noise SEL95 Boundary and the Outer Control Boundary must achieve the internal design sound levels must comply with Appendix 1- Acoustic Insulation, Section 3.	The inclusion of this rule will provide certainty that noise sensitive activities within the Residential Zone are appropriately mitigated against potential noise effects from the Hamilton Airport. The suggested changes we have proposed ensure that the wording aligns with that proposed for other zones.	Accept in part	12.3
FS1335.10	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose		The property legally described as Lot 2 DP 456538 (CFR 590290) is affected by the proposed Outer Control Boundary. While the submitter supports measures to set acoustic limits	Accept in part	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>within which the aerodrome will operate there remains uncertainty on the nature, scale and operation of the Airpark and how adverse effects on neighbouring properties can be appropriately managed. Consultation with NZTE is on-going.</i>		
823.21	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	Add a new Figure 3 to Appendix I (being Figure 4 of the Marshall Day Report attached to the original submission as Appendix B). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	This change is consequential amendments of introducing new Te Kowhai Airpark Airport Noise Control boundaries. In order to appropriately determine the level of acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities between the 55 and 65 dB Ldn OCB a new figure 3 should be included in Appendix I showing 2 decibel contours within the OCB.	Accept in part	12.3
FS1178.21	<i>Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.</i>	Oppose	<i>To be disallowed.</i>	<i>The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think</i>	Accept in part	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>we should have to. All for their business venture.</i>		
823.22	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	Retain the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone and the relevant rules that relate to the functioning of the zone (subject to amendments sought in the submission). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Recognises existing Airfield infrastructure and enables the establishment of a complementary residential 'airpark.' The Airfield operates separately as an existing piece of infrastructure and, while being part of Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, needs to be protected through the provision of operation, growth and reverse sensitivity effects are adequately managed.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1178.22	<i>Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.</i>	Oppose	<i>To be disallowed.</i>	<i>The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them. Its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.</i>	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
823.23	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	Retain the objectives and policies in Section 9.2: Te Kowhai Airpark as notified.	The objectives and policies for Te Kowhai Airpark Zone give direction to the rules and other methods that are necessary to manage development of the Airfield and the airpark.	Accept in part	4.3
FSI 178.23	<i>Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.</i>	Oppose	<i>To be disallowed.</i>	<i>The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.</i>	Accept in part	4.3
823.24	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	Amend Appendix 1- Acoustic Insulation Section 3 Te Kowhai Airpark to introduce the Te Kowhai Airpark Noise Control Boundaries (ANCB) as recommended in the Marshall Day Report (attached to the original submission as Appendix B). AND	This change is a consequential amendment of introducing new Te Kowhai Airpark Airport Noise Control Boundaries. The old OCNB has been rolled over from the Operative District Plan and does not adequately control aircraft noise, future proof the existing Airfield and protect against reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.			
FS1178.24	<i>Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.</i>	Oppose	<i>To be disallowed.</i>	<i>The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.</i>	Accept	12.3
823.25	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	Amend Appendix 1- Acoustic Insulation Section 3 Te Kowhai Airpark- Figure 2 "Te Kowhai Airpark, Ldn Contours for Sound Insulation Design" to be replaced by Figure 3 of the Marshall Day Report (attached to the original submission as Appendix B). AND	This change is a consequential amendment of introducing new Te Kowhai Airpark Airport Noise Control Boundaries. The rule refers to the old Te Kowhai Outer Control Noise Boundary (OCNB) which is to be replaced and Te Kowhai Airpark Noise Buffer which is to be deleted. The Proposed ANCB's includes taxiing noise from aircraft which negates the need for the	Accept in part	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>Amend Appendix 1- Acoustic Insulation Section 3 Te Kowhai Airpark to read as follows:</p> <p>3. Te Kowhai Airpark</p> <p>The Te Kowhai Airpark Outer Noise Control Boundaryies identify areas that experience high noise levels from aircraft landing and taking off from the Te Kowhai Airpark. The Te Kowhai Airpark Noise Buffer identifies land within the Rural Zone around the Te Kowhai Airfield that experiences high noise levels from aircrafts using the taxiways. <u>Noise Sensitive Activities Dwellings</u> within the Te Kowhai Airpark Outer Noise Control <u>Boundaryies</u> that are required to be acoustically insulated <u>must</u> to achieve the internal noise standards specified in sections 3.1 and 3.2 below.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Appendix 1- Acoustic Insulation Rule 3.1 to read as follows:</p> <p>3.1 Conditions for Permitted Activities Noise Sensitive Activities inside the Te Kowhai Airpark Outer Control Noise <u>Boundaryies</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>(3) Where a building is partly or wholly contained within the Te Kowhai Airpark Outer Noise Control Noise <u>Boundaryies</u>, a mechanical ventilation system or systems that will allow windows to be closed if necessary to achieve the required internal design sound level for habitable rooms is required to be installed. The mechanical systems or systems are to be designed,</p>	Te Kowhai Airpark Noise Buffer.		

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			installed and operating so that a habitable space (with windows and doors closed) is ventilated with fresh air in accordance with the New Zealand Building Code, Section G4- Ventilation. AND Delete Rule 3.2- Conditions for Permitted Activities the Te Kowhai Airpark Noise Buffer in Appendix I.			
FS1178.25	<i>Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.</i>	Oppose	<i>To be disallowed.</i>	<i>The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them. It's costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfield's northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have a damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.</i>	Accept in part	12.3
823.26	NZTE Operations	Neutral /	Amend the Planning Maps to show the	This change is a consequential amendment of introducing	Accept in part	11.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Limited	Amend	Proposed ANCB (as shown in Figure 3 of the Marshall Day Report attached to the original submission as Appendix B). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	new Te Kowhai Airpark Airport Noise Control Boundaries. As notified, the planning maps show the OCB from the Operative District Plan.		
FS1178.26	<i>Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.</i>	Oppose	<i>To be disallowed.</i>	<i>The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them. It's costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have a damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.</i>	Accept in part	11.4
823.27	NZTE Operations Limited	Neutral / Amend	Amend the title of Rule 27.2.6- Noise- Other than Taxiways as follows: 27.2.6- Noise- Other than Aircraft Operations than	This change is a consequential amendment of introducing new Te Kowhai Airpark Airport Noise Control Boundaries. Rule 27.2.6 as notified does not anticipate the proposed ANCB's, so needs to be amended	Accept	13.2.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Taxiways. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	accordingly.		
FS1178.27	<i>Kristine Stead on behalf of Marshall & Kristine Stead, Lloyd Davis, Kylie Davis Strongwick, Jason Strongwick, Nicola and Kerry Thompson.</i>	Oppose	<i>To be disallowed.</i>	<i>The proposed changes are severely impinging our rights to facilitate our development to its full potential whilst we have placed no restrictions on them. Its costly to move the runway to the south and bring noise control onto their property they are there for using our properties to achieve their proposed requirements when their property is able to contain the noise boundaries. Collectively we own approximately 750m along the airfields northern boundary. We are directly next to the actual airstrip in Te Kowhai where the new owners are proposing to expand their operations to include Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and all that accompanying changes that come with it should it go ahead. Our submission considerations last October were based on the report from the acoustic specialist Hegley that was in the original proposed plan of NZTE with consultation based and discussed on their report. NZTE presented another proposal from Marshall Day acoustics which was dated 8/10/18 but not presented until mid January 2019, which have damning effect over our property. They have entered this information by means of submitting on their plans which is where we are opposing this submission. We are especially concerned with the implications of this over our and neighbouring properties which would require building on land not owned by them to make us to have to apply for Resource consents to build and do not think we should have to. All for their business venture.</i>	Reject	13.2.3
830.14	Linda Silvester	Neutral / Amend	Add new provisions to Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone to include energy efficiency policies and rules (see submission for wording)	The Proposed District Plan only makes passing reference to climate change and says nothing about coal, gas and oil's effect on global warming. It is disappointing that Stage 2 of the Proposed District Plan is to be published in 2019 and that it is not possible to consider it in context with this part of the Plan. Section 1.9.5 reflects the	Reject	14.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Resource Management Act requirements around climate change and renewable energy.		
FS1276.179	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Reasons for WED's support are that climate change issues can't be separated from the rest of the plan. Section 5.2.9 of the RMA states "Development should be designed and located to avoid or mitigate the predicted effects of global climate change on natural hazards, especially increased flooding, erosion, fire, and storms. Where there is incomplete information, a precautionary approach should be taken." Section 5.3.8 of the RMA states "Scientific opinion differs about the possible impacts of global impacts of global climate change, but majority opinion predicts that the effects could include a greater frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. Increased storms, floods and droughts may occur. The extent of these is uncertain and a precautionary approach is taken, because of the high potential for harm."	Reject	14.3
FS1339.183	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	NZTE supports the idea of energy efficient policies and rules but does not support the inclusion of them in Chapter 27 as energy efficiency is addressed in the Building Act.	Accept	14.3
832.3	Hounsell Holdings Limited	Oppose	Amend the Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface for the Te Kowhai Airpark reduce the area to that shown on the Operative Waikato District Plan; AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	The reasoning for the expansion is not justified. The expansion of the Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface does not consider or deal with the potential impact on residential development.	Accept in part	9.4
FS1339.203	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The proposed OLS notified in the PWDP is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small	Accept in part	9.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>aircraft. This will ensure safer operations for departing/arriving aircraft during inclement weather conditions by allowing the use of readily available GPS based navigational technology. This will improve the safety and efficiency of the Aerodrome for aircraft operation under IFR rules. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS as notified in the pWDP through its design and implementation ensures an enhanced level of flight safety from the existing OLS in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5700Kg. The notified OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. The proposed OLS is necessary to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome. It will provide pilots with more flexibility to use and utilise advancements in navigational GPS based IFR technologies which were once cost prohibitive for smaller general aviation aircraft. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code IA+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport.</p>		
868.1	Huib Volker	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 - Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Submitter is a user of the Airfield as an aircraft operator and would like to ensure it survives. Submitter is considering buying into an airpark development planned for this location.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.64	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
868.2	Huib Volker	Support	Retain Chapter 27 - Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Submitter is a user of the Te Kowhai Airpark as an aircraft operator and would like to ensure it survives. Submitter is considering buying into an airpark	Accept in part	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				development planned for this location.		
FS1339.161	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
878.1	David Wilson	Support	Retain Chapter 9.2 Te Kowhai Airpark, as notified.	Te Kowhai aerodrome is an important hub for the aviation community of New Zealand. It's continued existence contributes to aviation safety in the Waikato region with fuel availability and a good alternate option to Hamilton. To enable an airpark would safeguard this unique facility and further enhance the considerable infrastructure that already exists at the aerodrome. This should be viewed as a huge opportunity for the Waikato region to take advantage of a unique and limited site where this type of development could be possible.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1339.65	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that the submission be allowed.	NZTE supports these submission points to the extent that they are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	4.3
878.2	David Wilson	Support	Retain Chapter 27 Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, as notified.	Te Kowhai aerodrome is an important hub for the aviation community of New Zealand. It's continued existence contributes to aviation safety in the Waikato region with fuel availability and a good alternate option to Hamilton. To enable an airpark would safeguard this unique facility and further enhance the considerable infrastructure that already exists at the aerodrome. This should be viewed as a huge opportunity for the Waikato region to take advantage of a unique and limited site where this type of development could be possible.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1339.162	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that these submissions be allowed.	NZTE supports these submissions to the extent that they are consistent with NZTE's submission and further submission.	Accept in part	7.3
923.104	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral / Amend	Add a new rule section setting requirements for mechanical ventilation as follows: <u>X. Mechanical ventilation I.</u> <u>Buildings that are required to have acoustic</u>	New sensitive land-uses should preferably be located away from areas of high noise exposure. However, in areas where there is not a practicable alternative, requirements to provide sound insulation provides a minimum 'back-stop' for managing adverse health effects.	Accept	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>insulation must be designed, constructed and maintained with a mechanical ventilation system so that windows can be kept closed. The mechanical ventilation system must achieve the following requirements:</u></p> <p><u>(i) For habitable rooms for a residential activity:</u></p> <p><u>A. Provide mechanical ventilation to satisfy clause G4 of the New Zealand Building Code;</u></p> <p><u>B. Be adjustable by the occupant to control the ventilation rate in increments up to a high air flow setting that provides at least 6 air changes per hour;</u></p> <p><u>C. Provide relief for equivalent volumes of spill air;</u></p> <p><u>D. Provide cooling and heating that is controllable by the occupant and can maintain the inside temperature between 18 degree Celsius and 25 degree Celsius;</u></p> <p><u>E. Generate less than 35 dB LAeq(30s) when measured 1m away from any grille or diffuser.</u></p> <p><u>(ii) For other spaces, a specification as determined by a suitably qualified and experienced person.</u></p> <p><u>2. A commissioning report must be submitted to the Council prior to occupation of the building demonstrating compliance with all of the mechanical ventilation system performance requirements in X.1.</u></p>	<p>In all cases where sound insulation is required under Appendix I it would be undermined if windows have to be opened. Whilst Appendix I does require mechanical ventilation in some instances, the specified performance would not be sufficient to provide thermal comfort. Therefore, occupants would either have to suffer excess noise or excess/insufficient temperature. As occupants would then be forced to open windows, this situation does not address the adverse noise effect. A ventilation system should be required that provides thermal comfort with windows closed.</p>		
923.108	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral / Amend	Delete Appendix 1- Acoustic Insulation 3.1. (3), 3.1.4 and 3.1.5	In all cases where sound insulation is required under Appendix I it would be undermined if windows have to	Accept in part	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Add to Appendix 1- Acoustic Insulation a new 3.1 (3) as follows: <u>A mechanical ventilation must be installed in accordance with X.</u>	be opened. Whilst Appendix 1 does require mechanical ventilation in some instances, the specified performance would not be sufficient to provide thermal comfort. Therefore, occupants would either have to suffer excess noise or excess/insufficient temperature. As occupants would then be forced to open windows, this situation does not address the adverse noise effect. A ventilation system should be required that provides thermal comfort with windows closed.		
923.109	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral / Amend	Delete Appendix 1- Acoustic Insulation 3.2 (3), 3.2 (4) and 3.2 (5) AND Add to Appendix 1- Acoustic Insulation a new 3.2 (3) as follows: <u>A mechanical ventilation must be installed in accordance with X.</u>	In all cases where sound insulation is required under Appendix 1 it would be undermined if windows have to be opened. Whilst Appendix 1 does require mechanical ventilation in some instances, the specified performance would not be sufficient to provide thermal comfort. Therefore, occupants would either have to suffer excess noise or excess/insufficient temperature. As occupants would then be forced to open windows, this situation does not address the adverse noise effect. A ventilation system should be required that provides thermal comfort with windows closed.	Reject	12.3
923.167	Waikato District Health Board	Oppose	Delete Rule 27.2.7 – Noise - Taxiways	The proposed noise limits are generally in accordance with guideline values and use current measurement and assessment standards, acoustical metrics, numerical values, time-frames and assessment location. Inclusion of rules for specific activity are supported, however, the following issues have been identified: - Incorrect terminology has been used in conflict with the standards specified, - No provision has been made for sound sources outside the scope of NZS 6802, - Measurement and assessment standards need to be specified, - There is an inconsistent approach for sound received	Accept in part	13.1.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>in another zone,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The separation of noise limit into Rules 27.2.6 and 27.2.7 adds unnecessary complexity. - The format of the rules is inconsistent with other chapters. 		
FS1339.186	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed but that Rule 27.2.7 is substituted in accordance with point 823.14.	NZTE has proposed the deletion of Rule 27.2.7 in point 823.14 of its submission but has proposed a new Rule 27.2.7 Noise - Aircraft Operations that is designed in accordance with NZS6805:1992 and the Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day.	Accept in part	13.1.3
923.168	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral / Amend	<p>Amend Rule 27.2.6 P1, P2, P3 and D1 Noise - Other than Taxiways, as follows: P1 (a) Noise from any activity in PRECINCT B must not exceed the following noise limits when measured at the notional boundary of a site within the Rural Zone: (i) 55dB (LAeq), 7am to 10pm every day; and (ii) 40dB (LAeq) and 70dB (LAFmax), 10pm to 7am the following day. (a)Sound from emergency sirens. (b)Sound from aircraft movements on taxiways received at 98A and 98B Limmer Road. P2 (a)Noise from any activity in PRECINCTS C OR D must not exceed the following noise limits when measured at the notional boundary of any site in the Rural Zone outside of the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone: (i) 50dB (LAeq), 7am to 7pm every day; and (ii) 45dB (LAeq), 7pm to 10pm every day; and (iii) 40dB (LAeq), and 65dB (LAFmax) all other times. Sound measured in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 and assessed in accordance with NZS 6802:2008 must not exceed: (a)For sound from activity in Precinct B, excluding</p>	<p>The proposed noise limits are generally in accordance with guideline values and use current measurement and assessment standards, acoustical metrics, numerical values, time-frames and assessment location. Inclusion of rules for specific activity are supported, however, the following issues have been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incorrect terminology has been used in conflict with the standards specified, - No provision has been made for sound sources outside the scope of NZS 6802, - Measurement and assessment standards need to be specified, - There is an inconsistent approach for sound received in another zone, - The separation of noise limit into Rules 27.2.6 and 27.2.7 adds unnecessary complexity, - The format of the rules is inconsistent with other chapters. 	Accept in part	13.2.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>aircraft movements on taxiways, the following noise limits at any point within a notional boundary on any site outside the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone: (i) 55 dB LAeq(15min), 7am to 10pm; (ii) 40 dB LAeq(15min), 10pm to 7am the following day; (iii) 70dBA LAFmax, 10pm to 7am the following day (b)For sound from activity in Precincts C or D, excluding aircraft movements on taxiways, the permitted activity noise limits for the zone of any site where sound is received outside the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone. (c)For sound from aircraft movements on taxiways, the following noise limits at any point within notional boundaries on 202, 212 and 214 Limmer Road: (i) 50 dB LAeq(15min), 7am to 10pm; (ii) 40 dB LAeq(15min), 10pm to 7am the following day; (iii) 65 dB LAFmax, 10pm to 7am the following day; (d)For sound from aircraft movements on taxiways, received at any other sites outside the Te Kowhai Airpark Zone, the permitted activity noise limits for the zone of any site where sound is received. P3 (a)In ALL PRECINCTS, Rules P1 and P2 do not apply to: (i) Noise from aircraft movement on the taxiways; or (ii) Construction noise, or (iii) Noise from emergency sirens. D1 (a)Sound that is outside the scope of NZS 6802:2008 or a permitted activity standard; and (b)Sound Any activity that does not comply with Rule 27.2.6 P1 or P2.</p>			
FS1339.185	NZTE Operations Limited	Support	NZTE seeks that this submission be allowed in part.	NZTE supports this submission in part insofar as the noise limits should be written in accordance with NZS 6802:2008 guidelines and to the extent that the rules are consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further	Accept in part	13.2.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				submission.		
941.2	Te Kowhai Community Group	Neutral / Amend	No specific decision sought, but submitter raises concerns about the extension of the Te Kowhai Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface and the need "to give effect to the principles of the Resource Management Act with the Proposed District Plan (avoid, remedy, mitigate)."	The Te Kowhai Community Group has a number of concerns with the proposed extension to the Obstacle Limitation Surface: - Lack of consultation by Waikato District Council within the wider district prior to notification. - Lack of clarity about future activities at the airpark. - No proposed limitations concerning noise abatement, hours of flying, night flying, duration and frequency of flights and scope and scale of future activities. - Lack of enforcement capability within the Obstacle Limitation Surface rules. - Lack of clarity about the safety of residential properties under the flight path footprint.	Reject	9.4
FS1339.210	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	<i>The position of the Te Kowhai Community Group is at odds with one of the stated objectives of the Te Kowhai Community Plan 2011-2021 which states that "the Te Kowhai airport needs to be supported and encouraged to grow". The proposed OLS is a necessary part of that growth. An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of obstacles. The proposed OLS notified in the pWDP is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. This will ensure safer operations for departing/arriving aircraft during inclement weather conditions by allowing the use of readily available GPS based navigational technology. This will improve the safety and efficiency of the Aerodrome for aircraft operation under IFR rules. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS as notified in the pWDP through its design and implementation ensures an enhanced level of flight safety from the existing OLS in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5700Kg. The notified OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be</i>	Accept	9.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. The proposed OLS is necessary to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome. It will provide pilots with more flexibility to use and utilise advancements in navigational GPS based IFR technologies which were once cost prohibitive for smaller general aviation aircraft. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code 1A+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport. The Air Noise Control Boundaries designed by Marshall Day Acoustics and included in the submission of NZTE would adequately manage airpark noise effects. Total aircraft noise would be limited at the Air Noise Control Boundaries which effectively limits aircraft movements.		
FS1383.1	Te Kowhai Community Group	Support	Support. Time of Operation: We would like hours of operations to be from dawn to dusk. Dawn and dusk vary throughout the year. This would allow aircraft to leave early in Summer and return later. Yet put controls in to restrict night flights.	As a time means they can fly within these times, which could be in half light, but not full darkness. The community are not comfortable with aircraft noise during the hours of darkness.	Reject	9.4
FS1383.2	Te Kowhai Community Group	Support	Support. Airpark Housing Development: We would like to support this, as our community grows.	Allows community growth and development.	Reject	9.4
943.58	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission opposes Rule 24.3.3.2 PI - Building, structures or vegetation within an Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface due to a number of effects that the Obstacle Limitation Surface (with respect to the Te Kowhai Airfield) will have on landowners including; Requirements for tree topping/removal. No clarity where costs lie	The submission raises many questions including: - What is the demand for IFR capability - What are the effects of IFR - What are the potential effects of other regulations relating to IFR. - How will Te Kowhai purpose meet those commitments. - There is no clarity of the benefits, or details of other changes and effects or commitment by the Te Kowhai Airfield other than a desire to future proof the aerodrome. - The Obstacle Limitation Surface change is required by CAA	Accept in part	9.4 & 10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			to removal any infringing obstacle. Increase setbacks from existing obstacle limitation surface. Two storey dwellings precluded by up to 8m linear. Not known if other items will be prohibited/regulated other than structures. No clarity on the benefits other than future proofing. No reasoning for the 1:5 gradient.	rules to implement IFR. However given the information available and reviewed, there is no information that confirms the basis or reason why the 1:5 gradient is necessary. - What are the other regulations requiring CAA compliance to allow IFR and what is the potential effect of these regulation on adjoining property owners? - What is the degree of commitment of Te Kowhai Airfield to meet those commitments? Will, for example, Te Kowhai Airfield commit to the relocation of their existing structures to the south that infringe the proposed Obstacle Limitation Surface? - Questions arise concerning the actual level of demand for IFR capability. - What are the probable future effects of IFR. - Will IFR result in additional take off and landings and if so what is the change and effect? Will it extend operation hours that will have associated effects on adjoining and nearby landowners? - Is there an actual need for aircraft operating in poor weather or low visibility that requires IFR and therefore the OLS? - Will IFR lead to flight training and associated effects? - Generally the landowners anticipate no known or assured benefits resulting from imposition of the proposed OLS that outweigh the dis-benefits.		
FS1335.14	Greig Metcalfe	Support		Under the Operative District Plan (Rule 25.49c) only the height of buildings and structures is controlled in the OSL, not vegetation or trees. The property legally described as Lot 2 DP 456538 (CFR 590290) contains a large number of trees that will breach the proposed OSL and will benefit from existing use rights pursuant to s10 of the RMA. While consultation between the submitter and the NZTE is on-going, there is not yet an understanding or agreement as to how the existing tree infringements will be managed both now and in the future.	Accept in part	9.4 & 10.3
FS1339.101	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. The OLS is a specifically designed, invisible volume of airspace extending off the end of	Accept in part	9.4 & 10.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				each runway, off the sides of the runway and above the aerodrome. This must remain obstacle free in and around the aerodrome for the safety of aircraft operating under IFR (instrument flying rules) as the Pilot does not have visual reference to the ground initially during an approach to the runway or circling manoeuvre during inclement weather. Therefore, there must be a greater safety margin or area than that required under VFR (visual flight rules). The protrusion through the OLS of any structure, including vegetation and trees, would make it unsafe for aircraft to operate at the Aerodrome and would make the OLS non-compliant under the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Requirements (AC139-7). The inclusion of vegetation and trees in an OLS rule is an industry standard and is included in the majority of district plans in New Zealand that have an OLS. Any existing or future buildings, structures, vegetation and trees must therefore be included in the OLS rules to ensure protrusions into the OLS do not occur.		
FS1347.11	GL & DP McBride	Support		Submitter number 943 raises concerns about the OLS on directly affected landowners, including requirements for tree owners to top/remove trees (submitter 987 is also affected), costs of compliance by landowners, increased setbacks and questions around the reasoning for the proposed 1:5 gradient of the OLS.	Accept in part	9.4 & 10.3
945.29	First Gas Limited	Neutral /Amend	Add a new condition (viii) to Rule 27.2.10 PI as follows: (viii) Earthworks to a depth of greater than 200mm are to be located a minimum of 12m from the centreline of a gas transmission pipeline. AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	To address reverse sensitivity effects, the submitter seeks the inclusion of a new earthworks rule requiring a 12m setback from gas transmission pipelines where earthworks are proposed to a depth of greater than 200mm.	Accept	16.3
FS1339.191	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that part of this submission be	NZTE opposes this submission to the extent that a 12 metre setback condition is not necessary in the PWDP as First Gas	Reject	16.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<i>disallowed in part.</i>	<i>already has the benefit of two 12 wide easements in respect of their pipelines, negating the need for an assessment under Rule 27.2.10 PI and Rule 27.2.10 RDI (b). NZTE is neutral on the submission of the addition of a new rule to 27.4 related to subdivision to the extent that any relief sought is consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.</i>		
945.30	First Gas Limited	Neutral /Amend	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 27.2.10 RDI (b) - Earthworks as follows: (xii) Effects on the safe, effective and efficient operation, maintenance and upgrade of infrastructure, including access. AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The submitter seeks to include an additional matter over which Council's discretion shall be limited under RDI (b) to address potential effects of earthworks on gas transmission lines.	Accept	16.3
<i>FSI339.192</i>	<i>NZTE Operations</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>NZTE seeks that part of this submission be disallowed in part.</i>	<i>NZTE opposes this submission to the extent that a 12 metre setback condition is not necessary in the PWDP as First Gas already has the benefit of two 12 wide easements in respect of their pipelines, negating the need for an assessment under Rule 27.2.10 PI and Rule 27.2.10 RDI (b). NZTE is neutral on the submission of the addition of a new rule to 27.4 related to subdivision to the extent that any relief sought is consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>16.3</i>
945.31	First Gas Limited	Neutral /Amend	Add a new rule to Rule 27.4 Subdivision as follows: Subdivision - Site containing a gas transmission pipeline (a) Subdivision of land containing a gas transmission pipeline is a restricted discretionary activity. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) The extent to which the subdivision design avoids or mitigates conflict with the gas infrastructure and activities. (ii) The ability for	To address reverse sensitivity effects, the submitter seeks the inclusion of a new rule under the Subdivision rules within the Rural zone. The addition of a new rule would make subdivision of a site containing of a site containing a gas transmission pipeline a restricted discretionary activity.	Accept in part	21.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>maintenance and inspection of pipelines including ensuring access to the pipelines. (iii) Consent notices on titles to ensure ongoing compliance with AS2885 Pipelines-Gas and Liquid Petroleum-Parts 1 to 3. (iv) The outcome of any consultation with First Gas Limited.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>			
FS1339.193	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that part of this submission be disallowed in part.	NZTE opposes this submission to the extent that a 12 metre setback condition is not necessary in the PWDP as First Gas already has the benefit of two 12 wide easements in respect of their pipelines, negating the need for an assessment under Rule 27.2.10 PI and Rule 27.2.10 RD1 (b). NZTE is neutral on the submission of the addition of a new rule to 27.4 related to subdivision to the extent that any relief sought is consistent with the relief sought in NZTE's submission and this further submission.	Accept in part	21.3
987.1	Graham and Di McBride on behalf of Self and M & P Stock, H & B Stratford, D & R Potter, J & P Stock, KG McBride.	Oppose	Delete the Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface at Te Kowhai from the Proposed Waikato District Plan.	Lack of public engagement by Waikato District Council before it was notified. Lack of technical data to support/justify the inclusion of the Obstacle Limitation Surface. Design of the Obstacle Limitation Surface in terms of effects on the submitter's properties (213 and 220 Collie Road). Potential adverse effects of the Obstacle Limitation Surface - noise, duration, intensity and safety. Noise abatement from aircraft vis-à-vis mitigation in existing houses. No limitations on incremental growth of airfield/traffic/ancillary services.	Reject	9.4
FS1339.208	NZTE Operations Limited	Oppose	NZTE seeks that this submission be disallowed.	An OLS is required to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome. These surfaces should be free of	Accept	9.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>obstacles. The proposed OLS notified in the PWDP is to recognise and protect the existing activity at the Airfield while allowing for improvements in navigational technology for small aircraft. This will ensure safer operations for departing/arriving aircraft during inclement weather conditions by allowing the use of readily available GPS based navigational technology. This will improve the safety and efficiency of the Aerodrome for aircraft operation under IFR rules. The Aerodrome is to remain a non-certificated Aerodrome (CAA Qualifying Aerodrome) under CAA aerodrome standards and requirements. The OLS as notified in the pWDP through its design and implementation ensures an enhanced level of flight safety from the existing OLS in accordance with the CAA AC139-7 Aerodrome Standards and Requirements for aircraft at or below 5700Kg. The notified OLS also allows the Aerodrome to be available during inclement weather conditions under IFR rules during a civil emergency or by military and rescue aircraft if required. The proposed OLS is necessary to ensure the future sustainability of the Aerodrome. It will provide pilots with more flexibility to use and utilise advancements in navigational GPS based IFR technologies which were once cost prohibitive for smaller general aviation aircraft. Aerodrome Design Standards, as specified in CAA AC-139-7, restricts aircraft operations of any commercial Air Transport aircraft operating under IFR Rules and the design category for the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will be Code 1A+, being a significantly lower level of categorisation than that for Waikato Regional Airport.</p>		