

To Hearing 17 Section 42a report

Evidence lodged 15th Feb 2021

From Kit Maxwell Submitter number VFS4003

I support the following recommendations of the section 42a report as follows;

1. Sec 42a paragraph 346-355 page 90 –adopt OLS of current operative plan.
2. Sec 42a para; Set operating hours as recommended by Paragraph 784 section 14.
3. Sec 42a paragraph 156-163. -Flight training schools and circuit training schools, and para 758,785,792 total calendar year movements
4. Sec 42a paragraph 317-319 page 86; Remove Lim encumbrance for properties located outside 12 metre OLS height zone.

Reasons for our support and evidence;

Item 1; OLS;

OLS of current operative plan to remain as;

- a. Few if any ILS equipped planes are in NZTE.
- b. No commercial passenger/commercial flights, and no night flights are proposed by NZTE. (Their written advice)
- c. The OLS impacts significantly on our surrounding properties

Reasons for 2 and 3.

- a. Daily operating hours quoted by NZTE are less than the Sec 42a recommendation (Evidence; Ref attached NZTE advice 5th June 2020 item 2 response)
- b. NZTE quote that no commercial flight schools are currently based at NZTE, and the development of multiple fly schools is not planned by NZTE. The recent 2019 annual movements are 50% less than in 2008 (microlight activities) and this 2008 movements level is the Sec 42a plan recommendation.

Reasons for 4. (LIM);

The proposed OLS zone imposes a LIM encumbrance to +/- 25 sq kms and unnecessarily affects thousands of residents. By example- for our property at 247 Collie Rd., NZTE have now confirmed that our calculation of our OLS height to ground is +/- 68 metres, after NZTE misquoted as 19 metres on 5th June 2020, then when questioned was requoted at 39 metres in their email of 13th June 2020, then again misquoted at 45 metres in Nov 2020. (The misinformation for the OLS height has caused consternation for the last year.)The LIM encumbrance creates unnecessary expense for any residents' future council applications or property reports and is unnecessary to most residential properties.

Kit and Rina Maxwell
247 Collie Road
Te Kowhai 3288
kmaxwell@xtra.co.nz

5th June 2020

From: Dan Readman [mailto:dan@nzte.net.nz]
Sent: Friday, 5 June 2020 1:22 p.m.
To: kmaxwell
Cc: amcfarlane@bbo.co.nz
Subject: Re: Te Kowhai Airfield.

Dear Kit and Rina

I have just arrived back from Los Angeles and completed the answers to your questions below in **bold**. Please feel free to stop in at the Aerodrome any time if you would like to have a look around. If I am not there myself we have a full time Airport Manager Mr Peter Laurie and he will take care of you.

Mention you have been talking with me.

Kind regards

Dan.

From: kmaxwell [mailto:kmaxwell@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 2 June 2020 2:41 p.m.
To: 'dan@nzte.net.nz'; 'amcfarlane@bbo.co.nz'
Subject: Te Kowhai Airfield.

Dear Mr Readman and Mr McFarlane,

We are relatively recent citizens to 247 Collie Road, Te Kowhai. We have a copy of your proposal (2018) and maps for the future development of the airport (NZTE).

As invited by yourselves, we have several questions which we would appreciate your advice to us, so that we can understand what our future living environment effects (if any) are likely to be from your proposal. From this information we can assess our future living district.

We are located in the western extremity of the proposed increased OLS zone.

Question 1; future proofing from your proposal. We do not have an understanding what 'future proofing' actually means, as no description is given in your information. We therefore presume you're description means changing the airport to being an IFR rated commercial airport, operating for 24 hours daily, rather than a community recreational resource club airport. Is this correct? If your application approves ILS operating rules, what daily flying operating hours will be used?

Aviation has some of the highest compliance standards and associated rules of any Industry and is governed by the Civil Aviation Act 1990 and many other aviation documents. Even small Aerodromes like Te Kowhai Aerodrome must meet certain Aerodrome and Safety standards. The term "Future Proofing" is used to describe the provisions and changes required to ensure an appropriate level of compliance and operational efficiency can be maintained at the Aerodrome in the future. These standards include meeting the Civil Aviation Aerodrome Design Standards and recommendations, all necessary safety recommendations and the implementation of an appropriate Air Noise Boundary to meet the NZ noise Standards. These key provisions are essential to ensure the Aerodrome is positioned to meet the future technological needs of aircraft in the future and provide a satisfactory level of Future Proofing to an

already established community resource. The term IFR (instrument flying rules) is not directly related to Commercial Operations as many commercial aircraft can also operate under VFR (visual flight rules) The majority of aircraft based at Te Kowhai Aerodrome operate under VFR rules due to the current design and compliance level. The introduction of the proposed OLS and comparative Aerodrome Design standards would “NOT” allow commercial Air Transport IFR operations and would be mainly used for private aircraft or emergency use only. Aerodrome operating hours at Te Kowhai generally occur between MCT (morning civil twilight) and ECT (evening civil twilight) which in general terms means from daylight to dusk. Both VFR and IFR aircraft can also operate at night under certain conditions but IFR aircraft operations are usually conducted during inclement weather conditions to improve safety and navigation when approaching or departing an Aerodrome. Night operations usually make up less than 2% of all aircraft movements at any comparable Aerodrome. Te Kowhai Aerodrome currently has 65 private aircraft based here with some commercial operations like flight training which has taken place at Te Kowhai for over 35 years. Te Kowhai Aerodrome is likely to remain a privately owned Aerodrome available for Public use with its primary operations being for Recreational and General Aviation type aircraft operations in the future.

Question 2; compared to your aircraft movements volume in say December 2019 to February 2020, what is your forecasted increase in movements for say in 2025 (comparable months)?

Currently the Te Kowhai Aerodrome has “no” aircraft movement Limitations at all. Part of the Future Proofing review process was to adopt the NZS-6805 (NZ Noise Standards) for Te Kowhai Aerodrome and be included into the Proposed Waikato District Plan. These Rules recommend aircraft movements should be considered for a period up to 30 years maximum and 10 years as a minimum. We have chosen to project aircraft movements (limitations) for a period of only 10 years. Adopting this approach means we have effectively imposed movement restrictions on aircraft operations at Te Kowhai Aerodrome. It is important to understand that complex noise models are used to determine the appropriate noise contours which in turn relate to aircraft movements. Regarding movement data for the periods described above, most aircraft operations are likely to occur during fine or stable weather conditions and lighter winds. These conditions are more likely to occur between the months of November to early May each year. As a guide Te Kowhai Aerodrome had almost 14,000 movements in 2008 yet for the period ending 30 June 2019 we had only 9925 movements. These historical declines or growth are usually caused by changes in aircraft ownership, high operating costs and increased compliance charges for General Aviation aircraft owners and are often directly related to the NZ economy. We do not anticipate aircraft movements in 2025 to exceed those of 2008 at this stage.

Question 3; the registration of the OLS restraints on our residence land is limiting for any future residential improvements we may wish to make. Is this registered on our title? How this is advised to us and how is it notarised on our land title?

The proposed OLS (obstacle limitation surface) forms part of the Waikato District Plan. The OLS is not an encumbrance registered on your land title. The Council uses the appropriate OLS planning maps to identify any properties located within this OLS volume of airspace. This is used to manage the control of obstacles within this area and ensure compliance with the CAA rules and associated District Plan provisions. Should an obstacle need to be erected within these OLS areas the Te Kowhai Aerodrome would be consulted as an affected party to establish the impact on the OLS safety. An example would be the landowner intended to erect a tall radio mast and on application to the Council for a building consent this would trigger a height check of the intended obstacle and requirements for any resource consent if

needed. Generally the OLS has limited impact on properties unless they are located in close proximity to the Aerodrome.

Question 4; we are trying to determine the ceiling height for the OLS at our property location and therefore the effects. We are in the next valley to the airport. We have a + 60 metre vertical height hill at our eastern boundary (towards airport). This should negate any practical need for an OLS restraint for us. Is our dwelling land level above or below the runway level? And what are the comparable levels to help our calculations?

The OLS (obstacle limitation surface) is a volume of invisible airspace used only to control the height of obstacles within a defined area around an Aerodrome. The approach and take off surface of the OLS is a fan shape with a gradient of 1:40 (metres) commencing from the Aerodrome Runways. The OLS is an overlay and not categorised by any individual property. This ensures the appropriate safety margins are protected for aircraft operating under IFR conditions without visual reference to the ground when approaching or departing the Aerodrome. It is important to understand that the OLS gradient is not the actual "flight path" of an aircraft and is only the protected airspace around and below an aircraft providing an adequate safety margin. The proposed OLS meets the Aerodrome design standards of CAA AC139-7 and is common for Aerodromes of this nature. There is a spot height of approximately 60.0 metres immediately east of 247 Collie Rd. This terrain sits just outside the southern edge of the OLS approach surface. Without reference to detailed contour maps the approximate height at the centre of this property is approximately 21.0 metres above the Motoriki Datum and approximately 19.0 metres below the lower limit of the OLS approach and take off surface. The Development of this property would NOT be restricted for any obstacle below a height of approximately 19.0 metres. The Aerodrome elevation is approximately 29.0 metres. Note also that the Rural Zone in the Proposed District Plan has a maximum permitted building height of 10 metres which is well below the OLS for your property.

Question 5; Marshall Day Acoustics report: This report quotes that the allowable noise standard be increased to the NZs 6805:1992 (aircraft operation levels). How do you intend to monitor this on a continuous basis and is this NZS standard based on commercial airports operations?

Marshall Day have recommended that Te Kowhai Aerodrome adopt the NZS 6805 standards for Airport Noise and Land use Planning. These standards are NOT and increase in noise level. In fact these standards will apply restrictions on the future operational movements and noise at Te Kowhai Aerodrome. Currently there are no limits on aircraft movements which attribute to noise. The purpose of the NZS noise standards is to ensure *"communities living close to the airport are properly protected from the effects of aircraft noise whilst recognising the need to be able to operate an airport efficiently"* The noise Standards can be applied to all levels of Airports and for Te Kowhai Aerodrome the noise contours have been specifically designed to allow for a mix of General Aviation and recreational type aircraft commonly is use and NOT that of a large scale commercial Airport. Noise limits are measured as a total average noise allowance over the busiest 3 months of operation. Noise is directly related to aircraft movements and this movement data is recorded and monitored for compliance by the Airport Operations Company in accordance with the District Plan Rules. It is in the Aerodromes best interest to actively manage aircraft noise for the surrounding community.

We are operating in a highly regulated and stringent environment and it is important to understand that these changes are driven by the requirement to be compliant with the many Aviation associated rules and the need to improve operational safety at the Aerodrome. I hope this gives you an insight into the technical background and highlights the importance of these changes to ensure Te Kowhai Aerodrome has a sustainable future.

Kind regards

Dan Readman

Director

NZTE Operations Limited

Te Kowhai Airfield

172 Limmer Rd, RD8

Hamilton 3288; New Zealand

Mob:021681991

13th June 2020

From: Dan Readman [mailto:dan@nzte.net.nz]

Sent: Saturday, 13 June 2020 1:21 p.m.

To: kmaxwell

Cc: amcfarlane@bbo.co.nz

Subject: Re: Te Kowhai Airfield.

Hi Kit and Rina

See below.

Dan.

Hello Dan,

Thank you for your helpful reply to our questions. We are working through our domestic evaluation and effects, and have some unclear aspects. Can you please further advise us on the following requests:-

1. For question 4 – Your ceiling height lower limit calculation for our location’s building and vegetation at 19 metres. How has your calculation been made please? (we are 2.4kms from the runway end, and your elevation land levels are near correct.)

My previous email looked at the high terrain in your vicinity but the simplest answer centred on your property would be 2400 m/40m (OLS gradient) which equals a total height of 60 metres above the Aerodrome elevation. At your location the elevation is approximately 21 metres which is lower than the Aerodrome elevation by 8 metres. So, 60 m (OLS HEIGHT) - 21 m ((your elevation) would give you a clearance of “39“ metres below the OLS gradient. (approximately) You can see in this case it is not restrictive at all but note the maximum District Plan building height in your zone should be 10 metres. Previously I looked for any potential limiting case adjacent to your property boundaries. As previously mentioned an OLS overlay is very common place at Aerodromes and normally only obstacles in close proximity to the runway are impacted.

Note: For our purposes we used a LIDAR system (Laser light measuring detection) to identify obstacles within the appropriate OLS areas being vegetation (trees) or any building structures that would infringe the OLS rather than measuring the height of the actual terrain. The elevation heights given are approximate.

2. For question 1. Future proofing;- With the past flight training activity, many touch n go flights practice take off loss of power. This results in a full power recovery re-starting low and directly over us. It does intrude greatly. What is your maximum commercial flight training number of movements going to be per busy day in the future and how many training planes/schools will be based in your commercial activity?

Te Kowhai Aerodrome has been in operation for over 50 years. Touch and go manoeuvres are commonly used by aircraft for both private flights and for training purposes. Pilots must also maintain their legal recency requirements to operate an aircraft in the circuit where a touch and go forms part of this procedure. Your comment may be referring to an EFATO (Engine Failure after take off) which is not directly related to a touch and go. This is where an aircraft may carry out the recommended safety procedures and actions in the event of an engine failure (loss of power emergency) after takeoff or at any time in flight. Aircraft based at Te Kowhai will generally avoid this procedure to minimise any disturbance to land owners in the vicinity of the Aerodrome however it does form part of all pilot training (private or commercial) and recency requirements. Some itinerant aircraft (Public visitors) that use Te Kowhai Aerodrome will carry out this procedure. This is more common to the west because of the prevailing southwesterly wind conditions making this the predominant departure and circuit direction.

Te Kowhai Aerodrome does NOT have any commercial flight training “schools” other than some small scale flight instruction. The large commercial training schools are all based at Hamilton Airport but Te Kowhai Aerodrome is available for Public use. We do not intend to have any large scale Flight training schools based at Te Kowhai Aerodrome in the future with the vast majority of aeroplanes being privately owned.

The Marshall Day report outlines the technical detail around aircraft movements and its relationship to the Air noise control boundaries. In general, maximum movements are not a function of being a commercial flight or a private operation but rather the calculation of total aircraft noise. A complex noise calculation model has been used to determine aircraft types, aircraft noise emissions and in turn aircraft movements using certain scenarios. From the Marshall Day report below.

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.

The important point to understand is that a noisier aircraft or an aircraft operating at night would reduce allowable movements (penalised) in comparison to a quieter aircraft operating during the day hence the complexity of these calculations. This is why NZTE Operations Ltd has proposed the appropriate air noise control boundaries to manage aircraft noise and the associated aircraft movements under a recognised standard.

There are currently NO aircraft movement limitations in the Operative Waikato District Plan or restrictions on the operation at Te Kowhai Aerodrome.

The adoption of the NZS 6805:1992 “Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning” will provide certainty for the surrounding community without unduly affecting the operational efficiency of the Aerodrome in the future.



NZTE Operations Limited
172 Limmer Road, RD 8, Te Kowhai, HAMILTON
E info@nzte.net.nz W nzte.net.nz

18th November 2020

Kit Maxwell
247 Collie Road
RD 8
Te Kowhai

Dear Kit

We represent the Te Kowhai Aerodrome (Aerodrome) as directors of NZTE Operations Limited (NZTE), owner and operator of the Aerodrome. Thank you for your submission on Variation 1 to the proposed Waikato District Plan (pWDP), we note your concerns in respect to the Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS), in particular around the effect on vegetation on your property.

This letter intends to provide some further context as to what an OLS is and hopefully alleviate some of your concerns you have about the extent that the OLS impacts your property. Attached to this letter in Appendix 1 is a map showing the location of the various submitter properties that have made a submission on the pWDP in relation to the OLS. You can see that your property is located in the western outer section of the take off and approach surface of the OLS.

In order to make use of emerging satellite technology to improve safety of aircraft in poor weather conditions through the use of Instrument Flight Rules (IFR), it is proposed to have aircraft operations of non-air transport day/night IFR for aircraft less than 5700kg. These aircraft are typically described as private small single or twin-engine propeller powered aircraft. To allow this, the CAA then requires an OLS of a set shape and size in accordance with the design standard under CAA Advisory Circular AC139-7. This design has been recommended by the Aerodrome's aviation consultant as the appropriate design standard.

An OLS is an invisible volume of airspace above and adjacent to the Aerodrome. OLS are necessary to enable aircraft to maintain a satisfactory level of safety while manoeuvring at low altitude in the vicinity of the aerodrome through ensuring that the airspace is clear of obstacles. OLS are regularly found depicted in New Zealand for both aerodromes and airports. There are three key components to the Te Kowhai OLS:

- a) the take off and approach surface - slopes up at a gradient of 1:40 to a distance of 2500m;
- b) the transitional side surface - extends upwards and outwards from each side of the runway strip at a vertical gradient of 1:5 to a height approximately 10m above runway level, then vertical to a height of 45m; and
- c) the inner horizontal surface - at a height of 45m extending outwards 2500m from the runway centreline.

Therefore at your property, being under the approach and take off surface, the OLS is at a height of approximately 45m. Other parts of your property do come within the 10m zone of the OLS, however due to the location at the outer edge of the inner horizontal surface, aircraft will not fly close to the ground here as they are a distance from the runway and pilots remain clear of natural obstacles or terrain. The document titled "height restrictions under the OLS" as part of the Waikato District Council documents issued for Variation 1 confirms this (included as Appendix 2). The approach and take off surfaces of the OLS are the most important for IFR operations and the inner horizontal surface is more significant for Visual Flight Rules, typically when aircraft are circling following take off or prior to landing. This is to ensure that a pilot can be certain they have clear air space at a height of 45m while manoeuvring. It does not mean that aircraft will fly at the minimum level of the OLS.

NZTE has no intention of forcing the removal of vast swaths of indigenous forest, or destroying habitats. All the OLS requires is that if or when a tree protrudes into the inner horizontal surface it is trimmed accordingly. Given the location of your property in relation to the OLS and the height above the properties in that location, NZTE does not consider that there will be much impact on any forestry in those locations. 12.

For further reference, we include a map at Appendix 3 that depicts the Te Kowhai OLS and the Hamilton Airport OLS. The Hamilton OLS is much larger in size and covers a larger portion of residential and rural areas, yet has very limited effect on the properties below. The Aerodrome caters to significantly less and smaller aircraft than Hamilton Airport, therefore accordingly has a smaller OLS and less effects on the below properties.

We are happy to answer any further questions you may have, please do not hesitate to give us a call on the below details.

Yours sincerely



The Directors of NZTE Operations Limited
Te Kowhai Airfield
172 Limmer Road, RD8
Hamilton 3288,
Mob: Dan 021 681 991

Letter to Airfield 17th Dec 2020

NZTE Operations Ltd

172 Limmer Rd

Te Kowhai

17 December 2020

Ref: Your letter of 18th November.

Dan,

We seek further explanations and wish to register our disagreement with the duplicity and misleading statements in your letter of the 18th November.

1) Tree removal or modification in 10-meter zone

In and near the 10-meter zone of our (265) property we have a commercial tree plantation of 25 years standing. This is planted for our future retirement income. Our investment and future-proofing will be damaged or rendered worthless for your self promoted future-proofing right to demand us to trim our trees. We reject your letter's duplicitous statement of "Limited Effects" but then claiming your right to order our tree modification.

2) Pilot Air Space

You claim that pilots will remain clear from our 2400 metre distance outer edge location. This is not the case and is deceiving. In your letter (June 2019) concerning pilot EFATO flying (descending to ground proximity) you suggest, that this is only done by itinerant Te Kowhai airfield using pilots. We disagree with your suggestion that we need to accept this invasive activity. Flying schools should be banned from this village based airfield. Also, if you collect landing fees, you, therefore should agree to manage and control your own air space users.

3) OLS Limits

Some of our western Collie Rd properties are more than 2520m from the centre line of the runway, we are therefore excluded from the OLS according to your original application. Changing the wording for your Var. 1 start point (see WDC appendix 9 of 20th July 2020) changes the measure commencement to close to your boundary area, This is not recorded as a CAA requirement. (WDC email correspondence 17/01/20). This is a subtle way of extending your runway and increasing your community dominance, and therefore affecting more unsuspecting property owners as well as ourselves. Please withdraw this wording change within Var. 1, So that our Collie Road properties will be excluded.

3a) One of our properties (247 Collie Road) is located solely within the proposed take-off and approach surface. We have received your two written previous estimates (13/06/2020) of 19m and 39m from you for your now new quoted OLS 45m height. We have asked a surveyor to check our calculation for the OLS zone and including the elevation differences. We have confirmation that at our location we have +/- 68m OLS clearance. You advise significantly incorrect information for the important fact for the OLS heights, which we query and seek answers for.

We ask for further explanations for our request and may ask further questions after further consultations.

Thank you

Kit Maxwell-247 Collie Rd & Vikki Madgwick- 265 Collie Rd, Te Kowhai.

From: Dan Readman [mailto:dan@nzte.net.nz]
Sent: Monday, 25 January 2021 1:52 p.m.
To: kmaxwell
Subject: Te Kowhai Aerodrome-OLS

Dear Kit (Vikki)

Thank you for your letter sent to NZTE Operations on the 17th December.

I have responded in general terms initially but more specifically to your questions 1-3 (a) at the base of this email so some information has been repeated.

The letter you are referring to was sent to numerous land owners [on the 18th November](#) and contained some generic information. This information was only specific to properties based on their location being within either the takeoff and approach OLS or the inner horizontal OLS.

In general, only the properties located within the approach and takeoff OLS have had detailed LIDAR modelling to obtain obstacle (buildings or vegetation) and elevation information. All properties located outside this area and within the inner horizontal OLS have not been individually surveyed other than the Variation 1 contour map. More detailed information on specific properties will be required when an instrument approach procedure (IFR) is designed for the Aerodrome. This data would be used to identify any aviation safety hazards and develop an ongoing maintenance programme including land owner agreements to manage obstacles that infringe the OLS surfaces if required.

Note: *In some cases it is acceptable for obstacles located within the inner horizontal surface to exceed the CAA design limit height restrictions (45m) but not if they are located within the critical approach and take off surface.*

Duplicity is a strong word however confusion has played a role here because the information we provided to you on 13th June 2020 giving spot height clearances between the OLS and ground level was **not** for the Maxwell property at [247 Collie Road](#). This information was intended for the Madgwick property located at [265 Collie Road](#) and some of the areas surrounding this title. This may have occurred because we received questions from you for both the Maxwell and the Madgwick properties on Vikki Madgwick's behalf. We may have referred to the Maxwell property rather than the Madgwick property in error at the time of writing which made this unclear. Our apologies if this was the case.

The property at [265 Collie Road](#) has rising terrain as you have mentioned in previous correspondence. This property is located within the inner horizontal surface and may have some operational limitations due to its elevation and additional tree heights. (Tree Plantation) (***Please see my comments above and below on obstacle management within the inner horizontal surface***) The Maxwell property located at [247 Collie Road](#) which is located solely within the approach and take off OLS has no known limitations identified. Without seeing your surveyors data the calculations you have provided for this property are approximately correct.

I have responded more specifically to questions 1-3 (a) below that we received from you in late December....

1. The 10 metre zone as depicted in the WDC variation 1 document is a contoured engineering analysis of ground elevation and its proximity to the OLS only. It does not provide additional information on obstacles or tree heights above ground level relative to the OLS. The property

at [265 Collie Road](#) and the surrounding area has significantly higher terrain than all other areas within the inner horizontal surface as shown on the variation 1 contour map and displayed in orange. The difference between Aerodrome elevation and this property's elevation including any potential obstacles or vegetation on-site may exceed the CAA design standard height limit of 45m for the inner horizontal OLS. On a positive note, ***some obstacles located outside the more critical takeoff and approach OLS but within the inner horizontal surface*** (Madgwick Property) may have the ability to be retained and managed with approach procedure design and operational rules to restrict IFR (instrument flight rules) aircraft from manoeuvring in these areas for safety. Any obstacles would be considered in conjunction with organisations like Aeropath and the CAA who design and approve these procedures and approval from the Aerodrome Operator. There was no intent to provide any duplicitous statements in terms of limited effects but you will see from the Variation 1 OLS contour map that only a very small area is shaded orange.

1. The OLS approach and Takeoff surfaces are aligned with each runway direction. At NZTE (Te Kowhai Aerodrome) the runway directions are runway 05 (050 degrees magnetic) and Runway 23 (230 degrees magnetic) which means any aircraft arriving or departing the Aerodrome operating under either VFR or IFR rules would initially be tracking in these directions depending on wind direction. An aircraft operating under VFR rules is not restricted by its arrival, departure or transit track outside the Aerodrome circuit pattern unless specific procedures are documented. Normally these types of procedures are only necessary for busy airports like Hamilton or Tauranga so aircraft may operate in any area at any time.

An EFATO is only one emergency procedure that Pilots must be trained to a competent level in the event of an inflight emergency. These procedures form part of the Civil Aviation Licensing and training requirements for any Pilot world wide. I can confirm again that Pilots based at Te Kowhai Aerodrome have been formally briefed by our Operations Company to minimise simulated EFATO procedures or any other procedure in the vicinity of the Aerodrome to minimise nuisance or annoyance to the surrounding community. It is in the best interests of the Aerodrome Owners to actively manage this relationship, which we do. However, as previously mentioned, itinerant and Public aircraft do use the Aerodrome and may carry out this procedure at times. Te Kowhai Aerodrome does not have any Flight training Schools based at the Aerodrome. These types of large training organisations are based at Aerodromes like Hamilton, Tauranga and Ardmore Airports and they do use the Aerodrome at times for training. Te Kowhai Aerodrome does conduct some flight training but small by comparison. The nature of this flight training is usually private owners completing annual pilot currency and pilot licence renewals to comply with the CAA rules. Most flights are private operations, type rating flights, syndicate owned aeroplane use or occasional introductory flights for new pilots.

Te Kowhai Aerodrome does not control the airspace that surrounds it. The airspace around Te Kowhai Aerodrome is “uncontrolled” in terms of air traffic control (ATC) with pilots maintaining their own separation. Airspace is designed by the NZ Airways Corporation and we do not manage airspace. Pilots have the responsibility to comply with these restrictions and the CAA enforce this. Landing fees at Te Kowhai Aerodrome make a small contribution to the daily operation of this facility which is funded privately.

1. The OLS approach and Take off surface including the inner horizontal surface distance is normally measured from the runway strip ends. This distance is 2500 metres in accordance with the CAA design standards. There was **NO** change made to the original proposed OLS other than some minor wording changes in Variation 1. The Waikato District Council were responsible for publicly notifying incorrect OLS information to the Public in the form of an OLS planning Map. This map depicted the inner horizontal surface distance as only 2000m. This was in error and not correct. Variation 1 was then necessary to correct this error and required a further Public re-notification. Unfortunately this caused additional confusion and misinformation that the Aerodrome Owners had to manage with

additional submissions where Variation 1 was perceived as a change. This was not the case. Please seek confirmation on this matter with Mr Will Gauntlet (Senior Manager) and Ms Emma Ensor (Senior Planner) at the Waikato District Council. The OLS is not related to increasing runway length at Te Kowhai and the runway itself is not being extended.

3a) Yes you are correct however the height information we provided related to spot heights at [265 Collie Road](#) (Madgwick) property and not [247 Collie Road](#) (Maxwell) property as our records have them listed. [247 Collie Road](#) may have had this information attached to it instead of the Madgwick property at [265 Collie Road](#) due to the fact we have received combined questions and correspondence from you on both properties. As mentioned the property at [265 Collie Road](#) and the surrounding area has higher terrain in close proximity to the OLS inner horizontal surface and the Variation 1 colour contoured map confirms this. By design the approach and takeoff OLS surface for this Aerodrome reaches a maximum height 62.5 metres above Aerodrome level at a distance of 2500m. I can confirm your surveyors calculated OLS clearance height of (+/-68 metres) is correct due to the elevation difference and I can easily calculate this within 0.5 metre using google earth elevations. If you would like to provide your surveyors information we would be happy to compare this with our OLS data.

In summary, the Te Kowhai Aerodrome has been in operation on a daily basis for over 50 years and as Owners of this facility we have the responsibility to ensure we are providing a satisfactory level of compliance with the CAA Aerodrome Standards and Recommendations including the New Zealand Standard NZS 6805:1992 “Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning” criteria.

It should be made clear to the wider community that there are currently **NO** restrictions on growth at Te Kowhai Aerodrome or any form of noise management policy in the Operative District Plan Rules that restrict aircraft movements now or in the future. The notified proposed District Plan and subsequent changes sought by NZTE through submissions are seeking to remedy this in a way that benefits both the community and the Aerodrome going forward. This should reiterate the importance to the community that supporting the proposed changes into the Proposed District Plan will provide surety for the community and support the planned growth strategy of the surrounding Te Kowhai Village in the future.

Kind regards

Dan.

Dan Readman

Director

NZTE Operations Limited

Te Kowhai Airfield

172 Limmer Rd, RD8

Hamilton 3288; New Zealand

Mob:021681991