



## Online submission

This is a submission that was made online via the Council's website.

<b>Submitter No.</b>	S41
<b>Submitter Name</b>	Jill Fraser
<b>Submitter first name</b>	Jill
<b>Submitter middle name</b>	Margaret
<b>Submitter surname</b>	Fraser
<b>Submitter is contact</b>	Yes
<b>Email</b>	
<b>Wish to be heard</b>	Yes
<b>Joint presentation</b>	Yes
<b>Trade competition</b>	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
<b>Directly affected</b>	N/A
<b>Withhold contact details?</b>	Yes

## Submission points

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
ZONES	RPROZ-R5	Support	<p>Rural airstrips or helicopter landing areas are activities which have the potential to adversely impact the amenity and character of the rural environment particularly where they are located in close proximity to residential houses. Where there is a concentration of houses ie a residential or rural living zone the plan has used a 2km separation distance. Condition a(ii) uses a distance of 500m for more sparsely populated areas where an individual dwelling or noise sensitive activity is in close proximity. However there is a need to have more specific conditions for permitted activities to ensure that individual neighbouring dwellings are not impacted adversely. Changes to address the frequency of flight movements and the hours of operation of flight movements will ensure the intensity of rural airstrips remains compatible with the amenity and character of the surrounding rural environment. Including specific assessment criteria for discretionary activities where a rural airstrip is within 500m of a noise sensitive activity will ensure that these matters are taken into consideration.</p>	

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
				<p>I support the retention of this rule RPROZ-R5 as it relates to rural airstrips and helicopter landing areas but seek some amendments to the description of the activity, the conditions for this permitted activity and matters for discretion where rural airstrips are within 500m of the notional boundary of a noise sensitive activity.</p> <p>The description of the activity: new or extensions to existing rural airstrips or helicopter landing areas - the key concern here is that this description should include any increase in the intensity of aircraft movements on existing rural airstrips not just the physical extensions to a runway or buildings associated with the airstrip. While the 1000 movement figure excludes agricultural aviation movements on the same site it should be made clear that this figure includes agricultural aviation movements required or generated to service other farms in the area in addition to recreational, commercial or private aviation movements</p> <p>Amend condition (b) so that the frequency of flights is also considered along with the maximum of 1000 flight movements per calendar year. A suggestion to address this would be to have a daily or weekly maximum to avoid situations where flight movements are concentrated over a much shorter period of time and thereby creating a more intensive activity and effects on neighbouring noise sensitive activities.</p> <p>Add another condition so that flight movements occur within certain hours of operation and early morning (before 7am) and late night (after 10pm) flight movements are avoided for permitted activities.</p> <p>While i understand that in assessing and evaluating resource consents for full discretionary activities (where a rural airstrip is within 500m of a noise sensitive activity) the following matters should be highlighted for consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The flight path.for take-offs and landings - this should not be over the site(s) on which the noise sensitive activity is located</li> <li>2. the total number and frequency of flights (a maximum number per calendar year or an average across a calendar year does not address the frequency of flights on any given day. (noting that agricultural aircraft movements on the same site as the airstrip are excluded from these maximums).</li> <li>3. the hours of operation of the rural airstrips</li> <li>4. Whether any lighting of the airstrip is proposed</li> </ol> <p>For such discretionary activities the consent of the property owners and/or tenants of noise sensitive activities located within 500m of a proposed rural airstrip or extensions to a rural airstrip should be required for such applications to be considered on a non-notified basis.</p>

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
ZONES	RPROZ-R1	Amend	The need for a minor residential unit to be in close proximity (within 25m) to the principal unit on a rural site that is greater than 12ha seems arbitrary and unnecessary. If the reasoning for the condition or standard is to ensure that the minor unit doesn't result in the loss of productive land then the gross floor area limit is the best mechanism to use. The rule itself requiring a separation of maximum 25m could have unintended consequences and actually result in more productive land being lost as the area between the dwellings would unlikely be used for farming or productive purposes. If the purpose of the maximum 25m separation is to ensure that infrastructure is shared - then the vehicle access rule addresses this issue. Vehicle accesses on farms greater than 12ha can be lengthy and it maybe that there is a need to house farm workers close to farming infrastructure such as yards or sheds etc for convenience and security reasons. The requirement for dwellings on farms to be in close proximity does not seem to have a clear environmental or resource management purpose and should be removed.	Remove condition (a)(iii)(c) - the requirement for minor residential units to be located within 25m of the principal residential building on the site

## Documents included with submission

None

---

## CONTACT

Copyright © Perception Planning Limited, 2016