



Online submission

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

Submitter No.	S38
Submitter Name	Aerospread Ltd
Submitter Company/Group Name	Aerospread Ltd
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	bruce@aerospread.co.nz
Wish to be heard	Yes
Joint presentation	Not stated
Trade competition	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
Directly affected	N/A
Withhold contact details?	No

Submission points

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
GENERAL DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS	NOISE-S5	Amend	<p>The clause seeks to limit agricultural aviation movements to 14 days. Of the 45 approximately rural airstrips inside the CHBDC the amount of usage can change from year to year and is also affected by seasonal changes.</p> <p>There are all weather airstrips that are used to support rural communities servicing sometimes six or seven different land owners off one airstrip.</p> <p>There can be as many as three or four different products to be flown on for one land owner. This could be (depending on trucking) four separate days, one for each product, but only 1.5 to 2.5 hours flying per day depending on tonnage.</p> <p>Wind and weather is another limiting factor. Safety is of the utmost importance and having a limited time frame to get work done could put undue pressure on pilots to get the job completed and could compromise safety. What will happen if this rule is not amended and is after the 14 days, jobs will be forced to move to another airstrip that has not used all the 14 days, this does not change the noise and will only penalise landowners with the increase cost of flying and cartage as well as increased carbon footprint, nothing but negatives any way you look at it.</p> <p>A better option if noise is an issue to some parties residence, the airstrip in question could be explored on a case by case bases and work with the local effected communities to get the outcome everyone is looking for.</p>	Amend NOISE-S5 (11) to unlimited days used for agricultural aviation movements
GENERAL DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS	NOISE-S5	Oppose	<p>The majority of rural airstrips in the region are sufficiently 'remote' to not pose a noise nuisance to rural residences.</p> <p>Most rural airstrips are used for agricultural aviation activity only. The operators are already working under CAA (Civil Aviation Authority) Part 137 rules. The aircraft does not produce noise apart from when the airstrip is being used for agricultural aviation movements. This is productive work in an area where (50% of employment is generated as well as 50% of the CHBDC income is from) as stated in the draft plan, DON'T LIMIT this.</p>	Amend NOISE-S5 (12) Delete

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
GENERAL DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS	NOISE-S5	Amend	As a consequence of changes sought to NOISE S5 (11) the provision should be amended to delete reference to 14 days usage in a calendar year.	Amend Noise -S5 (13) Please amend the agricultural aviation movements for up to 14 days in any calendar year.
GENERAL DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS	NOISE-S5	Oppose	Amend NOISE-S5 (16) as follows: Remove the up to 14 days in any calendar year for agricultural aviation to bring in line with NOISE-S5 (11) and (12).	<p>NOISE (16) Helicopter Landing Area.</p> <p>As a consequence of changes sought to NOISE S5 (11) the provision should be amended to delete reference to 14 days usage in a calendar year for helicopter agricultural aviation movements.</p>
GENERAL DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS	NOISE-S5	Amend	<p>This is a unique privately owned community airfield that is run with a voluntary team. This team provides considerable contribution to the district both for town and rural communities. Weekend gliding championship, fuel, Search & Rescue, Fire fighting, very cost effective flight training, hangarage, a home for local agricultural fixed-wing and helicopter firm's all supporting the community.</p> <p>Increasing voluntary work load and cost by tracking aircraft movements for little or no gain needs amending. We would like to see the number of movement that triggers more compliance increased to at least 15,000 movements if at all.</p>	Waipukurau Aerodrome (21 B & C) Annual Aircraft movements. 6500 per year amend to at least 10,000 movements per year.
GENERAL DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS	NOISE-S5	Amend	The club have a bin that is hired out for land owners to fly fertiliser on productive land and should be exempt from the movements the same as A,B,C,D,E and F and keep things consistent.	Waipukurau Aerodrome (22) Exemptions to these noise rules. Agricultural Aviation movements need adding to this list.
ZONES	GRUZ-R4	Support	We support a rule that provides for activities inherent in primary production and contributes to the committee.	Retain
ZONES	GRUZ-R5	Amend	<p>GRUZ-R5 New, or expansion of existing, rural airstrips and/or helicopter landing areas. It should be made clear that this should not apply to agricultural aviation movements ancillary to primary production activities. We do not support restrictions on 1,000 movements per annum where they apply to agricultural aviation.</p> <p>We do not support restricting the built footprint to 100 sm where it applies to fertiliser storage on rural airstrips.</p>	<p>It should be made clear that this should not apply to agricultural aviation movements ancillary to primary production activities.</p> <p>We do not support restrictions on 1,000 movements per annum where they apply to agricultural aviation both fix-wing and helicopter.</p> <p>We do not support restricting the built footprint to 100 sm where it applies to fertiliser storage on rural airstrips.</p>
ZONES	RPROZ-O4	Support	A clear rule that provides for activities inherent to primary production.	Retain

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
ZONES	RPROZ-R5	Amend	<p>RPROZ-R5</p> <p>New, or expansion of existing, rural airstrips and/or helicopter landing areas. Support in part. It should be made clear that this should not apply to agricultural aviation movements ancillary to primary production activities. We do not support restrictions on 1,000 movements per annum where they apply to agricultural aviation.</p> <p>We do not support restricting the built footprint to 100 sm where it applies to fertiliser storage on rural airstrips.</p>	<p>This should be clear that the rule will not apply to facilities for agricultural aviation activity ancillary to primary production activities. In particular that the 1,000 movements does not apply to agricultural aviation.</p>
General	[General]	Amend	<p>Agricultural aviation is a very small industry that contributes billions of dollars across the primary sector. As an operator there are many regulatory challenges that we face. Most of the rules are already in place like the (AIRCARE Fly Neighbourly Course for noise) and if something does fall outside the rules lets please work on a case by case basis to get the outcomes wanted by all parties not another blanket approach.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time for consideration.</p>	<p>The general thrust of my submission is to be practical and work, keep compliance simple where it is covered by other regulatory bodies refer back to them, i.e CAA in the case of aviation.</p>

Documents included with submission

None

CONTACT

Copyright © Perception Planning Limited, 2016