

From: letstalk@mackenzie.govt.nz
To: [Charmaine Duffell](mailto:Charmaine.Duffell@rationale.co.nz); jsygrove@rationale.co.nz
Subject: Anonymous User completed Submission Form - Plan Change 23: General Rural Zone, Natural Features and Landscapes, and Natural Character
Date: Friday, 26 January 2024 1:28:06 pm

CAUTION: This email originated from outside Mackenzie District Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Submission Form - Plan Change 23: General Rural Zone, Natural Features and Landscapes, and Natural Character with the responses below.

Full Name

John Evans

Email address

john.evans@aopa.nz

Postal Address

[REDACTED]

Phone number

[REDACTED]

Do you believe you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission?

No

Are you directly affected by an effect or the subject matter that adversely affects the environment and does not relate to trade competition of the effects of trade competition?

No

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are as follows:

GRUZ-R15 GRUZ-R16

I support/oppose these provisions:
(include whether you support or oppose in full or in part)

**The reason(s) for my submission are:
(state in summary your reasons, and whether you seek any amendments)**

GRUZ-R16 1-3 The origins, justification and evidence for the numerical values of listed setbacks are unclear, other than blanket attempts to “avoid potential conflict with noise sensitive activities”. The perceived effect of aircraft activity depends on the location of the adjoining sensitive activity to take off/landing direction as well as aircraft type, for example a drone (as an aircraft) has a relatively low noise signature. It is unclear why the setback is 500m for helicopters and 1km for fixed wing, from any notional boundary of any sensitive activity. It is unclear what a setback of 50m from any public road and 100m from any State Highway is to achieve. Noting, per the definition of airfield, any area an aircraft could move (i.e. taxi) is considered the extent of the airfield. A road is a noise generating area, not a noise sensitive area, therefore “avoiding potential conflict with noise sensitive activities” does not apply as rationale for this provision.

I seek the following decision from the Mackenzie District Council: (give precise details)

GRUZ-R16-1: Amend 1km setback to 500m, helicopters and fixed wing can be treated the same. GRUZ-R16-1: Add: “Or at a distance such that compliance with 55dBA Ldn* is achieved as measured at the notional boundary of a noise sensitive activity. GRUZ-R16-3: Remove in entirety *6805:1992 Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning Standard recommends that new residential or other noise sensitive uses are prohibited when noise levels are greater than 55dBA Ldn, therefore no controls are required where noise levels are less than 55dBA Ldn.

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?

I do

If others make a similar submission would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing?

I would
