

Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan
Decision Report pursuant to Clause 10 of the First Schedule
of the Resource Management Act 1991

Subject: Transportation

In Reference to:

- ***Transportation Provisions 17.1 – 17.4***
 - ***District Wide Rules 21.1.21, 21.1.24, 21.3.5, 21.3.8 and 21.3.11***
 - ***Assessment Criteria 22.1.6, 22.1.23 – 22.1.24***
 - ***Appendices 5 and 11***
-

17.1 Introduction

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
494.6	Land Transport New Zealand	-	-
495.5	ONTRACK	-	-

Discussion

Land Transport New Zealand (494.6) and **ONTRACK** (495.5) both support the current wording of the Introduction.

Evidence Heard

ONTRACK submitted evidence noting the Section 42A report recommendation of retaining the Introduction.

Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners noted the submitters support for the Introduction and retaining the Plan provisions. The Commissioners concur with the submitters that the existing Introduction provides the context for transportation in the Wairarapa.

Decision: 17.1 Introduction

Submission Reference: 494.6	Accept
495.5	Accept

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The Transportation Chapter provisions represent the most appropriate approach for managing the range of resource management issues associated with transportation in the Wairarapa.

17.2 Significant Resource Management Issues

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
495.6	ONTRACK	-	-

Discussion

ONTRACK (495.6) support the listed significant resource management issues.

Evidence Heard

ONTRACK submitted evidence noting the Section 42A report recommendation of retaining the Significant Resource Management Issues.

Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners noted the submitter's support for the Significant Resource Management Issues. The Commissioners concur with the submitter that the existing Significant Resource Management Issues identify the key land use and subdivision issues for transportation in the Wairarapa.

Decision: 17.2 Significant Resource Management Issues

Submission Reference: 495.6 Accept

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing Issue statements most appropriately describe the range of matters associated with transportation in the Wairarapa.

17.3.2 Policies TT1 – Managing the Road Network

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
525.71	Department of	-	-

	Conservation		
494.7	Land Transport New Zealand	-	-
526.69	Greater Wellington Regional Council	-	-
17.7	Transit New Zealand	-	-

Discussion

Department of Conservation (525.71) seeks that Policy (g) be amended to protect “natural” values from the effects of new, reconstructed and upgraded transport infrastructure. In addition, they request a new policy be added to ensure new and upgraded roads are designed not to discharge directly to waterbodies.

Greater Wellington Regional Council (526.69) requests that Policy (e) be amended by replacing “support and encourage” with “ensure”, to place stronger emphasis on providing for non-vehicular forms of transport.

Transit New Zealand (17.7) request the addition of two policies relating to subdivision and land use activities affecting the arterial road network.

Land Transport New Zealand (494.7) support the retention of the current policies.

Evidence Heard

Department of Conservation presented evidence supporting the Section 42A report recommendation of adding ‘natural’ to Policy (g).

Transit New Zealand presented evidence that the addition of policies to 17.3.2. would strengthen the Plan in managing subdivision and land use activities that adversely affect the State Highway network.

Commissioners’ Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the Department of Conservation and Section 42A report that adding the reference to “natural” values in Policy (g) would be effective in assessing the effects on these values for new, reconstructed and upgraded transport infrastructure.

The amendment sought by Greater Wellington Regional Council to “ensure” rather than “support and encourage” for the policy on non-vehicular forms of transport is not supported by the Commissioners. The Wairarapa covers a large area with the road network performing different roles in different situations. Amending the policy to ‘ensure’ non-vehicular forms of transport was provided in all road reserves would be at a significant cost, and have limited benefits. The Commissioners consider the existing policy wording of ‘support and encourage’ recognises the variances in the transport forms in the Wairarapa, with non-vehicular forms of transportation provided in particular locations, such as within urban areas.

The Commissioners concur with Transit NZ that the safe and efficient operation of the State Highway network is important to the wellbeing of the Wairarapa. However, we consider that the existing suite of policies in Section 17.3.2 and 18.3.2 are the most effective and efficient policies for achieving the objective for the road network. The existing policies in 17.3.2 recognise there is a hierarchy in the road network, with State Highways at the top of the hierarchy. In addition, 17.3.2 existing policies impose controls and standards on land use and

subdivision, and any new intersections and access points to manage the adverse effects of these proposals on the transportation network.

Decision: 17.3.2 Policies

Submission Reference: 525.71	Accept in part
526.69	Reject
494.7	Accept
17.7	Reject

Decision Amendment: 17.3.2 Policies

Amend Policy (g) as follows:

*“Protect **natural**, amenity, and landscape values...”*

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing policies describe the range of matters for managing the adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the road network, as well as managing the effects from the development and upgrading of the road network. The suite of policies are considered the most effective and efficient framework for achieving the objective of maintaining a safe and efficient road network.
- The amended policy recognises natural values are to be protected from the effects of new, reconstructed and upgraded transport infrastructure. The amended policy is effective in achieving the objective of managing the adverse effects from the development on the road network.

17.3.4 TT2 Objective – Managing the Rail Corridor

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
495.7	ONTRACK	-	-

Discussion

ONTRACK (495.7) support the current objective.

Evidence Heard

ONTRACK submitted evidence noting the Section 42A report recommendation of retaining the Objective.

Commissioners’ Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitter and Section 42A report that retaining the existing objective is the most appropriate for sustainably managing the rail corridor.

Decision: 17.3.4 Objective TT2

Submission Reference: 495.7 Accept

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing Objective is the most appropriate for sustainably managing the rail corridor.

17.3.5 TT2 Policies

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
495.8	ONTRACK	-	-
501.1	Barbara Durbin	-	-

Discussion

ONTRACK (495.8) request two new policies be added to require controls and standards on land use and subdivision to manage interactions with the railway network, including access over the railway.

Barbara Durbin (501.1) requests the addition of a new policy ensuring sufficient land is protected to provide for the future development of the rail corridor, rail commuter stops and ancillary uses.

Evidence Heard

ONTRACK submitted evidence supporting the Section 42A report recommendation of adding a new policy for controls and standards on land use and subdivision to manage the adverse effects on the railway network. Ontrack stated they reluctantly accepted the Section 42A report recommendation of not adding a policy on new access points or an increase in traffic for an existing access over the railway.

Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with ONTRACK and the Section 42A report that adding a policy based on controls and standards for managing the adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the railway network is an effective approach to achieve the objective for the rail corridor.

The Commissioners consider the second policy requested by ONTRACK in relation to new intersections and access points is effectively covered by the new policy, as access from the subdivision would be assessed as part of any resource consent application.

In terms of adding a new policy regarding sufficient land for the rail corridor and ancillary uses, the Commissioner note ONTRACK has a designation for the railway which is proposed to be rolled over in to the Combined Plan. Policy 17.3.2(c) provides for the development and

continued operation of the rail network. The Commissioners consider these existing provisions are the most effective for the expansion of the railway.

Decision: 17.3.5 Policies

Submission Reference: 495.8 Accept in part
501.1 Reject

Decision Amendment: 17.3.5 TT2 Policies

Add Policy (d) as follows:

(d) Establish controls and standards on land use and subdivision to avoid, remedy or mitigate any effects of the land use on the safe and efficient functioning and operation of the railway network.

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing policies are the most effective and efficient for achieving the objective of managing the effects of, and on, the rail corridor.
- The new policy provides for controls and standards as an effective approach for managing the adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the road network, which contribute towards achieving the objective for the rail network.

17.3.7 TT3 Objective

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
493.1	T and G Williams	FS 22 G & C Hearfield FS 20 S & M Matthews FS 21 T & N Vallance FS 30 Adamson Land Surveyors	Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose

Discussion

T and G Williams (493.1) seeks that the provisions for helicopter operations also apply to the existing helicopter operations at Te Parae Road. **G & C Hearfield, S & M Matthews, T & N Vallance** and **Adamson Land Surveyors** oppose this submission.

Evidence Heard

T and G Williams (493.1) presented evidence about the scale and nature of their helicopter operation at Te Parae. This evidence included written statements from a number of parties supporting the operation of this helicopter facility. No specific evidence was presented by the submitter specifically in relation to the wording of Objective 17.3.7 TT3. **S & M Matthews, T & N Vallance** and **Adamson Land Surveyors** presented evidence opposing the helicopter operation at Te Parae, highlighting the adverse effects being experienced, in particular, excessive noise.

Commissioners' Deliberations

The current objective and supporting policies provide a framework for the ongoing management and functioning of the air transport facilities in the Wairarapa, in particular, Hood Aerodrome. However, they also recognise that there are other small scale and isolated air transport facilities operating in the Wairarapa that have wider community benefits. The Commissioners consider the current objective and policies are appropriate, as they recognise the presence and importance of key air transport facilities within the Wairarapa, and seek to manage nearby development to minimise reverse sensitivity effects on these facilities. The Commissioners noted that because these policies are not location specific, it is not necessary to amend the existing objective to specifically recognise the Te Parae Road helicopter operation.

Decision: 17.3.7 Objective TT3

Submission Reference: 493.1	Reject
FS20	Accept
FS21	Accept
FS22	Accept
FS30	Accept

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- Objective 17.3.7 TT3 is not location specific, therefore, the objective does not need to be changed to recognise a helicopter operation at Te Parae.

17.3.10 Methods to Implement the Transportation Policies

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
494.8	Land Transport New Zealand	-	-
495.9	ONTRACK	-	-
493.1	T and G Williams	FS 22 G & C Hearfield FS 20 S & M Matthews FS 21 T & N Vallance FS 30 Adamson Land Surveyors	Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose

Discussion

Land Transport New Zealand (494.8) requests that the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol be added as a Method. **ONTRACK** (495.9) requests retention of Methods (e), (f) and (g).

T and G Williams (493.1) seeks that the provisions for helicopter operations also apply to the existing helicopter operations at Te Parae Road. **G & C Hearfield, S & M Matthews, T & N Vallance** and **Adamson Land Surveyors** oppose this submission.

Evidence Heard

Land Transport New Zealand presented evidence that reference to the NZ Urban Design Protocol could be expanded on in the Plan.

ONTRACK submitted evidence supporting the Section 42A report recommendation of retaining Methods (e), (f) and (g).

T and G Williams (493.1) presented evidence about the scale and nature of their helicopter operation at Te Parae. This evidence included written statements from a number of parties supporting the operation of this helicopter facility. No specific evidence was presented in relation to these Methods.

S & M Matthews, T & N Vallance and **Adamson Land Surveyors** presented evidence opposing the helicopter operation at Te Parae, highlighting the adverse effects being experienced, in particular, excessive noise.

Commissioners' Deliberations

The current methods recognise that a mix of regulatory and non-regulatory approaches are required to achieve the objective for air transport facilities.

The Commissioners note that the methods in Chapter 18 – Subdivision, Land Development and Urban Growth list the implementation of protocols and design guides, such as the NZ Urban Design Protocol. We consider the listing of this Method in Chapter 18 is effective rather than a separate listing within the Transportation chapter.

In terms of helicopter operations, the rules and standards for air transport facilities are one method applied, but only for those facilities that comply with NZS 6807:1994 – “*Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas*”.

The methods described in Section 17 are generic and do not make specific reference to particular facilities or operations. Accordingly, it was determined not to alter the methods to include specific reference to the Te Parae helicopter operation.

Decision: 17.3.10 Methods

Submission Reference: 493.1	Reject
495.9	Accept
493.1	Reject
FS 22	Accept
FS 20	Accept
FS 21	Accept
FS 30	Accept

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing Methods are the most efficient and effective in achieving the objectives for the transportation networks, including air transport facilities.
- The methods described in Chapter 17 are not location specific and it would be inappropriate to include specific reference to one air transport facility.

17.4 Anticipated Environmental Outcomes

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
17.8	Transit New Zealand	-	-
493.1	T and G Williams	FS 22 G & C Hearfield FS 20 S & M Matthews FS 21 T & N Vallance FS 30 Adamson Land Surveyors	Oppose Oppose Oppose Oppose

Discussion

Transit New Zealand (17.8) requests the addition of wording to the Anticipated Environmental Outcome to provide for a sustainable and integrated relationship between the transportation network and land uses and development.

T and G Williams (493.1) seeks that the provisions for helicopter operations also apply to the existing helicopter operations at Te Parae Road. **G & C Hearfield, S & M Matthews, T & N Vallance** and **Adamson Land Surveyors** oppose this submission.

Evidence Heard

Transit New Zealand presented evidence that they were pleased with the Section 42A report recommendation of adding reference to 'a sustainable and integrated manner' in Outcome (a).

T and G Williams (493.1) presented evidence about the scale and nature of their helicopter operation at Te Parae. This evidence included written statements from a number of parties supporting the operation of this helicopter facility. No specific evidence was presented in relation to the Anticipated Environmental Results.

S & M Matthews, T & N Vallance and **Adamson Land Surveyors** presented evidence opposing the helicopter operation at Te Parae, highlighting the adverse effects being experienced, in particular, excessive noise.

Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitter and Section 42A report that adding the reference to "in a sustainable and integrated manner" in Outcome (a) better expresses the intent of the Outcome, and is consistent with the Resource Management Act 1991.

In terms of helicopter operations, the current Anticipated Environmental Outcomes provide for the ongoing functioning of key air transport facilities in the Wairarapa. The outcomes are expressed generically and do not make specific reference to particular facilities or operations. Accordingly, it was determined not to alter the Anticipated Environmental Outcomes to include specific reference to the Te Parae helicopter operation.

Decision: 17.4 Anticipated Environmental Outcomes

Submission Reference: 17.8 Accept in part

493.1 Reject

FS 22	Accept
FS 20	Accept
FS 21	Accept
FS 30	Accept

Decision Amendment: 17.4 Anticipated Environmental Outcomes

Amend Outcome (a) as follows:

*“A transportation network that provides for the movement of goods and people in a safe and efficient manner, and is developed **in a sustainable and integrated manner** to meet the needs of the Wairarapa.*

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The Anticipated Environmental Outcomes in Chapter 17 are not location specific and it would therefore be inappropriate to make specific reference to one particular helicopter operation.
- The amended Outcome better expresses the intent of the Outcome in terms of the purpose and principles of the Act.

21.1.21 District-Wide Rules – Roads, Access, Parking & Loading Areas

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
453.1	Adamson Land Surveyors	FS 11 Greytown Community Heritage Trust	Support
453.2	Adamson Land Surveyors	-	-
285.16	Forestry Wairarapa Cluster Group	-	-
515.17	Juken New Zealand Ltd, Forestry Wairarapa	FS 103 Waipine	Support
263.7	New Zealand Fire Service Commission	FS 104 Wairarapa Rural Fire Service	Support
522.58	Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils	FS 32 Adamson Land Surveyors FS 102 Windy Peak Trust	Support Oppose

Discussion

Adamson Land Surveyors (453.1) requests front lots with an attached garage be excluded from the requirement for vehicles to exit and enter a property in a forward direction. **Greytown Community Heritage Trust** support this submission.

Forestry Wairarapa Cluster Group (285.16) and **Juken New Zealand Ltd** (515.17) seek clarification as to whether the requirement for compliance with NZS4404:2004 applies to roads on private land, such as forestry roads. If so, they request a lower standard apply to forestry roads. **Waipine** support this submission.

New Zealand Fire Service Commission (263.7) requests a specific parking standard for emergency service facilities. **Wairarapa Rural Fire District** supports this submission.

Planning Departments of Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils (522.58) requests the refinement of some parking standards, and the addition of a parking standard for hospitals. **Adamson Land Surveyors** supports this submission. **Windy Peak Trust** opposes this submission. **Adamson Land Surveyors** (453.2) also request the heading in Table 21.1.21.1 be deleted as it is superfluous.

Evidence Heard

Adamson Land Surveyors presented evidence supporting the Section 42A report recommendation of adding an exception to Rule 21.1.21(c)(iv)(1) for vehicles not to enter and exit a site in a forward direction in particular circumstances.

New Zealand Fire Service Commission presented evidence supporting the Section 42A report recommendation of adding a carpark standard for emergency service facilities.

Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitter and Section 42A report that adding an exception from the requirement for vehicles to be able to enter and exit sites in a forward direction is appropriate in particular circumstances. The circumstances in which this exception only applies to residentially zoned properties with access from District Arterial, Collector or Local Roads identified in the roading hierarchy. We consider this exception is effective for these situations, as reversing in or out of an access point can be undertaken in a safe manner given the traffic and road environment on these roads.

The Commissioners note the Plan does not apply any standards or requirements, including NZS 4404:2004 relating to roads on private land such as farm tracks and forestry roads, which is consistent with the relief sought by the submitter.

The Commissioners concur that a specific on-site parking standard for emergency service facilities is an effective approach for managing the demand for parking for this type of activity.

The table detailing the on-site parking requirements needs to be clear as to the calculation for determining the number of carparks for particular activities. We concur with the submitters and Section 42A report that the parking requirements be applied on an activities basis, rather than a zoning approach. Accordingly, we have adopted the table detailed in the Section 42A report for on-site parking requirements.

Decision: Rule 21.1.21 Permitted Activity

Submission Reference: 453.1	Accept in part
FS 11	Accept in part

285.16 FS 16	Accept in part Accept in part
515.17 FS 103	Accept in part Accept in part
263.7 FS 104	Accept in part Accept in part
522.58 FS 32	Accept Accept
453.2	Accept

Decision Amendment: 21.1.21 District-Wide Rules – Roads, Access, Parking and Loading Areas

Replace Table 21.1.21.1 Parking Requirements with the following:

Activity	Parking spaces required
Accommodation Activities	1 per accommodation unit, room, or campsite, plus 1 per 2 employees
Childcare Centre	1 per employee, plus 1 per 10 persons to be accommodated in the centre.
Commercial Activities (including, but not limited to retail, supermarkets and offices)	1 per 45m ² GFA, plus 1 per 100m ² outdoor display area
Educational Facilities (primary and secondary)	1 per employee
Educational Facilities (tertiary)	1 per employee plus 1 per 10 students
Emergency Service Facilities	1 per 100m ² GFA, plus 1 per on duty staff member (excluding volunteers)
Entertainment facility	1 per 3 persons the facility is designed to accommodate
Health Facility	4 per practitioner
Hospital	1 per bed the facility is designed to accommodate, plus 1 per 2 staff members on site
Industrial Activities	1 per 50m ² GFA
Place of Assembly	1 per 4 persons the place is designed to accommodate
Residential Activities	1 per residential unit
Restaurant	1 per 4 persons the facility is designed to accommodate.
Resthome	1 per 4 beds the facility is designed to accommodate, plus 1 per employee on site.
Sports fields and playing fields	1 for every 3 participants (design capacity)
Tavern	1 per 10m ² GFA

Add the following definition of Hospital:

“Hospital – (parking requirement) facilities including associated land and buildings used for the purposes of providing 24 hour healthcare service to the community.”

Amend 21.1.21(c)(iv)(1) as follows:

“Each required vehicle park shall have practical access from a public road. Sufficient manoeuvring space shall be provided to enable vehicles to enter and exit the site in a forward direction.

Exception: The requirement to exit and enter a site in a forward direction shall not apply to a front lot in the Residential Zone where a garage is attached to a dwelling and that obtains access to a District Arterial, Collector or Local Road. This exception does not apply where access is obtained directly from the State Highway or a Strategic Arterial Road.

Note: The hierarchy of roads is identified in Volume 2 of the Plan: Maps.

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The addition of an exception for the requirement that vehicles enter and exit the site in a forward direction is an effective approach for maintaining a safe and efficient road network, while providing for the efficient use of the land resource.
- The existing standards require compliance with NZS4404:2004 where new public roads are developed or upgraded, or where new private roads or access roads are to service a subdivision or land use in multiple ownership.
- The requirements for on-site parking need to be clearly expressed, so it is certain as to the number parking spaces required for particular activities. The approach based on activities instead of zones is considered the most effective, as the requirements depend and reflect on the nature and scale of the activity.

21.1.24 District-Wide Rules – Aerodrome Protection

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
215.1	N & C Winter	FS 94 A & M Flynn	Support
23.1	L Annear	-	-
23.2	L Annear	-	-
377.1	V & B Robertson	FS 93 A & M Flynn FS 97 T W L Property Holdings Ltd FS 95 W A Hargreaves Trust	Support Support Support

Discussion

N & C Winter (215.1) requests the Air Noise Boundaries and associated rules be deleted from the Plan. **A & M Flynn** supports this submission.

L Annear (23.1) and (23.2) requests amendments to the rules to allow additions and alterations to existing buildings within the Air Noise Boundaries, and to require noise insulation for exterior walls only.

V & B Robertson (377.1) requests the Air Noise Boundaries be revised to their previous locations, and alternative forms of noise management to be implemented, before imposing land use restrictions on surrounding land. **A & M Flynn, T W L Property Holdings Ltd** and **W A Hargreaves Trust** support this submission.

Evidence Heard

N & C Winter presented evidence regarding the lack of information available about the nature of activities at Hood Aerodrome. They stated their main objection related to the commissioning of the new runway as the flight path went over their house, and raised concerns about its safety compared to the other runways at Hood Aerodrome.

V & B Robertson presented evidence expressing disappointment about the lack of consultation on the developments at Hood Aerodrome. They contended Hood Aerodrome had experienced significant changes over the past few years, in particular, a huge decrease in helicopter activity. They stated that the air movement numbers in the Hood Aerodrome Management Plan were questionable, and that the predictions were very excessive. They requested their property should not be subject to building restrictions based on the growth projections for the aerodrome. They felt the aerodrome had been avoiding any effort to work with its neighbours and address noise problems itself.

A & M Flynn, T W L Property Holdings Ltd and **W A Hargreaves Trust** presented evidence querying the process for preparing the Hood Aerodrome Management Plan, in particular, consultation with surrounding property owners. They contended that the Management Plan contains inconsistent and inaccurate information, especially on flight movements. Therefore, they contended the air noise contours based on these movements were wrong and not needed.

Commissioners' Deliberations

Hood Aerodrome is the Wairarapa's main air transport facility and makes a significant contribution to the economic and social wellbeing of the local community. As with all airports, however, the Aerodrome can generate potentially significant adverse effects on the local environment. In its management, therefore, the operators of the Aerodrome are obliged to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the environment insofar as practicable without unduly affecting the operational requirements of the facility.

One of the main adverse effects from Hood Aerodrome is the emission of noise from aircraft operations.

Under the Resource Management Act, the management of noise emissions must be undertaken within a framework that allows the Aerodrome to provide for current and reasonably anticipated future demands, while minimising the potential conflict with the local environment, and the ability of surrounding landowners to use and enjoy their property. The objectives and policies of the District Plan formalise these goals.

Management of Airport Noise Emissions

All airports create noise emissions well outside airport boundaries, from aircraft takeoffs and landings, taxiing, warming up, engine maintenance and other activities. However, there are measures that can be undertaken to reduce the extent, frequency, scale and intensity of aircraft noise emissions, some of which occur within the regulatory scope of the Resource

Management Act, while others rely on other methods, such as Airport Management Plans and Memoranda of Understanding.

Given the nature and scale of activities at the Aerodrome, the management of external noise emissions can only be achieved to a certain degree. Hood Aerodrome is designated for airport purposes under the Operative Masterton District Plan, and is also proposed to be designated in the Combined Plan, slightly enlarged to include recently acquired adjoining land. As a designated public work, the Aerodrome is exempt from complying with the maximum noise level standards for the zone within which it is located or any other underlying rules.

However, conditions can be imposed on a designated public work, and to this end the Commissioners note that the Planner's Section 42A report on the designation for Hood Aerodrome, made several recommendations to the Independent Hearing Commissioner for the designation in this regard, including:

1. Preparation of and compliance with a Noise Management Plan
2. Ongoing compliance with the air noise contours
3. Compliance demonstration reports
4. Regular monitoring of noise emissions.

It is anticipated that these conditions, at a minimum, would be introduced as these have been offered by the Aerodrome Authority, following recommendations from its consultants. The Commissioners were informed by its planning advisers that such requirements are used throughout New Zealand to manage airport noise.

We consider that such conditions would be effective in managing aerodrome noise emissions as far as practicable, and would address the concern expressed by submitters that the Aerodrome is not currently effectively managing the noise generated from the facility.

In addition, the Commissioners would encourage the Airport Authority to form a liaison group with local residents in the preparation of the Noise Management Plan, and for its ongoing monitoring and development.

Management of Adjacent Land Uses

Notwithstanding the imposition of requirements on the Aerodrome to manage its noise emissions, the Commissioners recognise that, given the nature and scale of activities at the aerodrome, the noise emitted from the use of the Aerodrome has the potential to conflict with the amenity values sought by other nearby land uses, in particular, residential uses. There are several methods that are considered to be effective and appropriate measures to use to minimise further conflicts. These measures are used elsewhere in New Zealand (and overseas) to avoid or remedy the effects of airport operations on adjacent land uses and to reduce the potential for further sensitive land uses to be exacerbated.

In determining the appropriateness of the controls on neighbouring land, the Commissioners have considered the benefits and costs of the rules. The key benefit of the rules is to protect the aerodrome from future restrictions on its operation, due to limitations imposed by a more intensively developed surrounding environment, and establishment of sensitive land uses.

Subdivision Management

First, the Commissioners consider that it is an effective approach to manage subdivision and development in locations in close proximity to the Aerodrome to reduce the potential for more intensive development to exacerbate potential conflicts. This is achieved through zoning much of the area Rural Special, which generally seeks to limit subdivision to a minimum of 4 hectares. This zoning continues the zoning that has been in effect over the last few decades under the Masterton County and then Masterton District Plans, except as noted below.

At the time the Proposed Combined Wairarapa District Plan was promulgated, it was decided to rezone some predominantly undeveloped urban residentially zoned land on South Belt to Rural Special (including one of the submitter's) where the land is in close proximity to a runway flight path and is partly affected by the Outer Air Noise control. Some of the affected properties are still partly zoned Residential where they are located further away from the Aerodrome, and front South Belt.

Development Management: Air Noise Contours

Second, the Commissioners consider the air noise contour tool is the most effective in managing the area where current and future conflict with the aerodrome may occur in terms of noise emissions. As noted in the Hood Aerodrome Management Plan and supplementary material from the airport authority, flight movements are a key factor in determining the extent of the air noise contours. The Commissioners acknowledge the submitters' concerns regarding the validity of the flight movement estimates used to determine the air noise contours. We recognise the limitations in providing definitive statistics about the current and future movements at the Aerodrome, given the nature of current and future activities and the lack of comprehensive monitoring and recording systems (in particular, the Aerodrome is an unmanned facility with no detailed recordings of actual flight movements).

While the Commissioners would have preferred to have more definitive information about current flight movements as a basis to make the future projections, we recognise that this information is not available, and the projections are based on the available empirical evidence. We were also advised that some provision for variability will always be inherent in determining the extent of the air noise contours. Furthermore, the Commissioners note that the submitters' properties are in relatively close proximity to the Airport and are therefore likely to be generally affected by airport activities, notwithstanding the variables involved in determining the air noise contours.

While the latest modelling shows different contours to that in the Proposed Plan due to the changes in projected flight movements, we consider the existing contours would be effective in managing subdivision and development near the Aerodrome, and do not propose to amend them. Unless the Airport experiences considerable growth, the existing contours are likely to be appropriate for the life of the District Plan (i.e. 10 years). In this regard, the Commissioners were informed by the Airport Authority that the air noise contours arising from the current level of aircraft activity at the Aerodrome are not dissimilar from the proposed contours.

Turning to the rules that apply to the air noise contours, there are two rules: Rule 21.1.24(b) which requires noise insulation standards for additions and alterations to buildings for existing noise sensitive activities (such as dwellings), and Rule 21.3.5 which requires a resource consent for any new noise sensitive activity, including a new residential activity.

At the hearing, a submitter contended that Rule 21.1.24(b) would require them to noise insulate their existing dwelling. This is not correct. All existing dwellings within the outer air noise contour have existing use rights, and do not require the retrofitting of noise insulation. However, if additions or alterations were proposed to an existing dwelling, Rule 21.1.24(b) would require these additions or alterations only to comply with the minimum noise insulation standards. If part of an existing dwelling was not being altered, this part would still retain its existing use rights, and would not be required to be upgraded to comply with the minimum standards.

We note the comments from Marshall Day Acoustics that Rule 21.1.24(b) is consistent with the provision for noise management around other New Zealand airports. We accept that these noise insulation standards would impose some additional building costs on landowners undertaking additions or alterations, but that these measures would ensure that alterations or additions to residential dwellings are adequately insulated to protect residents' amenities.

We note that such insulation will have other benefits in terms of energy savings and heating, with consequent ongoing cost savings. The Commissioners also note that such insulation requirements would ensure the long term benefits for both residents and the ongoing efficient functioning of the Aerodrome, well beyond the 10 year life of the District Plan, or the 20 year forecasting timeframe.

We concur with the submitter that the noise insulation standards apply to exterior walls, not internal walls.

In terms of Rule 21.3.5, we consider the resource consent process is an effective means of managing the development of new noise sensitive activities. As a restricted discretionary activity, in determining any resource consent application, Council's discretion is limited to acoustic insulation, other acoustic mitigation measures, location of the proposed activity, and other measures to protect the operational requirements of the Aerodrome. Such applications would be processed on a non-notified basis, and are solely focused on matters pertaining to noise mitigation. For properties within the Rural (Special) Zone, the District Plan provides for the typical range of rural uses as permitted activities (including grazing, vineyards, horticulture and forestry).

Overall, we conclude that the air noise contours and associated rules are the most effective and efficient approach for managing development on land surrounding the Aerodrome. While this may impose some costs for these landowners in undertaking building work, we consider these costs are outweighed by the benefits to the current and future occupiers of the dwellings, and for the ongoing operation of the Aerodrome.

Development Management: Obstacle Limitation Surfaces

The other component to the Aerodrome Protection Rule (21.1.24) in the Proposed Wairarapa Combined District Plan is the Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS). Essentially, the OLS are a secondary height control (over and beyond the underlying zone height standards) to manage potential obstacles being established that could compromise the safety of aircraft movements at the Aerodrome. The dimensions of the OLS are defined in Appendix 11, with the spatial limits shown on the Planning Maps.

The use of OLS controls is a common approach to managing flight paths for runways to ensure they are clear of any obstacles. Hood Aerodrome has six OLS extending off the ends of three runways, being existing runway 06/24 (paved and grass), existing runway 10/28 (grass) and future runway 14/32 (grass). There was no specific submission or evidence presented in relation to the OLS for the existing runways 06/24 or 10/28. The Commissioners note the protection of the flight paths for Hood Aerodrome was applied in the Operative Masterton District Plan. The Commissioners also noted the existing OLS for the main runways identified in the Proposed Plan are similar to the airport protection areas in the Operative Masterton District Plan. The focus of submissions and evidence was in regard to the OLS for the future runway 14/32.

First, as outlined at the hearing, we would highlight that, in terms of the number, positioning and use of any runway at Hood Aerodrome, if they are within the designated land area, we as Commissioners on the Plan provisions do not have authority to approve or decline a runway. While we acknowledge the concerns of some submitters about the risks to the use of existing properties below runway flight paths, such risks can occur in any area in proximity to an airport, and not simply within flight paths. We note, also, that this runway would be used only infrequently, and by small fixed wing craft that can take off over relatively short distances.

Second, the OLS would have little practical effect on land uses within their ambit. Even properties within close proximity to the airport, such as those on South Road, are well below the relevant OLS, where the lowest point is about 25m above ground level (compared with the underlying height limit of 15m).

Accordingly, we consider that it is appropriate to apply an OLS to future runway 14/32, and that the OLS does not impose any significant restriction on the development of land.

Decision: Rule 21.1.24 Permitted Activity

Submission Reference: 215.1	Reject
FS 94	Reject
23.1	Reject
23.2	Accept
377.1	Reject
FS 93	Reject
FS 97	Reject
FS 95	Reject

Decision Amendment: 21.1.24 District – Wide Rules – Aerodrome Protection

Amend Rule 21.1.24(b)(i)(1)(b) fourth bullet point as follows:

Fibrous thermal insulation batts (not polystyrene) in ~~internal~~ external wall and ceiling cavities;

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The air noise contours and associated rules are the most effective and efficient approach for managing development on land surrounding the Aerodrome, and while this may impose some costs for these landowners in undertaking building work, we consider these costs are outweighed by the benefits to the current and future occupiers of the dwellings and their amenity values, and for the ongoing operation of the Aerodrome.
- Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS) are an effective tool for managing the height of structures to protect the flight paths for runways, providing for the ongoing safe and efficient use of the Aerodrome without imposing an unreasonable constraint on land where they apply.

21.3.11 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Helicopter Landing Areas

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
264.47	D Riddiford	-	-

Discussion

D Riddiford (264.47) notes he will submit in further detail on Helicopter Landing Areas at the hearing.

Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this matter.

Commissioners' Deliberations

As no specific reasons or relief sought was stated for this submission, the Commissioners consider the existing rule is the most effective and efficient for managing new helicopter landing areas.

Decision: Rule 21.3.11 Restricted Discretionary Activity

Submission Reference: 264.47 Reject

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing rule requiring resource consent for new helicopter landing areas is considered the most effective and efficient for managing the effects from this type of activity.

22.1.16 Assessment Criteria – Roads, Intersections, Access, Parking & Loading Areas

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
495.16	ONTRACK	-	-
495.17	ONTRACK	-	-

Discussion

ONTRACK (495.16) seeks the addition of text to the Assessment Criteria to consider the effects on the rail network. **ONTRACK** (495.17) seeks the addition of Ontrack as a consultation party.

Evidence Heard

ONTRACK presented evidence supporting the Section 42A report recommendation for 22.1.6(iii) by adding reference to 'rail'. For criteria (xiii), they requested the wording reflect recent changes to the management of the rail network.

Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitter and the Section 42A report that adding the reference to 'rail' and making the criteria consistent with recent changes in the management of rail infrastructure to be more effective.

Decision: Rule 22.1.16 Assessment Criteria

Submission Reference: 495.16 Accept
 495.17 Accept

Decision Amendment: Assessment Criteria 22.1.16

Amend 22.1.16 to read as follows:

*(iii) The extent to which the safety and efficiency of the road **and rail** network or the safety...*

*(xiii) The details and outcome of any consultation undertaken with the Road Controlling Authority (Transit New Zealand and/or District Council) **and the rail premises owner and/or the railway access provider (ONTRACK).***

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing and amended Assessment Criteria are the most effective and efficient in managing the effects on transportation networks from subdivision, use and development.

27 Definition - Helicopter Landing Area

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
492.3	Horticulture New Zealand	FS 112 D Riddiford FS 85 Federated Farmers of NZ (Inc) FS 54 NZ Winegrowers	Support Support Support

Discussion

Horticulture New Zealand (492.3) request that the definition of a helicopter landing area exclude landing and take off for spraying application on rural properties. **D Riddiford, Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)** and **NZ Winegrowers** support this submission.

Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this matter.

Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitters and the Section 42A report that by adding specific exclusion for helicopter movements associated with activities within the site better expresses the nature of helicopter operations to be managed by the Plan.

Decision: 27 Definition – Helicopter Landing Area

Submission Reference: 492.3	Accept in part
FS 112	Accept in part
FS 85	Accept in part
FS 54	Accept in part

Decision Amendment: 27 Definition – Helicopter Landing Area

Amend the definition of “helicopter landing area” as follows:

*“Helicopter Landing Area: - means a site used for more than four (4) helicopter movements (landing or departure) within any 28-day period, **excluding helicopter movements associated with primary production activities within the site.***

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The amended definition better expresses the nature of helicopter landing areas to be managed by the Plan, and to exclude temporary movements associated with primary production activities within a property.

32 Appendix 5 – Requirements for Roads, Access, Parking & Loading

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
455.1	Adamson Land Surveyors	-	-

Discussion

Adamson Land Surveyors (455.1) request that up to 10 lots can have access from a private rural accessway 6.0m wide, and rural accesses adjoining and serving lots of more than 1.5 ha only require a metal formation.

Evidence Heard

Adamson Land Surveyors presented evidence requesting that the sealing of accessways only apply to lots of 1.5ha or less, and that this requirement be considered in light of the philosophy of the NZ Handbook for People and the Environment which encourages the use of porous materials. They also requested the number of users (lots and dwellings) with access off a right of way be increased to 10. They noted there were complications with Table 3.1 in NZS 4404 as it referred to lots or dwelling units.

Commissioners’ Deliberations

The Plan adopts NZS4404:2004 as the primary tool for setting the construction standards for transport infrastructure. However, experience has demonstrated some standards may not be appropriate in the Wairarapa context, therefore, the Plan included specific variances for this purpose.

Accessways to small rural lots and multi-unit developments are situations where unsealed accessways have proved problematic in the past, as they can create nuisances for neighbouring properties.

The Commissioners acknowledge there are costs and benefits in requiring the sealing of these accessways. By sealing the accessways, this benefits the current and future owners of

the subject properties as they generally have lower maintenance costs and have a higher standard of access, as well as avoiding dust nuisances for neighbouring properties. Conversely, the financial costs of constructing a sealed accessway compared to an unsealed accessway are considerably higher. In addition, the sealing creates an impervious surface which increases surface water runoff which may require more management than unsealed surfaces. Weighing up the benefits and costs of sealing versus unsealing, the Commissioners consider the benefits outweigh the costs over the long term by avoiding the nuisances.

The 2 hectare lot size is considered the most effective rural lot size threshold for this purpose, as it is likely a neighbouring dwelling may be located in close proximity of a lot of this size. The resource consent process would be effective in evaluating any proposed non-compliance with the requirement of sealing the accessway.

In terms of the number of lots with access from a single accessway, the Commissioners adopt the evaluation of Councils' Roading Engineers expressed in the Section 42A report. NZS4404 applies six lots are the maximum number with rights to a single accessway, as any more than six has the potential to generate conflicting vehicle movements. As discussed in the Rural Zone decision report, the number of dwellings permitted on a site has been amended to one for smaller lots. Accordingly, the potential anomaly between lots and dwelling units referred to by the submitter in their evidence has been resolved by this amendment.

Decision: Appendix 5

Submission Reference: 455.1 Reject

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing standard for the number of lots from a single accessway is considered the most effective and efficient in providing for a safe and efficient transportation network.
- The requirement to seal accessways to small rural lots and multiunit residential developments is the most effective in avoiding nuisances with neighbouring properties.

Submission Summary

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
263.8	New Zealand Fire Service Commission	FS 104 Wairarapa Rural Fire District	Support

Discussion

New Zealand Fire Service Commission (263.8) requests a minimum formed carriageway width of 3.0 metres for accessways. **Wairarapa Rural Fire District** supports this submission.

Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this matter.

Commissioners' Deliberations

The New Zealand Standard (NZS 4404:2004) states the minimum legal width of an accessway is 3.6m, while the minimum formed carriageway is 2.75m. The submitter has requested the minimum formed carriageway width be increased to 3.0m.

The Commissioners noted the comments from Councils' Roading Engineers in the Section 42A report about the minimum width of accessway, which stated that the overall width already fell within the criteria being requested.

The submission noted that wider carriageways were required to provide sufficient space for fire fighters to move around a vehicle. We consider the legal width of 3.6m already effectively achieves this requirement, therefore, the existing formed carriageway width of 2.75m is retained.

Decision: Appendix 5

Submission Reference: 263.8 Reject
FS 104 Reject

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing formed carriageway width of 2.75m and legal accessway width of 3.6m is effective in providing access for all types of vehicles to rear properties.

Submission Summary

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
273.31	Tomlinson & Carruthers Surveyors Ltd	FS 31 Adamson Land Surveyors	Oppose in part

Discussion

Tomlinson & Carruthers Surveyors Ltd (273.31) request changes to the width of residential accessways, the number of lots from accessways, and the requirement to complete a 180° turning area within a lot. **Adamson Land Surveyors** oppose in part this submission.

Evidence Heard

Adamson Land Surveyors presented evidence clarifying their express concern related to the point at which the turning circle is measured from.

Commissioners' Deliberations

The matter of accessway widths is deliberated above for the NZ Fire Service submission. As discussed earlier, any subdivision proposal that does not comply with the requirements of Appendix 5 is to be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity. The Commissioners consider this activity status is appropriate for access standards, as it provides for a targeted assessment of this matter in the application.

For the number of access points to a site, the Commissioners concur with the advice of Councils' Roading Engineers that limiting the number of access points is an effective approach to maintaining a safe and efficient road network. This limitation is imperative in the Residential Zone, given the nature of the road environment, and the potential conflict between pedestrians and vehicular traffic entering and exiting residential properties.

Lastly, the requirement for a 180° turning area within a lot ensures there is sufficient on-site manoeuvring area for vehicles to undertake a three-point turn to exit a site in a forward direction. The Commissioners concur with the evidence of Adamson Land Surveyors that the measurement of this turning area needs to be applied as detailed in the Plan. Accordingly, the Commissioners consider the existing turning area requirement is effective in managing the on-site manoeuvring area.

As a consequential change for the previous deliberations for the requirement for vehicles to enter and exit a site in a forward direction, an exception is added for particular circumstances.

Decision: Appendix 5

Submission Reference: 273.31	Reject
FS 31	Accept

Consequential Amendment:

Amend 21.1.21(c)(iv)(1) as follows:

"Each required vehicle park shall have practical access from a public road. Sufficient manoeuvring space shall be provided to enable vehicles to enter and exit the site in a forward direction.

Exception: The requirement to exit and enter a site in a forward direction shall not apply to a front lot in the Residential Zone where a garage is attached to a dwelling and that obtains access to a District Arterial, Collector or Local Road. This exception does not apply where access is obtained directly from the State Highway or a Strategic Arterial Road.

Note: The hierarchy of roads is identified in Volume 2 of the Plan: Maps.

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing formed carriageway width of 2.75m and legal accessway width of 3.6m is effective in providing access for all types of vehicles to rear properties.
- The existing standards for the number of access points and on-site manoeuvring area are the most effective for managing the effects for access and manoeuvring.

Submission Summary

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
526.119	Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS 33 Adamson Land Surveyors FS 52 Horticulture NZ	Support Oppose

Discussion

Greater Wellington Regional Council (526.119) requests a minimum sightline standard to be introduced for access to roads in the Rural Zone. **Adamson Land Surveyors** supports this submission. **Horticulture New Zealand** opposes this submission.

Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this matter.

Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners noted the comments in the Section 42A report that Appendix 5 includes minimum sightlines for Railway Level Crossings, State Highways and other roads and driveways. We consider these existing standards are effective in managing the minimum sightline distance for access to roads in the Rural Zone.

Decision: Appendix 5

Submission Reference: 526.119 Accept in part
FS 33 Accept in part
FS 52 Accept in part

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing standards for minimum sightlines for access to roads in the Rural Zone are effective in providing for safe ingress and egress to a property.

Submission Summary

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
495.26	ONTRACK	-	-
495.27	ONTRACK	-	-
17.15	Transit New Zealand	-	-

Discussion

ONTRACK (495.26) and (495.27) requests a setback distance and sightlines for accessways near the railway be added.

Transit New Zealand (17.15) request Appendix 5 be retained.

Evidence Heard

ONTRACK submitted evidence accepting the Section 42A report recommendation of adding a clause for setback distance and sightlines for accessways near the railway, with minor amendments reflecting recent changes in the management of railway infrastructure. They also requested minor amendments to references in the Plan to Tranz Rail documents.

Commissioners' Deliberations

The Commissioners concur with the submitter and the Section 42A report assessment and recommendation that the addition of a clause for setback distance and sightlines for accessways near the railway is an effective approach for the safe operation of the railway network.

In terms of the requested new standard for road/rail crossings, the Commissioners noted the evidence of **ONTRACK** for retaining the existing standard, but to update this standard reference to the current edition of the Tranz Rail document. The Commissioners concur with the evidence presented by the submitter, that the existing standard with the minor amendment is the most effective approach for managing road/rail crossings.

Decision: Appendix 5

Submission Reference: 495.26	Accept
495.27	Accept in part
17.15	Accept

Decision Amendment: 32 Appendix 5 – Requirements for Roads, Access, Parking and Loading

Amend 32.1.4 by adding the following:

“Road and accessway intersections shall be designed to ensure sufficient sight distances and safety, having regard to expected traffic volumes and speeds on approach roads.

Where it is proposed to create a vehicle access or road intersection with any State Highway, the applicant shall obtain the approval of Transit New Zealand. Intersections with the State Highway shall meet Transit New Zealand requirements.

Where it is proposed to create an accessway over or under the railway and/or create an accessway and/or intersection within 30 metres of a road/rail level crossing, the applicant shall obtain the approval of the railway premises owner and/or the railway access provider (ONTRACK).”

Amend 32.1.5 as follows:

*“At road/rail level crossings, viewlines shall meet the minimum requirements of ~~OnTrack~~ **ONTRACK** (New Zealand Railways Corporation). Tranz Rail document CSG 417-Q517 Issue 2 **3** Section 4 sets out the requirements for*

viewlines. The minimum and desirable view along the track is specified for various train speeds. For crossings where automatic warning devices or stop signs are not installed the minimum view along the track at 30m from track centreline is also specified.”

Consequential Change:

Amend the document reference for Sight lines at Railway Level Crossings in Appendix 5 Standards for Roads, Access, Parking and Loading Table as follows:

~~“OnTrack~~ **ONTRACK** requirements (Document CSG 417-Q517 Issue 2 **3**)”

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The existing and amended standards for minimum sightlines for roads and property access in relation to the railway are effective in providing for safe ingress and egress to a property, and achieving the objective of a safe and efficient rail network.

Submission Summary

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
364.1	Stephen Meyrick	-	-

Discussion

Stephen Meyrick (364.1) requests Figure 32.2 be used on a discretionary basis when there is a need to shift water from one side of a rural lot crossing.

Evidence Heard

No specific evidence was presented on this matter.

Commissioners’ Deliberations

The Commissioners noted the comments in the Section 42A report that if a culvert was not required, it was effective for the Plan not to require its installation. Accordingly, the Commissioners concur with the recommendation to amendment to Figures 32.2 Type A and Type B of adding ‘where appropriate’.

Decision: Appendix 5

Submission Reference: 364.1 Accept in part

Decision Amendment: 32 Appendix 5 – Requirements for Roads, Access, Parking and Loading

Amend Figure 32.2 Type A and Type B by adding the following text to the label for the culvert pipe:

Culvert pipe 300mm min. dia where appropriate.

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- The amended for the figure reflects there are some situations where a culvert is not required. This amendment is effective is providing for the installation of access points that reflect the individual circumstances of each crossing point.

38 Appendix 11 Airport Protection Area

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Further Submitter Name and Number	Further Submission Support/Oppose
372.1	N & C Winter	-	-
375.1	B & V Robertson (Planning maps 39 & 51)	FS 93 A & M Flynn FS 97 T W L Property Holdings Ltd FS 95 W A Hargreaves Trust	Support Support Support

Discussion

N & C Winter (372.1) requests the Future Grass Runway 14/32 be deleted from Section 38.1.3.

B & V Robertson (375.1) request amend flight paths on Maps 39 and 51 and specifically the future runway 14/32 in 38.1.3 of Appendix 11. **A & M Flynn, W A Hargreaves Trust** and **T W L Property Holdings Ltd** support this submission.

Evidence Heard

N & C Winter presented evidence regarding the lack of information available about the nature of activities at Hood Aerodrome. They stated their main objection related to the commissioning of the new runway as the flight path went over their house, and raised concerns about its safety compared to the other runways at Hood Aerodrome.

V & B Robertson presented evidence expressing disappointment about the lack of consultation on the developments at Hood Aerodrome. They contended Hood Aerodrome had experienced significant changes over the past few years, in particular, a huge decrease in helicopter activity. They stated that the air movement numbers in the Hood Aerodrome Management Plan were questionable, and that the predictions were very excessive. Request their property should not be subject to building restrictions based on the growth projections for the aerodrome. They felt the aerodrome had been avoiding any effort to work with its neighbours and address noise problems itself.

A & M Flynn, T W L Property Holdings Ltd and **W A Hargreaves Trust** presented evidence querying the process for preparing the Hood Aerodrome Management Plan, in particular, consultation with surrounding property owners. They contended that the Management Plan contains inconsistent and inaccurate information, especially the flight movements. Therefore, they contended the air noise contours based on these movements were wrong and not needed.

Commissioners' Deliberations

Essentially, the OLS are a secondary height control (over and beyond the underlying zone height standards) to manage potential obstacles being established that could compromise the safety of aircraft movements at the Aerodrome. The dimensions of the OLS are defined in Appendix 11, with the spatial limits shown on the Planning Maps.

The use of OLS controls is a common approach to managing flight paths for runways to ensure they are clear of any obstacles. Hood Aerodrome has six OLS extending off the ends of three runways, being existing runway 06/24 (paved and grass), existing runway 10/28 (grass) and future runway 14/32 (grass). There was no specific submission or evidence presented in relation to the OLS for the existing runways 06/24 or 10/28. The Commissioners note the protection of the flight paths for Hood Aerodrome was applied in the Operative Masterton District Plan. The Commissioners also noted the existing OLS for the main runways identified in the Proposed Plan are similar to the airport protection areas in the Operative Masterton District Plan. The focus of submissions and evidence was in regard to the OLS for the future runway 14/32.

First, as outlined at the hearing, we would highlight that, in terms of the number, positioning and use of any runway at Hood Aerodrome, if they are within the designated land area, we as Commissioners on the Plan provisions do not have authority to approve or decline a runway. While we acknowledge the concerns of some submitters about the risks to the use of existing properties below runway flight paths, such risks can occur in any area in proximity to an airport, and not simply within flight paths. We note, also, that this runway would be used only infrequently, and by small fixed wing craft that can take off over relatively short distances.

Second, the OLS would have little practical effect on land uses within their ambit. Even properties within close proximity to the airport, such as those on South Road, are well below the relevant OLS, where the lowest point is about 25m above ground level (compared with the underlying height limit of 15m).

Accordingly, we consider that it is appropriate to apply an OLS to future runway 14/32, and that the OLS does not impose any significant restriction on the development of land.

Decision: Appendix 11

Submission Reference: 372.1	Reject
-----------------------------	--------

375.1	Reject
FS 93	Reject
FS 97	Reject
FS 95	Reject

Reasons

This decision is made for the following reasons:

- Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS) are an effective tool for managing the height of structures to protect the flight paths for runways, providing for the ongoing safe and efficient use of the Aerodrome without imposing an unreasonable constraint on land where they apply.

