

591 Change 43: Motueka Aerodrome Noise**■ SUBMISSIONS DEALT WITH IN THIS REPORT**

Consideration Order : 8

C43.1687.1	Abel Tasman Aviation Nelson Ltd	Area Map 52	Add noise contours in association with Motueka aerodrome, a strategic and economic asset.
<i>Oppose</i>	FC43.1782.4		
C43.1687.2	Abel Tasman Aviation Nelson Ltd	17.1	Add restrictions on aircraft noise-sensitive activities in areas within noise contours (noise provisions for Ardmore aerodrome supplied).
<i>Oppose</i>	FC43.1782.5		

■ ASSESSMENT

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Motueka aerodrome is located on the western side of Queen Victoria Street. Plan Change 43 extends west to Queen Victoria Street but no new residential zoning has been proposed within 300m of the aerodrome boundary.
- 1.2 The Council owns and manages the aerodrome which is subject to a management plan. Annual aircraft movement data has begun to be collected this year.
- 1.3 The Council's Coordinator, Environmental Health, advises that in recent times most aircraft noise complaints have come from the Upper Moutere area where air training exercises occur and that he has received, on average, one noise complaint a year on the operations at Motueka aerodrome.
The existing TRMP noise rules do not cover aircraft in flight and the excessive noise provisions of the Resource Management Act (S326) exempts "noise emitted by any - (a) aircraft being operated during, or immediately before or after flight..." from the definition of excessive noise.

2.0 SUBMISSION AND FURTHER SUBMISSION

- 2.1 Submitter 1687.1 requests that noise contours be prepared for Motueka aerodrome because it is a strategic and economic asset for the district. Staff contacted the Civil Aviation Authority who advised that there are a number of airports throughout New Zealand that have established air noise boundaries, the majority of these being the larger airports such as Wellington, Auckland, Christchurch, Queenstown and Nelson. The submitter has provided a copy of Ardmore Aerodrome provisions – however Motueka is unlikely to have anywhere near the number of aircraft movements as Ardmore which has 200,000 aircraft movements per annum.
- 2.2 Submitter 1687.2 requests that there are restrictions on noise sensitive activities in areas within the noise contours. The 30 pages of noise provisions relating to residential development near Ardmore aerodrome (from the former Papakura District Plan) have been supplied with the submission. The provisions are complex and took over 10 years to become included in the district plan.
- 2.3 There is one further submission FC43.1782 opposing the submissions on the grounds that the controls suggested relate to an aerodrome that is much higher use than currently occurs or is likely to occur at Motueka aerodrome. Also that the Plan Change provides for industrial activity, which is not noise sensitive on the land in Motueka West closest to the Motueka aerodrome.

3.0 ASSESSMENT

- 3.1 The Council as owner and manager of the aerodrome which is an important district asset could establish a noise contour map for it. This concept comes from the NZ Standard 6805 Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning. The standard has been developed for use by Councils for the control and management of airport noise in the vicinity of an airport or aerodrome, for the protection of community health and amenity values. It is intended to be applicable to all airports and aerodromes as defined in the Civil Aviation Regulations 1953 to ensure that communities living close to airports are properly protected from the effects of aircraft noise while recognising the need to be able to operate an airport efficiently. The standard uses a system which sets a limit for the average daily amount of aircraft noise exposure permitted in the vicinity of an airport, and only inside a fixed working area defined by the "air noise boundary" is the noise exposure allowed to be greater than this. In this working area there are strict rules of compatible land use, and air noise monitoring stations at this boundary ensure that the noise exposure is kept within the prescribed limits.
There is also a secondary and outer control boundary for the protection of amenity values.
- 3.2 Some airports use a computer-based package that is available for noise modelling. However that can only be used when some reliable data on current and future aircraft movements has been assembled. It can then be assessed whether there is a need for restrictions on noise sensitive activities within the noise contours. As this could involve other land outside the Plan Change 43 area, it would need to be done as a possible separate Plan change. The technical data that needs to be collected to establish the controls proposed by the standard requires a considerable amount of research to be done. The Council does not have the in house capability to do this work.

- 3.3 Industrial development is not considered to be a “noise sensitive development”. It has been located along the Queen Victoria Street frontage of Plan Change 43 so it acts as a buffer to the aerodrome as well as having good access to the arterial road network and labour.

■ RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS

Recommendation 591.1

C43.1687.1	Abel Tasman Aviation Nelson Ltd	Disallow
<i>Allow</i>	FC43.1782.4	
C43.1687.2	Abel Tasman Aviation Nelson Ltd	Disallow
<i>Allow</i>	FC43.1782.5	

Plan Amendments

Topic : 17.1

No Plan amendments to add restrictions on aircraft noise sensitive activities within specified control boundaries.

Topic : Area Map 52

No Plan amendment to add air noise contours in association with Motueka aerodrome.

Reasons

1. There is insufficient information available on current and future use of the Motueka aerodrome to prepare an air noise contour map at present. The technical data that would need to be collected to establish the sort of controls proposed by the submitter would require a considerable amount of financial resources as well as research to be undertaken for this modest size aerodrome.
2. The Council in recent years has received only a small number of complaints about aircraft noise from Motueka residents so the costs of these controls are likely to outweigh the benefits.