

**Wanganui District Council  
District Plan Review  
Phase 5**

**Section 32 Report**

**Proposed Plan Change 35  
(Airport Enterprise Zone and  
Air Noise Overlays)**

Prepared by  
WDC Policy Team

Dated March 2013

# CONTENTS

Content .....2

Introduction .....3

- 1. Plan Review Process
- 2. Statutory and Legislative Framework for the Review

Part 1 – Proposed Plan Change .....8

- 1. Background Research
- 2. Consultation and Outcomes
- 3. Description of the Proposed Plan Change

Part 2 – Section 32 Evaluation .....11

- 1. Requirement to make an Evaluation
- 2. Proposed Issues
- 3. Proposed Objectives
- 4. Proposed Rules

**Appendix One**                      **Marked Up Plan Text**  
(Tracked Changes for Plan Change 35 – Airport Enterprise Zone and Air Noise Overlays – Notified Version)

**Appendix Two**                      **Proposed Plan Maps**

**Appendix Three**                      **Wanganui Airport Plan Review - Noise Control Boundaries – Assessment of Noise Effects, Marshall Day Acoustics.**

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 PLAN REVIEW PROCESS

Section 79 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) requires Council to commence a review of its plans at least every 10 years. Recent amendments to the Act clarify that whole plans need not be reviewed. A Council may choose to review plans in part.

The Wanganui Airport is currently zoned 'Rural' in the Operative District Plan, with designation D45 covering a significant portion of the site. There are a number of activities accessory to the airport that have or wish to establish. This has created a small industrial area that isn't currently reflected or supported by the provisions in the Rural Zone. The Plan Change seeks to correct this establishing the Airport Enterprise Zone to better reflect the existing environment, and provide for continued growth. In addition, the airport is viewed as an important infrastructure asset. The nature of airport operations is that they generate significant amounts of noise. The surrounding environment is generally industrial or rural. However, protection for the existing and future noise footprint is sought to be identified on the Planning maps, along with additional Rules, to enable to the airport to continue to operate efficiently.

The intention of the review is not to meet a specific deadline under section 79 but to ensure the provisions in the Plan are efficient and effective in managing the resources in the District and ensuring that Council's obligations under the Act are met.

The RMA does not detail how a Council must review its plans. However consideration of the efficiency and effectiveness of existing provisions is considered the first step. Section 32 of the RMA requires Council to carry out an evaluation of options before notifying a proposed plan change. These matters are discussed throughout this report. The efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the stated objectives are analysed in this report, as are the various options that were considered.

## 1.2 STATUTORY AND LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR THE REVIEW

### 1.2.1 Resource Management Act 1991

Section 74 of the RMA requires the Council to change the District Plan in accordance with its functions under Section 31, the purpose of the Act in section 5 and the other matters under sections 6, 7 and 8.

Territorial authorities have the following functions under the RMA:

*31 Functions of territorial authorities under this Act*

1. *Every territorial authority shall have the following functions for the purpose of giving effect to this Act in its district:*
  - a. *The establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources.*
  - b. *The control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of*
    - i. *the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards*
2. *The methods used to carry out any of the functions under subsection (1) may include the control of subdivision.*

The Council is given these functions for the purpose of promoting the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, which is defined in section 5(2) as:

*In this Act, “sustainable management” means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety while:*

- a. *Sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and*
- b. *Safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; and*
- c. *Avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.*

Further guidance and direction on the way in which resources are to be managed is provided in sections 6, 7 and 8 of the RMA.

### **1.2.2 National Policy Statements and Environmental Standards**

The runway adjoins the coast, with dunes screening airport activities and proposed the Airport Enterprise Zone from the sea. The zone itself is significantly set back from any coastal marine features. Therefore, the matters in the National Coastal Policy Statement need not be extensively reviewed in relation to this Plan Change.

Matters in the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health, are not anticipated to require examination prior to the processing of the Plan Change. The NES is more appropriately considered during the land use and subdivision processes of the Act in this instance.

### 1.2.3 Regional Policy Statement

In addition, the RMA requires District Plan provisions ‘give effect’ to the Regional Policy Statement (section 75(3)). The Regional Policy Statement (RPS) is the main vehicle for interpreting and applying the sustainable management requirements of the RMA in a local context, and in this regard, guides the development of lower tier plans, including the District Plan.

Horizons Regional Council’s Regional Policy Statement has largely been replaced by the Operative parts of the One Plan. The One Plan is relevant to Plan Change 35 as it includes requirements relating to the protection and growth of significant infrastructure, while managing effects on the environment.

An assessment of how the provisions in Plan Change 35 compare with the Objectives and Policies of the One Plan are considered in Table 1 below:

**Table 1**

One Plan (RPS)		Proposed Plan Change 35
Objective	Policy	Evaluation
<p><b>Objective 3-1: Infrastructure<sup>^</sup> and other physical resources of regional or national importance</b> To have regard to the benefits of <i>infrastructure<sup>^</sup></i> and other physical resources of regional or national importance by enabling their establishment, <i>operation<sup>*</sup></i>, <i>maintenance<sup>*</sup></i> and <i>upgrading<sup>*</sup></i>.</p>	<p><b>Policy 3-1: Benefits of infrastructure<sup>^</sup> and other physical resources of regional or national importance</b> (a) The Regional Council and <i>Territorial Authorities<sup>^</sup></i> must recognise the following <i>infrastructure<sup>^</sup></i> as being physical resources of regional or national importance: (iv) the Palmerston North and Wanganui <i>airports<sup>^</sup></i></p> <p><b>Policy 3-2: Adverse effects<sup>^</sup> of other activities on infrastructure<sup>^</sup> and other physical resources of regional or national importance</b> The Regional Council and <i>Territorial Authorities<sup>^</sup></i> must ensure that adverse <i>effects<sup>^</sup></i> on <i>infrastructure<sup>^</sup></i> and other physical resources of regional or national importance from other activities are avoided</p>	<p>Objective OX1 is consistent with One Plan Objective 3-1 and Policy 3-1 in that it recognises its importance as regionally significant and seeks to protect the on-going operation of the airport. The Objective is also consistent with Policy 3-2 of the One Plan as it helps to effects on the Airport are avoided as much as practicable, the airport is identified, avoids new activities establishing that are inconsistent with the operational needs of the airport, and that the expansion of existing sensitive uses are avoided.</p> <p>Objective OX2 is also consistent with Objective 3-1 of the</p>

	<p>as far as reasonably practicable, including by using the following mechanisms:</p> <p>(a) ensuring that current <i>infrastructure</i><sup>^</sup>, <i>infrastructure</i><sup>^</sup> corridors and other physical resources of regional or national importance, are identified and had regard to in all resource management decision-making, and any development that would adversely affect the <i>operation</i><sup>*</sup>, <i>maintenance</i><sup>*</sup> or <i>upgrading</i><sup>*</sup> of those activities is avoided as far as reasonably practicable,</p> <p>(b) ensuring that any new activities that would adversely affect the <i>operation</i><sup>*</sup>, <i>maintenance</i><sup>*</sup> or <i>upgrading</i><sup>*</sup> of <i>infrastructure</i><sup>^</sup> and other physical resources of regional or national importance are not located near existing such resources or such resources allowed by unimplemented <i>resource consents</i><sup>^</sup> or other RMA authorisations,</p> <p>(ba) ensuring that there is no change to existing activities that increases their incompatibility with existing <i>infrastructure</i><sup>^</sup> and other physical resources of regional or national importance, or such resources allowed by unimplemented <i>resource consents</i><sup>^</sup> or other RMA authorisations,</p> <p>(c) notifying the owners or managers of <i>infrastructure</i><sup>^</sup> and other physical resources of regional or national importance of consent applications that may adversely affect the</p>	<p>One Plan in that the conflicts that can lead to constraints on the operation, maintenance and upgrading of the Wanganui Airport are to be minimised. As such, the Objective is also consistent with Policy 3-1, and 3-2.</p> <p>The Objective also accepts that there are adverse effects created by the operation of the airport, and that these are to be minimised.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>resources that they own or manage,</p> <p><b>Policy 3-3: Adverse effects<sup>^</sup> of infrastructure<sup>^</sup> and other physical resources of regional or national importance on the environment</b></p> <p>In managing any adverse environmental effects<sup>^</sup> arising from the establishment, <i>operation</i><sup>*</sup>, <i>maintenance</i><sup>*</sup> and <i>upgrading</i><sup>*</sup> of infrastructure<sup>^</sup> or other physical resources of regional or national importance, the Regional Council and Territorial Authorities<sup>^</sup> must:</p> <p>(a) allow the <i>operation</i><sup>*</sup>, <i>maintenance</i><sup>*</sup> and <i>upgrading</i><sup>*</sup> of all such activities once they have been established, no matter where they are located,</p> <p>(b) allow minor adverse effects<sup>^</sup> arising from the establishment of new infrastructure<sup>^</sup> and physical resources of regional or national importance, and</p> <p>(c) avoid, remedy or mitigate more than minor adverse effects<sup>^</sup> arising from the establishment of new infrastructure<sup>^</sup> and other physical resources of regional or national importance, taking into account:</p> <p>(i) the need for the infrastructure<sup>^</sup> or other physical resources of regional or national importance,</p> <p>(ii) any functional, operational or technical constraints that require</p>	
--	---	--

	<p><i>infrastructure</i><sup>^</sup> or other physical resources of regional or national importance to be located or designed in the manner proposed,  (iii) whether there are any reasonably practicable alternative locations or designs, and  (iv) whether any more than minor adverse <i>effects</i><sup>^</sup> that cannot be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated by services or works can be appropriately offset, including through the use of financial contributions.</p>	
--	---	--

## 2. PART 1 – PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE

### 2.1 BACKGROUND RESEARCH

Research for the specific zoning for activities outside Designation D45 (Airport Purposes) has been undertaken over a number of years. This has included a review of approaches by other district plans in terms of the protection of the Airport. In addition, regulations from the Civil Aviation Authority, the regulatory authority responsible for flight and aeronautical matters, have been reviewed.

The Operative District Plan currently does not include any rules for the control of Airport noise, including aircraft being operated during, or immediately before or after, flight. While this is well intentioned, this does not protect the Airport from complaints regarding unreasonable or excessive noise. Nor is it reasonable for existing or new in the vicinity to be subjected to an unlimited amount of noise.

As a result of the above reviews, it was identified that the management of noise was an area that required further, more specialist investigation. Marshall Day Acoustics were engaged to provide a specialist assessment of Air Noise as it relates to Wanganui Airport, and to provide recommendations for the management of air noise for the future. The report ‘Wanganui Airport Plan Review, Noise Control Boundaries – Assessment of Noise Effects - 13 November 2013’ is attached as Appendix Three.

The report applies an assessment of the existing noise generated by the Airport as a result of modelling and field recording, to NZS 6805:1992,



Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning. A 30 year growth scenario was provided to Marshall Day in order to reflect potential future levels. This reflected the business direction that the Airport has established in seeking growth.

The result is two noise contours being the Air Noise Boundary (ANB) representing noise at 65 dB L<sub>dn</sub>, and the Outer Control Boundary (OCB) at 55 dB L<sub>dn</sub> and a set of recommendations around the management of Activities Sensitive to Air Noise (ASAN). The contours and recommendations reflect both fixed and rotary wing aircraft.

The proposed contours have been included in the proposed Planning maps along with the majority of the report's recommendations which are included in the proposed text.

Additional research was undertaken regarding the ability to service the site for development. It was noted that sufficient water supply exists to serve dry development, and that minor works at the cost of any applicant, could achieve the disposal of waste water. It is probable that stormwater will be discharged to ground, given the sandy soils. This is a matter that would be further examined at the Building Consent Stage.

Council's Roding Traffic Safety Engineer was consulted regarding the suitability of the road for industrial activity, and also the suitability of the existing informal crossing to the north onto Airport Road. It was noted that the speed environment was appropriate, but that the existing crossing would require upgrading before use, No other roading concerns were raised.

## **2.2 CONSULTATION AND OUTCOMES**

Consultation with a range of stake holders, in accordance with the requirements of Schedule 1, was undertaken as part of formulating the proposed Plan change. This includes the existing leaseholders and commercial activities on the land affected, those who are to be located within an Air Noise Overlay, and Iwi. This included the Tupoho Working Party. In particular, part of the land known as Landgards Bluff may be returned to Maori, and engagement reflects the potential for Iwi to one again own this land which is partially affected by an Air Noise Overlay.

A discussion was held with stakeholders in late 2011 regarding a previous proposal that did not proceed. As a result, this latest draft of the proposal was posted to a new range off affected parties in late 2013 for informal response. Little feedback feedback was received either in favour or opposed to the draft. The draft was also placed on the Shaping Wanganui website.

The following parties were consulted:

Tupoho Working Party	Discussed at the meeting 4 <sup>th</sup> December 2013 and on-going dialogue with members.
Affected owners, occupiers and other stakeholders	Stakeholder meeting – Wanganui Airport (late 2011). Draft provisions circulated and feedback sought. Most responses were to identify the location of the Air Noise Overlays and discuss any implications.
General Public - regular newsletters on Shaping Wanganui & Shaping Wanganui website linked from Council website with feedback invited at all stages	Draft provisions put on Shaping Wanganui website.

### 2.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE

The purpose of the Plan change is to better provide for the existing and additional land use activities on the land surrounding the Wanganui Airport. In addition the Plan Change seeks to protect the operation of the airport by managing the establishment of activities in the vicinity which are sensitive to air noise.

The Plan change has two main parts. The first is the identification of a new zone called the Airport Enterprise Zone along with associated issues, objectives, policies, rules and standards which provide for new and expanded compatible land use activities. The second is the identification of two air noise overlays, the Air Noise Boundary (ANB) and the Outer Control Boundary (OCB). These extend beyond the Airport Enterprise Zone and are applied along with land use provisions to avoid new or expanded activities sensitive to air noise. While arising from the policy framework in the Airport Enterprise Zone, the wider air noise provisions are located within the District Wide Activity part of the Plan.

Changes to the District Plan text are included as marked up text in Appendix One, amended Planning maps are included in Appendix Two, and the technical report from Marshall Day Acoustics is located in Appendix Three.

### **3. PART 2 – SECTION 32 EVALUATION**

#### **3.1 REQUIREMENT TO MAKE AN EVALUATION**

The Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act) requires that when a Council undertakes a plan change that it must produce a report evaluating the proposed provisions. This is known as a Section 32 Report. This report contains an evaluation of the Proposed Plan Change, prepared in accordance with section 32 of the Resource Management Act (as amended 2013).

The evaluation examines:

- the extent to which the objectives of the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act (to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources), and
- whether, the provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives by
  - identifying other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives; and
  - assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives; and
  - summarising the reasons for deciding on the provisions; and
- contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.

For the purposes of this examination, the evaluation must:

- Identify and assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions including the opportunities for –
  - economic growth that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and
  - employment that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and
- if practicable, quantify the benefits and costs referred to above; and
- assess the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions.

#### **3.2 PROPOSED ISSUES**

Although not required by the Act, the identification of resource management issues is generally provided for in most District Plans. It provides a base to develop suitable objectives and policies that are relevant to the local circumstances or context.

The following issues are proposed:

**Issue 6.1.4 Wanganui Airport sustainability**

*Wanganui Airport is regionally significant infrastructure. It generates benefits to the wider community including, employment, mobility, tourism, lifestyle choices, and enables businesses to operate locally and around New Zealand. Airports, by their nature, have a number of requirements including safe operation of flight paths, economic viability, and undertake activities that generate noise. This can be compromised by incompatible noise sensitive activities or inflexible land use provisions.*

**Issue 6.1.5 Wanganui Airport Noise**

*Airport flight operations create significant levels of noise over a wide geographical area beyond the Airport itself. Some activities are more sensitive to this noise than others, including residential dwellings and schools. Over time, there is an increased probability of conflict between the needs of both uses. It is improbable that the Wanganui Airport can be moved, and reducing operating hours for air operations may result in a reduction of the viability of the continued operation of the Airport.*

**Comment**

Proposed Issue 6.1.4 recognises the benefits of the Wanganui Airport as regionally significant infrastructure and focusses on the activities in and around the Wanganui Airport. This includes the management of activities that have the potential to create safety issues for flight operations, and also enabling compatible supporting activities that allow the Airport to keep functioning and vibrant.

Issue 6.1.5 is more specifically focussed on the distribution of air noise from flight operations. The distribution of air noise crosses several zones in the District Plan and is therefore required to be dealt separately from the Airport Enterprise Zone. The Issue identifies that some activities may have amenity needs that are not compatible with significant air noise.

Proposed Issue	Relates to Existing Issue/s
Issue 6.1.4 and 6.1.5	N/A

**3.3 PROPOSED OBJECTIVES**

**6.2.3 Airport protection and land use**

*Protect the safe and efficient operation of Wanganui Airport from incompatible uses, and provide for land use development compatible with the amenity from airport operations.*

**Comment**

The following approaches were examined as part of the Plan Change process:

**Status quo**

The approach of the Operative District Plan does include

references to particular Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) regulations regarding objects affecting airspace. The references to airspace are considered appropriate. In particular, those regulations are enforced by another regulatory body and need not be revisited by the District Plan. Apart from noise provisions which are discussed in 6.2.4 below, there are few protections or little recognition of the importance of the Wanganui Airport.

The land use provisions in the Operative District Plan that relate to the Airport as a whole are the Rural Zone provisions and Designation D45. The designation does not cover the entire extent of the land on which the airport and associated activities occur. This designation has been 'rolled over' as part of Phase 4 of the District plan review and will have continued effect. The designation only relates to core airport operations such as the runway, and not the supporting commercial and industrial activities that are required to locate there. The continued reliance on the Rural Zone to manage the existing uses of the Airport and to provide for growth and the long term sustainability of the Airport will not assist in keeping the infrastructure viable.

#### Supporting land uses

The provision for supporting uses, or not, was considered. As was the type and nature of any uses provided for. The conclusion was that generally, airports had a range of support activities intrinsically linked to them, including rental car activity, ticketing, refreshments, flight terminals and others. The existing environment of the Wanganui Airport currently includes these activities which reflect the needs and expectations of Airport users. It is considered reasonable and necessary to manage these activities in a manner that reflects their presence and desirability.

#### Land use type

Another consideration was around the range of activities that may be provided for in addition to activities that are accessory to the operation of the airport. Matters around servicing, compatibility, and land supply were specific factors. Given the 'noisy' nature of the existing environment, and that the CBD fulfils this function, main street type retail is not provided for. However, retail associated with industrial type activities could be more appropriate. Industrial activities that do not require significant wastewater servicing may be appropriate with regard to amenity.

	<p>While finely balanced, discussions with Airport management led to consideration of residential activities associated with the storage and use of an aircraft. While the report by Marshall Day Acoustics recommends that no Activities Sensitive to Air Noise (ASAN) be provided for, it also states that the effects of noise could be mitigated in some instances. Given this concession it is considered that, provided any option for residential units only occurs in conjunction with airport activities, that this could be appropriate.</p> <p><u>Airport Protection</u></p> <p>Obstacle (trees and structures within flight paths) limitation surfaces are required by the CAA for safety reasons. As these are regulated and enforced by another body, it was considered unnecessary to regulate through the District Plan. However, a note has been included in the Proposed Plan Change in order to make Plan users aware of their obligations. A surface diagram may be constructed and appended in the Plan at a later date to assist in providing more information regarding the restriction.</p> <p><u>Zone Extent</u></p> <p>The potential extent of the zone was investigated in detail. Consideration was initially given to an all-encompassing zone including the runway and runoff areas, and two further sub zones for supporting activities such as the air terminal and a separate industrial type area. This approach was discounted after considerable thought primarily as Designation D45 provides for all the activities that were reasonably likely to occur. In addition, the activities that were to be encouraged are generally compatible between the supporting area and industrial area. The result is one area within the Zone. In addition, the location of the Zone boundary is 70 metres from the identified runways in accordance with CAA requirements.</p>
Appropriateness	<p>Several policy options were investigated during the drafting of 6.2.3. The term avoid was considered in the first instance.</p> <p>The Concise Oxford Dictionary defines the term ‘avoid’ as follows:</p> <p><i>‘Avoid 1. Keep away from; refrain from. 2. escape; evade 3. a. nullify b quash.’</i></p> <p>The term ‘protect’ was favoured as rather than focussing on ‘avoiding’ effects on the airport, the focus should be on the airport itself and its ability to function safely and effectively as key infrastructure. Protect is defined as follows:</p>

	<p><i>'Protect 1. keep safe, defend, guard'</i></p> <p>Avoid was also disregarded as a range of land use activities exist, that are ancillary to the Airport, or compatible with the amenity it produces.</p> <p>The term 'provide for' is more appropriate as it recognises there are some activities that can be appropriately located in or adjacent to the airport, that currently cannot proceed without the cost and delay of a resource consent. This enables a sustainable financial situation for the Airport through ground rents, and enables a range of land uses to create a hub for supporting and complimentary land uses, making each more efficient.</p> <p><b><u>Conclusion</u></b></p> <p>Proposed Objective 6.2.3 is considered appropriate in terms of meeting the purpose of the RMA. In particular, people and communities will be able to provide for their health and safety and economic wellbeing through the minimisation of their exposure to air noise, and enabling the continued safe and efficient operation of the Airport.</p>
--	---

<b>Proposed objective</b>	<b>Relates to Objective/s</b>
Objective 6.2.3	Objectives 6.2.4

<p><b>6.2.4 Air noise</b></p> <p><i>The adverse effects of operational noise from the Wanganui Airport are minimised.</i></p>	
Comment	<p>The following approaches were examined:</p> <p><u>Status quo</u></p> <p>The current District Plan excludes airport noise from being subject to the relevant zone noise provisions, but does not provide any alternative performance standards. Nor does the Plan identify where airport noise conflicts may arise, or anticipate changes over time in noise. It is unreasonable to exempt the Airport from any noise control, given the potential for significant adverse effects on sensitive activities. However, it is also unreasonable to allow activities that are sensitive to air noise to continue to establish in areas exposed to airport noise.</p> <p><u>Restricting air noise</u></p> <p>Some consideration was given to limiting the noise arising</p>

	<p>from the Airport. This included relocation, limiting hours of operation, and the number of flights. However, the air noise assessment by Marshall Day Acoustics identified that, currently, there were only limited numbers of land uses that were currently subject to air noise. It was considered that, with the current and projected noise generation of the airport, mitigation of noise from airport operations was unnecessary and unreasonable.</p> <p><u>Providing for future air noise</u></p> <p>Both the existing noise footprint and a projected footprint arising from a 30 year growth horizon were produced by Marshall Day Acoustics. The growth scenario was developed using a combination of trends in aviation, likely future commuter aircraft, the establishment of a sizable flight school, and a change in business model for the airport regarding landing fees. Examination of the extent of the future noise contours found that, over a thirty year period, the effects on existing Activities Sensitive to Air Noise would be minimal, and that the provision of mitigation for these activities would not be required. Balanced against the long term protection of the Airport as key regional infrastructure, use of the 30 year projected noise is appropriate.</p>
Appropriateness	<p><u>Avoid, mitigate, minimise</u></p> <p>Three policy options were investigated during the drafting of 6.2.4, avoid, mitigate, or minimise in terms of a desired long term outcome. The term avoid(ed) was considered in the first instance.</p> <p>The Concise Oxford Dictionary defines the term ‘avoid’ as follows:</p> <p><i>‘Avoid 1. Keep away from; refrain from. 2. escape; evade 3. a. nullify b quash.’</i></p> <p>While some activities are less sensitive to air noise, it is arguable that it is possible to avoid all the effects of air noise given its physical extent can be significant. The report by Marshall Day Acoustics does note that the avoidance of Activities Sensitive to Air Noise is desirable, but in some instances mitigation is possible.</p> <p>The second option reviewed was ‘mitigate’ as defined below:</p> <p><i>‘Mitigate; Make milder or less intense or severe; moderate.’</i></p> <p>Again, the report by Marshall Day Acoustics stated that, while mitigation is possible in some instances, where there are no</p>



	<p>pre-existing Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise, avoidance is the best option, and mitigation is not always possible. Therefore, mitigation is an unsuitable approach.</p> <p>The preferred option, minimise, is defined as follows:</p> <p><i>'Minimi[s]e 1. reduce or estimate at, the smallest possible amount or degree 2. Estimate or represent at less than true value or importance. 3. Attain a minimum value'</i></p> <p>The term deemed most appropriate is 'minimise'. This promotes the idea that effects are reduced to the smallest possible level without avoiding them completely. This is supported by policies that avoid new and expanded sensitive uses, but provides for residential units where related to aeronautical storage and activity where the effects can be mitigated.</p> <p><b><u>Conclusion</u></b></p> <p>Proposed Objective 6.2.4 is appropriate in terms of meeting the purpose of the RMA. In particular, people and communities will be able to provide for their health and safety and economic wellbeing through the minimisation of their exposure to air noise.</p>
--	--

Proposed objective	Relates to Objective/s
Objective 6.2.4	Objectives 6.2.3

### 3.4 PROPOSED POLICIES

The following new *policies* are proposed:

<b>6.3.6</b>	<p><b><i>Establishment of compatible activities</i></b>  <i>Provide for the establishment or expansion of activities in the Airport Enterprise Zone, that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a. are not sensitive to air noise,</i></li> <li><i>b. do not compromise the safe and efficient operation of airport activities, and,</i></li> <li><i>c. are compatible with noise, flight paths and aeronautical equipment required to operate the airport</i></li> </ul>
<b>Comment</b>	<p>Policy 6.3.6 seeks to enable other compatible land uses locate in, and adjacent to, the Airport itself. The policy identifies which potentially compatible as primarily those that are not sensitive to air noise, and broadly related to airport activity. There is also</p>

	a clear direction in Objective 6.2.3 towards activities that are compatible with key safety and regulatory requirements for airport infrastructure and requirements.
<b>Benefits</b>	<p><b>Environmental/Economic</b> A number of benefits arise from the policy. It enables development of a range of activities as permitted activities, with potential to increase economic activity and employment and provide financial support to the Airport.</p> <p>Safety and compatibility of activities are key to maintaining the Airport asset. This policy will avoid reverse sensitivity and ensure safety is not compromised.</p> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b> The protection of the airport will encourage retention of the Airport. This provides employment, but allows residents and visitors alike to travel around New Zealand.</p>
<b>Costs</b>	<p><b>Environmental/Economic</b> Any cost arising from 6.3.6 relate to the lost range of activities that could be provided for. However, this may potentially affect the safety and viability of the Airport and therefore be inconsistent with Objective 6.2.3.</p> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b> No known social or cultural costs. It is noted that Landguard Bluff is significant to local Iwi. This area, while adjacent, is not included in the area to be rezoned, and the proposed Plan change does not affect the significance of the site.</p>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	Policy 6.3.6 is effective in that it provides for compatible land use activities to enable growth and sustainability of the Airport.
<b>Efficiency</b>	Policy 6.3.6 is efficient, it clearly outlines activities expected in the zone, and it enables activities that would otherwise have been subject to a resource consent.
<b>Appropriateness</b>	The Policy is the most appropriate way to implement Objective 6.2.3 in that the safe and efficient operation of the airport is protected and compatible land use activities are enabled.
Risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the policies, rules, or other methods	<p>The risk of acting is that activities with unanticipated sensitivity to airport operations establish.</p> <p>The risk of not acting is the loss of investment and employment, and the potential for sensitive activities to establish resulting in reverse sensitivity effects.</p>

<b>Principal Alternative</b>	No obvious alternatives other than 'status quo' with no specific guidance on land uses in and around the Airport. This approach would be inconsistent with proposed Objective 6.2.3.
------------------------------	--

<b>6.3.7 Avoid unsafe activities and structures</b>	
<i>Avoid new or expanded activities and/or structures that compromise the safe and efficient operation of the Wanganui Airport.</i>	
<b>Comment</b>	Safety is of high importance in the aviation industry. The Airport has a range of regulatory requirements to ensure efficient and safe aviation can occur. While these requirements arise from separate legislation, there is still a place for and use management provisions and advisories within the Plan
<b>Benefits</b>	<p><b>Environmental</b> No significant environmental benefits arising from this policy other than the maintenance of safety.</p> <p><b>Economic</b> Development of supporting industry is promoted but only where it does not compromise safe operation of the Airport..</p> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b> The continued safe and efficient operation of the Airport.</p>
<b>Costs</b>	<p><b>Environmental and Economic</b> It is not anticipated that any significant environmental or economic costs will arise from implementing this Policy.</p> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b> No significant social or cultural costs will arise from this policy.</p>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	Policy 6.3.7 is effective, it ensures safety aspects of airport operations are maintained.
<b>Efficiency</b>	Policy 6.3.7 is efficient, it addresses safety issues prior to the erection of buildings and structures.
<b>Appropriateness</b>	The Policy is the most appropriate way to achieve Objective 6.2.3 as it maintains safety.
Risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the policies, rules, or other methods	<p>No significant risks in acting.</p> <p>The risk of not acting is that significant compromises in safety could reduce the Airport's ability to provide aviation services, cause death and or injury.</p>

<b>Principal Alternative</b>	The principal alternative is to prevent any activities or structures other than those required for Airport operations. This loss of economic potential may lead to reduced services or closure of the Airport.
------------------------------	--

<p><b>6.3.8 <u>Activities sensitive to aircraft noise</u></b></p> <p><u>Avoid new or expanded Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN) within the Outer Control Boundary (OCB) and Air Noise Boundary (ANB) overlays except that:</u></p> <p><u>a. Aircraft Hanger Dwellings may establish on sites that are within the Airport Enterprise Zone, excluding land located within the ANB, provided that the effects of air noise are mitigated.</u></p>	
<b>Comment</b>	<p>Policy 6.7.8 focusses on managing the effects of air noise to support Objective 6.2.4. The policy identifies the two noise contours (ANB and OCB) and seeks to avoid the establishment and expansion of activities sensitive to air noise in accordance with the recommendations of the Report by Marshall Day Acoustics.</p> <p>However, a specific exemption is provided for the establishment of Aircraft Hanger Dwellings. While this is not entirely consistent with the recommendations of the Report, discussion in the report recognised that it is possible, but not desirable to establish ASAN's within the OCB.</p> <p>However, a dwelling defined as an Aircraft Hanger Dwelling could be appropriate as the effects can be mitigated, and the close relationship between the activity and aeronautical activity distinguishes it from other residential activities. This is consistent with Objective 6.2.4 in that the most sensitive uses are avoided.</p>

<b>Benefits</b>	<p><b>Environmental</b> The noise environment is recognised and embedded in the Plan. It is recognised as necessary and minimised by best practice airport operations.</p> <p><b>Economic</b> Two potential economic benefits.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects which may result in a reduction of airport activities and income.</li> <li>2. Enabling other development in limited circumstances.</li> </ol> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b> No known cultural benefits. The Policy has a positive social effect in that air noise sensitive activities are prevented from locating in an inappropriate noise environment.</p>	
<b>Costs</b>	<p><b>Environmental</b> No significant costs to the natural or physical environment.</p> <p><b>Economic</b> Forgoing of noise sensitive development within the ANB and OCB is a cost. However, given the existing environment and zoning of those areas, this cost would be minimal.</p> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b> No significant social or cultural costs.</p>	
<b>Effectiveness</b>	The policy is effective. it minimises the effects of air noise on sensitive activities, consistent with Objective 6.2.4.	
<b>Efficiency</b>	Policy 6.7.8 is efficient as most effects are avoided, but clear about what exceptions apply.	
<b>Appropriateness</b>	The policy is the most appropriate way to achieve Objective 6.2.4 as the effects of air noise from the Airport operation are minimised.	
Risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the policies, rules, or other methods	<p>The risk of acting is that development of noise sensitive activities are unnecessarily restricted, or that mitigation measures required for Aircraft Hanger Dwellings are insufficient causing reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>The risk of not acting is the establishment of air noise sensitive activities leading to conflict with the operational requirements of the airport. This could restrict efficient Airport maintenance and operation.</p>	

<b>Principal Alternative</b>	The principal alternative was not regulate the issue. However, as discussed above, this would be inconsistent with Objectives 6.2.3 and 6.2.4 as this could restrict efficient Airport maintenance and operation.
------------------------------	---

<b>6.3.9 Airport operating requirements</b>	
<i>Require airport flight operations generated by Wanganui Airport to be conducted to achieve air noise of no more than 65DdB Ldn at the Air Noise Boundary (ANB) and 55dB Ldn at the Outer Control Boundary (OCB).</i>	
<b>Comment</b>	<p>Policy 6.7.9 seeks to recognise that, while the operation of the Airport generates noise, that the ability to generate noise should not be unlimited.</p> <p>A thirty year growth scenario was developed and provided to Marshall Day Acoustics for the development of the ANB and OCB. This affects the physical extent of those areas and therefore the controls associated with them.</p> <p>This Plan change seeks to avoid conflicts by managing noise sensitive uses. It is reasonable that the Airport adheres to noise parameters identified as fair and reasonable, avoid potential noise conflicts.</p>
<b>Benefits</b>	<p><b>Environmental</b> The Policy assists in ensuring noise in the OCB and ANB does not exceed what is projected and provided for.</p> <p><b>Economic</b> No significant economic benefits. However, requiring compliance with the nose contours will provide certainty and encourage investment in appropriate activities.</p> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b> The Policy provides a limit to anticipated noise levels. It requires best practicable options to be adopted at the Airport.</p>
<b>Costs</b>	<p><b>Environmental/ Economic</b> No significant environmental or economic costs to.</p> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b> No significant social or cultural costs.</p>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	The policy is effective, it reduces potential for conflict by specifying clear noise limits.

<b>Efficiency</b>	Policy 6.7.9 is efficient, it provides proactive measures to avoid conflict between noise sensitive activities and noise from airport operations
<b>Appropriateness</b>	The policy is the most appropriate way to achieve Objective 6.2.4, it minimises conflict between airport noise and sensitive uses.
Risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the policies, rules, or other methods	<p>The risk of acting is that flight operations may be restricted in future if the nature of noise generated by the Airport changes. However, this was considered as part of the 30 year future noise scenario.</p> <p>The primary risk of not acting is that existing activities that are sensitive to airport noise could be affected by operations exceeding what is assessed as a future model.</p>

<b>Principal Alternative</b>	The principal alternative was the status quo with no regulation of Airport noise. Only limited options would exist to address adverse effects, if Airport noise became unreasonable for sensitive activities.
------------------------------	---

### 3.5 PROPOSED RULES

The following new *rules* are proposed:

<p><b>Permitted activities</b></p> <p><b>Airport Enterprise Zone</b></p> <p><b>6.6.1</b> <i>The following activities are permitted activities in the Airport Enterprise Zone:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>Navigation instruments, runways, runoff areas, runway lighting, refueling facilities and activities ancillary to aeronautical infrastructure, including their construction, operation, repair and maintenance</i></li> <li>b. <i>Earthworks</i></li> <li>c. <i>Airport operations activities</i></li> <li>d. <i>Manufacturing activities</i></li> <li>e. <i>Commercial activities ancillary to any permitted activity.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Air Noise Overlays</b></p> <p><b>10.14.1</b> <i>The following are permitted activities within the Air Noise Boundary (ANB)</i></p>
---

<i>and Outer Control Boundary (OCB), unless otherwise stated:</i>	
<i>a. All activities, other than Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise</i>	
<b>Comment</b>	<p>The permitted activity list identifies a range of low risk activities (subject to compliance with performance standards) which will not have an effect of any significance on the operation of the Airport itself.</p> <p>Rule 6.6.1 applies only to the Airport Enterprise Zone and Rule 10.14.1 is a District Wide Rule that applies only where the ANB and OCB is in effect.</p>
<b>Benefits</b>	<p><b>Environmental</b></p> <p>The provisions enable activities that compliment, or are compatible with the operation of the Airport.</p> <p><b>Economic</b></p> <p>The list provides a wide range of activities, reducing the cost and delay of a resource consent as required for most under the current Plan. This will assist in creating more opportunity for investment at the Airport.</p>
	<p><b>Social/Cultural</b></p> <p>No significant social or cultural benefits, other than the retention of a local Airport.</p>
<b>Costs</b>	<p><b>Environmental</b></p> <p>No significant environmental costs.</p> <p><b>Economic</b></p> <p>Any costs are associated with activities not permitted by these rules. This is discussed separately.</p> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b></p> <p>No significant social or cultural costs.</p>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	The activities permitted are considered low risk, and therefore do not require management.
<b>Efficiency</b>	The provisions are efficient as they enable activities that will not increase risk to people and property, subject to compliance with performance standards.
<b>Appropriateness</b>	The rule is appropriate as the activities that are proposed to be permitted are considered low risk, and consistent with Objective 6.2.3.
<b>Principal Alternative</b>	The principal alternative is to regulate all activities within the Airport Enterprise Zone. This is not necessary as a range of activities can establish without significant adverse effects.



**Restricted Discretionary Activities**

**6.6.2** *The following activities are restricted discretionary activities in the Airport Enterprise Zone:*

- a. *Activities not meeting one or more of the performance standards unless otherwise stated.*

*Council restricts its discretion to the following matters:*

- a. *The ability of the proposal to meet the Assessment Criteria in 14.*
- b. *Subdivision, provided that:*

*The proposed subdivision complies with the relevant standards in 11.4, In addition, Council restricts its discretion to the following matters:*

- i. *the ability of the proposal to meet the Assessment Criteria in 14.*
- ii. *the provision of access to the runways for airport users.*
- iii. *the avoidance of allotment layouts that will adversely affect the ability of the airport to operate efficiently and safely.*

**Note: Subdivision applications subject to this rule shall be considered without service, public notification or written approvals from affected persons.**

<b>Comment</b>	The Rule manages the effects of minor non-compliance with the performance standard of the zone along with subdivision. Where the effects are considered significant affected parties can be considered (excluding subdivision) and may be declined.
<b>Benefits</b>	<p><b>Environmental</b> The Rule will ensure that the desired characteristics of the zone are maintained.</p> <p><b>Economic</b> Development within the Airport Enterprise Zone is provided for.</p> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b> Any significant effects on third parties can be addressed.</p>
<b>Costs</b>	<p><b>Environmental</b> No significant environmental costs.</p> <p><b>Economic</b> There may be additional costs relating to mitigation measures and the cost of a resource consent. This internalises effects that would have otherwise fallen on others.</p> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b> No significant social or cultural costs.</p>

<b>Effectiveness</b>	The provision is effective as development is provided for subject to mitigation of effects.
<b>Efficiency</b>	The rule is efficient as it clarifies expectations for activities.
<b>Appropriateness</b>	The rule is appropriate as it is consistent with the relevant policies which provide for a range of activities.

<b>Principal Alternative</b>	The principal alternative is to raise the activity status for non-compliance with zone performance standards to Discretionary or Non-complying status. However, non-compliance with most of the performance standards address specific areas of concern and wider assessment of the activity is not deemed necessary.
------------------------------	---

<b>Discretionary Activities</b>	
<b>6.6.3</b>	<i>The following activities are discretionary activities in the Airport Enterprise Zone:</i>
	<i>a. Aircraft Hanger Dwellings ancillary to the use of a building for storage of aircraft, excluding sites within the ANB.</i>
<b>6.7.2</b>	<b>Residential Units Internal Noise</b>
	<i>New Aircraft Hanger Dwellings on sites also within the OCB shall:</i>
	<i>i. be fitted with acoustic insulation to ensure that noise does not exceed Ldn 40 dBA in any habitable room with all doors and windows shut.</i>
	<i>ii. require an Acoustic Design report from a suitably qualified Acoustic Engineer confirming that any dwelling is designed to meet the (i) above.</i>
<b>Comment</b>	<p>Rule 6.6.3 provides for residential type accommodation within the Airport Enterprise Zone, but only when accessory to an aircraft hangar.</p> <p>Performance standard 6.7.2 also requires any Aircraft Hangar Dwellings pursuant to Rule 6.2.3 to insulate the effects of external noise. Where this cannot be achieved, the prohibited activity provisions apply. This is to ensure that, while the activity provided for is closely related to Airport activities, the risk of conflict should be completely mitigated.</p>

<p><b>Benefits</b></p>	<p><b>Environmental</b> There is a minor environmental benefit, which is a more vibrant built environment. Given accommodation is present on-site, there may be an increase in perceived safety and security.</p> <p><b>Economic</b> The provision of on-site accommodation may increase the ability to provide services in that quicker response times for customer needs may occur. Additional building development may arise, and businesses may be more secure.</p> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b> No significant cultural benefits. However, the provision provides an opportunity for persons who have an affinity with aviation to reside on site. This could be for security purposes, or simply for their personal enjoyment.</p>
<p><b>Costs</b></p>	<p><b>Environmental</b> It is not anticipated that significant environmental costs will arise.</p> <p><b>Economic</b> The only potential economic cost is the forgoing of development in areas zoned for residential development. However, it is not anticipated that a great number of Aircraft Hanger Dwellings will be built.</p> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b> No significant social or cultural costs.</p>
<p><b>Effectiveness</b></p>	<p>Rule 6.6.3 is effective, particularly when put alongside the specific requirements in performance standard 6.7.2 in terms of providing for activities that are not conflict with the safe and efficient operation of the Airport.</p>
<p><b>Efficiency</b></p>	<p>The Rule is efficient as it is specific and sets particular requirements in order to best use available land resource in the Airport Enterprise Zone.</p>
<p><b>Appropriateness</b></p>	<p>Rule 6.6.3 is appropriate in that it provides for compatible activities in the Airport Enterprise zone and does not affect the safe and efficient operation of the Airport in terms of Objective 6.2.3. Policy 6.3.8 specifically provides for Aircraft Hangar Dwellings as an exception to the avoidance of activities that are sensitive to aircraft noise. In addition, the Rule is considered appropriate in that the potential effects arising from conflict with air noise are minimised.</p>

<b>Principal Alternative</b>	The principal alternative is not to provide for Aircraft Hanger Dwellings at all. The balance is fine as to whether these could or should be included as there is potential for these activities to create adverse effects . However, the balance was tipped into providing for these due to the direct relationship with aviation type activities, and only on the basis of full mitigation of noise effects.
------------------------------	--

<p><b>Non-Complying Activities</b></p> <p><b>Airport Enterprise Zone</b></p> <p><b>6.6.4</b> <i>The following activities are non-complying activities in the Airport Enterprise Zone:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>Any other activity (excluding noise sensitive activities within the ANB) unless specifically provided for.</i></li> <li>b. <i>Retail activities not provided for as permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary activities.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Air Noise Overlays</b></p> <p><b>10.14.2</b> <i>The following activities are non-complying activities: Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise in the OCB, not provided for as permitted, discretionary (refer to Rule 6.2.3(a)) or prohibited activities</i></p>	
<b>Comment</b>	<p>Rules 6.6.4 and 10.14.2 represent high risk activities in the Airport Enterprise Zone and Air Noise overlays.</p> <p>Certain retail activities, in particular main street type pedestrian focussed retail, have different requirements to a retailer of machinery parts or other products for the commercial servicing industry. The latter is provided for as permitted activities, whereas the former is intended to be avoided.</p> <p>The report from Marshall Day recommends that ASAN should be prohibited in both the ANB (highest risk) and the OCB (high risk). However, the Report also notes that in some circumstances noise can be mitigated, but not in all cases. Regardless, the Report also notes that it is still undesirable to introduce new ASAN activities. Given this, a prohibited activity status is not warranted. However, a true exception would need to be proposed, along with suitable mitigation and an outcome that is consistent with the relevant objectives in policies regarding the avoidance of conflict for such an activity to be approved.</p>

<b>Benefits</b>	<p><b>Environmental</b> The rules ensure that the environment is protected and that only those high risk activities that can avoid or mitigate adverse effects will be permitted.</p> <p><b>Economic</b> Protects the on-going operation of the Airport</p> <p><b>Social</b> Prevents dwelling construction within inappropriate noise environments.</p> <p><b>Cultural</b> No significant cultural benefits.</p>
<b>Cost</b>	<p><b>Environmental</b> No significant environmental costs.</p> <p><b>Economic</b> Activities managed by these Rules will require resource consent that may or may not be granted. The costs are considered to fall on individuals and not on the Airport.</p> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b> No significant social or cultural costs.</p>
<b>Efficiency</b>	The Rules are efficient as they are specific in terms of what they are managing.
<b>Effectiveness</b>	The provisions are effective as activities that pose a high risk to the on-going operation of the Airport are identified and are required to go through a high level of scrutiny before they can be granted.
<b>Appropriateness</b>	The Rules above are appropriate as they provide a detailed test for activities that have been identified as having a high probability, but not extreme, of significant effects regarding conflict with the on-going operation of the Airport.

<b>Principal Alternative</b>	The principal alternative was to use the prohibited activity status. However, while the Report by Marshall Day stated that prohibition was preferred, these could be made distinct from the activities in Rules 6.6.5 and 10.14.3 (prohibited activities) in terms of ability to manage their effects. It is also noted that the 'gateway' test for non-complying activities requires proposals to 'not be inconsistent with' the objectives and policies of the Plan. This provides a suitable level of protection to meet the outcomes desired by Objectives 6.2.3. and 6.2.4.
------------------------------	--

**Prohibited Activities**

**Airport Enterprise Zone**

**6.6.5** *The following are prohibited activities in the Airport Enterprise Zone for which no consent may be sought:*

- a. *Aircraft Hangar Dwellings provided for by 6.6.3(a) that do not comply with the performance standard for internal noise in 6.7.2.*

**Air Noise Overlays**

**10.14.3** *The following activities are prohibited activities for which no consent may be sought:*

- a. *Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise within the ANB.*
- b. *Activities Sensitive to Air Noise in the OCB that do not comply with the performance standard for internal noise in 6.7.2.*

**Comment**

Both Rule 6.6.5 (Airport Enterprise Zone) and 10.14.3 (Air Noise Overlays – District Wide Activities) address the highest risk activities that would certainly create a conflict of use between the Airport and the noise it generates.

Rule 6.6.5 particularly manages Aircraft Hangar Dwellings that do not comply with the internal noise requirements. It is acknowledged in the assessment for Rule 6.6.3 which provides for these, that their inclusion is finely balanced. non-compliance with the internal noise presents significant risk of conflict.

Rule 10.14.3 addresses the overlay where the noise effects are the most intense, the ANB, and also includes ASAN's that do not comply with internal noise requirement in 6.7.2.

**Benefits**

**Environmental**  
The Rule has no significant benefits to the natural environment, but does assist in maintaining the physical resource that is the Airport.

**Economic**  
The Rules avoid the highest risk activities that are likely to adversely affect the on-going operation of the Airport. This provides for a wide range of jobs and businesses.

**Social/Cultural**  
The provisions completely avoid the highest risk new or expanded ASAN. This ensures that social or cultural values won't be encouraged to establish or in areas where their values may be compromised.

<b>Cost</b>	<p><b>Environmental</b> No significant environmental costs.</p> <p><b>Economic</b> Some land may have its development potential diminished for particular activity types. However, an analysis of the existing environment suggests that it is unlikely that sensitive activities will occur within the Industrial Zone towards Heads Road given the amenity values associated with the Manufacturing Zone in particular.</p> <p><b>Social/Cultural</b> No significant social/cultural costs are identified. It is noted that one existing school is affected by the Rules. However, it is understood in the Report by Marshall Day, that any increase in noise will be incremental and not noticeable on the site.</p>
<b>Efficiency</b>	The Rule is efficient as it minimises the creation of conflict by preventing the highest risk activities in the highest risk scenarios from establishing or expanding.
<b>Effectiveness</b>	The provision is effective as the result of the provision is that no new property or people are put at risk.
<b>Appropriateness</b>	The Rule is appropriate as it minimises the risk to the on-going operation to the Airport as required by Objectives 6.2.3 and 6.2.4.

<b>Principal Alternative</b>	The principal alternative to using a prohibited activity status is to provide for the activities as non-complying type activities. However, the technical report produced by from Marshall Day Acoustics, with reference to NZS 6805:1992 "Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning" strongly advocated that the activities should be avoided completely and represent a significant risk of conflict with the operation of the Airport.
------------------------------	--

# APPENDIX ONE

(Tracked Changes for Plan Change 35 – Airport Enterprise Zone and Air Noise Overlays – Notified Version)

**Note (Not part of this Plan Change): Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and Appendices A, B, C, D,E and F – apply to the Airport Enterprise Zone without amendment, except where specifically modified by the following:**

## 6 INDUSTRIAL ENVIRONMENT

### CONTENTS

---

[6.6 RULES- AIRPORT ENTERPRISE ZONE](#)

[6.7 Performance standards](#)

## 6 INDUSTRIAL ENVIRONMENT

The urban area of Wanganui straddles the lower reaches of the Whanganui River. The extent of urban development generally follows the sweep of the river plain and surrounding terraces. It is greater on the western side of the river, extending beyond the river estuary along the coast to the clifftops beyond Castlecliff.

The urban area takes up less than 1% of the total area of the District but is home to about 90% of the District's population.

Urban development is an important component of the District's economy. It provides homes, jobs, shopping facilities, professional and community services and recreation opportunities for people.

The present pattern of urban development and anticipated development trends use up land and, if unmanaged, and over time, may also lead to increased servicing costs and damage to the quality of the urban environment.

Urban development will be managed to sustain resource use to meet present and foreseeable future needs of the District community and protect and enhance environmental quality.

The Wanganui Regional Airport is significant regional transport infrastructure that supports a range industries adjoining the airport and around the district, and the lifestyle of the people of Wanganui.

### 6.1 ISSUES

#### 6.1.4 Wanganui Airport sustainability



Wanganui Airport is regionally significant infrastructure. It generates benefits to the wider community including, employment, mobility, tourism, lifestyle choices, and enables businesses to operate locally and around New Zealand. Airports, by their nature, have a number of requirements including safe operation of flight paths, economic viability, and undertake activities that generate noise. This can be compromised by incompatible noise sensitive activities or inflexible land use provisions.

#### **6.1.5 Wanganui Airport Air Noise**

Airport flight operations create significant levels of noise over a wide geographical area beyond the Airport itself. Some activities are more sensitive to this noise than others, including residential dwellings and schools. Over time, there is an increased probability of conflict between the needs of both uses. It is improbable that the Wanganui Airport can be moved, and reducing operating hours for air operations may result in a reduction of the viability of the continued operation of the Airport.

## **6.2 OBJECTIVES**

#### **6.2.3 Airport protection and land use**

Protect the safe and efficient operation of Wanganui Airport from incompatible uses, and provide for land use development compatible with the amenity from airport operations.

#### **6.2.4 Air Noise**

The adverse effects of operational noise from the Wanganui Airport are minimised

## **6.3 POLICIES**

#### **6.3.6 Establishment of compatible activities**

Provide for the establishment or expansion of activities in the Airport Enterprise Zone, that:

- a. are not sensitive to air noise,
- b. do not compromise the safe and efficient operation of airport activities, and,
- c. are compatible with noise, flight paths and aeronautical equipment required to operate the airport, and

#### **6.3.7 Avoid unsafe activities and structures**

Avoid new or expanded activities and/or structures that compromise the safe and efficient operation of the Wanganui Airport.

#### **6.3.8 Activities sensitive to aircraft noise**

Avoid new or expanded Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN) within the Outer Control Boundary (OCB) and Air Noise Boundary (ANB) overlays except that:

- a. Aircraft Hanger Dwellings may establish on sites that are within the Airport Enterprise Zone, excluding land located within the ANB, provided that the effects of air noise are mitigated.

### **6.3.9 Airport operating requirements**

Require airport flight operations generated by Wanganui Airport to be conducted to achieve air noise of no more than 65DdB Ldn at the Air Noise Boundary (ANB) and 55dB Ldn at the Outer Control Boundary (OCB).

## **6.6 RULES – AIRPORT ENTERPRISE ZONE**

### **6.6.1 Permitted activities**

The following activities are permitted activities in the Airport Enterprise Zone:

- a. Navigation instruments, runways, runoff areas, runway lighting, refueling facilities and activities ancillary to aeronautical infrastructure, including their construction, operation, repair and maintenance
- b. Earthworks
- c. Airport operations activities
- d. Manufacturing activities
- e. Commercial activities ancillary to any permitted activity.

### **6.6.2 Restricted discretionary activities**

The following activities are restricted discretionary activities in the Airport Enterprise Zone:

- a. Activities not meeting one or more of the performance standards unless otherwise stated.

Council restricts its discretion to the following matters:

- i. The ability of the proposal to meet the Assessment Criteria in 14.
- b. Subdivision, provided that:

The proposed subdivision complies with the relevant standards in 11.4

Council restricts its discretion to the following matters:

- i. the ability of the proposal to meet the Assessment Criteria in 14.
- ii. the provision of access to the runways for airport users.
- iii. the avoidance of allotment layouts that will adversely affect the ability of the airport to operate efficiently and safely.

**Note: Subdivision applications subject to this rule shall be considered without service, public notification or written approvals from affected persons.**

### **6.6.3 Discretionary Activities**

The following activities are discretionary activities in the Airport Enterprise Zone:

- a. Aircraft Hanger Dwellings ancillary to the use of a building for storage of aircraft, excluding sites within the ANB.

### **6.6.4 Non-complying Activities**

The following activities are non-complying activities in the Airport Enterprise Zone:

- a. Any other activity (excluding noise sensitive activities within the ANB) unless specifically provided for.
- b. Retail activities not provided for as permitted or restricted discretionary activities.

### **6.6.5 Prohibited Activities**

The following are prohibited activities in the Airport Enterprise Zone for which no consent may be sought:

- a. Activities provided for by 6.6.3(a) that do not comply with the performance standard for internal noise in 6.7.2.

## **6.7 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

### **6.7.1 Noise excluding air noise**

- a. Sound emissions from any land use activity in the Airport Enterprise Zone, excluding Airport operational noise, shall not exceed the following limits when measured within the boundary of any land zoned Central Commercial, Outer Commercial or Neighbourhood Commercial:

7am to 10pm 65 dBA L10

10pm to 7am 55 dBA L10

75dBA Lmax: or L95  
background  
sound level plus 30dBA,  
whichever is the lower.

- b. Sound emissions from any land use activity, excluding Airport operational noise, in the Airport Enterprise Zone shall when measured on any land zoned for residential purposes shall not exceed the following:

i. 7am to 6pm 55 dBA L10

ii. 6pm to 7am 45 dBA L10

85dBA Lmax or L95 background sound level plus 30dBA, whichever is the lower.

### **6.7.2 Residential Units Internal Noise**

- a. New Aircraft Hanger Dwellings shall:
- i. be fitted with acoustic insulation to ensure that noise does not exceed L<sub>dn</sub> 40 dBA in any habitable room with all doors and windows shut.
  - ii. require an Acoustic Design report from a suitably qualified Acoustic Engineer confirming that any new building is designed to meet the (i) above.

### **6.7.3 Aircraft Engine Testing**

- a. Noise levels from Aircraft Engine Testing shall comply with the following:
- i. Between the hours of 7am and 10pm, noise generated by aircraft engine testing and measured at the notional boundary of any site zoned for residential or rural use shall not exceed 55 dB L<sub>Aeq</sub>(15 hours); and;
  - ii. All aircraft engine testing shall be scheduled to take place between 7am and 10pm and only essential unplanned engine testing shall take place outside those hours.
  - iii. Noise from essential engine testing shall not exceed the following noise levels at the notional boundary of any site zoned rural or residential (excluding the land identified as designation D45) where no limit will apply:

<b><u>Time Period</u></b>	<b><u>Noise Level</u></b>
<u>All days 10.00 pm to 7.00 am</u>	<u>45 dB L<sub>Aeq</sub>(9 hours)</u>
<u>All days 10.00 pm to 7.00 am</u>	<u>80 dB L<sub>AFmax</sub></u>

- iv. On each occasion of testing the date, time, duration and reason for the tests shall be retained in a log which must be supplied to Council if requested
- v. Aircraft engine testing shall be measured in accordance with New Zealand Standard NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics – Measurement of environmental sound".

### **6.7.4 Light**

- a. Any particular artificial lighting system shall not result in increased luminance in excess of 8 lux in the measured ambient level in the

vertical plane at the windows of any residential building in the Residential zones.

b. No light source shall:

- i. create a safety hazard to air traffic using the Wanganui Airport,  
or
- ii. cause glare which may adversely affect the vision of motorists on a road

#### **6.7.5 Vibration**

No activity shall cause a vibration considered offensive or objectionable. In assessing whether vibration is offensive or objectionable, the limits set in NZS 2631: 1985-1989, Parts 1 - 3 shall be used.

#### **6.7.7 Hazardous Substances**

Any new or expanded *hazardous facility*\* is subject to the provisions of Appendix F - Hazardous Facility Screening Procedure.

#### **6.7.8 Structures**

No structure shall exceed a height of 12 metres above ground level.

Note: Where any object penetrates the notification surface Civil Aviation Rule Pt 77 requires that the proposal be notified to the Director of Civil Aviation who may require it to be marked or lit. This is a statutory requirement of the Civil Aviation Act 1990 that operates in addition to the District Plan.

#### **6.7.9 Parking, loading and access**

- a. All activities shall comply with the parking standards in District Wide Rule 10.3
- b. The vehicle crossing located on SECT 1 SO 373103 approximately 240 metres North East of the Service Lane adjoining Airport Road shall be upgraded to meet Rule 10.3 prior to the establishment of any activity that proposes to use the crossing for access.

#### **6.7.10 Advertising**

Advertising is subject to District Wide Rule 10.10 and, in relation to illuminated *signs*\*, to the standard in Rule 6.5.2 - Light.

# 10 DISTRICT WIDE PROVISIONS

## CONTENTS

---

10.14 AIR NOISE

### 10.3 TRANSPORTATION

### 10.4 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

#### 10.4.1 Parking

- a. Every activity shall provide a minimum number of on-site parking spaces as specified in the following table:

Table 1 - Parking Standards

Activity	Car Parking Spaces Required
<b>Residential activities</b>	
Dwelling units, <u>including Aircraft Hangar Dwellings</u>	1 space per dwelling unit.

Refer also to rules 10.4.5, 10.4.6, 10.4.12 and 10.10 Advertising

### 10.11 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

- 10.11.1** The number and design of signs which may be displayed on any site or building is set out in the rules for the particular zone in which the land is located.
- 10.11.2.** Signs shall be located on the same site as the activity to which they relate. Signs for election purposes are exempt from this standard.
- 10.11.3** No sign shall obstruct or detract from any official sign, sign, beacon or structure for aviation purposes or shall obstruct driver visibility along the road and at intersections and driveways.
- 10.11.4.** In all zones except the Outer Commercial, Central Commercial, Neighbourhood Commercial, Airport Enterprise and Manufacturing zones, there shall be a maximum of one free-standing sign per property. Official signs, property identification signs, warning signs and signs for election purposes are exempt from this standard.
- 10.11.5** The written approval of the Council, as landowner, is a prerequisite for any signs on road reserves, street furniture or in public places.

- 10.11.6** Signs attached to a building may extend up to a maximum of 6 metres above the highest point of the roof of the building, provided that no sign shall extend more than 10 metres above ground level.

Note: Where any object penetrates the notification surface Civil Aviation Rule Pt 77 requires that the proposal be notified to the Director of Civil Aviation who may require it to be marked or lit. This is a statutory requirement of the Civil Aviation Act 1990 that operates in addition to the District Plan.

## 10.14 AIR NOISE

Airports, and their associated flight operations, generate noise. This noise is distributed over a wide geographical area, and can vary from barely perceptible to significant nuisance depending on the sensitivity to air noise of the activity where the noise occurs. These provisions manage the relationship between air noise and land use activities that may be sensitive to that air noise. The following provisions should be read in conjunction with the Airport Enterprise Zone.

### **10.14.1 Permitted Activities**

The following are permitted activities within the Air Noise Boundary (ANB) and Outer Control Boundary (OCB), unless otherwise stated:

- a. All activities, other than Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise

### **10.14.2 Non Complying Activities**

The following activities are non-complying activities:

- a. Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise in the OCB, not provided for as permitted, discretionary (refer to Rule 6.2.3(a)).or prohibited activities

### **10.14.3 Prohibited Activities**

The following activities are prohibited activities for which no consent may be sought:

- a. Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise within the ANB.  
b. Activities Sensitive to Air Noise in the OCB that do not comply with the performance standard for internal noise in 6.7.2.

## 10.15 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

### **10.15.1 Air Noise Overlays**

- a. Air Noise resulting from the operation of the Wanganui Airport shall not exceed a Day/Night(Ldn) level of:
- i. 65dBA outside the Air Noise Boundary and
  - ii. 55dBA outside the Outer Control Boundary

# 11 SUBDIVISION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

## 11.4 RULES FOR SUBDIVISION (Part 1)

Note: The following provisions only apply to subdivision and land use activity in the Residential, Rural B, Airport Enterprise Zone, Neighbourhood Commercial and Reserves and

## 11.5 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS - SUBDIVISION

### 11.5.4 Allotment size. (Rule 11.5.4 (a) is partly subject to Appeal as indicated below)

New allotments, including balance allotments, shall meet the requirements of the following table:

Table 1 Minimum Net Allotment Area

Zone	Allotment Size Requirements - Net Site Area – Metres <sup>2</sup> (m <sup>2</sup> )
Sites Specifically for Network Utilities	No Minimum
Rural A	10,000m <sup>2</sup> (1 Hectare)
<u>Airport Enterprise Zone</u>	<u>No Minimum</u>
All other zones	Allotments shall be of sufficient size and shape to contain an activity or development in a manner that complies with the rules and standards for the zone concerned.

## 11.8 RULES FOR EARTHWORKS

Note: The following provisions only apply to subdivision and land use activity in the Residential, Rural B, Neighbourhood Commercial, Airport Enterprise, and Reserves and Open Spaces zones.

### 11.8.1 Permitted Activities.

The following are permitted activities:

- a. Earthworks in the Residential and Rural B, Airport Enterprise and Neighbourhood Commercial zones, subject to meeting the Performance Standards.

Refer also to 11.9.1



## **11.9 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR EARTHWORKS**

### **11.9.2 General earthworks standards.**

The following standards apply to earthworks in all zones except that provision 1(a) to 1(e) shall not apply to the Rural and Airport Enterprise zones:

# 14 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

## SUBDIVISION – PART II

Note: The following criteria relate only to subdivision in the Residential, Rural B, Neighbourhood Commercial, Airport Enterprise or Reserves and Open Spaces zones.

### 14.8 VEHICLE ACCESS, PARKING AND SIGNAGE

Note: The following criteria relate only to activities in the Residential, Rural B, Neighbourhood Commercial, Airport Enterprise or Reserves and Open Spaces zones.

### 14.9 TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

Note: The following criteria relate only to activities in the Residential, Rural B, Neighbourhood Commercial, Airport Enterprise or Reserves and Open Spaces zones.

### 14.10 WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

Note: The following criteria relate only to activities in the Residential, Rural B, Neighbourhood Commercial Airport Enterprise or Reserves and Open Spaces zones.

### 14.11 WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE

Note: The following criteria relate only to activities in the Residential, Rural B, Neighbourhood Commercial Airport Enterprise or Reserves and Open Spaces zones.

### 14.12 STORMWATER INFRASTRUCTURE

Note: The following criteria relate only to activities in the Residential, Rural B, Neighbourhood Commercial Airport Enterprise or Reserves and Open Spaces zones.

### 14.13 EARTHWORKS (Associated with Subdivison)

Note:

1. The following criteria relate only to activities in the Residential, Rural B, Neighbourhood Commercial Airport Enterprise or Reserves and Open Spaces zones.
2. Where land consent is required for earthworks in conjunction with subdivision consent, the relevant Assessment Criteria 14.7 shall also apply.

## 14.14 NETWORK UTILITY

Note: The following criteria relate only to activities in the Residential, Rural B, Neighbourhood Commercial, Airport Enterprise or Reserves and Open Spaces zones.

## 14.15 STREETScape AND LANDSCAPING

Note: The following criteria relate only to activities in the Residential, Rural B, Neighbourhood Commercial, Airport Enterprise or Reserves and Open Spaces zones.

## 14.16 GENERAL URBAN DESIGN CRITERIA

Note:

1. The following criteria relate only to activities in the Residential, Rural B, Neighbourhood Commercial, Airport Enterprise or Reserves and Open Spaces zones.
2. The level of assessment shall take into account scale, scope and complexity of proposal

## 14.17 EARTHWORKS

Note: The following criteria relate only to activities in the Residential, Rural B, Neighbourhood Commercial, Airport Enterprise or Reserves and Open Spaces zones.

# 15 INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS

Note: The following provisions only apply to subdivision activity in the Residential, Rural B, Neighbourhood Commercial, Airport Enterprise and Reserves and Open Spaces zones.

# 13 DEFINITIONS

**Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN)** – means any residential activity, visitor accommodation, retirement villages, day care facility, buildings used for overnight patient medical care or educational facility (including all associated outdoor spaces for such activities).

**Aircraft Hanger Dwellings** – means a single residential dwelling either substantially attached to or located within an aircraft hanger.

**Airport Operations Activities** – Activities that are related to the operation of the airport, including, but not limited to activities within or associated with flight terminals, car parking facilities, vehicle rental facilities, , flight schools, aeronautical fuel and mechanical services, hangars, rotary and fixed wing aviation services, and aero clubs.

**APPENDIX TWO**  
**Proposed Plan Maps**