

Q1

Your contact details (optional)

Name

Danny Brown

Q2

No

Do you wish to speak in support of your submission at the hearing? The hearing will be held in the Council Chamber on 14 September 2022. Please note that hearings are publicly live-streamed.

Page 2

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

How you would like to present your submission at the hearing?

Q4

Do you support the goals in the Ashburton Airport Development Plan (as follows)?* Ashburton airport is enabled to become more financially independent* More people are attracted to Ashburton Airport for activities that support the vibrancy and viability of the facility* Ashburton Airport is sustainably managed to support increased use of the facility over the next 30 years* Ashburton Airport remains an appealing, thriving hub for the local community and visiting aviation enthusiasts for the next thirty years

No,

Comments:

Having been involved throughout the process, this plan has only been focused on the financial aspect of the airport with profit making at the forefront. At no stage has the ADC presented any data around the environmental aspect of increased airport activity. This number of proposed flights per year (long term) from the sky diving company along with the allowance of future commercial operations heavily impacts the carbon footprint from / in Mid Canterbury. The people of Mid Canterbury should not be forced to accept the environmental impact for future generations for the financial benefit of this generation. The ADC need to provide the data around the forecasted CO2 emissions of this plan as if the proposed plan had 100% occupancy within the commercial operations, recreational hangars and hanger homes and provide a the plan to off set these emissions, along with how that will be funded.

Q5

In 2021/22, the total budget for Ashburton Airport was \$152,023, of which 60.9% (\$92,558) was funded from rates. Which level of rates funding would you support us working towards?

I support the current level of rates funding (60%),

Other (please specify):

For recreational use only. Not commercial.

Q6

Referring to the map below, please select which of the following you agree with:(you can click on the image to make it bigger)

Providing more space for recreational hangars,

The location proposed for the new recreational hangars precinct

,

Other (please specify):

Commercial - As per above suggestion. Along with additional noise for shift workers of existing landowners. We have two 24hr facilities that utilize this area to reside. Health and Safety protocols around sleep deprivation must be adhered to, ADC should not be creating H&S hazards for financial benefits. This would also apply if flights become 24hr for residents that work day shift.Please remember this will be a non maned airport and good faith agreements don't always work.

Q7

Referring to the hangar homes proposal on page 8 of the consultation document ([click here to view](#)), what is your preferred density of hangar homes?

No hangar homes,

Other (please specify):

The idea of hanger homes is fine, just not down Morris Rd or Seafield Rd. The existing residents do not deserve disturbance from airplanes being started, taxied and worked on for maintenance 5-20m from there boundary. When these properties were purchase, hanger homes were not part of the plan. There needs to be some kind of sacrifice from both parties....remove 1 or 2 of the existing 6 runways to achieve placing the planes away from existing residents. The existing residents shouldn't be forced to make all the sacrifice.

Q8

Do you have any other comments or feedback about this draft plan?

Respondent skipped this question