

What Council proposed	What submitters told us	What Council decided
<p>Flight School and safety issues Council informed submitters that, while preparing this Development Plan, NZ Airline Academy (NZAA), a flight school interested in expanding into Ashburton, approached Council seeking a lease.</p> <p>Pilot training already operates out of the Airport and is permitted in the District Plan. NZAA expects to grow its business and forecast to be generating 42 flights (84 aircraft movements) daily by 2025.</p>	<p>Flight School and safety issues Submitters raised safety and noise concerns about the NZAA proposal.</p> <p>Submitters also raised concerns about the impact of growth on grass runways from a significant increase in flying activity.</p>	<p>Flight School and safety issues Council focussed on the impacts of sharp and significant increases in flight activity on Airport infrastructure, other users and neighbours.</p> <p>Council noted that a lease to NZ Airline Academy was a separate but related matter that would be presented to Council in future.</p>
<p>Council noted that a new skydiving operation will shortly commence operation. Services have been put in place to enable Inflight NZ to operate from a site further west on Seafield Road than the previous operation.</p>	<p>A number of submitters raised concerns about sky diving safety, noting the issues that had arisen under a previous operator, and the pending arrival of a new operator.</p> <p>A number of submitters expressed concern about the risks inherent in skydivers landing at an Airport. Submitters felt that this risk would compound with the arrival of a large-scale flying school.</p>	<p>Council noted that a lease has previously been granted to Inflight NZ for skydiving operations at Ashburton Airport. Safety issues were addressed at that time. The operator meets Civil Aviation Authority requirements for safe operation and has a good track record with operations in several other sites.</p> <p>The new location is further from other buildings on the site than the previous location.</p>
<p>Council proposed statements of Airport vision, values and goals as a focus for development.</p>	<p>Submitters highlighted the lack of reference to safety within the values and goals in the draft AADP, and noted that this is a primary consideration in the aviation industry.</p>	<p>Council directed that the goals and values statement be reviewed to include reference to safety. Council added a new value under the heading of “Safety” and added reference to safety in Goal Three. This reflects Council’s intention that the Development Plan be read through the lens of the Vision, Values and Goals.</p>
<p>Hangar Sites Council proposed that two hectares of land on the southern side of the Airport (beside</p>	<p>Hangar Sites</p>	<p>Hangar Sites Council noted submitter concerns, as well as overall support, for the provision and location of</p>

What Council proposed	What submitters told us	What Council decided
<p>the Murdochs Road/Milton Road North intersection) would be available as a new recreational hangar precinct. This could safely house around 27 recreational aircraft, which is around a 50% increase in capacity.</p> <p>Sites could be leased at a recreational rate, and tenants would fund the building and operation of hangars.</p>	<p>Submitters expressed a range of views for and against the provision and location of recreational hangars.</p> <p>84 submitters (77%) support providing more space for recreational hangars. 72 submitters (66%) support the proposed location on the far north-east boundary of the Airport.</p> <p>There were also submitters calling for the recreation hangar precinct to be located elsewhere by swapping location with the commercial precinct or by purchasing more land.</p>	<p>recreational hangars. Council discussed alternatives before it affirmed the proposed location of the hangar sites.</p> <p>Council also decided that the recreational precinct would be available for commercial activities that would be better situated further away from residential neighbours.</p>
<p>Council proposed that 1.3 hectares of land on the southern side of the Airport (along the Seafield Road boundary) be available as a commercial hangar precinct for aviation businesses.</p> <p>It is envisaged that this area would fit about eight similar-sized hangars. Sections would be available to lease at a commercial rate, and tenants would be responsible for building and funding their hangar</p>	<p>Submitters expressed a range of views for and against the provision and location of commercial and recreational hangars.</p> <p>66 submitters (61%) support providing more space for recreational hangars. 54 submitters (50%) support the proposed location on the southern boundary (Seafield Road) of the Airport.</p> <p>Residential submitters raised concern about the impact of a developed commercial precinct on the vistas from Seafield Road, the need for car parking and landscaping plans, as well as traffic impacts.</p>	<p>Council noted submitter concerns, as well as overall support, for the provision of commercial hangars. Council affirmed the proposed location of the hangar sites.</p> <p>The commercial precinct would also be available for specific recreational activities that would be better situated on the Seafield Road area.</p> <p>Council is sympathetic to the views expressed about the high quality to the Alps from the Seafield Road frontage through the proposed commercial precinct. It acknowledges that careful thought needs to be given to the location, density, built amenity, and landscaping in this area when dealing with lease applications.</p>
<p>Council proposed that 2 hectares of land on the western side of the Airport (along the Morris Road boundary) be available for the</p>	<p>Submitters expressed a range of views for and against the provision and location of hangar homes, including aspects of design, landscaping, impact on</p>	<p>Council noted submitter concerns, as well as overall support, for the provision of hangar homes.</p>

What Council proposed	What submitters told us	What Council decided
<p>building of hangar homes. Council noted that a density of up to 14 homes would fit the rural residential atmosphere around Ashburton Airport.</p> <p>Hangar homes are a new activity for Ashburton Airport. District Plan rules do not presently allow people to live there. Council would explore a Resource Management Act (RMA) process that would allow people to live at the Airport.</p> <p>This proposal, the timing of development, and any specifications about the hangar homes, depends on the outcome of that Resource Management Act process.</p> <p>If it resulted in hangar homes being allowed, further consideration would need to be given to supporting infrastructure such as entrances; roading, kerb and channel; power; fibre; drinking water; wastewater; and stormwater.</p>	<p>runways, noise impacts on neighbours and visual amenity issues.</p> <p>70 submitters (64%) support providing space for hangar homes. 63 submitters (58%) support the proposed location on the western boundary (Morris Road).</p> <p>36 submitters (33%) favoured medium density (up to 14 homes). 25 submitters (23%) favoured low density (up to 10 houses). 16 submitters (15%) favoured no hangar homes. 11 submitters (10%) favoured high density (up to 20 homes).</p> <p>Submitters also raised issues about design standards, density, and the need to build good quality hangar homes.</p>	<p>Council affirmed the proposed location of the hangar homes.</p> <p>Council reaffirmed that many of the issues raised around hangar homes will be fully covered in the RMA process, which will ultimately be determined by an independent party.</p>
<p>Managing the effects of growth</p> <p>Growth and development planned is to be within the Airport's existing footprint. Its existing runways are to be retained in their current position, and all current users are enabled to remain at the Airport.</p>	<p>Managing the effects of growth</p> <p>Submitters raised the prospect of relocating Runway 11/29 to its original position. This would create more options to locate one of the precincts along Murdochs Road.</p> <p>Submitters suggested that Council could offer alternative plans for the development of the Airport by acquiring more land. Land owners to the north</p>	<p>Managing the effects of growth</p> <p>Council considered this idea, noting that a major change will likely require Council to consult again on the position of the runway and on new options for the location of hangars. Council also noted that Airport Users have expressed support for the existing arrangement of runways.</p>

What Council proposed	What submitters told us	What Council decided
	<p>noted that they remained open to conversations in future on this topic and asked to be kept informed of Council's intentions.</p>	<p>Council opted to retain runways in their current locations.</p> <p>Council affirms no immediate plans to purchase more land, given historic and current levels of demand. Council also recognises that this can be reviewed if circumstances change.</p>
<p>Council expects that both Airport and neighbouring residential activity is likely to intensify over the life of this 30 year Plan. This may create competing interests.</p> <p>Council intends to consider a review of District Plan provisions for controlling airport site noise. A key consideration is that the Airport's significant resources and activities are not provided anywhere else in the district.</p>	<p>Submitters raised some concerns about aircraft noise impacts on residential neighbourhoods around the Airport. Some submitters noted that Council has limited powers to address the noise of aircraft once they are airborne.</p> <p>Submitters suggested Council look at right-hand circuits for existing runways, as this would mean fewer aircraft flying above adjoining residential areas.</p>	<p>Council confirmed it has little or no statutory powers to address the noise of aircraft once airborne. It does have the ability to regulate noise from Airport operations prior to take-off and on landing. Council confirmed its intention to look into District Plan noise provisions.</p> <p>Council notes the suggestions around right-hand circuits as a method that would reduce flights over residential areas. This will be discussed with Airport users initially.</p>
<p>Providing essential infrastructure to support new and increasing use of the Airport. This would be funded by those who use the infrastructure.</p>	<p>Submitters noted the need to ensure adequate infrastructure to cope with growth. In addition to wastewater infrastructure, submitters also noted concerns about traffic safety and access to fibre. The constraints on development on surrounding residential D land is an issue as Environment Canterbury has declined to allow more discharge to land consents for on-site sewerage systems.</p>	<p>Provision of wastewater, water and other infrastructure to the locality of the Airport is related to, but outside the scope of, the Development Plan.</p> <p>Council is preparing detailed design for water infrastructure projects to service North-east Ashburton and Residential D zones around Ashburton. An issues and options paper is being prepared in regard to wastewater servicing in north-east Ashburton. These are long-term investments in infrastructure. Meeting the future</p>

What Council proposed	What submitters told us	What Council decided
<p>Council proposed to develop activity performance standards that would enable growth while:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. managing the effects of airport activities on neighbouring residential activity and visual amenity, and 2. recognising the Airport's value as the district's only aviation hub. <p>This would at first be implemented through appropriate lease conditions. In future it may also be introduced through District Plan rules.</p>	<p>As noted alongside other issues, submitters raised issues related to noise, traffic, access, car parking, protection of vistas, design of new buildings and others.</p>	<p>needs of the Airport is a relevant consideration but only one of many matters to be considered.</p> <p>Council reaffirmed its intention to support appropriate controls through performance standards in lease documents.</p>
<p>Financial Considerations</p> <p>Council believes Ashburton Airport has the potential to generate more income from rents and landing charges to reduce rates funding.</p> <p>Council aimed for a financially self-sufficient airport without rates input.</p>	<p>Financial Considerations</p> <p>43 submitters (39%) supported the current level of rates input. 29 submitters (27%) supported working towards moderate rates input of 30-50%. 14 submitters (13%) supported working towards a low rates input of 10-20%. 6 submitters (5%) supported working towards no rates input.</p> <p>Submitters noted the anticipated revenue from a flight school and argued for high rates of charging for commercial users.</p> <p>Submitters also argued for a long-term approach to improving the financial position of the Airport.</p> <p>Submitters asked for more budget transparency and more scrutiny of airport costs. Submitters</p>	<p>Financial Considerations</p> <p>Council noted the limited support for its nil rates objective. Council accepts that this is very ambitious and difficult to achieve in the short-term.</p> <p>Council expressed a desire to review commercial landing charges and noted its earlier resolution to review all Airport charges during the 2023/34 Annual Plan.</p> <p>Council can make more information on budgets and actuals available to Airport users and intends to do so. Council emphasises that overhead allocation is a rigorous process that Council must follow to account for the allocation of costs across all Council activities, including the Airport.</p>

What Council proposed	What submitters told us	What Council decided
	noted that overheads form a large part of the costs of the Airport.	
<p>RNAV System Council is investigating the installation of an Area Navigation (RNAV) Global Positioning System (GPS) approach. This technology would allow suitably equipped aircraft to land at Ashburton Airport when there is poor visibility.</p>	<p>RNAV System Submitters, principally local aviators, asked that Council defer any decision on the introduction of RNAV until it had completed its deliberations on the Development Plan and the approach from NZ Airline Academy.</p> <p>Submitters saw these decisions as separate but inter-related and felt that the RNAV decision should logically follow after the other two matters.</p>	<p>RNAV System Council parked any decision on RNAV at the request of airport users, pending the adoption of this Development Plan, and a decision on a lease to NZ Airline Academy.</p>
<p>Aviation Museum and Heritage Values Council proposed enabling the Ashburton Aviation Museum expansion to proceed, and maintaining the Airport’s existing heritage values.</p>	<p>Aviation Museum and Heritage Values Submitters expressed high levels of support for the Aviation Museum, its planned expansion and heritage features generally</p>	<p>Aviation Museum and Heritage Values Council confirmed its support for the Aviation Museum expansion, and its inclusion in the Development Plan.</p>
<p>Ashburton Speedway Council proposed no change for Ashburton Speedway, noting it has a lease with 27-28 years left to run. Council also noted some pressure on parking related to Speedway events and this is expected to grow. Future parking provision is an issue on Council’s radar.</p>	<p>Ashburton Speedway Submitters noted that, as Airport land becomes occupied with more hangars, Council will face a choice between relocating the Speedway or purchasing more land.</p>	<p>Ashburton Speedway Council reaffirms the current location of Ashburton Speedway, noting that it holds a long-term lease. Council has recently invested in entrance improvements and fencing to more clearly demarcate the Speedway lease area.</p>
	<p>New Ideas raised by Submitters Submitters noted the strategic value of the Airport from a civil defence emergency management (CDEM) perspective, and encouraged Council to invest in infrastructure to support that activity.</p>	<p>Council acknowledged the strategic value of the airport as a resource for Civil Defence response in cases of emergency. Council does not foresee an immediate need to provide CDEM infrastructure at the Airport.</p>

What Council proposed	What submitters told us	What Council decided
	Submitters noted a range of possible new services or amenities at the Airport, such as public toilets and camping areas	Council noted that proposals for new services or amenities at the Airport can be addressed through the Annual Plan & budget processes