

Attachment C - Summary of Submissions received																		
Sub #	Name	Speak at Hearing?	Main interest in Glenorchy Airstrip Reserve	Where do you live in relation to Glenorchy Airstrip?	OVERALL POSITION	Aviation Operations S 7	Comment	Use- S 8	Comment	Funding & Users Charges S9	Comment	Development & Infrastructure S 10	Comment	Carbon & Noise Emissions S 11	Comment	Governance & Community Input S 12	Comment	OTHER COMMENTS
1	Paul Cooper	No	Glenorchy resident, Glenorchy ratepayer	Rees Valley	Support	Neutral	If operators have to be there, these rules seem OK	Neutral	Private and emergency use only. NO overbearing use for tourists. Its a valley and the noise resonates, However if Tourist aviation companies have to be included section 8 seems sensible	Support	Commercial users MUST pay 90% of maintaining airstrip	Oppose	NO Hangers. However if 2 have to be there make sure they are high end and not just big tin sheds. They are at our town entrance	Support		Support	Email addresses of persons on the governance committee must be published	Basically the plan is good and overall all I support it. If commercial users have to be here they seem to be well controlled. Control and reporting is the key. They area should not be open to exploitation like Queenstown. We should cherish and look after the last of the quiet and un spoilt areas. No one groups activities should negatively impact on other parties
2	Luke McEwan	No	Commercial aircraft operator, Tourism operator	Queenstown	Neutral	Support	Extra attention to the GY airstrip is beneficial for all parties concerend	Oppose	Agree on the total limit of landings. Hours of use should include local farmers and filming jobs which bring a large influx of money and work to GY.									
3	Luke McEwan Glacier Southern Lakes	No	Commercial aircraft operator, Tourism operator	Queenstown	Neutral	Support		Oppose	Local farmers, Film work need the ability for early/late flights as they have large contribution to GY. Local Commercial operator do lots of short noisey flights, Qtown operators bring in high paying long duration flight type clients.	Oppose	Paying in advance? then asked to gift back unused flights dos not add up. The system is very confusing and clunky	Neutral	No need for infrastructure if becoming more limiting to use the airstrip	Support	General aviation can only go so far in how we are allowed to operate aircraft but initiatives to show that are supported	Support		Queenstown and Wanaka aircraft operators should have more of a say as they are bringing clients into Glenorchy to either stay at accommodation there or partake in tourism based activities. Having a pre paid limited per month landing allocation is not productive to encouraging Glenorchy as a destination. The local Helicopter operator there is the biggest contributor to noise simple becuae they sell low cost short flights that fill the noise bucket quickly alongside being a constant noise for neighbours. Operator more randomly with longer durations between take off and landing with minimize the effects of the airstrip for maximum gains. Your billing system needs attention: prepaying for landings is crazy and then being asked that if you still dont use them after paying for them, they will be taken off you for the following year. Tourism landings in advance is impossible to predict accurately
4	scott coates	No	Glenorchy resident, Glenorchy ratepayer	Glenorchy Township	Oppose	Oppose	the airport has been there long time before anyone decided to build there bar the farm. looks like tourism and the town is the big looser this round	Oppose	looking like no growth at the airport. that means nothing changes and nothing has been fixed in this situation of lacking take off and landing numbers	Neutral	users should pay simple	Support	toilets and hangers are needed to provide safety for aircraft and customers	Neutral	every person drives a car flying machines use petroleum. and make noise.	Support	I would prefer a larger GCA voice in this plan	this document is heavily one sided towards noise issues and people that decided to buy land right next to a airstrip. yes they have a important part to play in management but not at the expense of the towns needs. increase flight numbers to a reasonable level like say other helicopter landing consents in area, so other options are not needed like at present. any fire in glenorchy one would expect the helicopters there quick smart to put it out. the noise has lessened majorly in last 5 years and frankly is a mute point with present activities.
5	Virginia Sharp	No	Glenorchy resident, Glenorchy ratepayer	Rees Valley	Support	Support	limit air craft as much as possible	Support	limit air craft as much as possible	Support	only support if commercial users pay all fees	Oppose	no hangers	Support	if air craft have to be there - it would be good if carbon emissions are limited	Support	only support if easily contactable	over al I support as it limits helicopter use
6	Joseph Allen-Perkins	No	Commercial aircraft operator	Queenstown	Support	Support	It is crucial that the airstrip is maintained to a safe standard, and the best way to do that is certainly by employing someone who knows how to do it. It is too valuable a resource for the region to have in disrepair.	Support	While not permitting any further skydiving activities does cut down future opportunities for employment and economic gain in the area it is understandable given the noise generated. it is important however to not carry this mentality too much further.	Support	While not being a massive financial contributor myself I know those that regularly use the airstrip are happy to pay a reasonable price to do so.	Support	The building of hangars, bathrooms and a waiting area will support the economic return of the airstrip with minimal impact on the community.	Neutral	I think it is important to specify metrics used for this type of thing. Tourism being a large part, carbon and noise emissions per visitor may be a good metric to use. Many users have already invested millions into reducing this metric in the last decade.			
7	Cameron Wood	No	Commercial aircraft operator, Tourism operator - Film production	Queenstown	Oppose	Neutral		Oppose	1. Flight Operating Hours – Overly Restrictive // 2. Aircraft Movement Cap – Needs Flexibility	Neutral		Support	1. Urgent Need for Public Facilities // 2. Hangar Development – Strongly Supported	Neutral		Neutral		Refer to attached pdf submission #7
8	Hugo Loneragan	No	Glenorchy resident	Wyuna Preserve	Support	Support		Support		Support		Support	Little impact on Wyuna residents.	Support		Support		
9	Kate Evers	No	Glenorchy resident	Wyuna Preserve	Support	Neutral		Neutral	Just keen it is always kept to the minimum required for heliglenorchy, emergency services and farming support.	Support	Would like commercial kept to absolute minimum.	Neutral	Always keep to minimum required to support planned uses.	Support	No more noise than the current situation.	Support		Has been a great consultation process. Only to state the obvious that Wyuna residents do not what an increase in the number of flights or buildings at the airport.
10	James Stokes Glenorchy Air	Yes	Commercial aircraft operator, Tourism operator	Queenstown		Neutral	Neutral	Oppose	It is a good thing that the airstrip will be managed, however the council should be doing this efficiently and not overregulating operations needlessly	Oppose	The landscape has drastically changed since 2019, if the parachute landing area is to be removed then limiting commercial operations would be an expensive waste of the councils resources. movement numbers will not exceed 2019 level without skydiving ops	Support	The Airstrip has zero facilities so charges are currently at or above market rates for comparable strips. public toilets and shelter are much needed pieces of in	Oppose	It is not the councils job to instruct businesses on how to operate or to speculate in unproven technology before it is proven. aviation is given a bad name for emissions that it does not deserve, this survey is more damaging than flying		Neutral	Aviation has had a minimal voice on the GALC, it is dominated by residents and council so we don't really have a say. meetings are also held in the middle of the day when we are flying so half the time we cant turn up.The councils job here is no maintain landings to 2019 levels in accordance with the related environment court decision. Putting needless limits on individual operators is a waste of time and represents overregulation in the present context. It would be appropriate to revisit the need for limits if numbers increase but the chances of this are low if the Sky Diving operator is not going to start up again.
11	John Evans AOPA	Yes	Community organisation	AOPA represented members reside and fly throughout New Zealand, many of which reside within QLDC territory.	support	Support	Support	Neutral	We support that QLDC manages the asset as a reserve that does not require CAA Rule Part 139, which is not required for our membership. We support that Section 3.6 is reflected in General Obj. 6.1 recognising that this has been an airstrip since 1953. These are generally sensible and support the continued availability of the strip for recreational flying.lying	Neutral	We support S8.1.2. - ensure the airstrip is available for recreational aviation. Suggest 8.2.6 needs rewording. To the casual observer most modern microlights are indistinguishable from other light aircraft and cannot be singled out as being noisy and	Support	This is a community asset, the reserve land cannot be developed to realise returns expected from commercial development. We support fair/reasonable charging. 9.2.5 should be deleted as mechanisms exist to elsewhere to determine pricing.	Support	Support in light of recreational activity not of mention within Objectives/Policies. Emissions from Glenorchy Airstrip have not been calculated, including recreational use (a very fractional contribution)	Support	We support the ongoing existence of the GACGC	"8.2.6. Prohibit intensive high annoyance noisy activities such as microlight" is somewhat unfounded, given many of our membership operate "microlight" aircraft comparable to "legacy" aircraft such as Cessna's, and they are not generally considered "high annoyance" or "noisy" AOPA NZ (Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association New Zealand) has over 1050 total members, with 750 of those being pilots. We represent the largest aviation group in New Zealand and advocate for pilots' interests.
12	Glenorchy Community Association	Yes	Community organisation	Glenorchy Township	Support	Support		Support		Support		Support		Support		Support		The Glenorchy Community Association (GCA) fully support the draft reserve management plan, its objectives and policies. The community have identified that the 50ha parcel as land known as the Blanket Bay recreation reserve sited adjacent to the airstrip would be the preferred location in the event that the settlement had to relocate or rebuild after an alpine fault rupture.Accordingly we submit that the following additions are made to the draft:- 2. Reserve Description - add new sentence to the last paragraph "The community have identified this parcel as being the preferred location for relocating or rebuilding the settlement if required after an alpine fault event." 3.6 History - add new paragraph at the end of this section "An outcome from the Head of the Lake Adaptation workstream led by the Otago Regional Council in 2023-25 was the realisation that much of the current Glenorchy settlement may be uninhabitable following an alpine fault rupture. The community have identified the 50ha Blanket Bay recreation reserve adjacent to the airstrip as the preferred location in the event that the settlement has to be relocated and rebuilt. Future growth and development at the airstrip should not compromise this possibility."

Sub #	Name	Speak at Hearing?	Main interest in Glenorchy Airstrip Reserve	Where do you live in relation to Glenorchy Airstrip?	OVERALL POSITION	Aviation Operations \$ 7	Comment	Use- S 8	Comment	Funding & Users Charges \$9	Comment	Development & Infrastructure \$ 10	Comment	Carbon & Noise Emissions \$ 11	Comment	Governance & Community Input \$ 12	Comment	OTHER COMMENTS
13	Andrew Green	Yes	Glenorchy resident, Glenorchy ratepayer, Recreational aircraft operator	Rees Valley	Support	Support		Support		Oppose	For recreational aircraft, current landing fees are excessive for services available in comparison to other airfields	Support		Neutral		Support		
14	Ben Davis Totally Tourism	No	Commercial aircraft operator	Queenstown	Support	Support	Refinements are needed to ensure aviation activity at Glenorchy remains viable, resilient, and able to provide long term benefit to the community. In particular, restrictions tied to 2019 flight numbers risk unnecessarily constraining future growth inovat	Support	Improvements such as clear layout planning for helicopters and fixed wing aircraft. However, operational flexibility is essential, the airstrip must be able to respond to seasonal demand and emergencies without being hampered by overly rigid procedures.	Support	Landing fees and leases should contribute to the cost of maintaining the airstrip but must remain affordable so as not to discourage use or concentrate access to only one or two operators.	Support	Modest, sensitive development to ensure the airstrip remains safe and functional. This includes separate landing areas, basic passenger facilities such as toilets and waiting areas, and a communal helipad. Ensure safety, visitor, operational efficiency	Support	We are already investing in more efficient aircraft and operational practices that reduce fuel burn and noise impact. We support Council's proposal to give weight to noise and carbon reduction in flight allocation and charging	Support	We encourage QLDC to ensure governance processes remain transparent, efficient, and informed by robust operational data.	The Glenorchy Airstrip is far more than just a small rural airstrip — it is a critical piece of regional infrastructure. It underpins emergency response, conservation operations, farming logistics, and a significant share of the local tourism economy. It also provides employment opportunities for the Glenorchy community and beyond. With careful and balanced management, the airstrip can continue to deliver these benefits while respecting the natural environment and the amenity of nearby residents. Totally Tourism encourages QLDC to adopt a plan that protects community values while also ensuring aviation at Glenorchy remains viable, innovative, and beneficial to the wider region.
15	Jane McCurdy	No	Film Technician.	Queenstown	Strongly oppose	Neutral		Support	Support commercial aviation, activity, should not be limited to 2019 (Covid) levels.	Neutral		Neutral		Oppose	Why is the baseline based on 2019 (covid) figures?	Oppose	Why do the rich NMBYS get so much say in the future of the GY airstrip - which was there well before Wyuna was developed.	We use the Glenorchy Airstrip as a base for filming (when using aviation operators) for the Glenorchy area. Glenorchy is a very important area for filming in the region, and the airport at Glenorchy is a valuable location, as well as being the base for local aviation operators.
16	Thomas Watson	Yes	Commercial aircraft operator, Recreational aircraft operator	Queenstown	Support	Oppose	8.2.6.-don't ban as some are as quiet as GA aircraft. 8.3.2.4 operators over 12 landings should agree to terms but not enter agreement. 8.3.2.7- bucket allocation doesn't work- Milford.	Neutral	8.3.2.7- don't repeat Milford with the 'bucket' allocation. Reserve that if movements exceed upper levels. 8.3.3.4- remove 'skydiving' replaced with 'general'	Support	9.2.5. Do not agree with this. Should be stable clear fees and not the advisory committee over-reach to limit landings by using landing fees to discourage landings. Tool blunt of a tool.	Neutral	Generally in agreement, however 10.2.1. This should not be a limit of 2 hangars. There are many examples of community vitality created by encouraging hangar establishment.	Neutral	Glenorchy is not Queenstown with large commercial airliners operating constantly, creating 17% of the districts emissions. 11.2.1-Aspirational, but how will the authority factor this into landing allocations?	Oppose	GACGC is unfortunately, heavily weighted by non-aviation representatives. There is only one aviation rep in the governance group, with 4 others non-aviation related. 2 are against aviation in GY. Community input yes please, NIMBY's no thank you	Please use the term aerodrome, not airstrip in the Plan. 8.3.2.9 One of the key elements of the PDP is utilising quieter aircraft into and out of Glenorchy. For that, you require a level surface. Cessna Caravans are perfectly able to use the airstrip IF it was level and didn't have significant humps and dips at both ends. By and large, I agree with the PDP, however, attempting to replicate Milford Sound's 'bucket' allocation is flawed and I'm not convinced QAC will manage the allocation efficiently. I am also concerned at the limit being a 2019 snapshot and not an average over a longer timeframe. As an emergency airfield, Glenorchy is vital for aviation in the Southern Lakes. It is quite possible that on occasion Glenorchy is the only place multiple aircraft can land when weather conditions are poor in Queenstown, when an aircraft is experiencing an abnormal condition, or the Glenorchy road is compromised. It is imperative the Council as the designated authority, not only maintains, but improves the operational surface for fixed wing aircraft. 10.2.5 itinerant helipad not required. Fixed wing and helis can separate fine without a designated heli landing pad. Thank you for the opportunity to have a say.
17	David Benjamin	No	Glenorchy resident, Glenorchy ratepayer	Glenorchy Township	Neutral	Neutral		Neutral	I question the recording of aircraft movements.As an aside I would support the CAA changing the flight paths of light aircraft over Glenorchy.	Neutral	Increase landing fees to cover costs, ratepayers shouldn't be subsidising the operators.	Neutral	Approved development and infrastructure costs to be met by the operators.	Neutral	Adopt the noise management plan that the Environment Court awarded the Wyuna preserve residents association incorporated to the Glenorchy township.	Neutral		
18	Mat Woods, Chief Executive Destination Queenstown	No	Regional Tourism Organisation	Wānaka	Support	Support	We support continued engagement of an experienced aerodrome operator like QAC. Safety and CAA compliance must remain. We support improvements in to layout planning. Operational flexibility is essential to respond to seasonal demand and emergencies.	Support	We recommend allowing for managed growth above the 2019 baseline, subject to compliance with noise contours and robust monitoring.This ensures community concerns are respected while recognising aviation's contribution to employment and conservation.	Support	A user pays system is appropriate. Landing fees and leases should contribute to maintaining the airstrip but must remain affordable. We support fees as a policy lever if charges incentivise positive behaviour e.g. low noise aircraft, carbon reduction.	Support	We support modest, sensitive development to ensure airstrip is safe and functional. e.g. two hangars, basic passenger facilities (toilets/waiting areas), and a communal helipad to reduce conflict between itinerant helicopters and fixed wing operations.	Support	We recognise community concerns and climate change responsibilities. Operators are investing in more efficient aircraft and responsible operational practices. We support a proposal to give weight to noise/carbon reduction in flight allocation and charging	Support	Glenorchy Airstrip Consultative Governance Committee (GACGC) is important for balancing the views of operators, community, and Council. We encourage QLDC to ensure governance remain transparent, efficient, and informed by robust operational data.	We support the draft plan's intent to provide a safe, well-managed grass airstrip that enables essential aviation activities including emergency response, farming, conservation, and tourism, while recognising the need to manage noise and emissions. We have concerns that certain restrictions, particularly around flight numbers and growth limits tied to 2019, could unnecessarily constrain future operations, economic recovery, and innovation in aviation. The Glenorchy Airstrip is far more than just a small rural airstrip - it is critical regional infrastructure. It underpins emergency response, conservation operations, farming logistics, and a significant share of the local tourism economy. It also provides employment opportunities for the Glenorchy community and beyond. With careful and balanced management, the airstrip can continue to deliver these benefits while respecting the natural environment and the amenity of nearby residents. We encourage QLDC to adopt a plan that protects community values while also ensuring aviation at Glenorchy remains viable, innovative, and beneficial to the wider region.
19	Alex Turnbull	No	Recreational aircraft operator	Queenstown	Neutral	Support	The aerodrome is a vital strategic community asset. This is for times of natural disaster when road access may be cut off. It also serves as a vital diversionary aerodrome for all flight in the area private and commercial.	Support	As with all infrastructure it needs to be used in order to stay in good condition. Commercial operations at the aerodrome provide the bulk of the revenue to help pay to maintain it for everyone. It also helps the local economy.	Neutral	Landing fees should be charged at a fair level. However fees should not be used to discourage any type of activity. This approach inevitably leads to a downward spiral where fees then have to go up more because of reduced activity.	Support	Infrastructure should be allowed to be developed to maintain this as a viable small aerodrome.	Oppose	This section of the plan is incredibly misleading and not well thought out.	Oppose	I feel the structure of the GACGC is biased towards those who want to reduce activity at the aerodrome.	
20	Alex Turnbull Air Milford	No	Commercial aircraft operator	Queenstown	Neutral	Support	The aerodrome is a vital strategic community asset. It is also a vital diversionary aerodrome as was demonstrated earlier this year. If road access is cut off to GY by natural disaster it also serves as a vital backup.	Support	Commercial operations at the aerodrome provide the bulk of the revenue to help pay to maintain it for everyone. It also helps the local economy.	Neutral	Landing fees should be charged at a fair level. However fees should not be used to discourage any type of activity. This approach inevitably leads to a downward spiral where fees then have to go up more because of reduced activity.	Support	Infrastructure should be allowed to be developed to maintain this as a viable small aerodrome. Commercial use of the aerodrome is vital to maintaining it's viability.	Oppose	This section of the plan is not well thought out and takes a broad approach when it could be a lot more nuanced and focused.	Oppose	The GACGC is biased towards those who want to reduce activity at the aerodrome.	
21	Chris McLennan	No	Glenorchy resident	Glenorchy Township	Support	Support		Neutral	I feel an increase in flight numbers could be justified based on criteria such as local economy and employment along with emergency services and DOC support services	Support		Support	Facilities such as toilets, waiting areas and hangars are much needed and long overdue. Services from the airstrip are an integral part of Glenorchy but supporting facilities are absent	Support		Support		
22	Nick Nicholson HeliGlenorchy/ Action Helicopters	Yes	Commercial Operator	Queenstown	Oppose	Oppose		Oppose	Remove flight limit.			Oppose	Supports provision for hangar. Permanent fuel storage should be permitted.	Support	Remove reference to designation conditions.	Support	Remove reference to GACGC in the plan as required by designation not RMP.	See attached pdf submission #22

Sub #	Name	Speak at Hearing?	Main interest in Glenorchy Airstrip Reserve	Where do you live in relation to Glenorchy Airstrip?	OVERALL POSITION	Aviation Operations S 7	Comment	Use- S 8	Comment	Funding & Users Charges S9	Comment	Development & Infrastructure S 10	Comment	Carbon & Noise Emissions S 11	Comment	Governance & Community Input S 12	Comment	OTHER COMMENTS
23	Film Otago Southland (FOS)	No	Film Industry Representative Body	Otago Southland	Neutral	Neutral	FOS recognises that the draft RMP does not explicitly provide for or prevent filming activities and that historically, filming requests to utilise the Reserve have been effectively managed via existing QLDC processes, such as the Reserve Permit process. In general, FOS is supportive of maintaining the status quo, as it seems to have worked well for industry requirements in the past.		the proposed flight operation time parameters and aircraft movement cap seem overly restrictive. FOS advocates for the flight operation restrictions to be adapted to match morning and evening twilight, and that the RMP incorporate a process for exceptions and one-off approvals in situations such as: - o Operators that can demonstrate low-noise and low-emission technology - o Special one-off events or operations or regional benefit - o Seasonal fluctuations				FOS is generally supportive of proposed infrastructure on the Reserve such as public toilet facilities and additional hangars.				FOS appreciates the draft RMP's intent to balance environmental concerns with community and economic outcomes. The regional screen industry is supported by a local workforce and local businesses and is recognised as being a valuable economic driver for the district. All high-impact film productions also take care to engage with community stakeholders before undertaking filming that will affect the local community.	See attached pdf submission #23