

IN THE MATTER of the Resource  
Management Act 1991  
AND  
IN THE MATTER of the Queenstown  
Lakes Proposed District Plan  
Informal Airports  
Submission of Clive Manners Wood

My name is Clive Manners Wood. I have lived in the district for 45 years. The last 38 years I have resided at the old Ben Lomond Homestead past the Coronet Peak turn-off.

Over the years my wife, Shane, has planted extensive gardens including a field of lavender, built a lavender oil distillery and opened a farm shop. So we are reliant on maintaining a tranquil pleasant environment.

I became involved in helicopter noise pollution during Christmas/New year 2006. Alfresco garden lunches with my family were shattered by low flying helicopters lining up to land in the tourist zone at Arthurs Point. The QLDC health and safety officer emailed saying the operator did not have consent for the landings. But a week later the CEO emailed saying they had consent. After four years of litigation, costing Arthurs Point residents \$50,000 and the ratepayers approximately \$250,000, supporting the helicopter operator, the helipad was shut down.

During 2009 we had to oppose the introduction of Plan Change 27A which tried to introduce NZS 6807:1994. (Noise management and land use planning for helicopter landing areas.) This would have allowed, according to a noise consultant, 20 landings or 40 movements per day at Arthurs Point. Two years of litigation and a further cost of \$10,000, for Arthurs Point residents, only confirmed the current noise conditions would not be overridden by the helicopter standard.

I was also involved in the litigation concerning the QLDC allowing unlimited helicopter landings on the Ben Lomond Recreational Reserve. Another cost to the ratepayers of around \$400,000. The website [www.queenstown-noise.co.nz](http://www.queenstown-noise.co.nz) contains most of the above legal decisions and useful information on noise.

So I have acquired a reasonable understanding of the law and jargon surrounding helicopter noise pollution.

The latest episode proposes the introduction of " informal airports " allowing 3 landings per week, 500 metres from a notional boundary and consented solely on the opinion of a noise consultant.

Once again we are told we **must** adopt NZS 6807:1994. (Noise management and land use planning for helicopter landing areas.)

Any one who has shopped at Remarkables Park will understand how much noise helicopters generate taking off and landing 500 metres away at the airport.

Section 32 of the RMA requires that an evaluation report must contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental effects that are anticipated from the implementation of this proposal.

In my opinion the following are a list of points that have not been considered.

\*No evidence of community support for informal airports.

\*No explanation why the current noise controls have been discarded after serving the community for generations.

\*A lack of understanding that people live in rural areas for peace and quiet.

\*No evaluation of the cumulative effects of numerous helipads all over the district.

\*No explanation why we must adopt NZS 6807: 1994. (Noise management and land use planning for helicopter landing areas.) And fails to mention the standard has already been rejected by the community in 2011.

\*No evaluation or explanation of the difference between the existing sound levels and NZS6807: 1994.

\*The report must show the community wishes to adopt the standard.

\*And explain that the council is not legally bound to adopt the standard.

\*The report has to prove the community is aware of the provisions of NZS6807. And whether the standard would increase noise pollution? (The short answer is the community has no understanding of the standard because to obtain a copy costs \$70! And the standard was written by the helicopter industry and never signed off by the ministry of health.)

\*The report should have stated that NZS6807 averages helicopter noise over 24 hours rather than the 15 minutes current regulations require.

In my opinion three flights a week is just trying to get a foot in door. As Mr. Chiles explains, if we adopt NZS6807 then a 500 metre separation would allow 10 flights a day or 140 take-off and landings per week.

I am loathe to say, but in my opinion, Messrs. Blair and Chiles reports are biased, lack transparency and detail required by the Act. And in all fairness they should declare whom they are representing.

The whole issue is simply about noise pollution. The fact you cannot see it, taste, or smell it may explain why it has not received as much attention as other types of pollution.

Queenstown is striving to become a mature resort. Aspen, our sister city, banned all helicopter flyovers and landings, including their airport. Because they are serious about noise pollution

To conclude, I consider it is imperative we retain the status quo for future generations and our visitors.

Clive Manners Wood  
16/6/2016

