BEFORE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

In the Matter of: the Resource Management Act 1991 ("the Act")

•

And

In the Matter of:

the proposed Canterbury Air Regional

Plar

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF BRODIE ANTON AKACICH ON BEHALF OF CHRISTCHURCH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED AS SUBMITTER (61504)

Date: 28 October 2015

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Brodie Anton Akacich. I hold the title of Environmental Manager with Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL). Prior to CIAL, my employment roles have been with Townsville Airport Pty Ltd as the Environment and Sustainability Management Officer and the Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Water as Natural Resource Management Officer.
- 1.2 I hold the qualification of Bachelor of Applied Science, Majoring in Environment Management from James Cook University. I have over 6 years' experience in the Aviation Industry in the field of Environmental Management and Wildlife Hazard Management.
- 1.3 I am providing this evidence on behalf of CIAL as a submitter on the proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan (pCARP).
- 1.4 CIAL seeks to place emphasis on the following matters:
- 1.5 The Airport is a strategic piece of infrastructure to the South Island and that operational limits on the airport will have flow on impacts to the region and the South Island of New Zealand. This impact includes but is not limited to the regional economy, emergency response, tourism and as a gateway port into New Zealand.
- 1.6 Recognition of the Special Purpose (Airport) Zone (SPAZ) zoned in the Christchurch City Council City Plan, and that activities occurring on the airport are unique to our land use and that activities relating directly to Aviation should be permitted under the plan.
- 1.7 Ability to ensure the Christchurch International Airport Fire Service can train to ensure a high level of competency should our fire fighters be required to respond to an emergency.

2. RULE 7.3

- 2.1 The relief sought by CIAL was for activities directly related to Aircraft, which are excluded from the plan under the definition of a "Large scale burning device" to remain excluded from the plan and not assessable under schedule 2.
- 2.2 Since our submission, CIAL has sought clarification on topics relating to Fire Training and are comfortable that our Fire-fighters can carry out essential aircraft related training activities year round and house fire training activities outside the winter months from 1st of April to the 30th of September.
- 2.3 We still seek relief that activities include such as Aircraft Operation, Aircraft Idle Testing and Aircraft repairs and maintenance including off-wing testing remain excluded from the plan.
- 2.4 All land used for aviation related activities, is zoned in the Christchurch City Plan as a Special Purpose (Airport) Zone (Volume 3, Part 8, Clause 1.3). The Special Purpose (Airport) Zone contains facilities associated with the operations of Christchurch International Airport including runways, airport buildings and surrounding land used for airport support services. The Special Purpose (Airport) Zone recognises:
 - (a) the substantial physical resources provided by the Airport;
 - (b) the role of the Airport as 'Strategic Infrastructure';
 - (c) the need to provide for continued use and development of the Airport, and the importance of its wider economic role for Canterbury and the South Island; and
 - (d) the likely continuation of the designation for 'Airport Purposes'.
- 2.5 CIAL currently holds one designation in the operative City Plan (see Volume 3, Part 12, clause 2.1). The existing designation covers an area of 912 hectares of land and the majority of this is owned by CIAL, with the balance being land owned by third parties.
- 2.6 Given the current effects of Aircraft Operation, Aircraft Idle Testing and Aircraft Repairs are already less than minor and are consistent with our zoning and designation, CIAL seeks that the current definition of *Large* scale burning device" be expanded to include "Aircraft" and "Aircraft related activities at an airport"

3. RULE 7.29 AND 7.30

- 3.1 CIAL is supportive of these rules, the relief we are seeking in regards to these rules is the ability of review Dust management plans for activities that will discharge dust beyond their boundaries within 3km of airport. In addition to this, we request that this boundary is published in the pCARP on the appropriate plan/
- 3.2 We seek this relief due to the safety sensitive nature of aviation as dust can significantly reduce visibility on the airfield. Refer to appendix A for an example of how dust can reduce visibility.

4. RULE 7.31

- 4.1 The airport should be notified of any burning of material within 3km of the airport in case the prevailing wind direction may cause the smoke to impact visibility into the airport
- 4.2 CIAL wishes to draw attention to the Civil Aviation Authority rule 77.7 included as appendix B in my evidence. Should any large scale burning device be proposed within Christchurch International Airports Approach slope Boundary as published on maps 15B, 16B, 17B, 29B, 30B, 31B of the Christchurch City Plan, CIAL requests that CIAL is notified as an affected party.
- 4.3 As Appendix C to my evidence I have attached an indicative plan showing the Approach slopes and 3km Radius.

APPENDIX A: PHOTO SHOWING DUST IMPACTS ON THE AIRFIELD

4.4 This Photo was taken at 2:02pm on the 11/04/2014 from the CIAL corporate office towards the South-west during a strong North-westerly wind.



APPENDIX B: CIVIL AVIATION RULES PART 77: OBJECTS AND ACTIVITIES AFFECTING NAVIGABLE AIRSPACE

77.7 Notice of use of a structure discharging efflux, a light, or a laser

- (a) A person proposing to use a structure must notify the Director of the proposal in accordance with rule 77.13 if—
- (1) the structure may discharge efflux at a velocity in excess of 4.3 m per second through an obstacle limitation surface of an aerodrome; or
- (2) the structure may discharge efflux at a velocity in excess of 4.3 m per second higher than 60 m above ground level.
- (b) A person proposing to operate a light or a laser must notify the Director in accordance with rule 77.13 if—
- (1) because of its glare or affect on a pilot's vision, the light or laser is liable to endanger aircraft; or
 - (2) for a laser, it would produce exposures in navigable air space exceeding the maximum permissible exposure defined for that laser in NZS/AS 2211; or
 - (3) it is likely to endanger aircraft by being mistaken for—
 - (i) a light or part of a system of lights established or approved for display at or near an aerodrome; or
 - (ii) a light marking a hazard in navigable airspace.

APPENDIX C: RUNWAY APPROACH SLOPES AND 3 KILOMETER RADIUS OF RUNWAY 02/20

