

## Comments

### LTP 2021-31

<b>Comment ID</b>	1078
<b>Response Date</b>	12/04/21 9:10 AM
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1
<b>First name</b>	Steve Mangan
<b>Surname</b>	Mangan
<b>Email address</b>	

**Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation?** No, I'm submitting as an individual

**Are you willing to tell us more about yourself?** No

**Do you think we've prioritised the right issues and opportunities?** No

**Do you generally support the activities proposed in the following portfolios:**

**Water and Land** No

**Do you have any further comments on the activities proposed in specific portfolio/s (please select all those you wish to comment on):**

- ☒ Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development
- ☒ Regional and Strategic Leadership

**Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development portfolio comments:**

Some years ago we brought a block of land with the through that we will be able to develop into housing in the near future and assist in the housing shortage, as it is at the fringe and edge of the 50dBA flight zone. We see that CIAL has and is manipulating the flight data and line of plane flight path and landing direction to make full use over the residence of all of the chch city area. They have allowed the pilot to approach by visual flight path ( this is within the last 4 to 5 or so years and with no consultation to land or house owners or affected city residence ) and in doing this the pilots can cut corners at will. We and all residence in the near area are affected by this type of non compliant arrangement.

**Is the proposed increase in rates affordable for your household?** Neither option is affordable

**Any further comments on affordability for your household?**

If the CCC and Ecan allow more land to be developed with 10,000 new houses every 2 years there would be no need to increase rates. That is 10,000 x \$4000 per house rate approx = \$40 000 000 per year. With a rate rise of 47% over the next 10 years how will anyone afford to live here.

**Is the proposed increase in rates affordable as a whole for the Canterbury community?**

**Any further comments on affordability for the community?**

If the CCC and Ecan allow more land to be developed with 10,000 new houses every 2 years there would be no need to increase rates. That is 10,000 x \$4000 per house rate approx = \$40 000 000 per year. With a rate rise of 47% over the next 10 years how will anyone afford to live here.

**Do you support the changes we're proposing to how we apply Uniform Annual General Charges?**

**Would you support the use of borrowing for operating expenditure to offset some of the first year rates?**

**Any further comments on the use of borrowing for operating expenditure?**

If you can't live on the income that is coming in, then re thinks how you are spending our very hard earned money.

**Where do you live in Canterbury? Select your district below:**

**Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Kaikoura**

**Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Hurunui**

**Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waimakariri**

**Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Christchurch**

**Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Selwyn**

**Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Ashburton**

**Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Mackenzie**

**Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Timaru**

**Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waimate**

**Would you like to see us investing in the following initiatives in your area? Waitaki**

**Do you wish to speak to your submission?** Yes

*We may use your phone number to contact you to arrange attendance at a hearing. This information will be kept private.*

**Phone number**

**Would you like to be kept up-to-date with the outcome of this consultation?** Yes

**How did you find out about giving feedback?** . Environment Canterbury website

*Your information is held and administered by Environment Canterbury in accordance with the Privacy Act 2020 and Environment Canterbury's Privacy Policy.*

**There is personal information/contact details in my submission I do not want disclosed:** Yes

**Tell us which information you do not want disclosed:** Address and phone number



ECAN Draft Long - Term Plan 2021-31 Submission.

This submission relates to the requirement to re-evaluate. The air Noise Contours surrounding Christchurch International Airport every ten years.

This submission relates to the requirement to re-evaluate. The air Noise Contours surrounding Christchurch International Airport every ten years.

My background. As a long-time resident of Christchurch and been aware of flight paths and noise controls across the city.

Some years ago we brought a block of land with the thought that we will be able to develop into housing in the near future as it is at the fringe of the city and edge of the 50dBA flight zone.

We see that CIAL has and is manipulating the flight data and line of plane flight path and landing direction to make full use of the entire chch cities, residential area.

They have allowed the pilot to approach by visual flight path ( this is within the last 4 - 6 years and with no consultation to land owners or affected city residents ) and in doing this the pilots can cut corners at will. We and all residents in the near area are affected by this type of non -compliant arrangement.

How in today's world after 9 11 can any Council or Airport authority allow planes to fly all over the city. I purpose that this all stops at once and all planes enter from the countryside west of the airport.

There is ample air space where there is little chance of an air disaster having any major effect on our city.

I see the air movements data. That the two owning ententes of the Airport have in place may never be able to be achieved so I think that there needs to be a correction in numbers in any new revised planning 175000 flights per year. that's 480 flights per day and equates to around 96000 persons per day. This will never be achievable within the next 20 years.

CIAL has no right to impose any contours after buying into Tarras for a new airport. Their point that 175000 projected movements, after Tarras development will be considerably less than 50,000 much of which will be the smaller commuter craft.

This fact that CCC and CIAL can spend money at will with out

#### Air Noise Contour Re-evaluation

Land owners require re-evaluation of the Air Noise Contours to be carried out this year. Regardless of absurdness of a 50 dBA Ldn contour, The actual contours should accurately represent current reality.

Continued reliance on the current contours is inefficient in terms of the RMA. It places restrictions on land use solely due to modelling error.

The contours have not been remodelled for 14 years yet they are still driving development decisions. This situation is totally unacceptable.

As a signatory to the Experts Agreement, Regional Council has failed to resolve this matter nor plan for or budget to carry it out.

Agreed to be altered to greater reflect the realities existing at the time of any reevaluation. For example the total number of air movements, (currently agreed at 175,000) if at the time of each review is assessed as unrealistic or unachievable was subject to change in order to reflect reality.

It was envisaged that the actual noise profiles of the aircraft fleet flying at the time of the review should also be used. The objective indicated was to produce contours that were based on realistic accurate data inputs, balancing airport needs and neighbours land use rights.

It is obvious that the current contours are grossly exaggerated and inaccurate. One of the two major variables that make up the contour input data, the entire aircraft fleet and the associated aircraft noise profiles, is redundant.

Every one of those planes no longer fly's into Christchurch International Airport.

The noise profiles of the current aircraft fleet are of orders of magnitude quieter. Accurate data on this variable alone will significantly reduce contour size at all dBA levels. Hundreds of houses have now been built on the land at Rolleston that was previously prohibited under the 50 dBA Ldn contour. All on land,

that by agreement was simply rezoned. All with zero adverse noise generated health effects to those residents and with nil adverse impacts on (CIAL) airport operations. Same situation in Kaiapoi and the Clearwater resort continues to develop within the 50db contour.

The sad fact is that CCC has lost thousands of residential rate payer opportunities all on the safest land in Canterbury while protecting its airport operations at a ridiculous 50 dBA Ldn noise activity avoidance level.

The reality is that mitigation of adverse noise effects at 50 dBA is very easily achieved. With background noise already way above 50 dBA what amenity adverse effects are alleged is very unclear.

The perverse effect has been that large tracks of potential highly desirable and safe residential land already largely serviced by major access road and very easily sub dividable to the benefit of (CCC) are blocked out of development while Selwyn has become the largest residential growth area with 75% of its residence commuting into Christchurch daily.