

Comments

LTP 2021-31

Comment ID	1092
Response Date	12/04/21 9:32 AM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
First name	Paul
Surname	Prendergast
Email address	

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

What do you feel are the significant challenges and opportunities we face?

Effective and efficient use of and within within the airport noise contours need reviewing as they are out of date and not meeting the mandate under RMA changes whilst CIAL have exclusive privilege to develop their own land under CCC ownership

Which of the proposed options would you like to see us progress with? Option 1: statutory work, prior commitments and accelerating key initiatives

It is important that we hear what you would like to keep in the plan, what you think should be removed, and anything that you think we have missed?

Please see submission

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

Water and Land	No
Biodiversity and Biosecurity	Yes

Climate Change and Community Resilience	Yes
Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development	No
Regional and Strategic Leadership	Yes

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

Air Quality, Transport and Urban Development portfolio comments:

Please see submission

Is the proposed increase in rates affordable as a whole for the Canterbury community? No

Any further comments on affordability for the community?

Is it whole of community when ccc is charging more

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 . On-demand public transport services

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? No

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: No

ECAN Long term plan -2021-31 Requirement to re-evaluate the Air Noise Contours surrounding CIAL

Impacted Properties : Outlier Boundary Properties under Current Classification: Rural 5 Special Activities 50db Ldn Air Noise Contour

Request- Properties in the Yaldhurst 5db Ldn contour area be reviewed immediately given NZS6805 best practice for outer control boundaries is 55db Ldn so why is CIAL given exclusive privilege by CCC to develop properties within their own property portfolio within the 50db Ldn whilst CCC retain the 50 dbLdn in the outer boundaries impacting on private land ownership and the value of our land.

Why the review of the zoning is required immediately in 2021

- CIAL has outer control boundaries lower than NZS6805 recommendations and lower than any airport in NZ at the detriment to airport boundary personal land owners.
- A re-evaluation was not carried out in 2017 , as promised through the district plan
- CIAL given consent to developing their own land within the 50db Ldn limits whereas personal land owners are not allowed.
- CIAL current income highly weighted towards property development that they own and external purchases such as Tarras whilst private land owners are restricted in the airport boundaries signaling that long term movements at Christchurch Airport is restricted
- What is the reviewed 10-30 year plan for air movements at CIAL as the 50db Ldn was projected using 175,000 air movements?
- CIAL have allowed development of a new Helicopter base close to our properties with high noise levels impacting local residents.
- A 50db noise level is acceptable within the Novotel rooms complex whilst not acceptable to private land owners
- CIAL have claimed noise levels affect health yet their hotel development is higher than that so are all people inside their room a health risk?
- CIAL used their rural use in the past as part of variation 52 to implement the lower 50db LDN. Rural use has now been replaced by commercial development activities
- Selwyn Council has now allowed development of housing within previously 50db Ldn contour without health impacts so what does CCC know that Selwyn doesn't. Would it be different result if CCC did not own the airport and give CIAL advantageous rights versus the CCC ratepayer.
- Major arterials like Riccarton, Fendalton and Papanui have levels of in excess 70db Ldn so how can the health impact be used with CIAL when in those areas with also increased congestion and environmental pollution be allowed
- CCC is allowing ratepayers to move to other councils who have reviewed their district plans at the expense to CCC ratepayers and then allowing those ratepayers to use our CCC facilities?
- CCC allowing Pound road developments whilst Yaldhurst Road residents are restricted. Has the district plan be reviewed for them who were within the same 50db Ldn restrictions?

Conclusion A review of the outer boundary noise contour levels be reviewed in 2021 as it is restrictive to private land owners, is below the International standards, gives advantage to CIAL operating under a different set of rules, and goes against the effective and efficient use of land today under the RMA mandate.

P Prendergast