

**FURTHER SUBMISSION IN OPPOSITION TO SUBMISSIONS ON A PUBLICLY NOTIFIED
PROPOSED PLAN UNDER CLAUSE 8 OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE TO THE RESOURCE
MANAGEMENT ACT 1991 (RMA)**

TO: The Manager
City Planning
Auckland City Council
Private Bag 92516
Wellesley Street
Auckland 1036

CITY PLANNING
25 MAY 2007
AUCKLAND C.C.

**FURTHER SUBMISSION
ON:** Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section of the
Auckland City District Plan (**Proposed Plan**)

SUBMITTER NAME: Advanced Flight Limited

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE: c/- David McGregor/Marija Batistich
Bell Gully
Barristers and Solicitors
PO Box 4199
AUCKLAND

FURTHER SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF ADVANCED FLIGHT LIMITED

- 1 This submission sets out Advanced Flight Limited's (**AFL**) further submissions opposing or supporting the original submissions of other submitters, as set out in the attached schedule.
- 2 AFL specialise in executive helicopter charter and helicopter management. AFL operates New Zealand's most modern fleet of helicopters and specialises in flights to locations around the upper North Island, the Coromandel and the greater Auckland area, particularly the Hauraki Gulf islands.
- 3 AFL has summarised the reasons for its opposition or support in the attached schedule and reserves the right to call further evidence and/or expand on those reasons if necessary at the hearing.
- 4 AFL does wish to be heard in support of its submission.
- 5 If others make a similar submission AFL would be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.


David McGregor/Marija Batistich
Counsel for Advanced Flight Limited

25 May 2007

Address for Service:
Advanced Flight Limited
c/- David McGregor/Marija Batistich
Bell Gully
Barristers and Solicitors
PO Box 4199
Auckland
PH: (09) 916 8801
FAX: (09) 916 8800

SCHEDULE OF FURTHER SUBMISSIONS

Plan Section Reference	Original Submitter and submitter reference	Oppose/Support	Advanced Flight Limited's (AFL) Further Submission
Part 13	HELETRANZ LIMITED 966/5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19	Support	<p>AFL agrees that Part 13 should be amended so that it recognises the importance of air travel for the economic growth and development of the Hauraki Gulf Islands and that all provisions which restrict direct access by air for visitors should be deleted.</p> <p>AFL also agrees that the Proposed Plan should recognise the increased demand for air travel services and the resulting increased demand for helipads, while managing any adverse effects which may arise from this demand.</p> <p>AFL further agrees that reverse sensitivity issues should be addressed in the Proposed Plan.</p>
Part 13.2.3 Airstrips and helipads	A E DAVIES 579/5	Oppose	AFL opposes this submission as the proposed single designated helipad for Church Bay is overly restrictive and fails to provide for the needs of individual property owners and may adversely affect the aviation and tourism industries operating in the area.
Part 13.3.2 Objective - airstrips and helipads	A E DAVIES 579/11	Oppose	AFL considers that there is no legitimate reason for airstrip and helipad policies to focus on Western Waiheke without an effects-based justification.
Part 13.3.2 Objective - airstrips and helipads	WAIHEKE ISLAND COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP INC 3061/124	Oppose	AFL considers that there is no legitimate reason nor effects-based justification for policies on airstrips and helipads to focus on Western Waiheke only.
Part 13.3.2 Objective - airstrips and helipads	NORTH SHORE HELICOPTERS 330/2	Support	AFL agrees that the Proposed Plan should recognise that airstrips and helipads may be legitimately required in order to provide for the varied requirements of visitors, locals and other property owners.
Part 13.3.2 Objective - airstrips and helipads	T C & C A F RENDLE 2080/2	Support	AFL agrees that the Proposed Plan should recognise that airstrips and helipads may be legitimately required in order to provide for the varied requirements of visitors, locals and other property owners.
Part 13.3.2 Objective - airstrips and helipads	HELILINK LIMITED 2625/2	Support	AFL agrees that the Proposed Plan should recognise that airstrips and helipads may be legitimately required in order to provide for the varied requirements of visitors, locals and other property owners.
Part 13.4.3 Airstrips and helipads	RENAISSANCE AOTEAROA FOUNDATION 3658/1	Oppose	AFL considers that the proposed restriction on "straight-line flights" over populated areas is not effects-based and would unduly restrict aviation services to the Hauraki Gulf Islands.

Plan Section Reference	Original Submitter and submitter reference	Oppose/Support	Advanced Flight Limited's (AFL) Further Submission
Part 13.8 Rules – Helipads and airstrips	RENAISSANCE AOTEAROA FOUNDATION 49/2, 3 and 4	Oppose	AFL considers that the proposed amendment would unduly restrict the location and use of helipads within the Rural 1-3 Zones. AFL considers such blanket restrictions would severely limit the ability of the aviation and tourism industries to provide for the varied requirements of both visitors and locals, as well as contributing to the economic and social wellbeing of the Hauraki Gulf Islands. AFL considers that the operative plan appropriately provides for helipads.
Part 13.8 Rules – Helipads and airstrips	COLIN BEARDON & CHRISTINE BEARDON ORGANISATION 1039/3	Oppose	AFL considers that the proposed amendment is not-effects-based and such blanket restrictions would severely limit the ability of the aviation and tourism industries to provide for the varied requirements of both visitors and locals, as well as contributing to the economic and social wellbeing of the Hauraki Gulf Islands.
Part 13.8 Rules – Helipads and airstrips	MP & KM HERBER 1241/1, 2, 3 and 4.	Oppose	AFL considers that the restrictions proposed by the submitter are not effects-based and such blanket restrictions would severely limit the ability of the aviation and tourism industries to provide for the varied requirements of both visitors and locals, as well as contributing to the economic and social wellbeing of the Hauraki Gulf Islands.
Part 13.8 Rules – Helipads and airstrips	S KERR 1842/6	Oppose	AFL considers that the Operative Plan adequately controls the number of flights and noise levels generated by helicopter flights in the rural zones. The submitter ignores the significant contribution made to the Waiheke Island economy by visitors utilising accommodation providers and associated industries, including aviation.
Part 13.8 Rules – Helipads and airstrips	WAIHEKE ISLAND COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP INC 3061/116, 117, 118	Oppose	AFL considers that the proposed control over the number of helipads is not effects-based. The proposal that a single designated helipad area be provided for each village for general use is unrealistic and would severely limit the ability of the aviation and tourism industries to provide for the varied requirements of visitors and locals, as well as contributing to the economic and social wellbeing of the Hauraki Gulf Islands.
Part 13.8 Rules – Helipads and airstrips	S WASHINGTON 3402/1	Oppose	AFL considers that the proposal that helicopter use be limited to emergencies is unrealistic and would severely limit the ability of the aviation and tourism industries to contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the Hauraki Gulf Islands.
Part 13.8 Rules – Helipads and airstrips	P PHANSHELL 3720/1	Oppose	AFL considers that the proposed amendment would unduly restrict the location and use of helipads within the Rural 1-3 Zones.

Plan Section Reference	Original Submitter and submitter reference	Oppose/Support	Advanced Flight Limited's (AFL) Further Submission
Part 13.8 Rules – Helipads and airstrips	T C & C A F RENDE 2080/1	Support in Part	AFL agrees that the Proposed Plan unduly restricts the number of helicopter movements in the Landform 1-7 areas. However, AFL considers that 8 movements inwards and outwards in any seven day period is insufficient to meet the ensure the continued viability of the aviation industry servicing Waiheke Island.
Part 13.8 Rules – Helipads and airstrips	HELILINK LIMITED 2625/1	Support in Part	AFL agrees that the Proposed Plan unduly restricts the number of helicopter movements in the Landform 1-7. However, AFL considers that 8 movements inwards and outwards in any seven day period is insufficient to meet the ensure the continued viability of the aviation industry servicing Waiheke Island.
Part 13.8 Rules – Helipads and airstrips	HELETRANZ LIMITED 966/15, 16, 17 and 18	Support	AFL agrees that, at a minimum, at least one inward and one outward trip per helipad per day should be a permitted activity under the Proposed Plan. AFL further agrees that the proposed non-complying activity status for the majority of helipads and airstrips is unduly restrictive and that such activities should be either permitted or restricted discretionary, as appropriate, and subject to appropriate assessment criteria.

From: Harker, Julia JXAH [julia.harker@bellgully.com]
Sent: Friday, 25 May 2007 9:50
To: hgiplan
Subject: Further Submissions on the Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section of the Auckland City District Plan
Attachments: Advanced Flight Ltd further submissions.pdf

Please find attached the further submissions for our client, Advanced Flight Limited, on the Proposed Hauraki Gulf Islands Section of the Auckland City District Plan.

A copy of the further submissions will be served on the original submitters in accordance with the statutory deadline.

Please acknowledge receipt.

Yours faithfully,

Julia Harker
Solicitor

Bell Gully Barristers and Solicitors

Phone (Direct): +64 9 916 8709

Fax: +64 9 916 8801

Vero Centre, 48 Shortland Street, Auckland, New Zealand

<<Advanced Flight Ltd further submissions.pdf>>

This email and any attachments contain information, which is confidential and may be subject to legal privilege and copyright. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not use, distribute or copy this email or attachments. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return email and then delete this email and any attachments.

Bell Gully accepts no responsibility for changes made to this email or to any attachments after transmission from Bell Gully. It is your responsibility to check this email and any attachments for viruses. Emails are not secure and cannot be guaranteed to be error free as they can be intercepted, amended, lost or destroyed and may contain computer viruses. Anyone who communicates with us by email is taken to accept these risks.

The contents of any email addressed to our clients is subject to our Terms of Engagement; anything that does not relate to the official business of Bell Gully is neither given nor endorsed by Bell Gully.

Please refer to www.bellgully.com or telephone +649 9168800 or +644 4737777 for more information.

25/05/07