



**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF HELETRANZ LIMITED
IN SUPPORT OR OPPOSITION TO SUBMISSIONS ON PROPOSED
HAURAKI GULF DISTRICT PLAN**

To: The Manager City Planning
Private Bag 92516
Wellesley St
Auckland

2906

Fax: 09 3077395
Also by email: hgiplan@aucklandcity.govt.nz

Name of Submitter: Heltranz Limited

Address of Submitter: c/o Tony Monk
P.O. Box 300 460
Albany
Auckland
(note this is not the address for service)

Submissions:

1. The further submissions of **Heletranz Limited** are contained in the attached table. The attached table records the name of the original submitter and the relevant submission number, those parts of the submission that are supported or opposed and the reasons for that support or opposition.
2. **Heletranz Limited** wishes to be heard in support of these submissions.
3. If others are making a similar submission **Heletranz Limited** may be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.

Dated at Auckland this 28th day of May 2007.

Signature on behalf of Heletranz Limited



Keith Cullum
Senior Planner
Acting as Authorised Agent

Address for Service:

Burton Planning Consultants Limited
P.O. Box 33 817
Takapuna
Auckland

Attention: Keith Cullum
Phone: 917 4304
Fax: 917 4311
Email: kcullum@burtonconsultants.co.nz

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF HELETRANZ LIMITED
TO PROPOSED HAURAKI GULF DISTRICT PLAN**

Name of Submitter	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason for Opposition/Support
Waiheke Community Board	1055/2	Support	Make appropriate amendments to the Plan to acknowledge the necessity for a Travel and Traffic Strategy and Council to undertake and implement this strategy.	The Proposed Plan fails to recognise the significance of air transport to the development of tourism in the Hauraki Gulf Islands. The need for a Travel and Traffic Strategy that recognises and provides for air transport, to enhance both the current operation and the future development of tourism related business activities, should be recognised. This strategy should then be incorporated in the objectives, policies and rules of the Plan.
Allen Edwin Davies	579/9	Oppose	For the Church Bay Estate area and the area bounded by Onetangi and Seaview Roads, personal helipads should not be allowed, but a single designated helipad provided for each of those areas for general use.	Personal access to private properties by helicopter is appropriate and supported by case law. The Civil Aviation Authority is the primary authority that regulates matters relating to this access.
The Waiheke Island Community Planning Group Incorporated	3061/116	Oppose	There needs to be some control over the proliferation of helipads, particularly helipads for personal use.	Personal access to private properties by helicopter is appropriate and supported by case law. The Civil Aviation Authority is the primary authority that regulates matters relating to this access.
The Waiheke Island Community Planning Group Incorporated	3061/117	Support / Oppose	A single designated helipad should be provided for each village for general use.	A designated helipad may be an appropriate community facility. However the existence of such a helipad should not, and in most instances would not, limit the ability of individuals to gain access by air to their own properties.

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF HELEFRANZ LIMITED
TO PROPOSED HAURAKI GULF DISTRICT PLAN**

Name of Submitter	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason for Opposition/Support
North Shore Helicopters	330/2	Support	Requests and amendment to 13.3.2(4) as follows "By recognising that airstrips or helipads may be required for farming activities, visitor accommodation and tourist complexes."	The objectives of the Proposed Plan give inadequate recognition to the importance of air access to visitor accommodation and tourist facilities.
Helifink Limited	2625/2			
Trevor Charles Rendle & Carol Anne Frances Rendle	2080/2			
Allen Edwin Davics	579/11	Oppose	Add to policy 5 of Clause 13.3.2 as follows: "by not providing for helipads in locations that can adversely affect the amenity of surrounding residents, with particular reference to <u>Western Waiheke.</u> "	Personal access to private properties by helicopter is appropriate, and generally supported by case law. The Civil Aviation Authority is the primary authority that regulates matters relating to this access. Where helipads are for other than personal use, under the RMA there is the ability to manage adverse effects. Management, rather than exclusion, of activities, should be the preferred option.
J. Dryland	1286/98	Support in part	Clause 13.4.3 needs amendment as designations are not the appropriate technique to manage existing airfields and appropriate zones should be formulated. Helicopter use in many locations should simply be provided for as permitted activities up to specified frequency of movements.	The second part of this submission is supported, as in many locations (including Waiheke), it would be appropriate for at least 1 inward and 1 outward movement per day to be permitted.
Answer Services (Holdings) Ltd	1287/142			
D. Hill Estate	1288/76			
Walden Family Trust	1289/140			
Peter Tait-Jamieson	2878/99			

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF HELETRANZ LIMITED
TO PROPOSED HAURAKI GULF DISTRICT PLAN**

Name of Submitter	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason for Opposition/Support
Renaissance Aotearoa Foundation Agent	3658/1	Oppose	Add to the end of Clause 13.4.3 "including careful analysis of potential flight paths, to avoid straight line flights from common mainland aerodromes and helipads that would fly over populated areas.	Selection of flight paths should be evaluated by considering a range of matters. Operating efficiency and fuel efficiency are important considerations. Further, the control of flight paths is not a District Plan matter, except where directly associated with landing and takeoff.
Renaissance Aotearoa Foundation Agent	49/3	Oppose	Questions the inclusion of Landforms 1-7 in Clause 13.8 as this seems to suggest discretion to permit helipads in wetlands, coastal dunes and other fragile areas.	The Landform units are geographically extensive and diverse within themselves. There are many locations within every land unit where helipads would be acceptable. Specially vulnerable areas should be dealt with through specific controls.
Renaissance Aotearoa Foundation Agent	49/4	Oppose	Identify a sole landing point for public and private helicopter traffic (other than emergency services) on Waiheke and include in Plan.	Such a level of restriction is unreasonable.
Onetangi Beach Ratepayers Association Incorporated	540/1	Oppose	Seeks amendments to achieve appropriate controls on helicopter movements near beach areas.	The control of helicopter flight paths in beach areas, except where directly associated with landing and takeoff, is not a matter to be controlled by the District Plan.
Lynette Loris Reed	1022/6	Oppose	All future helipads should need a resource consent which must be notified.	Such a level of restriction is unreasonable. Further, notification needs to be addressed on a case by case basis, in accordance with the RMA.
Lynette Loris Reed	1026/6	Oppose	All future helipads are to require consent, and to be notified with landings and takeoffs restricted to 12 landings and 12 takeoffs per calendar month.	Such a level of restriction is unreasonable. Further, notification needs to be addressed on a case by case basis, in accordance with the RMA.

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF HELETRANZ LIMITED
TO PROPOSED HAURAKI GULF DISTRICT PLAN**

Name of Submitter	Submission Number	Oppose/ Support	Submission	Reason for Opposition/Support
Lynette Loris Reed	1026/7	Oppose	All helicopter arrivals and departures are to be direct to or direct from the landing site and not over residential properties around the area.	Other than for immediate landing and takeoff, the District Plan does not control flight paths. If a resource consent is required, approval conditions can be put in place to ensure that local adverse effects are minimised.
Colin Beardon and Christine Beardon	1039/3	Oppose	Place maximum limits on the number of permitted helicopter movements in or near residential areas.	While it is accepted that controlling the number of flights in certain situations may be appropriate, each situation should be assessed on merit.
Mark Parisian & Kahneelah M. Herber	1241/1	Oppose	Limit the number of inward and outward helicopter flights in Landforms 1-7.	Helicopter movements in Landforms 1-7 should be a permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary, dependent on the particular situation. No single limit on movements is appropriate.
Mark Parisian & Kahneelah M. Herber	1241/4	Oppose	If the required monitoring brings to light instances in which assessment for helipads of airstrips are not being met, the application will be revoked.	The enforcement procedures available under the Resource Management Act and the Civil Aviation Regulations are the appropriate means of control.
Suzanne Kerr	1842/6	Oppose	There needs to be very clear limits on the number of / or the amount of noise generated by helicopter flights. The rural atmosphere should not be disturbed by upmarket lodges using helicopters.	Visitor facilities and activities located in rural areas are a significant contributor to the economy. In addition some are integral part of the rural and agricultural activities. Issues of reverse sensitivity relating, in particular to countryside living and helipads, require more consideration in the Plan.

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF HELETRANZ LIMITED
TO PROPOSED HAURAKI GULF DISTRICT PLAN**

Name of Submitter	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason for Opposition/Support
The Waitke Island Community Planning Group Incorporated	3061/118	Oppose	All helipads should be at least a restricted discretionary activity requiring resource consent and specifying automatic public notification because of the impact of flight paths beyond the immediate landing area location in particular.	Such a level of restriction is unreasonable.
John Griffiths	3227/5	Oppose	The restriction of aircraft (particularly helicopters) with the exception of those used for emergency, over the island.	Such a level of restriction is unreasonable.
Rhonda Griffiths	3241/5			
North Shore Helicopters	330/1	Support	Requests an amendment to Clause 13.8.2(1) providing for eight inward and eight outward movements in a seven day period.	The proposed level of three inward and three outward movements in a seven day period is inadequate.
Helilink Limited	2080/1			
Trevor Charles Rendle	2625/1			

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF HELETRANZ LIMITED
TO PROPOSED HAURAKI GULF DISTRICT PLAN**

Name of Submitter	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason for Opposition/Support
Thumb Point Station Limited	526/11	Support	The take off and landing of private helicopters on private land should be allowed as a permitted activity within landforms 1-7.	In the Proposed Plan a helipad is defined as "land and buildings used for the take off and landing of helicopters". The use of informal landing sites on farmland on Waiheke and other islands, may in certain situations, be unduly restricted by the proposed rules for Land forms 1-7.
Man O'War Farm Limited	527/11			
Huruhe Station Limited	528/11			
Man O'War Station Limited	529/11			
South Coast Station Limited	539/11			
Lynette Loris Reed	1022/7	Oppose	The number of allowable landings and takeoffs must be restricted to 12 landings and 12 takeoffs in any calendar month (except for the Westpac or other medivac helicopters).	This proposal is unnecessarily restrictive. In order to ensure an appropriate balance is struck between encouragement of economic development and the need to minimise detrimental effects of the activity, more flexibility is required. In particular more recognition should be given to the existence of peak and off peak periods in the tourism and accommodation industries.

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF HELETRANZ LIMITED
TO PROPOSED HAURAKI GULF DISTRICT PLAN**

Name of Submitter	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason for Opposition/Support
Renaissance Aotearoa Foundation Agent	49/1	Oppose	That Clause 13.8.3(2) be amended to say "Rural 1 and 3 provided they are used for no more than three inward and three outward movements in a seven day period."	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The level of control envisaged by Clause 13.8.3(2) is inappropriate. 2. Further, rules for Rural 2 should be the same as for Rural 1 and 3.
Renaissance Aotearoa Foundation Agent	49/2	Oppose	<p>That Clause 13.8.3(2) be amended to read:</p> <p>Rural 1-3</p> <p>-provided they are used for no more than three inward and three outward movements in and seven day period and provided</p> <p>-they are sited no further than 80m (horizontal) from mean high water line (or in the case of the headland, no more than 50m from the edge of the headland dropping into the sea)</p> <p>-that they are sited so as not to disturb endangered native birds (such as dotterels) during nesting season</p> <p>- that the site is not at the inner part of a harbour or water enclosed on three sides</p>	<p>In Rural 1-3, subject to the standards that are met, helipads should be permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary activities.</p>

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF HELETRANZ LIMITED
TO PROPOSED HAURAKI GULF DISTRICT PLAN**

Name of Submitter	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason for Opposition/Support
Bryce and Julie Adern	619/19	Oppose	-that no more than two such helipads may be located in any rural subdivision (such as Church Bay Estates, Matiatia Estates or Park Point) For all rural land units helipads should be included as a discretionary activity.	In Rural 1-3, subject to relevant standards, helipads should be permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary activities.
Nicholas Bryan Jones Cable Bay Vineyards Limited	754/21 859/21	Oppose	Helipads should be included as a discretionary activity.	In Rural 1-3, subject to relevant standards, helipads should be permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary activities.
Mark Parisian & Kahmceelah M. Herber	1241/2	Oppose	Limit the number of helipads in a given area in rural amenity areas 1-3	In Rural 1-3, subject to relevant standards, helipads should be permitted, restricted discretionary or discretionary activities.
Susan Washington	3402/1	Oppose	Airplances and helicopter use very limited, perhaps just emergency use.	Blanket restrictions on private and commercial use of helicopters and fixed wing aircraft are inappropriate.
Mark Parisian & Kahmceelah M. Herber	1241/3	Oppose	Make the assessment criteria non-negotiable when considering an application for a helipad or airstrip	Non-negotiable assessment criteria are inappropriate, as each application should be assessed on its own merits.
Phee Phanshell	3720/1	Oppose	The Council's assessment of helipads and airstrips in rural 1-3 also include consideration of the cumulative effects of the number of helipad sites.	This is achieved by requiring consents for other than permitted activities.

King, Rachel

From: Tapsell, Susanne on behalf of hgiplan
Sent: Tuesday, 29 May 2007 11:37
To: King, Rachel
Subject: FW: Heletranz Submission Replacement Version with new Page 1
Attachments: 06j111 Further Submissions HGIDP Page 1 Replacement.doc

From: Keith Cullum [mailto:keith@burtonconsultants.co.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 29 May 2007 10:07
To: hgiplan
Subject: Heletranz Submission Replacement Version with new Page 1

Please find attached a new version of the submission emailed last night, with a replacement page 1 correcting typographical errors that occurred during the review process.

Please use this version to replace page 1.

Thank you

Keith Cullum

Burton Planning Consultants Limited

8/06/07