Nelson City Council | Te Kaunihera o Whakatū

PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 30 (NELSON AIRPORT LIMITED)

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED (BY SUBMITTER NUMBER)

9 September 2023

The enclosed submission summaries provide a summary of each submitter's relief requested on Private Plan Change 30 (Nelson Airport Limited) to the Nelson Resource Management Plan. Please refer to the original submissions for full details of each submission. All submissions can be viewed via the Council website.

Guide to Making a Further Submission

Important Information:

- Any person who made an original submission or who has a greater interest than the general public, can make a further submission.
- A further submission may only be made in support of, or in opposition to an original submission to Plan Change 30.
- A further submission must state whether you support or oppose an original submission (or part thereof) and whether or not you wish to be heard on your further submission.
- A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter to which your further submission relates, within five working days of making your further submission to the Nelson City Council.
- Further submissions must be received by Nelson City Council prior to **4pm, 25 September 2023.**

The Summary of Decisions Requested summarises the decisions that have been requested in the original submissions received. If you intend to make a further submission, it is recommended that you read the full original submission.

Full copies of the original submissions are available to view: Online at **shape.nelson.govt.nz/plan-change-30-nelson-airport-runway-extension,** at Civic House or any of the Nelson Libraries.

Further submission forms are also available at these locations.

When preparing your further submission, please use the **Submitter Point Number** in the tables below to indicate what submission point you are referring to. Clearly state whether you support or oppose the decision requested you are making a further submission on. Give the reasons for your support or opposition.

Use the Further Submission Form to help set out your further submission. It is in your best interests to make your further submission as clear as possible.

One copy of the further submission must be sent to Council and a second copy sent to the original submitter within 5 working days of providing Council with the further submission.

The postal/email addresses of submitters for the purpose of service of further submissions, as per Schedule 1, Clause 8A, Service of further submissions, RMA, are available to view online.

Please note that this summary does not include submissions received on the Nelson Airport Ltd Notice of Requirement (NOR) application. The RMA does not allow for further submissions on an NOR application.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S2.002	Nelson Aeroclub	Support	In support of future expansion of the airport. Nelson Aeroclub have been around since the beginning and may long it continue. Having the option for a longer runway is in the pilot's best safety interests. Also, a big step in public interest will be the airport funding noise mitigation.	Approve
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S3.003	Kenneth Shelley	Oppose	The submitter is a homeowner on the perimeter of the runway extension. - Nelson Airport have large resources. The public living in close to the proposed runway extension have nothing of these resources available to them. Nelson Council have a responsibility towards the vulnerable and voiceless. - The value of our home and the ability to sell the property has diminished considerably since the runway extension was announced. - Noise is a huge issue for those whose homes will be within meters of the airport runway and service roads. It is not just the take-off that creates the noise or low-level planes landing, but an aircraft on an approach road or waiting on the tarmac to take off. Whilst mitigation can be made, this does not benefit the outside space. - Fumes from aviation fuel are a considerable problem and health risk. Moving this risk nearer to homes and families must be fully investigated before a decision is reached. - The Nelson Airport board have not made a sufficiently substantial claim for the need to extend the runway. Submission references certain claims made by the Nelson Airport that are not true or too generalised. - Community engagement in 2022 was a PR exercise and not consultation. Neighbours were not consulted before	Decline the proposal for an extension to the runway.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					it was started, and no reasonable explanation was provided for why this development should be acceptable.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S5.002	John Warren	Support	- The current runway is inefficient in that it will not allow full loads on existing planes. - An extension would allow full loads on existing and future planes. - The air connections to Nelson are vital for Nelson's residents and businesses. - The newer planes are likely to be quieter. - The loss of some of the golf course is unfortunate, but only affects a tiny minority of Nelson's residents.	Fully support this plan change with minimal changes.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S7.002	Peter Mellor	Oppose	The submitter would like this plan to be reconsidered since the proposals effectively destroys a resource used by the people of Nelson since before the airport was even created. Please consider alternatives to using land presently used by Nelson Golf Club.	Reconsideration of using land presently used by the Nelson Golf Club.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S8.001	L Kirby	Oppose	The submitters property is within the Proposed Airnoise Boundary 65 dB Ldn. Factors that the proposal has not taken into account: 1. Mental wellbeing. 2. Physical wellbeing. 3. Home value depreciation. 4. Compensation. The submitter would expect to be offered: 1. Retrofitted double glazing. 2. Heat pumps in living areas and bedrooms. 3. Increased ceiling and wall insulation. 4. A covered patio area, fencing and planting outside to mitigate some of the noise and visual disruption. 5. An outright offer to purchase the property or monetary compensation.	Proposed Airport Plan Change 30 is not undertaken.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Research will show Nelson Airport are offering considerably less to home owners under the Nelson airport extension, as compared to other airports worldwide. The extension will have considerable benefits for the Nelson region, but will create significant hardship for the home owners affected who should be suitably recompensed. The submitters does not feel the offer goes far enough. There may be no practicality of being able to retrofit acoustic insulation.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Planning Maps	S9.001	Robin Whalley	Oppose in part	The plan should reflect where existing airport noise affects recreational users. The Marshall Day plan (Figure 14 page 37) does not accurately show the existing noise affects in the " Current Airport Effects Overlay ". Daily readings in the 55dBLdn and 60 dBLdn zone already exceed 85 dBLdn within these boundaries.	Correct the noise maxima within zones to reflect actual avadata.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S9.002	Robin Whalley	Oppose	Ratepayers are increasingly cynical with the "consultation " process. Council took eleven weeks from 23 March until public notification on 10 June. The documents to review and consider total 143 pages, with sixty additional documents. The closing date for submissions from the public is cynical. This leaves many to conclude that decisions have already been made. The closing date for submissions should be extended until 4pm 28 July.	Defer closing date for submissions to 4 pm 28 July.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S10.002	Lisa Pratter	Support	Nelson is quickly growing and needs to grow with the times. Houses around airport knew when they built or bought in the area there was an airport and that it would likely grow in the future.	Go ahead with the extension.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S14.001	Sally Hetzel	Oppose	The submitter is a golf course user. - Health and wellbeing: major impact on the Nelson Golf Course function. Would impact mental and physical wellbeing of submitter and community members. - Nelson Golf Club has become a Community Centre.	No decision specified.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- Environmental Concerns: impact on our roads. Would increase submitters negative impact on the environment. Currently, bicycling to Nelson Golf Course is an option. The Nelson Golf Course has contributed to the positive physical and mental health of many members of the community, enabled several charitable organizations to make positive contributions to people in need, and is the only 18 hole golf course within the Nelson community and should not have to close due to runway extensions.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S15.002	Alison McLeish	Oppose	Nelson Airport has already experienced flooding in the car park and access roads due to king tides and coastal surges. Evidence shows that coastal developments around New Zealand, including airports, are at serious risk from climate change and increased extreme weather events. Despite all the evidence both nationally and around the world Nelson carries on regardless with Business as Usual. The sooner we can turn our attention and limited resources to planning for a sustainable future, through resilience and managed retreat the better.	Refuse any further infrastructure development on the coastline and barely above sea level.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S16.003	Golf Haven Way Body Corporate	Oppose in part	The submitter is a group of 12 residences who are a Body Corporate relating to land located adjacent to Nelson Airport between the existing and proposed 60dBA and 65dBA contours of the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). - did not receive any notification of the proposed Private Plan Change 30 until 12 June 2023. - the proposed wording of the rules means that the new construction of most ancillary buildings would no longer be a Permitted Activity. This means we will need a Resource Consent as well as a Building Permit. - the reduction of the target indoor level to 40 dBA Ldn is not necessary. - there are technical errors in the proposed Appendix 19.1	Decline the building controls proposed to apply within the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Airnoise Boundary, as set out in the proposed rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson/Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- consideration must be given to consistent rules between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S16.004	Golf Haven Way Body Corporate	Oppose	The submitter is a group of 12 residences who are a Body Corporate relating to land located adjacent to Nelson Airport. The submitter and the Nelson Golf Club are severely adversely impacted by the runway extension proposed by Nelson Airport Ltd. Why is planning approval required at this point in time? Has evaluation of extending the runway south been properly considered? Notes environmental evaluation, liquefaction, effect on golf course, Martin Jenkins economic assessment, incorporation of an Engineered Material Arrestment System into either RESA, NZCAA regulations requiring a 90m RESA vs 240m if practicable, and the Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) used. Environmental/social impacts of the zoning change on Body Corp Residents: (i) Landscape values (ii) Property values (iii) Pollution - noise and fumes. (iv) Loss of Nelson Golf Clubhouse Devastation of Nelson's Golf Course including loss in economic benefit to the region, on-going costs for travelling further to the courses, and burden on our health sector in the future.	Refuse to approve DAA1 and the extended Airport Zone and it's proposed conditions. That Nelson Airport reassess the option to extend the airport runway to the South considering true costs and social and recreational consequences.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S18.002	Generation Global	Support	Nelson City is an isolated location geographically and relies heavily on Nelson Airport, Port Nelson, and the few roads that connect Nelson with the rest of the country. Ensuring these are fit for purpose is essential. Planning for the future is an important role for Council	Full support for the objectives of the proposal to provide for the construction, operation, use and maintenance of the northern runway extension at Nelson

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					and government bodies and it is heartening to see future planning is being carried out to ensure Nelson City is able to cater to whatever aircraft types may be required in the future to support Nelson's growth and strategic connection to the rest of the world. The plan looks well thought out and seems to consider all factors.	Airport.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S20.001	Thomas Darling	Support	This will benefit the region hugely especially if this extension helps larger aircraft land here at Nelson.	Support the runway extension.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S21.002	Stephen Cross	Oppose	Specific reasons referred to in the submission relate to: - Evaluation of options - the application, as it stands, has failed to meet the requirements of Sec 171 of the RMA. - Alternative options have not been assessed. Nelson Airport has considered only two options. Nelson Airport has not considered the use of EMAS (Engineered Material Arresting System) to reduce the length of runway and runoff area required. An EMAS will reduce length requirements by 150m at each end of the runway, compared to having RESAs. If Nelson Airport were to adopt EMAS, many of the perceived difficulties associated with a southern extension would disappear. Far fewer people would be impacted by noise or loss of amenity. - Economic modelling has not recognised the substantial costs being imposed on the community. Much of the purported benefit of Option A over Option B arises from cost savings to the airport company, which arise from imposing costs on the community. These costs include: 1) Economic effect on businesses 2) Loss of amenity 3) Loss of property value 4) Loss of development potential and associated environmental cost 5) Unquantified effect on health and wellbeing of community. 6) Option Value not being paid for.	Reject the Private Plan Change in its entirety. Failing this, the outcome that would best meet the stated objectives of NAL would be to extend the runway to the South but incorporate EMAS to reduce the overall length of land required, thus obviating the need for any reclamation of the Waimea Estuary.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Including effect on Tahuna Beach Camp, Nelson Golf Club, Nelson Golf Clubrooms, Airport perimeter walkway and Tahuna Beach area. No economic value has been placed on amenity values between Option A and Option B. - The assessment between Option A and Option B (Northern and Southern runway extensions) is biased. The Multi-Criteria Assessment is so biased it is unreliable and should be disregarded. For example, the assessment of landscape values and in contrast, the effect on the Golf Club. Also questions the geohazards score. - Inadequate investigation has occurred to allow for meaningful cost comparisons. The need for such high contingency sums arises from the lack of investigation undertaken on the sites and speculation about what subsoil conditions might be. - NAL is vague and inconsistent about its intentions. Questions why NAL needs the new OLS and Aircraft Noise Contours to be in place before the runway extension is constructed? What is the need? Why NAL can't operate within the existing northern noise? There is a disconnect between saying modern aircraft are quieter than existing noise contours presumed but then saying there is a need for existing noise contours to be extended north even prior to any runway extension contours until the airport extension is completed. There are other discrepancies that need explanation.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S21.004	Stephen Cross	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for S21.002.	Nelson Airport adopt the approach taken by Queenstown Airport and take a more consultative and conciliatory approach to its neighbouring community.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S21.013	Stephen Cross	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for S21.002.	NAL should also fund a sound-proof refuge where stressed residents can gather and meet to escape noise and regather their

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
						mental health.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S21.017	Stephen Cross	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for S21.002.	NAL should provide TBHP with marketing quid pro quos to compensate for the loss of guest revenue as a result of NAL degrading the visitor experience.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S23.001	Phillip Maguire	Support	The submitter has participated in aviation enterprise for 45 years. The reasons for the submission are to: - ensure the Nelson Region participates in the future growth of New Zealand's shift into new technology within aviation, - make provision for airport development to allow for future aircraft with low emissions to operate services, - for the benefit of the community and the economic results it will provide. The submission refers to: - Timely opportunity to review and refresh the aviation settings. - Continuation of a pragmatic, risk-based approach. - Will generate economic activity, provide employment opportunities in the region, and meet Nelson's long-term aviation needs. - Creates the pathway as a full service airport. - The next generation of aircraft may require more runway for take-off and are demonstrating much quieter noise 'foot-prints' than that of jet-fuelled aircraft.	Consider the matters raised in the submission and accordingly support the Plan Change 30.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S25.001	Mark Newman	Oppose in part	The submitter supports extending the runway to the south and states that the cost to Nelson as a whole to extend to the north is greater than the cost to the airport to extend to the south. Nelson will lose property values in the area, the ability for intensification of housing, the loss of a major recreation facility (the golf club) which also attracts tourists whose spending benefits the town.	Extend the airport to the south.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S26.001	Jace Hobbs	Oppose	The experts do not know the future of aviation tech. The proposed airport expansion supposes that electric airplanes will not be as powerful and will need a longer runway. That is not a good conclusion. Battery technology is improving at an amazing rate and we do not know the benefits we will see in aviation from better, higher density batteries that are sure to develop. We also do not know the future of replacing petroleum with hydrogen as a fuel. With increased renewable energy, we may well decide that hydrogen is the aviation fuel of the future and will not need a change in our runway design for that fuel source. Also, electric airplanes will be moving towards improved propeller design that will have more thrust.	Don't lengthen the runway. - Council should not subject the community living under the flight path to increased noise as it is near intolerable as it is.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S26.002	Jace Hobbs	Oppose	We now know the land at the airport is in perpetual subsidence. That coupled with sea level rise will imperil the runway as it is. To extend it and therefore increase the jeopardy that sea level rise (and associated storms) will cause is foolish. The submitter considers the proposal full of assumptions that are not clear from science.	Don't lengthen the runway - Our community is in Climate emergency and any plan to increase runway length should be discarded.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S28.001	Andrew Kelly	Oppose	The submitters objects to moving due to the stress of moving their dwelling as it hasn't been moved for a long time and due to the financial burden.	Don't have to relocate.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S29.003	Glenda Robinson	Oppose	The submitter owns 33 Otterson Street and are concerned about the noise.	To be compensated for the noise impact on their property.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S29.004	Glenda Robinson	Oppose	Concerned about the entrance to the Golf Course which the submitters understand will happen if the Golf Course is relocated. Otterson Street is extremely narrow when the cars are parked on the road.	The road needs to be widened if this street is to become the main entrance to the Golf Course.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S30.001	Fiona Harper	Oppose	Chapter 3 - Activities sensitive to Airport Noise. The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable and does not constitute sustainable	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					management of the resources they represent. It gives primacy to Airport over existing resources. The submitter is a resident at the Tahunanui Holiday Park.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S30.002	Fiona Harper	Oppose	Chapter 5 - DO11.1 (a) District Wide Objective DO 11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". But to whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can the levels proposed be "appropriate" if they result in a landowner (existing) having to insulate and ventilate their home to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing land areas for future development, but at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximize activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners. The submitter is a resident at the Tahunanui Holiday Park.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S30.003	Fiona Harper	Oppose	Chapter 5 - DO.11.1.3.1 "Manage the wellbeing of the surrounding community". The proposal and the Change simply pass the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community. The submitter is a resident at the Tahunanui Holiday Park.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S30.004	Fiona Harper	Oppose	Chapter 5 - DO.11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community" Whilst the existence of an Airport does do that, neither the Plan Change nor the Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					The submitter is a resident at the Tahunanui Holiday Park.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S30.005	Fiona Harper	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.(e) There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay {AECO) This Objective will have huge effects on all of the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be caught out/restricted by this. The submitter is a resident at the Tahunanui Holiday Park.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S30.006	Fiona Harper	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 This Objective will have huge effects on all of the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be caught out/restricted by this. The submitter is a resident at the Tahunanui Holiday Park.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S30.007	Fiona Harper	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities, but close reading reveals that is not the case in either the Airport Effects Control Overlay or Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings leaving camping and short-term living (camping and short-term accommodation) not permitted but non-complying camping, and short-term living becomes prohibited once the runway extension under DAA 1 is operational. This has a huge effect on the regional (and potentially significant) facility of Tahuna Beach Holiday Park. The submitter is a resident at the Tahunanui Holiday Park.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S30.008	Fiona Harper	Oppose	OSsr 53 This provision makes replacement, or substantial alteration, of an existing building containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property owners' rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control not the obligation of the other landowners. The submitter is a resident at the Tahunanui Holiday Park.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S30.012	Fiona Harper	Oppose	1. Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is a well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors annually from all over New Zealand and further afield, as well providing well-being and particular need for its residents. 2. Consultation with Tahuna Beach Holiday Park personnel or residents for both PC30 and the NOR has been poor / virtually non-existent. 3. The noise effects proposed are considered to be substantial, thereby significantly impacting on the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, and particularly for Tahuna Beach Holiday Park. The submitter is a resident at the Tahunanui Holiday Park.	Reject PPC30 in its entirety.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S33.001	Margaret Meechang	Oppose in part	- Visitors will find their holiday spot completely out of character. - Little has been considered as to the impacts which will happen. - Impact on our residents and environment is paramount. - Stress is impacting on those who can see what might	Serious investigation and understanding of effects and impacts of what takes place. Change of perspectives in general.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					happen to the area. - You will lose locals, tourists, and sports people. - Deep dread that voices of concern won't be decently considered. - Pollution takes effect with greater numbers of people, planes, traffic. - Loss of nationally noted golf course. - Complete change of the 'feel' of Tahunanui for residents and visitors alike. - Look at all the perspectives. - Don't forget the environment. - Sea rising and liquefaction?	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S34.001	John Fellowes	Oppose	As a resident at the Tahunanui Beach Holiday Park, the submitters quality of life/lifestyle will be adversely affected if the Airport extension is allowed to proceed.	Oppose the plan change allowing the extension of the airport runway because of the huge adverse effects it will have on the residents of Tahunanui.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S35.002	Judith Reid	Oppose in part	The submitter lives at the top end of Golf Road. - Frequently woken between 1am and 3am from engine testing. - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far higher than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	That the proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected and the engine testing Rule INr.25 comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S36.001	Daniel McCarthy	Support	As a manager of a local business the frequency of flight delays and sometimes lack of available flights hinders operation greatly. Also believe Nelson city's location is extremely vulnerable to a large scale natural disaster. If the road network and port access was severely damaged, the airport would be critical for our well-being. Only concern on the upgrade is the small scope of the project. An extension of 1,510m does not allow larger aircraft but	I support any upgrade of the airport that increases safety and operation capability.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					perhaps this should considered for future proofing. If engineering works are going to be started it makes sense to achieve as much as possible during this period. It seems shortsighted to spend money and council time on a small upgrade when the need and demand for regional jets in here now. I believe the scope should be extended in order to cater for regional jets. This would greatly increase access to the district for tourism and business and also improve our resilience during a natural disaster.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S37.001	Jaimee Hiku	Oppose	The extension would make an already difficult housing crisis even worse.	This change shouldn't be allowed. I oppose.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S38.001	Alexander Simpson	Oppose	The submitter is a golf club user and local resident. - Why is the RESA so long. - No analysis of what a shorter RESA would look like for the southern option. - No analysis of a hybrid of North and South for the extension. - Many rules in Airport zone are deemed permitted. - Nelson's Golf Course would be severely impacted. The region would lose a valuable attraction. - No provision has been made for relocation or replacement, provision for remaining holes, or compensating the Golf Club. - The financial impact of losing Nelson's Golf Course would be significant for the hospitality industry in the region. - The runway extension has no taxiway from the end of the proposed Northern end, yet this is shown in the airport long term plan. - As both local councils own NAL, what costs will I be facing as a ratepayer? - The health benefits of Nelson's Golf Course would be lost. Including for school children and those who walk/run the airport perimeter. - Costed quality of life factors relating to these benefits have not been calculated. - Other courses in the area do not have the capacity to	Decline proposed plan change as submitted by Nelson Airport Limited.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					accept the current Nelson Golf Course membership. - Nelson's Golf Course is also a community hub, used by more than 70 local organisations. - Problem of noise with a Northern extension. Outside there will always be the annoyance. - Will the Tahunanui Park still be a sought-after holiday retreat? - What impact will a Northern extension have on Tahunanui schools? In summary, there are omissions in the plan and its costings and not all options have been explored. Health impacts have not been calculated or included. A southern extension should be the favoured option as it would have far less impact on the community of Nelson and its economy.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S40.001	Grant Core	Oppose	1) Active member of the Nelson Golf Club and this plan change would ultimately cause the elimination of the Nelson Golf Club. 2) The Nelson Golf Club is used by many organizations for meetings and events. 3) The Nelson community would also lose its only 18 hole championship golf facility. 4) Will not be beneficial for the Tahunanui community to have more air traffic and noise closer to homes and businesses.	Decline Private Plan Change 30 for Nelson Airport Runway Extension in its entirety.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S41.001	Richard Blunt	Oppose	Incorrect or lack of economic evaluation for this preferred Option. States that it is less expensive but fails to include any of the significant costs to compensate to replace most of the existing Nelson Golf Club facilities. No indication of proposed funding for the associated costs for the extended runway and likely significant burden on Nelson ratepayers.	I wish to object to the current application for the north runway extension.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Recent report on the future sea rise and flooding of the Airport would suggest that any runway extension needs more assessment.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S42.001	John Handforth	Oppose	The submitter is a Nelson golf club user. The Nelson Golf club is a thriving private sports club that serves its members and many visitors with an enjoyable and low risk leisure activity. The proposed changes to extend the runway would render the golf course unusable. The opportunity to play golf at a location close to the submitters home is a much valued activity. There are no other courses in close proximity that could replace Nelson Golf club. Understands the need for an airport in Nelson but do not feel its expansion should impact on other land users in that area. There seems to have been no real analysis done on extending the runway southwards other than claiming the land is subject to liquefaction. Surely, this will also be a feature of the land that the golf club now occupies.	Discontinuation of runway expansion into Nelson Golf Club.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S44.001	Murray Lauchlan	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club. Private Plan Change 30 is ill considered and not in the best economic or social interests of the wider Nelson community, with significant impacts to the Nelson Golf Club (NGC), and residents and tourism businesses in the Tāhunanui area. Reasons for this are: 1. Nelson Golf Club (NGC) was established circa 1905, and is regarded as Nelson's premier championship course. 2. NGC supports a membership of around 700	Decline the Plan change in its entirety.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					playing members and many hundreds of additional users, and general users of the club house facility. 3. PC30 will decimate the NGC as a golfing facility. 4. The adjoining Greens Motel and private residences on Golf Haven Way will face a significant loss of business and amenity. 5. The north-east extension of the runway will severely impact the amenity and market value of those properties and businesses. 6. With climate change impacts already evident it seems folly to persist with a commercial development that is unsuited to this location. PC30 is based upon hypothetical information about "new generation" aircraft that have yet to be developed and for which the runway requirements are speculative and largely unknown. Nelson Airport has not thoroughly investigated alternative development options that would have significantly less impact on our community. These being: 1. An extension of the existing runway to the south-west over land the airport company already owns and including a reclamation of a relatively small portion of the Waimea Inlet. 2. The construction of an entirely new runway extending from near the current runways north-eastern extreme in a south-westerly direction along the undeveloped peninsula. This would require a reclamation of a relatively small portion of the Waimea Inlet.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S46.001	Patrick Sanderson	Oppose	Submitter is a user of the Nelson Golf Club. Extending South is submitters preference. - Northern extension will cause major problems for the residents of Tahunanui as well as ruining the current layout of the Nelson Golf Club. - If the extension went North there would need to be	Not approve the runway extension to the North over the Nelson Golf Club land.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					substantial compensation paid the Nelson Golf Club which would be a huge burden on the owners of the airport (Nelson and Tasman ratepayers). - An alternative would be to extend as far as possible to the South without incurring major construction costs and limiting the extension to the North which would allow the Nelson Golf Club to continue as an 18 hole championship course albeit with some redesigning.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S47.001	Annabel Schuler	Oppose	Submitter is a user of the Gol Course Clubhouse. 1. The Nelson Golf Club has become a popular facility for more than 70 groups and organisations - quite aside from its primary purpose. A significant change in the environment around the clubhouse will affect its popularity. Removing that facility 70 times over it makes a large impact on the social fibre of the community. 2. The proposed plan change is likely to see one community asset sacrificed for another. Many tourists and visitors come to Nelson to use the highly regarded links course. If it is carved up the club, and the Nelson region, will have lost a very valuable asset that can never be replaced. There must be a better way. The airport authority and the two councils need to examine other solutions rather than take the easy option.	Oppose in its entirety.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Planning Maps	S50.001	Fiona Esplen	Oppose	The Tahuna Beach Holiday Park would be hugely impacted in a negative way. It is a business that brings a large amount of tourism to the area including international and domestic visitors. If the proposed plan goes ahead it would be a massive loss of accommodation to the domestic caravan and motorhome industry that has grown enormously since Covid. These domestic tourists stay there and visit the region year round and generally stay longer than international tourists bringing income to the province year round. Without the Tahuna Beach Holiday Park these tourists and their spending would disappear.	Reconsider the area affected by the current proposal especially the camping ground at Tahuna Beach.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S51.001	Matt Waghorn	Oppose	Increased noise boundaries and general effect of these on the ability of property owners and other affected parties, including the holiday park, to alter, build, plant and change their land use is wrong. The effects are wide ranging and limiting to long term house owners and the holiday park. The issue of noise would only be exacerbated by the likely increasing frequency of flights. The limitations of the airport due to its location need to be acknowledged and accepted. Residents cannot be impacted further.	Decline the extension of the runway to the north in full.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S51.003	Matt Waghorn	Oppose	30 days for public submission is wrong given the complexity of this issue. Nelson Airport would have had months to prepare this using expert consults, and as such, the public should have the same time to analyse, and submit accordingly. Nelson Council should be upholding reasonable standards to ratepayers. Additionally, the holiday park has not be identified as an affected party which is incorrect as the proposed direct noise zone direct encroaches onto holiday park land. They should be directly consulted before any further progression of this proposed plan change is allowed to continue.	Delay process until further community consultation can be held.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S52.001	Luisa McNabb	Oppose	The submitter is a local property owner and user of the campground, To extend the runway over land not only takes away land for use (Tahunanui campground area ana private landowners) but specifically would increase the noise level over these areas, which already have a significant noise issue. The campground is well frequented by tourists and visitors which has a very positive effect on Nelson businesses. To reduce the size of the Tahunanui camp would be detrimental to this. As it is a runway surely it can be stabilised and placed over water.	If the runway is to be extended, extend over the water as opposed to over land.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					The campground is a great place and a big asset to Nelson City, please leave the campground as it is.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S53.001	Tim Burns	Oppose	Submitters family and friends have holidayed at the Holiday Park for years and it would be a significant loss to the region if proposal goes ahead. If adopted, the proposed changes will: • place severe restrictions on ability to develop the Holiday Park, to undertake renovations and replacements, and to landscape. • restrict the areas where holidaymakers, sporting and other recreational groups, tourers and workers can stay. • subject Holiday Park visitors and guests to higher levels of noise, while existing noise levels already feature in negative feedback. • diminish everyone's experience of being at the Holiday Park, as well as badly affect the reputation, reducing the Park's financial long-term viability.	Disregard this proposal and explore other options such as expanding south (over water) rather than north (over people).
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S54.001	Michelle Sowman	Oppose	The submitter is a local resident and questions that if an extension is required why not reclaim ground to the south in the estuary rather than extending to the north. 1. Understand that an environmental report has been undertaken regarding the estuary although have been unable to obtain a copy. Understand one of the main objections is liquefaction risk. Reality is the whole area is subject to liquefaction, as is most of Nelson's coastline. Why hasn't a Geotech report been commissioned giving more detail as to why reclaiming land south is not an option? 2. Would have a detrimental effect the value and ability to sell the submitters property. New zoning would restrict any resident from any future work. This is a very stressful situation. 3. Health & Safety is compromised - mental & physical	Reclaim ground to the south in the estuary rather than extending to the north.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					health and potential increase in volume of noise. Double glazing does not resolve enjoying your garden and sitting outside. Fumes from aviation fuel in a climate that requires zero emissions is also unacceptable. 4. With the current proposal potentially the Nelson Community lose the Nelson Golf Course. Questions the information available and the consultation.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S55.001	Peter Churchill	Oppose	The submitter is a user of the Nelson Golf Club. Nelson's Golf Course is not only an amenity available for its active members, it also serves and meets a wide range of community needs. It is also highly regarded at a national level. The golf course is also a major focal point of interest when flying into Nelson, it stands out as a signature statement and place of interest enjoyed by numerous passengers. Without Nelson's Golf Course being located in this central location the ability to use this amenity and participate in this healthy activity would be lost.	Decline Nelson Airports proposed plan change, specifically the part that affects Nelson's Golf Course and the proposal to extend the runway northwards, and adopt alternative options, specifically extending the runway southwards.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S56.001	Ali Baxter	Oppose	There are other options further requiring investigation, such as expanding south (over water) rather than north (over people). The increased noise/more frequent flights over a populated area. It has been unreasonable to expect people to go through a 154-page proposal, analyse and respond in detail in just 30 days.	In their entirety
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S57.001	Andrew Pope	Oppose	Against the proposed addition to Nelson airport encroaching on Tahuna camping ground. Families have been travelling to Tahuna camp for many	Against the Nelson airport making any changes to the airport in the direction of Tahuna Motor Camp.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					generations. forging relationships and friendships at this iconic destination. The camp provides many extra dollars to the Nelson economy over the holiday period. Obviously changes have to be made to the airport. Make proposed changes in the opposite direction towards Monaco where there is bare land. Would save the camp and all it stands for.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S58.001	Anne Heal	Oppose	There seems to be a lack of time for consultation on such a major issue and the impact it will have on the campground. The camp is an important asset for the city, bringing visitors and spending money into the region. Given the effect that the proposed change will have on the camp there needs to be more time for consultation and explore other options.	Rethink the proposed change or at least give more time for consultation.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S60.001	Graham Foxwell	Oppose in part	The submitter does not object to the runway extension in principle but believes that the northward extension is a very poor choice. If the extension northward takes effect, it will have a significantly detrimental affect on many residential properties, it is most likely to have a very detrimental effect on the Holiday Park and the beach. Why spoil these facilities when another less obtrusive option is available.	The better option will be to extend the runway South, with minimal impact on residential property or public.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S61.001	Pam Chapman	Oppose in part	The noise pollution over people's homes and campers would be detrimental to tourism in the area and would also reduce the quality of life for locals and would see homes devalued.	Do not extend the runway over people which would jeopardize the quality of life for so many people.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S62.001	Penelope Yates	Oppose	No reasons specified.	Object to changes in their entirety.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S63.001	Mike Elkington	Oppose	The submitter is a user of the holiday park. Don't hurt the holiday park. Submitter has been visiting	Don’t destroy the holiday park to extend the runway, go a different direction with

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					the holiday park for years and it is pretty much the only reason they visit Nelson. By improving the airport in this way, you are getting rid of people coming to spend money in Nelson. It's really counter intuitive.	airport if possible.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S64.001	Clifford Mancer	Oppose	To extend the runway and the noise contours northwards into residential and open space zones will have a large impact on residents and travellers, and can be avoided completely by extending the runway and noise contours southwards. The impairment of Totaranui Beach Camp would impact significantly on the desirability of visiting Nelson. Despite the proposed changes not being required for 10 to 15 years, Council has decided to allow a minimum consultation period. For a change as significant as this, proper time should be allowed for consultation. There is no requirement for this level of urgency to be applied, and for the consultation to be meaningful more time should be allowed.	Object to these changes in their entirety.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S65.001	Charles Horrocks	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club and a resident of Stoke. 1. The proposal lacks a cost analysis that realistically includes the value of the Nelson Golf Club land, its improvements, and the potential opportunity costs. 2. Once these costs are properly considered the economics of a southern extension will become more viable. 3. Bringing the airport closer to a more heavily populated area defies logic in terms of safety considerations and the associated environmental impact. 4. Insufficient consideration has been given to the cultural, health and economic benefits that the Nelson Golf Club brings to the Nelson region.	Oppose the application in its entirety.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					5. The proposal fails to consider the impact of the northern extension on the Tahuna Beach Holiday Park, which also brings significant economic benefit to Nelson. The application makes a presumption that the Nelson Golf Club could continue as a 9 to 12-hole golf course. A reduction in the course's size and status would discourage many of those visitors and have a significant adverse effect on existing members. A wide range of community groups make use of the club's facilities. The proposal would render the clubhouse redundant for golfing purposes and impact adversely on its use as a community events centre. For some, the loss of the Nelson club would be devastating and the prospect of having to drive to Greenacres would be onerous. Could more be done to extend at the southern end without the need to reclaim the Waimea Inlet? Could Nelson Airport make some of its existing land available to compensate? Is there a clear rationale for an extension to exactly 1510m? Could the Runway End Safety Areas (RESA) be less? To what extent has the alternative of an Engineering Materials Arresting System (EMAS) been considered? Mindful of all the environmental issues - the removal of the reclamation at the southern end combined with a shorter extension at the northern end could reduce overall potential damage to the marine ecology.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S66.001	Samuel Butler-Hogg	Oppose	The current proposal is beneficial only to the airport and does not take into account any residents who will be affected. There are so many assumptions that are being made.	Not extend the runway as per this plan and move the airport or look at other options that don't ruin the area.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					It sounds like is the airport is wanting to extend the runway to bring in Jet Aircraft. There is a changing face of travel in general - in NZ and internationally. People living in the area that would be affected by the changes are not going to want to stay living there, but who is going to buy a house under an airport flight path. The holiday park would be finished. The best option would be to do some forward planning and move the airport. When the airport was built, it was in the middle of nowhere, that's not the case now, and the area is only going to get more populated as time goes by. People will continue to come to the area as a destination.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S67.001	Matt Hancock	Oppose	Why would the airport extend the runway north instead of south? This will increase noise/more frequent flights over a populated area. The Tahuna Beach Holiday Park will be adversely affected. This holiday park has been a key part of many Kiwis lives for many years and provides an affordable holiday option for many families who cannot afford more expensive holiday accommodation. It is also unreasonable to expect people to go through a 154-page proposal, analyse and respond in detail in just 30 days.	Decline the proposal to extend the runway northward.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S68.001	John Gamblin	Oppose	The submitter objects to the changes 'in their entirety' because of: 1) the runway being extended north instead of south, 2) the increased noise/more frequent flights over a populated area,	Airport consider alternatives that have no new affect on Tahuna residents and the camping ground to the north of the airport.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					3) it has been unreasonable to expect people to go through a 154-page proposal, analyse and respond in detail in just 30 days.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S69.001	Paul Scott	Oppose	The submitter is very disappointed to hear of maybe changing Tahuna beach camp. Feel that it will be a misjustice to the Nelson region changing it. Progress is to be expected but at what cost to Nelson's beauty. To all of the holiday makers past, present and future the camp is beautiful. Hate to think of the cost to small businesses through this. Hope it is left alone.	No decision specified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S70.001	Simon Winter	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club. The extension to the runway would have devastating impacts on the Gold Club. It is currently an amazing facility for a great number of golfers and is a very accessible venue for many other community groups. Nelson Gold Club has the largest membership in the region and hence many hundreds of golfers would be displaced. There are well over 50 community groups that use the facility, all of whom would be affected. Nelson would lose its internationally acclaimed course which attracts many people annually from out of town and overseas, all of whom spend sustainable money in the region when visiting. The option of extending the runway south instead should be explored more as it would have little or no impact on the existing course and members.	Refuse both applications with respect to extending the runway.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S71.001	Laura Fear	Oppose	This is a significant change for our community and insufficient time has been given to provide feedback on the plan. Please extend the feedback timeframe to a minimum of 3 months, so that residents and businesses	Extension of the ability to give feedback.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					have time to evaluate the change and provide constructive feedback.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S73.001	Louise Hamer-Smith	Oppose in part	The submitters reasons are because of: 1. the runway being extended north instead of south, 2. the increased noise/more frequent flights over a populated area.	Object to the changes in their entirety.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S74.001	Tony Stephens	Support	Encourage infrastructure that can accommodate the lower emission aircraft requirements at the Nelson Airport as future aviation improvements come about. Encourage within the build, higher passenger capacity. Likely that over time even larger passenger aircraft will also see lower emission gains. If so, we should be building and upgrading the runway and airport facility infrastructure to be prepared for regional growth and increasing airport visit numbers. Preference that our regional airport stays close to the city centres of Richmond and Nelson. The alternative being a whole new facility having to be built elsewhere at a later date, at an even greater cost to the region, and long drive times. Hope that all noise mitigation measures possible will be taken on behalf of those living within the area.	Approval of the airport extension upgrades.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S75.001	Julia Daly	Oppose	Reason is because of the regular campers at Tahuna.	Oppose the submission entirely.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S76.001	Vailima Orchard	Oppose in part	The submitter will loose the use of seasonal worker accommodation at Tahuna Holiday Park.	Why can't it extend to the South?
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S78.004	Axel Knauer	Oppose	Opposes the planned runway extension to the north. By giving the runway extension to the north priority over the southern option, commercial considerations are given more weight than the impact this will have on	Refuse the Private Plan Change in its entirety until the following has been incorporated: - Council has sought independent consultation regarding the larger social

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					many people in the northern part of the airport. In a time, where inequality forces increasing numbers of people to seek cheaper and affordable accommodation, the proposed extension will drastically reduce the available options.	impact of the planned extension to the north, - investigated if the proposed additional cost and impact of an extension.to the south outweighs the social impact of the northern extension impact. Should it prove too expensive to realize, the necessity of an increase in air transport volume at Nelson Airport should be questioned.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S78.005	Axel Knauer	Oppose	Opposes the re-zoning and reduction of recreational areas. The planned extension will reduce the attractiveness, value and access to recreational areas. The Tahuna Holiday Park is an important and affordable option for families on holiday in the region. The value of the northern recreational and residential areas will be negatively affected. Increased noise pollution and a reduction in available space will also have negative social and commercial effects.	Refuse the Private Plan Change in its entirety.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S78.006	Axel Knauer	Oppose	Opposes the short notice period (30 days) provided to make submissions to a very complex proposal. The complexity of the proposal requires a lot more time to evaluate all current and future aspects.	Refuse the Private Plan Change in its entirety until the following has been incorporated: - the 30 day submission period is far too short to completely evaluate the very complex issue at hand. It provides no realistic opportunity to seek expert consultation. Therefore, the Council should extend this period to at least 90 days.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S79.001	Margaret Carr	Oppose	The Tahuna Motor camp is the only camp of its type close to Nelson City with convenient buses. The plan would jeopardise the future of the camp.	To make the airport extension to the north rather than south.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S80.001	NZ Airports	Support	NZ Airports is the industry association for New Zealand airports that promotes the important contribution and value of the airport sector to New Zealand and its	Approve the Private Plan Change 30.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					communities. Aviation is crucial for Nelson's regional connectivity, its economic prosperity, and its residents' social connectivity with the rest of New Zealand, and Nelson Airport is the essential hub for aviation in Nelson City and the Tasman District. The airport is a Lifeline Utility under the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act 2002, so it is regarded as critical infrastructure and has a vital role during natural disasters. Nelson and the surrounding region must continue to have a modern, resilient, well-designed, and appropriately sized airport for the economic and social health of its population. It is prudent for NAL to plan for the runway extension necessary to allow the next generation of aircraft to use Nelson Airport. The changes are necessary to ensure Nelson Airport's medium and long-term future, that it remains an efficient and safe airport, and to allow the airport to adapt to changing energy sources and aircraft technology.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S81.001	Edgar Carpenter	Oppose	The submitter has been a Holiday Park user. The holiday park is one of the beautiful parts of Nelson. For travellers it is important to have this infrastructure.	There is a lot more research on what areas could be developed for this project.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S82.001	Tim Stockman	Oppose	Objects to planned changes that negatively affect Tahuna camping park.	Alternative decision.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S83.001	Neil Bennett	Oppose	Submitter started going to Tahuna Park in 1968 and has been going on a reasonable regular basis since. Enjoyed staying at Tahuna even with the aircraft noise	We oppose the extension to Nelson Airport to the north as applied for.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					overhead. These extensions will increase the noise level as the air traffic will increase over the future years. This extended area will constrict the upgrading of buildings and grounds within the park. The increased noise is quite a major problem for all the visitors of Tahunanui especially the casual ones. If the extension were planned to go to the southern end it would be less disruptive to the park management, visitors to the park and the effect on the local residents of Tahunanui. It would be quite obvious that some filling would be required but it would be more advantageous in the long term as there will be increased air movements in the next decade.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S84.001	Duncan Fuller	Oppose	The option to go south rather than north has not been fully explored. The reason given to date is simply not adequate as liquefaction covers the whole area. If this plan succeeds it would be the end of the golf club. Simply not acceptable. This is a facility that has been and will continue to be used by countless Nelsonians and others from around NZ and the world for more than 100 years. Over 70 clubs and organisations use the cafe and there is considerable benefit to the region. Proposal should also be ruled out unless it can be achieved in a way that does not cause such a disruption to a very large number of people.	Not to proceed with the airport extension as currently planned.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S85.001	Allan Brown	Oppose	The submitter was an Airline pilot for 33 years. Concerned on the community impact for not certain the gain. Air New Zealand ATR & Dash 300 are rarely limited with payload. Improved RESA would be a luxury. Talking to design engineers at Airbus over the years towards the future, engines will be more powerful with improved	No consideration on the public and environmental impact. The cost benefit consideration alone makes this proposal a major concern.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					efficiency. Notes the cost benefit consideration to environmental public impact.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S86.001	Graeme Tinkler	Oppose	Changes would severely affect submitter's ability to enjoy camping and the beach at Tahuna.	No changes to Tahunanui Camping Ground.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S87.001	Gwynneth Tinkler	Oppose	Loss of camping at Tahuna camping ground.	Loss of camping facility.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S89.001	Alice Haans	Oppose in part	Would impact on the holiday park too much. The holiday park has been a great source of family holidays for decades and is a much loved holiday spot. It would be a real shame to have this new runway take away this great park.	Oppose the decision to change the airport plan.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S90.001	Ray Clarke	Oppose in part	The plan as it is presented doesn't allow for the preservation of the public interest relating to the Tahunanui Camping ground and the importance of this facility to Nelson and wider New Zealand.	That more time and consideration is given to seeking the most agreeable solution.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S90.002	Ray Clarke	Oppose in part	The plan as it is presented doesn't allow for the preservation of the public interest relating to the Tahunanui Camping ground and the importance of this facility to Nelson and wider New Zealand.	That more time is given for the submission process.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S91.001	Emma Symons	Oppose	No reasons specified.	Oppose the submission for expand the Nelson Airport.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S93.001	Jen Hodgkinson	Oppose	Objects to the changes in their entirety because of: - the runway being extended north instead of south, - the increased noise/more frequent flights over a populated area, or, - it has been unreasonable to expect people to go through a 154-page proposal, analyse and respond in detail in just 30 days.	Further investigate the runway being extended north instead of south, thus reducing noise/more frequent flights over a populated area.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S95.001	Leah Shopneck	Oppose	The submitter is a Nelson resident. Everything that submitter likes about Nelson would change. The school where the submitters children will go will have to deal with an increase in noise levels that will disturb students and disadvantage them, the beach	Rewrite the current plans or cancel all together.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					will be too noisy to enjoy, the campground will no longer exist, and friends and family living in Tahuna will be forced to live inside. Understands that the world of aviation is changing but it feels like this proposed change will hurt the local area more than benefit it. Why not move the airport? Extend over the water? Nelson is a beautiful town that will be taken over by an airport. The document is unreadable for the average person particularly in only a 30 day timespan.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S96.001	William Milnes	Oppose in part	The submitter has stayed at Tahuna Beach Camp. It is a special place for visitors to Nelson. If the requested plan change goes ahead, it will dramatically impact the feasibility of the campground. It will also affect the numbers of travellers who visit Nelson, as if you cannot offer a beachfront campground, or what is available is negatively affected by aircraft noise, it will encourage many holiday makers and travellers to go elsewhere for their holidays.	Decline or substantively amend the plan change.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S97.001	Gail Stent	Oppose	Oppose that the runway is being extended north instead of south. There will be the increased noise/more frequent flights over a populated area, campsite and beach. The beach is a major part of Nelson's outdoor leisure activities.	That the runway should be extended south rather than north.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S98.001	Jeffery Robinson	Oppose in part	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club, an owner of a unit in the Ocean View Apartments in Tahunanui and a Chartered Civil Engineer (NZ). The method used (MCA) by the Applicant to choose only a northern runway extension is flawed and biased towards the north.	The proposed runway is extended both to the north and to the south and not limited to the north only, as shown in Figure 12: Runway Extension of original submission, and that no part of the existing sealed runway is shortened.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					The Economic assessment is underdone and not to the standard required for such an important Plan change. The submitter would like to share an alternative runway extension which would extend the runway both to the south and to the north - and therefore reduce the impact on the Nelson Golf Club, Tahuna Holiday Campsite and other close by residential properties. Would like the applicant to consider a shorter RESA length - the proposed 240 m is much longer than the existing distance between the sealed runway edge and security fence and understand that this is a recommended length that could be less. Refer to Figure 12: Runway Extension in the original submission of a sketch of the runway being extended both south and north with 150 by 150 RESAs.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S98.002	Jeffery Robinson	Oppose in part	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club, an owner of a unit in the Ocean View Apartments in Tahunanui and a Chartered Civil Engineer (NZ). The Plan change will have a negative impact on the potential for the Tahunanui suburb to develop to its full potential - it is in an amazing location which is slowly changing towards a more integrated part of the Nelson City experience. Interested to hear what the long term planning is by the Council for this part of Nelson and how the proposed Plan change affects/limits this. Suggests that an assessment of the economic effects on a future Tahunanui with the proposed Airport zone changes be carried out.	The Council (and therefore Commissioners appointed) ensures that the Plan change does not adversely limit the future development of the suburb Tahunanui.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S98.003	Jeffery Robinson	Oppose in part	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club, an owner of a unit in the Ocean View Apartments in Tahunanui and a Chartered Civil Engineer (NZ). The method used (MCA) by the Applicant to choose only a northern runway extension is flawed and biased towards the north. The submitter has developed an	The MCA (Multi Criteria Analysis) is revised to present a more balanced assessment.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					alternative assessment using the same criteria and scoring resulting in a much closer total score - so close that a southern extension could not be ignored.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S99.001	Helen Shaw	Oppose in part	The submitter is a user/ visitor of the Nelson area. Please consider different options that will not effect the unique area. The campsite on which everyone enjoys the quiet nature of the site. Changing the airport direction of the extension would benefit the holiday visitors and residents, keeping Nelson's natural beauty and welcoming feeling.	Change the direction of the airport or alternative area for the extension.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S101.001	Stephen Gill	Oppose in part	To avoid demolition of homes and holiday areas.	No change to layout of Tahuna Holiday park and the airport extend north instead of south.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S102.001	Jason Stossel	Oppose	1. Increased noise levels to adversely impact residential properties including the health and wellbeing of the individuals living within the properties. 2. Restrictions on use and development of private residential properties. 3. Lack of effective engagement by NAL and NCC with potentially adversely impacted residential properties. 4. Inadequate number of alternative options considered and lack of communication of currently explored alternative options by NAL to the northern runway expansion.	Reject all plan changes relating to extending the runway to the north.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S103.001	Rob Murphy	Oppose	There should be no extension to Nelson Airport runway. The airport has ruined the cities beauty and caused noise and emissions pollution for far too long. Many leisure activities are prohibited around the airport and the continuous noise has an impact on health and wellbeing. Would also breach Councils climate change approach to	No change.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					building in flood prone areas. The airport is already at risk of storms and flood inundation. The airport should be shut down and turned into low cost housing.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S104.001	Jane Edgecombe	Oppose	This is a family park which is booked out every year over every holiday period consistently and brings in thousands of dollars to the region in tourism spend each year. It holds family memories and a tradition for many campers.	That the land at Tahuna not to be used for the extension of the airport.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S105.001	Graeme Mellow	Oppose	The proposal will significantly impact on the operations of the Tahunanui campground.	That consideration is given to extending the runway to the South.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S106.001	Leone Rapana	Oppose	The time frame to access, analyse and respond to a proposal that will have a future impact on a populated area/Tahunanui community is too short.	Decline proposal.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S106.003	Leone Rapana	Oppose	Extending north instead of south will have future impacts of increased noise and more frequent flights in a populated area / Tahunanui community, tourism destination, and disability holiday home getaway.	Decline proposal.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S108.001	Isaac Mackle	Oppose in part	Increased noise over a populated area where families like to enjoy their holidays.	Decline proposal, the runway should be extended north instead of south.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S109.001	David Valentine	Oppose in part	Impact on the golf club, camp ground and surrounding houses.	That the runway and airport boundary extend to the south, over the water.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S110.001	Murray Steele	Oppose	To protect the quality of life for people in the proposed extension area.	No extension to the airport.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S111.001	Jeff Riordan	Oppose	An extensive investigation into the effects, both economic and social regarding the closing of the Nelson Golf course will provide valuable information to determine which way the airport should be extended, either south or north. Not enough due diligence done regarding the total impact on our region.	Delay the decision until an independent review is completed on the effects of closing down the Nelson Golf course in terms of its members, the wider nelson district community and tourists visiting the region.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S111.003	Jeff Riordan	Oppose	There may be an opportunity to investigate extending the Nelson Golf course along the sea front to the south if more time was allocated to the process.	Find a way to accommodate the Nelson Golf course on land next to the existing course along the sea front to the south.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S112.001	Tony Cridge	Oppose in part	Any extension to the airport should not impact on the land use where the existing Tahunanui Camp Ground is currently. NZ has lost so many good grounds for holiday makers, surely Councils can find another way to extend the Nelson Airport .	That any extension to the airport should not impact on the existing adjacent camping ground.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S114.001	Pierre Le Houcq	Oppose	15 years guest of Tahuna Beach Holiday Park	Decline, object to the changes in their entirity.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S115.001	David Coursey	Oppose	The effect of extending airport movements to the north, will severely impact the future operation of Tahuna camping ground and the local community when an extension to the south would appear to have minimal extra effect on anyone. The Tahuna recreation area has been in Council control for at least 27 years longer than the airport and the Camp is a major Nelson tourist attraction over the summer holiday period hosting up to 5000 visitors per night. Tourism, obviously being the airport driver, appears not to be considered regarding this impact.	Decline this proposal.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S116.001	Judith Coursey	Oppose	Submitter and now her family has camped at Tahunanui since the mid 1950's. Objects to the runway being extended 150m to the north, impacting the future of the camp and the nearby community due to extended noise contours and considerably lower aircraft approach heights. Lower approach path is a huge risk over a built-up housing area such as Tahunanui and it should not ever be considered.	Decline this proposal.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S117.001	Jane Butler	Oppose	To continue decades of holiday-makers use of and family fun at the popular and well-supported Holiday Park, it needs to minimise noise interference, and be able to renovate, develop, landscape and provide entertainment and facilities to continue to be current with family fun expectations. The Holiday Park is an iconic part of the	That the airport is contained and/or an alternative site sought or developed to complement the current one in such a place as to not intrude on the beautiful coastline and the recreational facilities it provides (without air traffic noise and

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					'Top of the South' and a renowned holiday spot that has provided rest, relaxation and enjoyment for generations, and submitter wishes this to continue for the community and future families.	interference).
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S118.001	Hamish Neill	Support in part	Recognising that growth and change is inevitable, the submitter as a long term Nelson resident does not support the extension north due to its social impacts on the existing residents, on the Motor Camp, the beach and the Golf Club being substantial and, at cost, greater than an extension to the south. Nelson prides itself as a domestic and international recreation and holiday place and hub to the north of the airport, and displacing the centre of airport flight traffic north will impact negatively on this. Submitter wishes alternatives to a northern extension considered.	That the runway be extended to the south
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S119.001	Maarten Bangma	Oppose in part	Increase noise/more frequent flights over a populated area with runway extended to the north.	That the runway be extended over the water to the south if required
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S119.002	Maarten Bangma	Oppose in part	Submission period unreasonable for people to analyse and respond given the size of the documentation	Submitter objects to the proposal in its entirety
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S121.001	Neil Fenton	Oppose	The submitter is a local resident and member of Nelson Golf Club. The submission refers to: - The proposal to extend the runway north being flawed. The rationale for the extension is mostly based on a need to accommodate for certain future technologies that likely will never exist in any kind of commercially viable quantities. Hydrogen and electric aircraft are generally regarded as not viable commercially with current or any foreseeable technology and resources, except for small aircraft that seat a handful of passengers and with very limited range. - Some of the conclusions and reasoning for weighting to the North option as opposed to the south option have	Decline the proposed plan in its entirety and not extend the runway north through Nelson golf course. Consider other options which affect fewer people detrimentally than this current proposal of extending the runway north.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					been to suit a NAL agenda and the economic feasibility of the options. Examples given of archaeological sites and avian ecology. - Effects on the golf club. The proposal will affect holes 1,9,10 &18, and 8 as well. It will cut all access from the clubhouse to the golf course, with no alternatives to remedy this. While the application states that "the Nelson Golf Club layout should be able to be reconfigured such that the open space attributes and recreational activity itself as undertaken on the balance area is not eliminated", no golf course architect has been contacted. NAL should provide an alternative for the only championship golf course in the Nelson region. - Effects on the submitter as a golfer. Mental and physical health, social contact with friends and family. - The submitter purchased his property two years ago and a major contributing factor was the proximity to the golf course. The property will now fall into the new Airport Effects Control Overlay and be affected by the new restrictions associated with the extension. The need for resource consent for any work on the property is unfair, with NAL having the final say and. while not being close enough to the airport to warrant any assistance into sound proofing the house. - The submitter was unaware of any potential airport extensions when buying this property. Will have to endure stress and uncertainty over property valuation.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S122.001	William Joy	Oppose	The proposal has the potential to destroy a very high quality Golf Course that is well located for the Nelson community. Its loss would result in negative lifestyle and economic consequences. The proposed land designations for the northern option create many negative issues within the community. This need not be the case as the justification for the	To reject in its entirety the proposed Airport Change 30

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					extended runway is inconclusive and the cost of the northern option appears very understated. The submission refers to: - Rationale behind report is flawed. Examples and reasons are provided. - Justification for lengthening the runway is unwarranted. It's based on speculative assumptions about future aircraft. - The Multi Criteria Assessment (MCA) is a subjective method. In this case it is missing criteria of interest to the golf club and other parties. The weighting process is also subjective. - Lifestyle Effects - The club is providing the double benefit of exercise and friendships. There are a lot of meaningful contributions to local charities. Use of the club facilities by the wider community. - Economic Effects - The club produces very significant economic activity in the local community. - A 9 hole course and the resulting economic, social and community activity would be considerably reduced. - To play 18 holes on a course of almost equal standard would require a 15km drive to Greenacres - fuel, time and pollution cost to this option. - The economic report fails to quantify the positive economic and health benefits of the club. - Wider Community Effects - the Northern option will likely reduce opportunities for commercial, industrial and residential development in Tahunanui. Opportunity cost for the northern option that needs to be quantified. - There is an impact on local residents - properties affected are likely to be less valuable. - Aircraft - the report lacks specifics about what type of aircraft will be flying in the medium to longer term. Speculation that more environmentally friendly aircraft will require longer runways. Reality is that we don't know. Suggestion: - When it is actually known that a longer runway will be	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					needed complete the design and build the required extension to the South. - This approach has the advantage of allowing for the continued use of a valuable community recreation hub - the gold club; allows opportunities for easier development of commercial, residential and industrial projects in Tahunanui; eliminates value loss on properties near the northern end; residents would not have to put up with the added noise pollution; and financing could be facilitated by Infrastructure Holdings Limited issuing new shares to the public.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S124.001	Raewynn Jenkins	Oppose	The submitter lives at the Tahuna Motor camp and the Airnoise Boundary (red) line runs through her property. The submission refers to the following: - Lack of information and secrecy on how the airport came to their final plan - The submitter's home on a site at the Tahuna Holiday Park, her retirement plan, and the potential she may have to remove her home at some stage, without compensation, because a new airport runway extension. - Why can't the Nelson Airport relocate out of the area? - The orange line of the airport effects control overlay will affect a large range of residents. What legal standing do the Residents of Nelson have to outlaw any of this. - Tahuna Holiday camp has been the highlight of peoples camping lives and the Golf club services the Nelson community - it is time the Airport found another site. - Noise effects: The submitter and others currently suffer extensively with the noise. Why should they move because new aircrafts are going to be noisier? Who decided on the parameters of where the red line goes?	Cancel this plan.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S125.001	Kevin Sowman	Oppose	The submitter refers to: • The loss of a 18 Hole Championship Golf Course: This will have a major impact on the community, its members, and the many smaller clubs & community groups that use the clubhouse, all of which will have a negative impact on people's mental health & wellbeing. The money raised for charities such as Rescue Helicopters will be lost. • The impact on pets when the runway is cleared of birds with bird scaring rockets. • The impact on health from increased aviation fumes closer to homes. • The increase of noise from the planes taxiing along the new service runway, with noise gets louder (over 100 dB) when the plane turns onto the runway. The noise level map has not been taken with the proposed new support runway in mind, as this new support runway is not shown in any of the maps on the Airport "Road to Zero" web site. • The accuracy, clarity and accessibility of information given to promote the northern runway, including the cost of the proposed extension ($32 million) as this does not include the cost of purchasing the golf course land, clubrooms and other facilities and services. • Why does the runway need to be extended at all? The internet specifies a required max length of runway of 1315m for the ATR 72 & 1178m for the Q300. The replacement planes that Air New Zealand are looking at are called ES-30, and the spec on these also says 1100m (these only hold 30 people and will be available in 2030). • Considering the impact on the Nelson	No decision is specified.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					community, the environmental report that was commissioned is lacking in detail and how it was prepared is questioned. • As the Nelson City Council has a vested interest in the airport, how do they maintain a neutral stance?	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S126.001	Gary Newell	Oppose	The Submission refers to the extended runway and increased size of the airport resulting in: - bigger planes & so more noise & likely more frequent flights - likely loss of the camping ground area, which is extremely valuable to the Nelson region because of its proximity to the sea & being close to the city. Itis unreasonable to expect people to go through a 154-page proposal, analyse and respond in detail in just 30 days.	Consider other options for extending the airport, rather than having to use the valuable land currently occupied by the Tahuna Camp. Also consider extending the runway in a northerly direction rather than to the South as currently being under consideration.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S127.001	Nelson Regional Development Agency	Support	The submitter is the regional development agency for the Nelson Tasman region, and a combined Economic Development Agency/ Regional Tourism Organisation. NRDA's role is to promote the economic development of Nelson Tasman. The submission notes the importance of Nelson Airport to the regional economy, as: - A vital link for business and residents: Nelson Airport is a highly connected and reliable airport; it is a critical asset for our regional economy; it provides vital access to larger markets and connection to their international networks; it is a critical asset to leverage when attracting investment and businesses to the region; and it is a key regional infrastructure strength supporting our innovation ecosystem. NRDA heavily promotes the airport and its ability to connect to the wider country as an advantage for living and working in the region. - A Gateway for the region's visitor economy: Visitor spending filters into a range of industries, and a	Approve the proposal in full.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					significant number of our visitors come through the airport.; and the airport's connectivity and accessibility play a critical role in promoting the region, both to visitors, conference organisers and International Travel Sellers. - In context of the wider transport network: Nelson Tasman is the only main export centre in New Zealand with no rail link, and SH6 is the only main roading route connecting the region to the wider economy. This places greater reliance on the airport. - Briefing for Ministers 2023 outlines the importance of the Nelson Airport Masterplan, a key requirement of which is an extension of the airport's main sealed runway, included for the contribution it will make to our economy, how the project supports sustainability, and the resilience of assets against climate change, and support for investment attraction. Well planned and interconnected infrastructure is essential to help deliver high productivity and improved wellbeing outcomes for the region. Without provision for an extended runway the region would be placed at an economic disadvantage. An extension of the airport's main sealed runway. and associated changes to noise, will: - Ensure over 30 years of aeronautical capacity and improve operational resilience and reliability; - Enable future hosting of sustainably powered aircraft which cannot proceed within the current infrastructure constraints. There is a risk that future travel choices will be restricted if this technology cannot be accommodated in Nelson. The submitter urges the Airport to take a consultative and collaborative approach as it progresses with its planning to help address within its overall solutions the	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					concerns that some established visitor sector businesses have about the impact of the new designations on their future operations, where there is scope to do so. The proposal will keep Nelson Tasman competitive in terms of air connectivity, unlock investment opportunities for Nelson Airport, and provide for reliable and resilient infrastructure.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S128.001	Dianne Sharma-Winter	Oppose	The submitter does not support the runway extension at this time. In an era of rapid climate change, fossil fuel divestment and rising sea levels, this proposal is short-sighted and environmentally irresponsible. There is mention of needing a larger runway to accommodate planes that haven't been built yet and with no evidence to support that.	Decline the airport runway extension in its entirety.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S129.001	Noeline Inglis	Oppose	The submission refers to: - Airport Survey: Airport runway extension promoted for reason of alternative fuel and enhanced safety but Submitter believes that there may be bigger planes, more destinations and potential for International flights. - Noise: Noise pollution will affect houses outside the airport effects layer as noise travels in "line of sight" to those along the Tahunanui /Annesbrook hills who will be more often negatively impacted by noise from any planned runway extension to the North - Personal loss to Submitter as a Member of the Golf Club: If the golf course closes or become 9-hole, loss of social contact, regular exercise, and convenience of the course. - Importance of golf in society: Exercise/health benefit; socialisation and mental health benefit; co-operation, fund raising and charity contributions; suit all ages, physical abilities, ethnic backgrounds and income brackets; different users i.e. business house golf, school groups.	Save the golf course, respect the residents and their right to quiet enjoyment of their property, retain opportunities to exercise in green space locally, re-examine runway extension to the south.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- The Golf Club: Has been in operation for 126 years. It is a social hub for the community, used for lunch groups, meetings, celebrations, weddings etc. that will be threatened by the proposed changes. It is a significant employer. - Impact on Wildlife within the golf course and alongside the estuary, as the only large area of local green space. - Impact on the Walkway around the Airport: Loss of access and recreational use by community. - Freight out of Nelson: Virtually none of the region's main export produce goes by air. What export freight would be handled by the airport if the runway is lengthened? - North vs South extension of Runway: The golf course itself is regarded as a logical emergency landing area or runoff area so moving the runway North places possible incidents closer to the houses. Subgrade of safety runoff area unlikely to stand up to the weight of a plane. Fewer households affected by southern runway extension. - Sea Level Rise, Coastal Inundation and Liquefaction Risk: how future proofed will the regional Airport be? - Safety of the Airport and Access for Emergency Services: How are the Nelson fire and emergency services going to get to the proposed Northern extension? Nelson has been reported as one of the more dangerous airports to land on in NZ. A safer Airport for the region requires thought to moving it.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S132.001	Richard McIntosh	Oppose	The submission refers to the undesirable impact this will have on established housing (already under pressure in Nelson) and on the motor camp which is a vital part of the Nelson community bringing visitors and money to the area.	Decline the Private Plan (PPC30) to extend the airport runway to the north encroaching on houses and Tahuna Motor Camp in their entirety.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					The area affected does not need increased noise levels. It would be logical for the airport to develop a new runway to the south where there is room for development and with modern machinery, technology etc., used to reclaim land for a new runway.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S133.001	Anna-Maria Gough	Oppose	The proposal will impinge on the quality of service that has been offered by the Tahuna Holiday Park for generations to enjoy.	Would prefer flight traffic/noise pollution be deferred to an area with less population
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S134.001	Robert Shore	Oppose	Submitter is a member of Nelson Golf Club. Opposes the application in its entirety. Reasons: 1. It will render Nelson Golf Club course not fit for purpose. 2. Decimates the course as a National Championship course. 3. Leaves no access to the balance of Nelson Golf Club land on western side. 4. The many improvements such as clubhouse, proshop, practice area and irrigation will be severed from Nelson Golf Club land. 5. Nelson needs an 18 hole championship course to contribute to the economic growth of the Nelson region. 6. The applicant has not shown any considered action to the effect of the sustainability of the Nelson Golf Club land as a golf course. 7. Consideration should be given to southern extension, cost should not always be considered the best alternative.	Consideration should be given to southern extension, cost should not always be considered the best alternative.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S135.001	Stephen Walsh	Oppose in part	Which venue would bring more tourists?	Object at this time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S136.001	Lynda Hannah	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the new runway due to the urgent need for climate action and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The submission refers to:	Decline the application to extend the runway.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- The need to reduce use of aviation to reduce this sector's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions, at a rate of 9% a year to comply with IPCC's advice to reduce net GHG emissions 45% from 2010 levels by 2030. - The application not quantifying the embedded carbon emissions for the extension to the existing main runway and associated pavement works, to determine the impact of the carbon footprint of this construction on the Nelson Tasman carbon budget. - The combined impacts of sea-level rise and land sinking affecting the current location of the airport.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S138.001	D Stulen	Oppose	Submission refers to: - Noise and increased number of flights in a populated area. - Lack of community engagement on the whole process. - Short turnaround time for submissions. - Other options for airport expansion (relocate to a more suitable location or reclaim land).	Oppose the changes in their entirety.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S139.002	Thomas Ratcliffe	Oppose	The submission refers to: - The disruption of extending the runway to the north when there is so much space available to the south and not one person would be disturbed. - The ease of culverting and reclaiming the estuary, and its existing level of pollution. - The Golf club being ruined. - Residents not being given more priority.	The submitter is totally against the extension of the runway to the north.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S140.003	Paula Baldwin	Oppose in part	• The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. • The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out by superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north and for no extension. • If the extension takes place to the North, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. • If the extension takes place to the South, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct	The Airport Effects Control Overlay must stay in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					location at the northern end of the aerodrome. • If the extension takes place partly to the North and partly to the South, then the Overlay will be in incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome. The submitter opposes the Noise Mitigation Plan within the Airport Effects Control Overlay for the following reasons: • When attending a meeting held at Nelson Airport on 31 May 2022, general discussion included Nelson Airport advising they would consider paying for the installation of heat pumps in the houses* affected by noise, to enable the residents to live comfortably in their homes without windows open due to the airport noise ... but a good proportion of the residential area that will be affected by greater airport noise is rental accommodation. How are tenants also going to afford the cost of running the heat pump? • No household will actually meet the criteria that's being suggested.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S140.004	Paula Baldwin	Oppose in part	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1 • The proposed wording of the Rules will result in far reaching and drastic restrictions on new builds and will have unintended consequences. • The rules and requirements should be consistent between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	That the proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail toREr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S140.005	Paula Baldwin	Oppose in part	• The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. • Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. • The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	That the proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and engine testing / RuleINr.25 comply with NZS 6802.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S140.006	Paula Baldwin	Oppose in part	The submitter refers to the demise of the Nelson Golf Club as a result of a runway extension. Nelson Airport is no more strategically important than the Nelson Golf Club. The Club, as a venue and supporter of community, would be a huge loss to Nelson. There are many groups that use the venue. Nationally, this golf course is the only one available in Nelson to hold competitions. The Nelson Golf Club provides an awesome green space between the residential area and a noisy activity. There is no loss of the airport if it stays in its current size.	Decline application by Nelson Airport Limited.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S140.007	Paula Baldwin	Oppose in part	The submitter raises the conflict of interest in Nelson City Council hearing an application by Nelson Airport Limited.	These applications are immediately referred to a Commission, so NCC removes itself from the process.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S141.001	Nelson Tasman Chamber of Commerce	Support	The submitter is a not-for-profit membership organisation that has been supporting businesses and commercial activity in the region since 1858. The submission refers to: - The Airport as essential infrastructure for the business community of the Nelson Tasman Region, and one of NZ's busiest airports and an important asset for our regional economy. - The role and immense importance of the Airport: 1. In regional connectivity, essential for businesses, residents and tourism. 2. Supporting the region's tourism industry. 3. For trade and business, including talent attraction and staff retention, access to international markets and establishing connections beyond Nelson, and as an important asset for attracting new businesses and investment to the region. 4. In support of education and research, with reference to Cawthron and the role of the airport in enabling academic collaborations, research partnerships, and educational opportunities by facilitating travel to and	That the proposal be approved in full.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					from the region. 5. As a base for emergency services, including medical flights, search and rescue, and fire-fighting support, and the timely response to emergencies and provision of essential services. Nelson Airport plays a central role linking the region with the rest of NZ and the world, contributing to its growth, development and overall well-being. The proposal, including an extended runway, will: - ensure a more resilient and future-proofed airport for the Nelson Tasman region; - be able to accommodate a new era of sustainably-powered aircraft; without which the region would risk becoming isolated and the viability of operating businesses in the region would be impacted. In summary the submitter believes the proposed changes will support the business community of Nelson Tasman and keep the region competitive in terms of air connectivity, reliability and sustainability.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S142.001	Philippa Eberlein	Oppose	The submitter has been a member of Nelson Golf Club for 18 years. The submission refers to: - Nelson Golf Club being a nationally and internationally recognised facility, for community groups to national golf competitions, bringing in revenue to the club and the community. - The convenience of the course for the Submitter, by bike or foot. and effect of the runway extension on her recreational activity. - Sinking of the airport land (on average sinks 3.4mm a year) and continual erosion of the coast. The golf course can cope with these changes at little cost.	Decline Plan Change 30 for Nelson runway extension.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- The Nelson Golf Club as a 15 hectare green space, and its open water ways, would be a big environmental loss.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S143.001	Marty Ruhe	Oppose	Given the significantly high numbers of homeless in Nelson in dire need of housing, safe & secure accommodation, the submitter believes it would be better the extension be over water to avoid a more negative impact on people's lives.	Avoid a negative impact on people's lives.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S144.001	Guy King	Oppose	The noise levels emitted from these aircraft will be huge and will be difficult to mitigate against. Large green open spaces are few and far between and should be kept at any cost. The airport extension development would force Nelson Golf Club out of existence.	The Airport extension does not go ahead, and the golf course is maintained in its present state.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S145.001	Logan Geeves	Oppose	The Submission refers to: 1. Lack of time in consultation process with all stake holders, including aircraft manufacturers. 2. Lack of investigation into Aircraft performance abilities for A320, Boeing 737, ATR all series, Q 300 and regional aircraft currently used in Australia, with regards to single engine flapless approach glide paths, single engine go round, engine failure on take-off pre V1 and after V1. Given current height restrictions to the north of the field will result in endangerment of all those in residence i.e. Nelson city. This is for both runway directions given these aircraft's single engine performance capabilities. 3. Given current trends in aviation there has been a clear indication for economic load capacity that frequent smaller aircraft are in higher demand.	No specific relief is given.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S146.001	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	MW.iii Definitions - Annual Aircraft Noise Contour (AANC) This definition relates to monitoring/regulating airport noise emissions, which should be addressed only in the designation conditions.	Delete definition.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S146.002	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Amend	MW.iii Definitions - Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise (ASAN) Airport noise might affect a range of activities and inclusion of a definition is supported. However, the list of activities should be extended to include community activities.	Amend as follows:...*4. Health facility;* **or5. Community activity**. Make a consequential amendment to the definition of "Community activity" as follows: *Community activity as it relates to* **ASAN and** to the...
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S146.003	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	MW.iii Definitions - Aircraft Engine Testing This definition relates to monitoring/regulating airport noise emissions, which should be addressed only in the designation conditions.	Delete definition.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S146.004	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	MW.iii Definitions - Aircraft operations This definition relates to monitoring/regulating airport noise emissions, which should be addressed only in the designation conditions. If this definition is retained the excluded activities should be removed. ASANs should be built to address all (actual) noise exposure and not a subset based on an administrative distinction.	Delete definition.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S146.005	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Amend	MW.iii Definitions - Airnoise Boundary The definition should specify the contour is for a future scenario using the existing definition.	Amend as follows:...*approximately 65 dB Ldn* ~~from~~ **Future Aircraft Noise Contour.**
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S146.006	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Amend	MW.iii Definitions - Airport Effects Control Overlay The definition should relate to the planning maps in general and not maps specific to the airport.	Amend as follows:...*as shown on the planning maps* ~~for Nelson Airport~~.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S146.007	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Support	MW.iii Definitions - Pasques Use of dB and not "Pasques" is New Zealand industry best practice and is consistent with international practice.	Delete definition as proposed.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.008	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Amend	AD11.3.13 Airport effects overlays The description should make clear matters being addressed by the plan and matters being addressed under the designation.	Amend as follows:...*The Airport Operator is also required* **by designation conditions...**
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S146.009	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Amend	DO11.1.2.ii Airport noise causes a range of adverse health effects on people. This is not adequately represented by the term "annoyance effects".	Amend as follows:...*This can lead to* **adverse health** ~~annoyance~~ effects on *the surrounding community....*
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S146.010	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	DO11.1.3 Policies DO11.1.3, DO11.1.4 and DO11.1.5 overlap and lack clarity (there is also partial repetition of the proposed DO11.1.2). These should be consolidated into a revised DO11.1.3 focused on managing airport noise emissions to protect public health. The notified wording is also limited to only a subset of airport activity. Adverse health effects arise from all airport noise emissions from the airport. While different controls might be appropriate for different aspects, this policy should relate to all airport noise adversely affecting health.	Reject notified provision and replace with a policy, explanations, reasons and methods to protect public health by managing all airport noise emissions through designation conditions.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S146.011	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Support	DO11.1.4 This policy overlaps with DO11.1.3 and DO11.1.5, which should be consolidated and clarified.	Delete policy, explanations, reasons and methods as proposed.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S146.012	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	DO11.1.5 This policy overlaps with DO11.1.3 and DO11.1.4.	Delete policy, explanations, reasons and methods.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S146.013	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Amend	DO11e.3.1 Complaints are not an appropriate measure of adverse health effects.	Amend as follows: ~~Level of noise complaints from residents around airport.~~
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S146.014	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Amend	DO16.1.1.xv The noise controls for surrounding activities are related to their zones and not the Airport Zone. Noise within the Airport Zone is controlled by the designation and not NRMP rules.	Amend as follows: ~~The zone recognises the noise impacts, both from and within the zone associated with Aircraft Operations, Aircraft Engine Testing and Compass Swings.~~
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.015	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Support	REr.64 Avoidance of intensification of sensitive activities in an area subject to unhealthy noise exposures avoids increasing harm to public health.	Retain rule as notified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.016	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Support	REr.65 Requiring buildings in noisy areas to provide healthy indoor noise environments reduces adverse public health effects.	Retain rule as notified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.017	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Support	REr.65A Requiring buildings in noisy areas to provide healthy indoor noise environments reduces adverse public health effects.	Retain rule as notified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.018	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Support	SCr.71 Requiring buildings in noisy areas to provide healthy indoor noise environments reduces adverse public health effects.	Retain rule as notified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.019	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Support	SCr.71A Requiring buildings in noisy areas to provide healthy indoor noise environments reduces adverse public health effects.	Retain rule as notified.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.020	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Support	INr.67 Requiring buildings in noisy areas to provide healthy indoor noise environments reduces adverse public health effects.	Retain rule as notified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.021	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Support	INr.67A Requiring buildings in noisy areas to provide healthy indoor noise environments reduces adverse public health effects.	Retain rule as notified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.022	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	OSs.7.i Provisions are required to address noise effects in the Motor Camp. However, the proposed provisions do not address noise exposure of campers in the Airport Effects Control Overlay. It is unclear why short-term living accommodation specifically has been prohibited. It is also unclear why rules have apparently been included within objectives and policies.	Reject notified provision and replace with provisions that result in healthy noise levels for all occupants of the Motor Camp within the zone rules.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.023	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	OSr.23 It appears that all (or virtually all) of the Motor Camp is in the proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay. As such OSr.23.1 as notified has no application. If this activity is to be provided for then it should be subject to sound insulation and ventilation requirements	Reject notified rule and replace with provisions requiring sound insulation and ventilation for caretaker accommodation.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.024	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Support	OSr.53 Requiring buildings in noisy areas to provide healthy indoor noise environments reduces adverse public health effects.	Retain rule as notified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.025	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Support	OSr.53A Requiring buildings in noisy areas to provide healthy	Retain rule as notified.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					indoor noise environments reduces adverse public health effects.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.026	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Support	COr.21 Restrictions on new buildings for sensitive activities in an area subject to unhealthy noise exposures avoids increasing harm to public health.	Retain rule as notified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.027	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Amend	AIRPZ.2 The existing description supports operation of the airport but does not address responsible management to minimise public health harm.	Amend to add the following sentence: **However, the airport planning, development and operation will seek to minimise such external effects to protect public health.**
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S146.028	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	AIRPZ-O3 There are two objectives (O1 and O2) supporting the operation of the airport. This third objective should be written in terms of environmental (and particularly health) outcomes and not restate the need for airport operations or discount/compromise the health outcomes sought.	Reject the objective as notified and replace with an objective to minimise adverse public health effects without qualification.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S146.029	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	AIRPZ.P5 As for O3, a primary purpose of this policy should be to minimise adverse public health effects, without being qualified or fettered by reference to the role and function of the airport (currently in the leading text).	Reject the policy as notified and replace with a policy to minimise adverse public health effects from airport noise exposure.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.030	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	AIRPz.20 Either aviation activity should be provided for through a designation or through plan rules. Currently there are duplicate and overlapping provisions, which does not allow for robust and efficient application of noise management measures to protect public health. If the intention is to allow for aviation activity through a designation then duplicate provisions should be removed from the plan rules.	Delete rule.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.031	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Amend	AIRPz.22 As for all other zones, ASANs in the Airnoise Boundary should be prohibited.	Amend AIRPz.22.3 to add the following sentence: **New Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise or the construction of any new Building to accommodate an Activity Sensitive to Airport Noise are prohibited in the Airnoise Boundary.**
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.032	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Amend	AIRPz.24.3 Only education that is not an ASAN should be provided for.	Amend as follows: *Educational facilities and Education Activities***, as excluded from the definition of Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise** are...
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.033	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	AIRPz.29 As noted for AIRPz.20, all noise controls should be in the designation conditions and not duplicated. It does not appear that cumulative noise effects or the Best Practicable Option for this activity have been evaluated.	Delete rule.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.034	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	AIRPz.30 As noted for AIRPz.20, all noise controls should be in the designation conditions and not duplicated. It does not appear that cumulative noise effects or the Best Practicable Option for this activity have been evaluated.	Delete rule.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.035	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	AIRPz.39 This rule is written to apply by exception (if the relevant adjoining zone rule explicitly applies), which results in ambiguity and omissions. It should be rewritten so that adjoining zone noise limits always apply.	Delete notified AIRP.39.1 and replace with: *There are no noise limits at any point within the Airport Zone. Noise from activity in the Airport Zone shall comply with the zone noise limits for other zones where the noise is received.*

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					An exception is not appropriate for aviation activity noise because that can be authorised regardless under the designation conditions. Exempting it here would undermine the designation conditions.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.036	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	AIRPz.40 As noted for AIRPz.20, all noise controls should be in the designation conditions and not duplicated.	Delete rule.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S146.037	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Support	AIRPz.41 Controlling construction noise in accordance with NZS 6803 is good practice for managing adverse public health effects.	Retain rule as notified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Appendices	S146.038	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Amend	Ap19.1.ii Provision of ventilation and cooling is essential if windows need to be closed so that occupants have adequate thermal comfort. The notified provisions vary from other district plans and it is unclear whether option (a) in particular would provide adequate thermal comfort.	Amend the rule as required to result in adequate thermal comfort with windows closed.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Appendices	S146.039	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	Ap19 Future Aircraft Noise Contours The noise contours only represent a subset of aviation activity (e.g. certain flights movements, ground engine running and compass swings are excluded). Adverse health effects on the community will arise from the cumulative noise of all aviation activity. As such, designing buildings on the basis of these contours could result in inadequate sound insulation (and resulting adverse health effects) because the actual noise exposure would be higher than represented by these contours.	Replace the notified Future Aircraft Noise Contours with contours that include all aviation activity without any exemptions/exceptions.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Planning Maps	S146.040	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough	Oppose	Planning maps - Airnoise Boundary and Airport Effects Control Overlay For the reasons set out above with respect to the Future Aircraft Noise Contours, the overlay and boundary on the planning maps should include all aviation noise.	Replace the notified Airnoise Boundary and Airport Effects Control Overlay with contours that include all aviation activity without any exemptions.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S147.001	Alexander Cochrane	Oppose in part	The submitter states that the runway extension should be to the south, by building a runway extension like a bridge, the Otira viaduct or the 100 tonne wharves at Port Nelson, which would still give access to Monaco, would have little effect on the estuary, and would not affect as many homeowners or properties.	Extending the runway south would be the logical way to go.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S148.001	Richard Sullivan	Oppose	The submitter is a member of Nelson Golf Course and an Economist. The submission refers to: - The application will make Nelson a less desirable place to live and visit, as the runway extension to the north will mean the golf course will be unusable and Tahunanui Beach will be impacted by aircraft flying lower (more noise). - The reasons for the runway extension are challenged, for example that electric aircraft may need longer runways as opposed to the potential for vertical take-off and landing craft. - If the runway is to accommodate electric aircraft which are presumably quieter, why the need for greater noise boundaries. - Overall, increasing the capacity of the airport by lengthening the runway to the north is poor economic development. Increased tourism reduces the attractiveness of Nelson as a destination. Suggests increasing the number of flights of smaller planes so the current runway services more people and increase its use.	Decline the application for any runway extension.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- For Nelson to thrive it must reduce its reliance on the physical movement of goods and people. Investing in such expensive infrastructure to support a low wage, low productivity industry will ensure the region continues to lag in average incomes. - Concentrate on what makes Nelson a good place to live will garner greater benefits in the future and attract higher wages and salaries, particularly given the increased ability for people to work remotely i.e. maintain the recreational value of the golf course and Tahunanui beach, offering a good place to live with access to recreation and natural amenity.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Planning Maps	S148.003	Richard Sullivan	Oppose	If the runway is to accommodate electric aircraft which are presumably quieter, why the need for greater noise boundaries.	Decline the application to expand the noise boundaries.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S149.001	Debbie Hampson	Oppose	The noise pollution would absolutely ruin Tahunanui beach (for any leisure activities....walking, swimming, relaxing, kayaking, paddleboarding etc.), and also Tahunanui Motor camp, Tahunanui village, the golf club & for all residents.	Object to the plan in its entirety.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S150.001	Samuel Jones	Oppose	The Submission refers to: - The time frame for submissions being unfair and unjust. - The alternative of building the extension south of the airport should be explored in more detail, as opposed to building north through residential and commercial property. - Communication the Airport has had with local communities and businesses having been dreadful. Claims the process has been hurried and kept quiet from the community. The PPC30 application is complex and difficult to understand.	Do not extend the airport north.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- Extending the airport north will severely increase noise and flight frequency over the populated area of Tahunanui and, with the impact on the local campground and surrounding businesses/beach environment, have a major negative impact on the broader Nelson community.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S151.001	Mario Boffa	Oppose	The submitter objects to the extension going north as it's a residential area and will affect a lot of residents in the Tahunanui area.	Extension to go south.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S152.001	Toni Stenhouse	Oppose	The submitter and family have over the past 90 years been regular users of the Tahuna beach camping ground. This proposed change will significantly impact their enjoyment and rest, and as the biggest camp in the area it will impact tourist numbers over summer.	Extend the runway north instead of south, or reduce the number of flights.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S153.001	Paul Harrison	Oppose in part	The submitter is a member of Nelson Golf Club. The submission refers to the proposal considering only 2 options, the north or south extensions, with no obvious thought to extending partially in both directions: - The northern extension would close a fantastic local resource, and mean the Submitter would need to travel further to the next nearest 18 hole course (Greenacres). - If the runway extends in both directions it may be possibly to retain the Nelson golf course, with some changes in layout i.e. use of existing airport land such as the grass runway.	That before a final decision is made, consideration is given whether both ends could be extended, to a lesser degree, and still achieve the same desired runway length.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S154.001	Andrew Simpson	Oppose in part	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club, and lives in a flat attached to the south side of the Clubhouse. The submission refers to: - The lack of content in the documents in relation to the effect of the proposal on the golf club as the airport's largest and nearest neighbour, with 700 members and	Instruct the Airport to turn their runway extension around.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					70 community user groups. - The Submitter's loss of his home. - Council's interest as a shareholder in the airport. - Exclusion from any fair compensation. - The preferred option being extension to the south by filling the estuary where there is space but with effect on fewer people and at much lower cost, or to relocate the airport off low-lying land to a new site such as past Brightwater. - The lack of scientific research undertaken in the investigations, and lack of intent in considering the options specified by the submitter.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S156.001	David Tocker	Oppose	The Submission refers to: - The short window for objections being undemocratic. - Extending south over the sea, while costing a little more, is a good option. It would also allow entry roads off the expressway from Richmond direction straight into the airport precinct. - Nelson historically having been built on tourism, not just for those who fly in, to use and enjoy the Tahuna Park, the wide open spaces, the golf course and the beach.	Extend the airport to the south.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S157.001	Barbara and Tim Robson	Oppose	The Submission refers to the proposed runway extension: • The airport site is vulnerable to significant flooding due to the combined impacts of sea-level rise and land sinking. The latest SeaRise data shows that the Nelson Airport site, with the sea on 3 sides, is more vulnerable because it is sinking while sea levels are rising. Dr Richard Levy, Principal Scientist at GNS Science/Te Pu Ao is quoted as saying that, for areas such as Nelson airport, Vertical Land Movement alongside SLR brings forward the time to start adapting by 10 to 15 years. Refers to https://www.cawthron.org.nz/annual-lecture/. Shape Nelson site's own FAQ response to the question of climate change acknowledges that this is a vulnerable site when it says that suitable alternative locations for an	Decline the request for Airport Plan Change 30.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					airport within the region are not easily found and that NAL are focused on making Nelson Airport as resilient as possible to the effects of all natural events including climate change. • Nelson City Council has declared a Climate Emergency and said that all decisions will be looked at through a climate lens. They have endorsed Nelson Tasman Climate Forum's identified need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 9% a year to meet IPCC's advice to reduce net GHG emissions by 45% from 2010 levels by 2030. The application is not consistent with this commitment and doesn't give measures for the embedded carbon emissions for the actual construction of the runway extension to determine if the size of the carbon footprint would be acceptable. • It is not realistic, given current available technology, to assume that zero emission flights will be available in the near future and larger capacity low-emission aircraft will be practical. Business as Usual in terms of travel habits is not ok, and Council should not be sanctioning behaviour that continues to consume energy and emit. • There are many gaps in the applicant's Project 2 Zero" case. It's "sustainability" and feasibility arguments do not acknowledge current climate science.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S158.001	Desley Curtis	Oppose	The Submission refers to: - The impact on what is currently a relaxed seaside environment to live and play. - That the runway is being extended north instead of south. - The increased noise/more frequent flights over a populated area. - The 30 days for submissions.	Object to the changes 'in their entirety'.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S160.001	David McDiarmid	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club and a rate payer.	Oppose Private Plan Change 30 for the Nelson Airport runway extension.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					The submission refers to: - The effect of the proposed Nelson Airport Runway extension on land owned for 120 years by the Nelson Golf Club, one of the largest green spaces within the Nelson City environs, and the heavy impact its loss would have on the golfing community and the clubs and various organisations and local charities who regularly utilise the Club's amenities. - The Airport authority needs to act as a responsible neighbour and seriously consider alternatives that do not impinge on the leisure, freedom and wellbeing of the golf course and community as a whole. The price the community is expected to pay for the airport authority's profit far outweighs any possible gains the airport can offer the Nelson Golf Club and community that is impacted by this proposal. - Coastal inundation and sinking of land will render the airport unusable in the not-too-distant future. - The alternative southern extension has not seriously explored, and a full report by an independent authority needs to be provided to support their argument. Jenkins Creek has been moved once before. - Residents' loss of security about the value of their properties and being in limbo for the next 10-20 years. - The golfing alternatives for the Nelson Golf Club's current members, who choose to play here due to its central location. The nearest 18-hole course is at Best Island, and that would add further traffic to the road to Richmond which is already at capacity.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S161.001	Nardia Allan	Oppose in part	The submitter and her family are residents of Otterson Street. The submission refers to:	Additional mitigation works on the submitters house.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- Mitigation works on their house (i.e. triple glazing and sound-proof batts in the roof due to the bigger planes and more plane traffic, and new heating if required to get rid of their fire), and any other limitations to the property caused by the proposed upgrade. - Questions if there is a change in pollution caused by aircraft.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S161.003	Nardia Allan	Oppose in part	The submitter and her family are residents of Otterson Street. The submission refers to parking on their street, which is too small, for the safety of children.	A sign preventing parking on Otterson Street.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S163.001	Josh Scotland	Amend	An alternative runway direction, while ensuring Nelson is still an easy and safe airport to fly into, would keep both the golf course and nelson airport happy, and the residents of Tahunanui would appreciate that the aircraft would not have to fly directly over them.	Exchange land and alter the runway direction for the same length of runway and future options to extend it further.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S164.001	Mike Dowers	Oppose	Thousands of people enjoy Tahuna camp which will be destroyed.	That the airport expands out to sea.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S165.001	Debbie Edwards	Oppose	The Submission refers to: - The golf course as a great asset for Nelson. - The effects of extending the airport runway towards Tahunanui, with aircraft noise increasing for the residents of Tahuna and adverse effects on Nelson's tourist attraction Tahuna Beach.	Extend south and reclaim land for the airport extension.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S166.001	Rhonda Dowers	Oppose	Tahuna camp is used by thousands of people who come to Nelson every year and aid the local community with holiday purchases. The existing proposal will take that enjoyment from a lot of people and will impact many local businesses.	Expand the airport over water instead of towards the camp.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S167.003	Tracey and Anna Gordon	Oppose in part	The change in zoning from residential to airport will dramatically reduce the value of the submitters' home.	Extend the airport runway south.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S168.001	Air New Zealand Limited	Support	The submission refers to the role, services and climate crisis response commitment of Air New Zealand (Air NZ) as the national airline. Air NZ generally supports the Project to the extent that it will: a) promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purposes of the Resource Management Act 1991; b) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; c) enable the people and communities of Nelson to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being; d) avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects on the environment; and e) ensure consistency with good resource management practice. The specific reasons for Air NZ's support are: (a) The key objective of the project to enable extension of the existing runway will ensure it can provide for the needs of future (next generation) aircraft types, remove operating constraints by existing aircraft to improve reliability, and improve safety through the Runway End Safety Areas. (b) The need to plan for all future potential aircraft types, in addition to facilitating unconstrained existing turboprop operations. (c) Next generation aircraft technology presents a significant opportunity to reduce domestic aviation emissions. Aotearoa is ideally suited to lead the world in both early aircraft demonstration and long-term deployment due to a domestic network that has many short-range routes, and its largely renewable electricity	Air NZ supports the project and the preservation of the possibility of a future runway upgrade as part of this planning process.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					grid present opportunity for scalable green hydrogen production. Air NZ cannot deliver this technology without the infrastructure required to make this a commercial aviation reality.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S169.001	Hayley Coram	Oppose	The submitter and family live in Otterson Street. The submission refers to: - Proposed noise mitigation works: The late plane around 10 pm and early plane around 6am currently wake their children. The proposal will result in bigger and more frequent planes. They also have concerns with any further limitations on their property. - Will there be any change in pollution rates or air quality?	Sound proof the submitters house with batts in the roof and double glazing.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S170.001	John Adams	Oppose in part	The submitter lives in Parkers Road. The submission refers to: - Clarification on the compensation packages for residents, currently limited to further noise insulation in the submitter's house. - Impact on the value of the submitter's house due to the runway extension and limitations on buildings on his section. It is unacceptable that there is no offer of financial compensation. - The submitter was many years ago involved in preparing the land for the southern extension by removal of the houses, and this influenced his current house purchase.	Decline the airport runway extension to the north, and extend to the south.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S171.001	Joy Montgomery	Oppose	The submitter is a permanent resident at Tahuna Holiday Camp. The submission refers to: - The need for much more information and extensive community consultation on the proposed changes to	Further community consultation especially for directly affected residents.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					discuss all impacts, minimisation of all negative effects, and consideration of any other possible alternatives. - Noise and the impact on revenue streams for Tahuna Holiday Camp, leading to rent increases for permanent residents or, worst case, the camp having to close down.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S172.001	Alyce Graf	Oppose in part	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club. The club has bought the submitter so much joy and opportunity. Connection and appreciation for community has grown more. Charities days - these events not only raise much needed funds but provide local professionals and business networking opportunities to grow businesses. The golf clubs proximity to Nelson CBD is very important. The roading infrastructure between Nelson and Richmond is already under so much pressure in peak hours, making it non-viable to drive to Greenacres golf club after work or in a lunch break. Waahi Taakaro golf club, although it's a beautiful course is only 9 holes and doesn't have the practice facilities required and is very susceptible to flooding and damage. Golf is a growing sport with membership numbers strong & growing. The submitter supports the development and improvement of the airport infrastructure, it's essential to the region, but not at the cost of the golf club and the beautiful green space it supports and occupies.	Oppose due to the impact on the Nelson Golf Club
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S173.001	Zero Carbon Nelson Tasman Inc	Oppose	The submitter has an interest in problems and solutions for the climate crisis in both mitigation and adaptation, and works with councils and communities to reduce regional emissions to limit the global temperature increase to less than 1.5degreesC and build resilience in adapting to climate change. The Submitter has viewed this application from a climate change perspective. The submission refers to the Nelson runway extension	Decline the Plan Change 30, and NAL develops and commits to a dynamic adaptive pathways approach to this project. or If Plan Change 30 is accepted, conditions are added to ensure the Plan Change and runway extension do not increase the use

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					being predicated on a set of questionable assumptions: A. That this would be a wise and just use of our remaining and decreasing carbon budget: The submission refers to the 2018 IPCC Special Report, Aotearoa's role as a CO2 emitter, and various publications referencing greenhouse gas emissions from aviation. A serious omission in the application is it doesn't quantify embedded carbon emissions for extending of the runway, asphalt pavement and RESA. B. That there will be continuous growth of passengers and freight: The submission refers to reduction in GDP growth as fossil fuel is phased out and there are more extensive weather events, natural disasters, behaviour change away from carbon intensive travel etc. C. That future planes will be carbon neutral by 2050: Technological breakthrough to allow carbon neutral long haul flights, and electrification of all planes, is unrealistic. The submission refers to several publications on the matter. D. That the Airport location can be protected from Sea Level Rise: Use of the term "resilience" in the application is questioned, not to keep things are they are but to adapt, learn and transform. E. That the RMA Plan Change legislation is fit-for-purpose to decide this. The submission refers to other NZ national policy documents, new legislation and various planning tools and plans, and suggest the long term plan for the airport should be managed relocation. There is no indication the Airport intends to reduce carbon emissions from its runway and domestic aviation at a rate than complies with IPCC advice or Nelson Tasman Climate Forum calculations, and NLA has not included the carbon budget for the proposed development, so the Submitter has no confidence that	fossil fuel planes.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					the full ramifications for our climate crisis have considered.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S173.003	Zero Carbon Nelson Tasman Inc	Oppose	The submitter has an interest in problems and solutions for the climate crisis in both mitigation and adaptation, and works with councils and communities to reduce regional emissions to limit the global temperature increase to less than 1.5degreesC and build resilience in adapting to climate change. The submitter has viewed this application from a climate change perspective. The submission refers to the Nelson runway extension being predicated on a set of questionable assumptions: A. That this would be a wise and just use of our remaining and decreasing carbon budget: The submission refers to the 2018 IPCC Special Report, Aotearoa's role as a CO2 emitter, and various publications referencing greenhouse gas emissions from aviation. A serious omission in the application is it doesn't quantify embedded carbon emissions for extending of the runway, asphalt pavement and RESA. B. That there will be continuous growth of passengers and freight: The submission refers to reduction in GDP growth as fossil fuel is phased out and there are more extensive weather events, natural disasters, behaviour change away from carbon intensive travel etc. C. That future planes will be carbon neutral by 2050: Technological breakthrough to allow carbon neutral long haul flights, and electrification of all planes, is unrealistic. The submission refers to several publications on the matter. D. That the Airport location can be protected from Sea Level Rise: Use of the term "resilience" in the application is questioned, not to keep things are they are but to adapt, learn and transform.	Decline the Plan Change 30, and NAL develops and commits to a dynamic adaptive pathways approach to this project. or If Plan Change 30 is accepted, a condition is added that requires NAL to measure and publicly report on the greenhouse gas emissions of the construction and operation of the extended runway, including those associated with its ongoing use by all inward and outward bound aircraft.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					E. That the RMA Plan Change legislation is fit-for-purpose to decide this. The submission refers to other NZ national policy documents, new legislation and various planning tools and plans, and suggest the long term plan for the airport should be managed relocation. There is no indication the Airport intends to reduce carbon emissions from its runway and domestic aviation at a rate than complies with IPCC advice or Nelson Tasman Climate Forum calculations, and NLA has not included the carbon budget for the proposed development, so the Submitter has no confidence that the full ramifications for our climate crisis have considered.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S173.004	Zero Carbon Nelson Tasman Inc	Oppose	The submitter has an interest in problems and solutions for the climate crisis in both mitigation and adaptation, and works with councils and communities to reduce regional emissions to limit the global temperature increase to less than 1.5degreesC and build resilience in adapting to climate change. The submitter has viewed this application from a climate change perspective. The submission refers to the Nelson runway extension being predicated on a set of questionable assumptions: A. That this would be a wise and just use of our remaining and decreasing carbon budget: The submission refers to the 2018 IPCC Special Report, Aotearoa's role as a CO2 emitter, and various publications referencing greenhouse gas emissions from aviation. A serious omission in the application is it doesn't quantify embedded carbon emissions for extending of the runway, asphalt pavement and RESA. B. That there will be continuous growth of passengers and freight: The submission refers to reduction in GDP growth as fossil fuel is phased out and there are more extensive weather events, natural disasters, behaviour change away from carbon intensive travel etc.	Decline the NOR, and NAL develops and commits to a dynamic adaptive pathways approach to this project. or: If the NORs accepted, a condition is added that requires NAL to measure and publicly report on the greenhouse gas emissions of the construction and operation of the extended runway, including those associated with its ongoing use by all inward and outward bound aircraft.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					C. That future planes will be carbon neutral by 2050: Technological breakthrough to allow carbon neutral long haul flights, and electrification of all planes, is unrealistic. The submission refers to several publications on the matter. D. That the Airport location can be protected from Sea Level Rise: Use of the term "resilience" in the application is questioned, not to keep things are they are but to adapt, learn and transform. E. That the RMA Plan Change legislation is fit-for-purpose to decide this. The submission refers to other NZ national policy documents, new legislation and various planning tools and plans, and suggest the long term plan for the airport should be managed relocation. There is no indication the Airport intends to reduce carbon emissions from its runway and domestic aviation at a rate than complies with IPCC advice or Nelson Tasman Climate Forum calculations, and NLA has not included the carbon budget for the proposed development, so the Submitter has no confidence that the full ramifications for our climate crisis have considered.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S174.001	Shaun Allan	Oppose	The submitter and family are long-term visitors to Tahuna Beach Holiday Park. The submission refers to: - Being able to cherish and share many more great memories with family at the Park. - As one of the largest holiday parks in the southern hemisphere, it is loved and supported by many people over New Zealand who will be against the proposal. - Why not build the airport out the opposite direction over the mudflats? - Tahuna Beach Holiday Park brings in so many new and	Oppose the closure of Tahuna Beach Holiday Park and Motel for the proposed expansion of Nelson Airport.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					long term campers/customers because it is close to sunny swimming beaches, 15 minutes walk from Nelson City Centre, and a day drives to Mapua, Golden Bay etc.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S176.001	Maree Allan	Oppose in part	The submitter regularly stays at Tahuna Campground. The submission opposes the extension of Nelson Airport over and destroying the largest campground in the Southern Hemisphere that has been operating for so many years.	Extend the Nelson Airport over the water, and not over Tahuna Campground.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S178.001	Wyatt Crockett	Oppose	Extending the runway to the north will: - affect a large number of families, homes and business; - completely devastate the golf course, with the runway splitting the course in half and ruining this amenity enjoyed by so many Nelsonians.	Extend the runway to the south.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S181.001	Kelly Francis	Oppose	No reasons specified.	Extending the runway is bad for Tahunanui and its residents.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S182.001	Dorothy Charles	Oppose	The submitter is an active member of the Nelson Golf Club, using the course three to four times each week. When at the course for a round of golf, the submitter is achieving a good level of exercise in the fresh air and with likeminded people who show friendship. Really good for ones wellbeing. Entire family are members of the Nelson Golf Club. Gives intense pleasure and pride. If the course was to close many generations of Nelsonians will be deprived of the opportunity. Many less Nelsonians lives will be affected not just golfers but Nelson City as a whole.	No matter the cost, the extension to the Nelson Airport Runway must go South.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S184.001	Ronald Argue	Support in part	The Submission seeks that the southern end could be extended with some reclamation of the mud flat, with the access road for Monaco moved to the outer edge of this reclamation and the south of the Nelson runway raised in height. This would move the noise envelope south so not affecting so many residents and perhaps	Extend the southern end of the runway too, so that less extension would be required at the north end.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					allow the Nelson Golf Club to still have a viable golf course.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S185.001	Prudence Bell	Oppose	The Submission states that the proposed runway extension will: 1. Render Nelson's only 18-hole championship golf course unusable, significantly affecting: - tournament and casual use, and the health and well-being, of 700 Golf club members and the 10,000 visitors to the club each year; - over 70 community groups who use the club for community meetings, fundraising and recreational purposes; - users of the club facility as a venue and cafe for weddings, birthdays and social events. 2. Result in increased noise from takeoffs and landings, and lower aircraft approaches, adversely affecting: - visitors and holidaymakers to the Tahuna Beach camp who, when they choose not to return, will have a negative on the Nelson economy; - use of the nearby recreational facilities, parks and beaches, which are part of the jewel in Nelson's crown, made unpleasant, noisy and less enjoyable for users. 3. Significantly increasing CO2 emissions as all users of the golf course will need to travel out of town for golf. 4. Result in Nelson losing many events and therefore visitors and families that the current 18-hole championship course attracts to the region, because nearby golf courses do not have the size and capacity to increase their memberships; or are only 9-hole courses, the nearest being Waahi Taakaro which has been subject to recent weather events that make it unfit for expansion, vulnerable to future events, and expensive to remediate. 5. As Nelson golf course is one of the largest usable	Do not extend the runway through Nelson Golf Course but explore more fully the option to extend in south, over the estuary, where the adverse effect on the lives of ratepayers and people in the Tahunanui and the wider Nelson community will not be as significant.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					green spaces in the City, the proposal will adversely affect the health and wellbeing of: - many current user groups who use the facility for golf, walking, cycling, running and their ease of access to these facilities. - residents living nearby due to increased noise and stress close to residential and other local community spaces. 6. Nelson Charities, who raise many thousands of dollars for local charities, will lose funding. Nelson's Golf Club currently holds 6-8 such events per annum in support of these local charities. 7. Extending to the south could prove to be approximately 7 times cheaper than extending across the Golf course when considering compensating current residents. Their house values will also drop given the lower flying aircraft and increased noise levels, which should be taken into account when considering costs. 8. Without extending on to the estuary any further at the Southern end, there is another 45m of land is available for runway extension. Without proof that future aircraft will indeed even need longer runways, this option should be taken advantage of in the first instance.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S187.001	Noeline Inglis	Oppose	The submission questions the ability to be Net Zero by 2050: - aviation has huge energy needs; - the cost of production and huge volume needed for a proposed move to biofuels means it is likely this will only result in a minimal dilution of aviation gas used; - sustainable aviation fuel whether electric, hydrogen, biogas or other sources of fuel are so far in the future e.g. beyond 2050.	Net zero emissions by 2050.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S187.002	Noeline Inglis	Oppose	The submitter challenges the Airport estimates of cost for the Northern runway extension/run off area, including no provision for compensation to/for:	Land purchase payment.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- members of the Nelson Golf Club for loss of their use of their grounds and buildings. - the businesses destroyed in the loss of the 18-hole Golf Course - improvements made to the Grounds themselves or machinery purchased to do this work. - the value of the Nelson Golf Club, Cafe and Golf Professional business as going concerns, nor any redundancy/loss of income payment to be made to those working there. The estimated costs for the Northern extension are far lower than will become reality.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S188.001	Dan McGettigan	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Course. The submission refers to: - Golf as an enjoyable leisure and social activity. - The significant detrimental effect on the submitter and future generations, as well as the many clubs and organisations who use the club house or enjoy the proximity of this world-class facility. - The Nelson Golf Course and club rooms being rendered unusable for purpose, with 700 members needing to travel to the 18 hole course at Greenacres on an already over congested roading system.	That the proposed runway extension does not impact on the viability of the Nelson Golf Course.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S188.004	Dan McGettigan	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Course. The submission refers to: - Golf as an enjoyable leisure and social activity. - The significant detrimental effect on the submitter and future generations, as well as the many clubs and organisations who use the club house or enjoy the proximity of this world-class facility. - The Nelson Golf Course and club rooms being rendered unusable for purpose, with 700 members needing to	That the MCA is revised to more thoroughly research the viability of a southern runway extension.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					travel to the 18 hole course at Greenacres on an already over congested roading system.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S189.001	Maureen/Mary Thomson	Oppose in part	The submitter is a resident of the Tahunanui Hills and a member of the Nelson Golf club. Aware of how much the beach area, Holiday Camp, the Golf Club and the airport are necessary for the whole region's survival as a holiday destination and for the finances of the Nelson region. To bring aircraft in lower over our valuable recreation areas does not make sense. Involved socially in one of the many social groups who use the club. To carve this valuable asset in two, making it unusable, is simply ridiculous. Have seen little information on an extension to the south bearing in mind that the Port area is all on reclaimed land. Asks that the Council serves all of Nelson and takes time to look thoroughly at all alternatives.	Take more time to think the alternatives through, to enable both the Airport and the Golf Club to coexist as they have done for over a hundred years.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S190.001	Peter Mortimer	Oppose	The Submission refers to: - The substantial effect on the use of the Tahuna Holiday Park due to plane noise. The Park is extremely important for the wellbeing of people as a popular place to holiday. - The 30-day submission period was unreasonable. - The very limited community engagement by Nelson Airport is disappointing.	Object to the proposed Nelson runway extension in its entirety.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Planning Maps	S191.002	Colin Simmons	Oppose in part	The submitter is a retired airline pilot and instructor, and a Nelson resident. The submitter supports the need for the proposed runway extension to 1510m to enable full capacity operation for the ATR aircraft, but questions the need for a 240m RESA at each end of the runway given the options which are available for a reduction in the length of these RESAs without compromising safety. The submission refers to:	Require a re-evaluation of the length of the requested runway extension.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- A RESA of 240m is the maximum distance required by regulation, if practicable. - In the case of international operations, a 240m RESA would provide adequate protection for aircraft up to the size of an Airbus A380. Given that the proposed Runway Extension at Nelson is not long enough to permit the regular operation of current domestic jet aircraft, a 240m RESA to protect ATR aircraft or similar would seem to be excessive and unnecessary. - The Supreme Court case decision overturning the CAA Director's approval of a 90m RESA for the proposed Wellington Airport runway extension, where the Court looked at the question of what is "practicable" as needing to "be addressed in the particular context in which the issue is raised". In the case of Wellington International Airport the largest aircraft operating regularly is the Airbus A350-900 with a maximum Landing Weight of 207,000 kg, more than 900% heavier than the ATR . - Given the wording of the ICAO and CAA Regulations, and the Supreme Court ruling, has NAC applied to the Director of CAA for a lesser RESA than 240m? - As an alternative to a grass or mixed paved and grass RESAs, the submission refers to a newer and more effective material in use called EMAS (Engineered Material Arresting System) used to decelerate an aircraft in an emergency. A very conservative assessment suggests that if EMAS was installed in Nelson the minimum reduction in the length of the RESAs would be 180m (90m at each end). This would significantly reduce the northward displacement of the runway and associated zones. - Any northward displacement of the airport operating zones will inevitably have a negative impact on the	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Tahunanui area for several reasons: a. Noise abatement. Newer aircraft will probably have Electric or Hydrogen powered engines but will still be propellor driven. They will therefore still create appreciable noise, particularly in the take-off and landing phases. b. Possible restrictions on the use of the Motor Camp, the largest in NZ, which is very popular with tourists. The camp also has a large number of permanent residents. c. Possible restrictions within the airport zoning on residents ability to extend or modify their properties. d. Possible limitations on the use of the beach, recently voted as the best, most accessible beach in NZ. e. Possible effects on the Golf Course, another significant recreational facility. The submitter supports the need to extend the runway, which will inevitably necessitate some north eastern extension but requests that the extension is kept to an absolute minimum, consistent with safety, to reduce the social impacts on the community.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S192.001	Katharine Malcolm	Oppose	The Submission refers to: - Flying contributes significantly to climate change. The extension of the runway should not be considered; the intention should be to discourage the public from flying. - The ground on which the runway extension is proposed is sinking, would be subject to liquefaction in an earthquake and will be impacted by sea level rise.	Decline an extension of the Nelson airport runway.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S193.001	Ian Segers	Oppose	The noise will be too loud for the motor camp.	Do not go ahead with airport plan proposal.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S194.001	Gordon Harvey	Oppose in part	The submitter is a member of the Nelson golf club. The submission refers to: - The loss to the Nelson community if the golf club is shut down by the airport purchasing the golf course,. - The course is a world class facility that attracts large	Decline the airport's extension north.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					numbers of visitors, both to play golf and use the facilities that the club provides. - The submitter can see that the runway may need to be extended in the future, but not north into recreational and residential areas where creating further issues. - Nelson City (Central Nelson) is dying because successive councils have made it a less user friendly, easy to access place, with less and less facilities, and without the correct infrastructure to thrive. Shutting down Nelson's premium golf course is yet another piece of essential infrastructure being deleted. It would cost a lot of ratepayers money to relocate Nelson Golf Club but there are no obvious alternative sites for this close to central Nelson. - Extend the runway extension south, where there is ample space and it would be more cost effective to extend than north.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S195.001	Ray Weston	Oppose	The submitter objects due to: 1. Loss of amenity. 2. Increased noise. 3. Extending to the south has not been fully investigated. 4. Loss of amenity for the Tahuna Beach Holiday Park Reserve and Residents, be they long or short term. 5. Loss of recreational facility, i.e. Nelson Golf Club. 6. Other environmental effects.	That the proposed plan change be declined.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S198.001	Alison McAlpine	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club. Consider the impact this proposal will have on many people's lives and the economy of the region. The submitter knows what access to such a beautiful place means to so many. The submitter refers to:	That the decision to alter/close the Nelson Golf Course be reconsidered.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					1. Consideration of future aeronautical engineering plans/designs which may not require longer runway in Nelson. 2. Nelson citizens wellbeing. For over many years this beautiful site has been home to the Nelson Golf Club. It has significantly added /enhanced lives of many thousands of Nelsonians. 3. The high calibre of the course brings many International and National visitors through tournaments and is a major contributor to the economy. 4. The NGC is a significant social setting for many hundreds of Nelsonians on a weekly basis. 5. It provides employment. 6. It is a world class golf course from which Nelson draws huge benefits.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S200.001	James Barbour	Oppose	Environmental impact of noise, visual amenity, safety, and traffic on bordering airport neighbourhood. Indeed, the airport as it is now generating these impacts. The proposed Airport Plan Change 30 will not mitigate these impacts, rather it will make them more adverse.	Decline.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S201.001	Dr Jozef Van Rens	Oppose	- I do not support this plan change in light of the urgent need for climate action and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. - I am part of the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum. I am also an individual who understands that the Climate Crisis is a real crisis and there need to be action on every level of our society to reduce our emissions. - NTCF endorses a reduction in use of aviation to reduce this sector's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions, at a rate of 9% a year to comply with IPCC's advice to reduce net GHG emissions 45% from 2010 levels by 2030. This is not consistent with a need for a new runway. - The application doesn't quantify the embedded carbon emissions for the extension to the existing main runway and associated pavement works. Such quantification is	No specific relief given.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					needed to make judgements on impact the carbon footprint of this construction on the Nelson Tasman carbon budget. - The current location of Nelson airport will experience significant flooding in the future, due to the combined impacts of sea-level rise and land sinking. Investing in a runway extension does not make sense given the airport may need to be relocated.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S202.001	Robin Schiff	Oppose	The submitter does not support the proposal in light of the urgent need for climate action and reducing greenhouse gas emissions: 1.The current location of Nelson airport will experience significant flooding in the future, due to the combined impacts of sea-level rise and land sinking. Investing in a runway extension does not make sense given the airport may need to be relocated. 2.The application doesn't quantify the embedded carbon emissions for the extension to the existing main runway and associated pavement works. Such quantification is needed to make judgements on impact the carbon footprint of this construction on the Nelson Tasman carbon budget. 3.We need a reduction in use of aviation to reduce this sector's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions, at a rate of 9% a year to comply with IPCC's advice to reduce net GHG emissions 45% from 2010 levels by 2030. This is not consistent with a need for a new runway.	Decline the proposed plan to extend the runway to allow bigger planes to land.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S203.001	Steven Crundwell	Support	The submitter believes that commercial aviation is more important to Nelsonians in general than the adjacent golf course recreation. Nelson has poor road connectivity and no rail connection, so commercial aviation is a critical link for Nelson to the rest of NZ and beyond.	Support Nelson Airport's runway being able to expand northwards if required to future-proof commercial aviation options in and out of Nelson.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S204.001	John White	Oppose	The submitter is a current member of Nelson Golf Club. The submission refers to: - The friendships / exercise this club has given, whether playing as an individual - or through supporting the many Corporate Charity Golf events held throughout the year. - There is no other facility that can provide this if Nelson Golf Course closes - Waahi Taakaro is limited by size and weather events; Greenacres is a long commute. - This course caters for the local colleges and primary school programs. The Submitter has young grandsons that he is looking forward to introducing them to the game of golf. Losing this course will deny this chance. - The airport should be extended towards Richmond on reclaimed land, giving all parties the results required.	Oppose the lengthening of Nelson airport through the Nelson Golf Course.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S205.001	Glenn Cheyne	Oppose	No extension is the submitters preferred option considering impacts on the local residents, noise assessment, environmental sustainability, archaeology, ecology, coastal environments, hazards etc. A greater range of options should be considered, including maintaining the existing runway with no runway extension. The extension options from NAL assessments are limited to northern and southern extensions. These limited options predetermine that a runway extension is the only option and the likely outcome. These are the only options considered in noise assessment, archaeology assessment, etc. There is no assessment of a "no extension" or "existing runway" option.	Oppose the extension of Nelson Airport runway.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S205.002	Glenn Cheyne	Oppose	The 30-day submission period is too short. Especially important given the complexity, quantity and length of information. Many assessments have multiple documents each containing detailed, complex and specialist information and data. Also limits submitter's ability and time to "meet with	Extend the time for public submissions.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					other Parties", "exchange views" and " Lodging a joint submission" as recommended by NCC in their letter on 10th June 2023. Feels like the quantity and complexity of information restricts ability to make sense of it and submit, rather than encourage submissions. Also means many in the community cannot read it all, nor comprehend it all.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S205.003	Glenn Cheyne	Oppose	The Nelson Airport - Runway Options Noise Assessment, 9th February 2023, Marshall Day Acoustics, identifies (RONA): - "a large number of people predicted to be highly annoyed by aircraft noise" and "the impact on outdoor living cannot be mitigated". p.16 - "The number of houses impacted by noisy events is 55-64 houses". p.17 - "northern runway extension results in a large number of people experiencing a significant increase in noise" and "an appreciable number of houses experience "noisy events" p.19 - "northern runway extension option scored -2.5 ...partway between moderate and significant adverse effect" p.20 Significant and highly annoying noise levels have been assessed for residential properties. However other facilities are not assessed, including Tahunanui Beach Reserve, Tahunanui Beach Holiday Camp, Nelson Golf Course, Monaco and Waimea estuary. Current nor future increase in jet noise are not considered. Noise assessment does not consider noise and high levels of annoyance from construction of the runway. The RONA report shows an increase in people highly annoyed as aircraft noise increases. It also shows the greater the number of people highly annoyed. This trend	Recognition of highly annoying and significant noise levels in the NAL options. Recognition that noise levels will be greater than NAL noise assessments.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					would indicate that a study completed in 2023 or in 10-15 years would have even higher numbers of Nelson residents highly annoyed. Older studies and outdated reports minimise and downplay levels of annoyance.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S205.005	Glenn Cheyne	Oppose	Measures to mitigate noise will create a ghetto of underdevelopment in Tahunanui. Submitter recommends that night time restriction on engine noise be extended from 11pm to 7am. Recommended hours of sleep range from 7+ hours for an adult to 12-16 hours for an infant. Current nor proposed night time noise restrictions do not meet recommended hours of sleep for any affected residents and greatly impact on sleep for infants through to teens. NAL should acoustically insulate all buildings within the 55db Ldn rather than the suggested 65db Ldn. These measures do not need to wait for planned proposed runway extensions but could be included in a plan change now to mitigate current significant levels of noise from NAL Measures to restrict noise are at minimum levels recommended, however NAL could take, and NCC could plan for greater measures than minimum. This would improve quality of life for impacted residents. The best option to limit noise levels is no extension.	That greater measures should be taken to stop or mitigate noise from NAL.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S205.006	Glenn Cheyne	Oppose	- Sustainability - limited view of sustainability, focusing on economic sustainability, however a broader view, including social sustainability, should view NAL proposals as unsustainable to local communities. - Climate Change - Air travel is a major contributor to climate change. Increasing capacity at NAL contributes to greater climate change and decreases sustainability of Nelson. An extension of an airport close to Tasman Bay is also unsustainable due to future impacts of sea level	Give consideration to other factors.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					rise. -163m vs 370m extension - difficult to understand why a 370m length is proposed for the northern extension, when a 163m extension (half the length) is sufficient for the southern extension. - Conflict of Interest - NCC as an owner of Nelson airport has a conflict of interest representing residents and the airport company. Independent commissioners should not be paid for by ratepayers but by NAL. - Compensation - Air New Zealand could look at measures to compensate residents affected by their aircraft. Air New Zealand have attached a letter of support. However, they benefit from privatised profits of air travel while high levels of noise and annoyance are a public cost to local residents. Air New Zealand could offer greater support by offering affected residents annual credits to compensate for noise.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S206.001	Rob Milner	Oppose	The use of the existing Golf club building(s) facility by Nelson residents for various purposes other than golf is a part of the Nelson population and an accepted social amenity. Quotes the Nelson Golf Club submission, referring to: - over 70 Community Groups that use the facilities at Nelson's Golf Course. Will lose their homes if the plans are approved. - Nelson Golf Club has approx. 700 active members. - raise hundreds of thousands of dollars for charities. It would have a significant knock-on effect to these charities if it was forced to close. - easy access to facilities that make a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of members, visitors, and community groups. The closing of the Nelson Golf Course would put a further burden on the health sector locally. - Nelson's Golf Course is the only 18-hole Championship	Consideration to relocate Nelson Airport be given priority due to land subsidence, rising water levels and the destruction of a perfectly suitable land use such as Nelson Golf Club.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Course in the Nelson region. - Nelson Golf Club land provides the city with one of its largest usable green spaces and adds to the overall aesthetically pleasing appearance of Nelson City, - If people were unable to use Nelson Golf Course they would have to travel out of town, this would place more burden on Nelson's already congested roads and public transport. - There are other options, such as extending the runway south which would have little or no effect on Nelson's Golf Course.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S207.001	Elaine Bailey	Oppose	There will be an increase in noise with additional flights over this populated area.	Choose an alternative location to increase air traffic that does not impact as many homes and businesses.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S208.003	Benjamin Krul	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out to allow for an extension to the north and an extension to the south. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, or if no extension takes place, then the Overlay will be incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	The Airport Effects Control Overlay must stay in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S208.004	Benjamin Krul	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Airnoise Boundary, REr.65.1, REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1 - The proposed wording of the rules means that the new construction of most ancillary buildings, such as a studio, sleep-out, she-shed, play-house would no longer be a Permitted Activity. - The reduction of the target indoor level to 40 dBA Ldn is not necessary.	That the proposed changes should be declined, and that the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- There are technical errors in the proposed Appendix 19.1 - Consideration must be given to consistent rules between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S208.005	Benjamin Krul	Oppose	Rule INr.25 concerning engine testing - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far higher than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	That the proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and the engine testing / Rule INr.25 comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S208.007	Benjamin Krul	Oppose	Compass Swing rule - The testing of aircraft compasses should be subject to the same rules as the testing of aircraft engines. - The proposed new rule does not address the emissions nuisance.	That the Notice of Requirement and the proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected and that Council require the following controls on compass swinging: - It must be carried out downwind of the nearest residential area. - The noise level must comply with INr.25 unless: * The affected residents are given 24 hours prior notice. * The procedure is carried out between 9 am and 3 pm on schooldays.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S210.003	Erena Rowe	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay. - The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out by superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north and for no extension.	The Airport Effects Control Overlay stays in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, then the Overlay will be in incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S210.004	Erena Rowe	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1. - The proposed wording of the Rules will result in far reaching and drastic restrictions on new builds, and will have unintended consequences. - The rules and requirements should be consistent between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	The proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S210.005	Erena Rowe	Oppose	Rule INr.25 -- Aircraft Testing. - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	Proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and engine testing / Rule INr.25 should comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S211.001	Ocean View Body Corporate	Neutral	Disruption to quiet enjoyment of premises.	Confirmation/decision by Council that the extended air pathway will not fly directly over the housing on beach Road Tahunanui, specifically Ocean View Apartments at 33 Beach Road.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S213.001	Craig Orr	Oppose	The proposed plan will not only have a significant impact on the established residential community surrounding Tahunanui, but it will also destroy the long-established Nelson Golf Club. All of which can be easily, and more	Decline the Private Plan Change 30 for the airport runway extension.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					cost effectively, avoided by extending the runway to the southern end, with reclamations.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Planning Maps	S214.001	Brian Coulter	Oppose in part	The submitter opposes the extension of Airport Effects Control Overlay for the following reasons: - The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out by superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north and for no extension. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, then the Overlay will be incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	The Airport Effects Control Overlay stays in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S214.002	Brian Coulter	Oppose in part	The submitter is a committee member of the Nelson Airport Noise Action Council. Has a better understanding than most on these issues, however needs much more to time to comprehend the extremely technical and lengthy Airport proposals. Members of the affected community without this background must be totally confused by it.	The time for submissions be extended.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S215.001	Sean Riordan	Oppose	The submitter is the co-owner of Total Golf (the shop at the Nelson Golf Club) and has a long history with Nelson Golf Club The submitter has huge concern over the airport extension heading north and refers to:	Not build the Airport extension to the North.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- Total Golf is the only Golf retail space in the Nelson region, has been the home of some of the best PGA Trainees that NZ has produced, and is held in high regard to the golfing community. - Total Golf sponsors local clubs and provides employment to 7 staff. - Total Golf is the only source of income of the submitter. - Notes the ramifications on Nelson Golf Club members of the club closing. - History and tradition that will be lost if this proposal goes ahead. - No chance the submitters business (Total Golf) will be able to survive or even be reproduced in a similar fashion because of the current location.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S216.001	Sam Brown	Oppose	Lack of public consideration and the lack of accessibility to the plans especially in Tahuna. Normal consent processes should apply. Current market rates need to be applied, as when this happens our values will drop. It is moving too fast, it is not going to be safe and it is too close to residential areas. Submitters property has a lot of environment issues from the planes already. Very dusty, fuel pollution, and noise pollution, with double glazing and full insulation. This plan is not in the interest of Tahunanui or Nelson and needs to be fully broadcast to the whole suburb and surrounding, and discussion needs to be heard.	Halt the decision, more engagement, and community involvement.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S217.001	Phillip Castaing	Oppose	The argument that the runway is too short to accommodate the sustainably powered aircraft of the future is flawed for the following reasons: 1. Electric or hydrogen-powered airplanes are expected to be the best hopes for low-emission aircraft. However, currently the science to support either of these solutions does not exist. 2. 95% of worldwide hydrogen production is currently generated from fossil fuels. Having aircraft using this fuel would not meet the goal of reducing carbon emissions. 3. Much research and development is still required. 4. As there is no certainty if and when low-emission aircraft will be manufactured, the runway extension will only result in more and/or larger carbon-emitting aircraft using the runway and will contravene the council's climate policy and work against the climate emergency declaration. The airport is situated just above sea level and in an area that is subsiding and experiencing coastline retreat.	The proposed plan to extend the Nelson airport runway be removed.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S218.004	Dharan Longley	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay. - The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out by superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north and for no extension. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome.	The Airport Effects Control Overlay stays in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, then the Overlay will be in incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S218.005	Dharan Longley	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1. - The proposed wording of the Rules will result in far reaching and drastic restrictions on new builds, and will have unintended consequences. - The rules and requirements should be consistent between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	The proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S218.006	Dharan Longley	Oppose	Rule INr.25 Aircraft Testing: - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	Proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and engine testing / Rule INr.25 should comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S222.001	Kevin Seque	Oppose	The submitter is a holiday maker to Nelson and the Tahuna Beach Holiday Park. The submission refers to: - Submission timeline - Councils priority - Councillors - Time and effect - Lack of ratepayer concern by Council The submitter also refers to the following regarding the runway northward: - detrimental effects on the local community and environment. - noise pollution and the resulting reduction in air quality would significantly impact the quality of life for	Opposes the northward runway extension. If a runway extension is established as environmentally viable would be happy with a southward runway extension only.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					residents. - crucial to recognize the value of the amenities that currently exist. Environmental Impact of Northward Extension: 1. Destruction of natural habitats and green spaces. 2. Noise pollution levels. 3. Air quality. 4. Carbon Impact of Northward Extension. 5. Strain on existing infrastructure. 6. Implications for safety and security. Alternative and logical solution: - Extend the runway southward over water would help minimize these adverse environmental effects. - The southward water extension of the runway achieves primary goals for the commercial applicant whilst preserving the natural beauty and quality of life for the inhabitants of the effected locality.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S223.001	Eduard Buyck	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club. Quality of life will significantly deteriorate if the plan is approved. Will reduce the overall attractiveness of Nelson for future generations. The plan indicates that the Nelson Airport Ltd (NAL) intends to construct the runway extension in 10 to 15 years, without NAL taking any current action to mitigate or compensate the Nelson Golf Club at this time. If the plan is approved it will have immediate impact on the operation of the Nelson Golf Club and places it in a poor position for later negotiations.	Decline the plan change.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S224.001	Cath Mackie	Oppose	Information given to the public is not the full picture of what this submission would mean to the local Tahunanui area & all Nelson rate payers. No mentions the fact that they would have to pay to purchase the Golf Club land. This is misleading.	The plan is dismissed in its entirity.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Hundreds of people use the Golf Club on a weekly basis, including from out of Nelson and community groups. The airport has not shown any concern/interest for all the people losing the golf club would effect, including all the staff. No alternative has been offered and the Golf Club has been ignored.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S225.001	John Reid	Oppose	Reliable science tells us in 30-40 years time sea level rises would make the airport unusable. Airports should never be adjacent to residential areas as they interfere with quality of life that all residents are entitled to enjoy. They will also restrict future development and add to noise pollution and traffic congestion.	The proposed Airport Plan change could result in destroying the widely used Nelson Golf Club Course at Tahuna. Many local and visiting golfers would lose access to one of the best courses in New Zealand. Thousands of visitors come to Nelson to enjoy the facility. Hundreds of community groups use these facilities.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S226.001	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association	Oppose	Aware of the important regional benefits to developing the Airport, if implemented, the Plan Change as it stands, will have a profoundly detrimental effect on many Tahunanui and wider Nelson residents. Submitter wants this to benefits all.	Reject the proposed Plan Change as it is currently written.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S226.002	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association	Oppose	Lack of consultation, especially in respect to the Tahunanui community - the nearest meeting was in the Honest Lawyer, Monaco, over 1 year ago. Monaco is not necessarily an easy location for people in Tahunanui to access. Appearance of consultation without truly consulting the most affected residents and businesses. Publicity and public awareness of the Plan Change has been very selective. Very few households made aware of any specific issues within the plan, with only a targeted letter drop to some households, but none to the households in Tahunanui Hills. The information regarding Plan Change has largely been online, key point level only, without any detail or ability	Reject on the grounds of a lack of accessibility and a lack of community engagement, and lack of public consultation regarding this plan change.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					to engage. No hard copies of the Proposal supplied for viewing at the Council or Nellie Nightingale Library.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S226.004	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association	Oppose	Nelson Airport is required to consider all possible alternatives to the northern extension. Why does the Airport need to take so much land? The projected runway extension includes a RESA of 240m at each end on the basis that this is a requirement. Believe this to be a misinterpretation of the actual regulations. There is a disparity between the proposed length of runway extension and the type of aircraft landing at Nelson Airport. The proposed Runway Extension at Nelson to a length of 1510m is not long enough to permit the regular operation of jet aircraft. Given the type of aircraft likely to be operated from Nelson, and the social dislocation in the Tahunanui area resulting from an extension beyond that which is necessary, a reasonable case could be made to the Director General for a reduction in the RESA length. There is a more modern process available using a material known as EMAS (Engineered Material Arresting System), installed at 68 Airports in the USA and 15 more world-wide and is incorporated in proposals for both Wellington and Queenstown Airports. Using data from the current USA FAA requirements a very conservative assessment suggests that if EMSA was installed in Nelson the minimum reduction in the length of the RESAs would be 180m (90m at each end). This would result in a significant reduction in the	Reject the plan for the north-only extension of the runway.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					northward displacement of the runway and associated zones.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S226.005	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association	Oppose	Effect on the Tahunanui beachside village, its businesses, external-non airport development and the value of residents' property values. The restriction of building in the Airport Effects Control Overlay will delay growth. Severe restrictions may be placed on commercial and residential property rights, for an extension that is 10-15 years away, stalling local growth and development of much needed emergency and social housing in a low-decile, highly deprived suburb.	Reject the need for prohibition of new buildings within the Airport Effects Control Overlay as it will inhibit growth of Tahunanui.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S226.006	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association	Oppose	A huge tourist and economic attraction to the Tahunanui seaside village, this Plan's developments will affect the Holiday Park's ability to operate, grow and flourish. The permanent Park residents will lose their right to live there, in the midst of an emerging housing provision crisis. This affects over 100 residents. There can be no caretakers living onsite, affecting camp security and safety. No new buildings will be allowed to be built in the Control Overlay which bisects the camp.	Reject the restrictions on building within the Airport Effects Control Overlay as it relates to the Tahuna Beach Holiday Park.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S226.007	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association	Oppose	All emergency and a high percentage of social housing for Nelson is located in Tahunanui, with very high needs in terms of mental and physical health. Any reduction in the amount of housing available will increase pressure on an already stressed housing market. A lot of these housing placements are located in motels, subverting the motels away from receiving tourists and being economically focused on their traditional activities.	Reject the restrictions placed on building within the Airport Effects Control Overlay as it relates to the provision of emergency and social housing.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S226.008	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association	Oppose	There is a need to maintain quiet times for residents and businesses nearby. A curfew is needed to minimise noise, e.g. Queenstown Airport - hours of operation 6am-10pm, no scheduled flights before 7am. There is no evidence that future aircraft will be quieter. Propeller noise will still exist, which generates most of the airport noise, with increased air traffic volumes residents and local businesses will be subject to increased noise.	Reject the lack of an Airport Curfew in this plan.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S226.009	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association	Oppose	Residents moved into their homes with the reasonable expectation of quietly enjoying their outside spaces and pursuits. This provides people with social, emotional, spiritual and physical connection with the environment. Tahunanui Beach - a huge social, recreational and sporting location for all of Nelson. The Tahunanui beachside village provides the community with the opportunity for passive leisure spaces, the opportunity to unplug and connect. The proposed development will be very intrusive and will affect this jewel in the crown of Nelson. Likewise, the reasonable right to enjoy your home's backyard which is the quintessential Kiwi way of life. Residents will lose the power to make decisions or make changes to their own properties. Increased airport noise and particulate matter will be disruptive to households enjoying their outdoor spaces, planes will be flying closer to their homes and more frequently, and this will have an impact on the enjoyment of their version of the Kiwi dream.	Reject the overriding of existing residents' right to quiet enjoyment of their own homes and area.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S226.010	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association	Oppose	This isn't acceptable, as it will curtail another very popular recreational facility in the Tahunanui beachside village.	Reject the impact on the Nelson Golf Course's land.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S226.011	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association	Oppose	Under this Plan Change, the Airport is given disproportionate power to develop other activities - Airport Zone, Diverse Activities, 10.10.2, Pg 88 - allowing accommodation, recreation, retail business to be developed. This will be competing against the City of Nelson and Tahunanui businesses, and gives permission without the normal checks and balances any other developers would have to fulfil. It is uncompetitive and will adversely affect retailers in Nelson City and Tahunanui.	Reject the disproportionate power proposed to be handed to Nelson Airport to develop other activities inside its zone.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S227.001	Jennifer Allan	Oppose	The submitter is a Tahunanui Holiday Park user and submission reasons include because of: 1. How popular and well supported the Nelson Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is. 2. Many businesses near to Nelson Tahuna Beach Holiday Park would lose a huge amount of customers if the campground were to close. 3. The expected increased noise and more frequent flights over a populated area with the expansion of the airport.	Oppose the closure of Nelson Tahuna Beach Holiday Park for the expansion of the Nelson Airport.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S228.001	Yvonne Harvey	Oppose in part	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club. The Nelson Golf Club has been in that particular area for many years and owns its own land, which is virtually flat. It is also the only Links course in the Nelson region which brings in a lot of tourists to play on the course. Many people use the golf club for rehabilitation for many issues from physical, mental and social issues due	The airport extension extend out into the estuary of Monaco.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					to the course being virtually flat. Nelson's infrastructure hasn't been thought out very well over the years and has caused a lot of businesses to move away from the Nelson City area. It would be a shame to take the golf clubs land and cause many other issues too - the camping ground and many homes.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S229.001	Elizabeth Dooley	Oppose	Submitter read that the airport is steadily sinking, so perhaps it's in a bad place. Lots of airports are built some way from the city so having the airport away from where people live would be best because of the noise and pollution. No point in extending the runway. Nelson and Tasman councils are both struggling with repair bills caused by flooding and suspects this will end up being another.	Refuse the Plan Change because of the noise, pollution, emissions and the fact that the land is waterlogged.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S230.001	John Dore	Oppose	Against extending the runway to the North due the social detriment to Tahunanui beach and aspects of sensible runway extension. Tahunanui beach is a social community gathering location for many people. Points against extension to the North; - Noise pollution to Tahunanui beach and greater population density, - Sea bird hazard to aircraft, - Easterly turbulence from Britannia Hill causing unstable approaches, - Natural costal erosion from Northey swells in climate change, and - Sand base strata for runway upgrades. Why is the extension not to the South? Submitters refers to: - Future aircraft	Runway extension to the South better solution. Opposed to extensions to the North.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- Aircraft equipment type - Jet future verses propellor - Commercial aspects. In conclusion to mitigate unnecessary runway extensions: - Best fit aircraft type to runway. - Frequency as opposed to capacity and weight. - RNP approaches for better noise abatement. - RESA and clearways over naturally clear areas.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S231.001	Tracey Harrison	Oppose	Submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Course. Incredible benefits the course brings to the members, visitors and local community in general. Given its location in Tahunanui, it's easy to see how it has become a focal point for both members and visitors alike. Loss of the club would mean a 45 mins drive to the nearest 18 hole alternative and would surely place a higher demand on road users. This addition may well prove too greater burden for some of the older member. This would affect their well-being and mental health.	Reconsider the option to build the runway extension to the south rather than north.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S233.002	Juliet Randle	Oppose	Submitter did not receive any notification of the proposed Private Plan Change 30 until the last possible 21 day minimum time frame. - The proposed wording of the rules means that the new construction of most ancillary buildings, such as a studio, sleep-out, she-shed, play-house would no longer be a Permitted Activity. - The reduction of the target indoor level to 40 dBA Ldn is not necessary. - There are technical errors in the proposed Appendix 19.1. - Consideration must be given to consistent rules	That the proposed changes should be declined, and that the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S233.003	Juliet Randle	Oppose	- The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far higher than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	That the proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and the engine testing / Rule INr.25 comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S235.001	Mark Dowson	Oppose	The affect on the Nelson Golf Club would be for it to close down. Resulting in a negative affect on its members.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S236.001	Doug Osborn	Oppose	Insufficient thought has been given to future growth in both residential and leisure activities for this area. The timeline for submissions is far too short for proper opposition to be organized and coordinated.	Decline the application for the change.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S238.001	Mark Shearing	Oppose	Against extending the Nelson airport to the North and cutting into the golf course. It would be better to extend to the south where you will not affect anyone at all. The golf course is a well known golf club that has numerous people coming from out of town to play golf. Also extending the runway to the North will have a negative financial impact on the Tahunanui Holiday Park. This park is probably one of the biggest accommodation providers in Nelson, if you lose this as accommodation, you will then in turn lose a lot of visitors to Nelson. It has a great community atmosphere and contributes a lot over the holiday season with visitors. If the holiday park has to shut down due to the extension it would not be worth having the airport as you will have lost so many visitors to the region. It makes far more common sense to extend going south over the estuary.	Not extend the Nelson Airport runway to the North and only extend to the South.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S239.001	David Farnsworth	Oppose	The Applicant has not provided sufficient compelling evidence of a need for the plan changes within the next 10 to 15 years. The reasons advanced are superficial and speculative as future aircraft developments are not clear. Existing carriers want changes now because of present constraints but any changes to meet these needs must await the shape of changes which may emerge in 10 or 15 years time. Development in Tahunanui may face a constrained future as a result. Essentially what is the need for these changes now?	That the plan change does not adversely affect or limit future development in Tahunanui.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S240.001	Jacqui Tyrrell	Oppose	Based on data that is likely to change radically in the next decade. Climate change is not mentioned in the documents but it is possible that Monaco will no longer be viable as a place to live due to sea level rise, which would change the weightings on which the preference for the northern extension option is based. The noise created by the northern extension option would impact the whole of Tahunanui. Tahunanui School would be subject to increased noise levels. The Tahunanui Beach Holiday Park seems to be not taken into account. It is a very busy place in all seasons. Any plan change that impinges on its ability to provide good-quality facilities will affect large numbers of people. The impact of the northern option on this asset would be huge. Tahunanui Beach has been growing in popularity in all seasons. Seen no recognition in the application of how the northern option would impinge on the pleasantness of the beach as a place for recreation - although loss of access for boaties is one of the undesirable features of	Delay the Plan Change for at least 5 years and preferably 10 years.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					the southern option. Many more dog-walkers and beachcombers than there are boaties.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S241.001	Shirley James	Oppose in part	The proposals lack clarity about the "real life" differences between the existing airport noise corridor and airport effects contour, and the changes to these contours under the proposed plans. I still do not know whether we are expecting more planes, heavier planes, noisier planes or just closer planes.	Defer acceptance of the planned changes pending information which is more accessible to a nonprofessional audience.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S241.002	Shirley James	Oppose in part	The Tahunanui Beach Holiday Camp is not recognised as residential under the terms of this proposal despite the presence of a significant number of homes permanently located on this site and the presence of temporary visitors' accommodation which is of huge benefit to the Nelson community and tourist industry.	Recognition of Tahunanui Beach Holiday Camp as a residential area under the terms of this or any alternative airport proposal.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S242.001	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities ("Kāinga Ora")	Oppose	The Nelson City region is a priority for Kainga Ora to reconfigure and grow its housing stock, 20 of which are in the proposed Air Noise Boundary (ANB) and Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO) identified in PPC30. Housing supply issues have made housing less affordable and as such there is an increased demand for public housing. The application states Nelson Airport meets the definition of nationally significant infrastructure and is consequently identified as a qualifying matter of the National Policy Statement on urban Development 2020 (NPSUD). Qualifying matters are only relevant considerations for Tier 1 authorities, whereas NCC is a Tier 2 authority. The NPSUD does not direct that the expansion of nationally or regionally significant infrastructure is of greater importance than its broader objectives. The properties that will be impacted by the proposed ANB and AECO are located in Tahunanui and Stoke, which are established urban areas with many employment opportunities, well-serviced by existing and planned public transport and where there is high	That the proposed objectives and policies are amended to provide a more focused direction on managing the effects of airport noise on ASAN, rather than 'protection' approach which seeks to avoid ASAN. Kainga Ora seek a less restrictive policy and rule framework that enables ASAN in the AECO, providing it does not undermine the efficient operation use and development of the Nelson Airport and the effects can either be avoided, managed or mitigated.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					demand for housing and for business land in the area. Specific reasons for the submission: a. The NoR and PPC, as proposed, have the potential to adversely impact the ability of people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing. b. The amended provisions set an exceedingly high bar which renders all ASAN in the AECO unlikely and largely unobtainable. c. The provisions as proposed unreasonably hinder future residential development which might otherwise be compatible with nationally and regionally significant infrastructure. d. The proposed changes will unduly limit the ability for Kainga Ora to develop more intensive residential development on its landholdings affected by the ANB and AECO. e. Both the NoR and PPC30 have the potential to place a mitigation burden on private landowners by not proposing to adequately mitigate any increases to existing airport noise effects on adjoining sensitive activities as a result of the proposal. f. Insufficient evidence is provided within the Assessment of Alternatives regarding the potential long-term noise effects on surrounding communities. g. There is insufficient consideration of, and assessment against, the National Policy Statement on urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD). h. There is a need for a more balanced approach within both the NoR and PPC30 in relation to the enablement for ASAN.	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					i. NAL is seeking a policy and consenting framework that does not align with the broad direction of the NPSUD and is adopting a narrower 'reverse sensitivity' based approach than envisaged by the operative NRMP with an emphasis on the avoidance, rather than the management and mitigation of adverse effects.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S242.002	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities ("Kāinga Ora")	Oppose	The potential adverse effects associated with residential activity in these areas are consistent, identifiable and largely predictable. In the circumstances, it is possible to provide for residential development and remove density requirements, where compliance with acoustic insulation standards are met and if necessary a Discretionary activity status introduced with targeted criteria to enable the assessment of specific effects. This would be a more measured and appropriate means of achieving a mixed-use framework whilst still safeguarding the Nelson Airport as nationally and regionally significant infrastructure. A Discretionary Activity would open the process for any and all matters to be considered, which is what Kainga Ora understands is desired and intended by the policy framework. Additional reasons for the submission are as set out for submission 242.001.	That both documents are amended to provide a permitted and enabling pathway for ASAN within the ANB and AECO through: i. The incorporation of permitted standards relating to acoustic insulation. ii. The removal of the proposed Prohibited activity status for new ASAN in the ANB and the Non-complying activity status for new ASAN in the AECO. Kainga Ora consider these activity status overly restrictive and seeks that the activity statuses are amended to Discretionary Activity.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S242.003	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities ("Kāinga Ora")	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for submission 242.001.	Include provision for a Restricted Discretionary Activity for non-compliances with the rule framework and include associated matters of discretion with a clear focus of relating to effects on the amenity and health of ASAN.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S242.004	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities ("Kāinga Ora")	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for submission 242.001.	Retain the operative framework for those areas outside of the 60 dB contour, as set out in the NRMP and does not provide any framework of rules or constraints with the District Plan for ASAN relating to noise

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
						emissions below 60 dBn Ldn
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S242.005	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities ("Kāinga Ora")	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for submission 242.001.	Provide and enable opportunities for appropriate ASAN in locations where it can be demonstrated that there will not be significant adverse effects (including in relation to noise and reverse sensitivity effects). Kainga Ora seeks an evidence-based and effects-focused approach is required and considers that this is more appropriate to provide the flexibility for ASAN to be enabled within the ANB and AECO as part of a wider consideration of urban form and land supply.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S242.006	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities ("Kāinga Ora")	Support	Reasons are as set out for submission 242.001.	Support proposed Objectives DO11.1, DO14.1 and Policy DO15.1.1 as they provide flexibility to enable ASAN within the proposed ANB and AECO with appropriate mitigation.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S242.007	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities ("Kāinga Ora")	Oppose	Policy DO11.1.2 directs the avoidance of ASAN with the proposed ANB and AECO. Kainga Ora considers that the avoidance approach is not necessary or appropriate. It does not appear to presently provide sufficient flexibility for the optimisation of infill development and intensification in line with the broader objectives of the NPSUD. Additional reasons for the submission are as set out for submission 242.001.	Delete Policy DO11.1.2.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S242.009	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities ("Kāinga Ora")	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for submission 242.001.	Further or other relief, or other consequential or other amendments, as are considered appropriate and necessary to address the concerns set out in the submission.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S243.001	Geoffrey Thornton	Oppose	Opposes the airport runway extension to the north because of the detrimental impact on the Tahunanui Holiday Park and Beach communities.	No decision specified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S244.001	David Tighe-Umbers	Oppose	If approved, the effect of this plan change on the Tāhuna Beach Holiday Park, is likely to be fatal. Increased noise will deter many campers from visiting Nelson, and the inability of the campground management to perform any building development without the approval of Airport management is untenable. Effect on residential property owners in the new overlay areas is also untenable, as the devaluation of their properties from being unable to develop them as normal is an unacceptable infringement on property owners' rights. Extending the runway to the south would have a far lower impact on airport neighbours. Environmental concerns being used as an excuse to rule out this option is frivolous, as the amount of coastline affected is an immeasurably tiny fraction of New Zealand's total coastline. Given the several years that Nelson Airport has had to research and prepare PPC30, allowing only 20 working days for public submission is totally undemocratic. Nelson City Council is supposed to be working for the residents of Nelson, who ultimately employ all of the Council.	Decline Proposed Airport Plan Change 30.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S245.001	Bruce Higgs	Oppose	The submitter owns property in Parkers Road, in the affected noise overlay. The increase in daily aircraft movements over this time, together with the change of aircraft types has made it unpleasant to be outdoors and creates the necessity to keep doors and windows closed at times, particularly over the summer months. Should a runway extension to the North proceed the aircraft will be flying lower over our property which is obviously going to cause more noise disturbance and	If an extension is required extend to the south which will have less effect on landowners.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					thus affect one's health and well-being. It will then become an unacceptable nuisance. Mischievous to claim that the extension is not for the capability of larger aircraft to operate from Nelson Airport in the future. Has the liquefaction and sea level rise data been considered in the extension proposal? If the northern extension went ahead as proposed it would have the effect of devaluing our property. The proposal doesn't factor in any considerations to landowners for this. Proposal states that whilst extending to the South was considered there were ecological considerations and therefore the preferred option is extending to the North. Obviously, more value on sea/estuary life than human health.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S246.003	Isabella Merschdorf	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay. - The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out by superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north and for no extension. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, then the Overlay will be in incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	The Airport Effects Control Overlay stays in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S246.004	Isabella Merschdorf	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1. - The proposed wording of the Rules will result in far reaching and drastic restrictions on new builds, and will have unintended consequences. - The rules and requirements should be consistent between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	The proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S246.005	Isabella Merschdorf	Oppose	Rule INr.25 -- Aircraft Testing. - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	Proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and engine testing / Rule INr.25 should comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S247.003	Gerhard Merschdorf	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay. - The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out by superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north and for no extension. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, then the Overlay will be in incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	The Airport Effects Control Overlay stays in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S247.004	Gerhard Merschdorf	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1. - The proposed wording of the Rules will result in far reaching and drastic restrictions on new builds, and will have unintended consequences. - The rules and requirements should be consistent between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	The proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S247.005	Gerhard Merschdorf	Oppose	Rule INr.25 -- Aircraft Testing. - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	Proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and engine testing / Rule INr.25 should comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S248.003	Andrea Merschdorf	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay. - The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out by superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north and for no extension. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, then the Overlay will be in incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	The Airport Effects Control Overlay stays in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S248.004	Andrea Merschdorf	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1. - The proposed wording of the Rules will result in far reaching and drastic restrictions on new builds, and will have unintended consequences. - The rules and requirements should be consistent between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	The proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S248.005	Andrea Merschdorf	Oppose	Rule INr.25 -- Aircraft Testing. - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	Proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and engine testing / Rule INr.25 should comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S249.003	Beachside Villas Motel	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay. - The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out by superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north and for no extension. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, then the Overlay will be in incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	The Airport Effects Control Overlay stays in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S249.004	Beachside Villas Motel	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1. - The proposed wording of the Rules will result in far reaching and drastic restrictions on new builds, and will have unintended consequences. - The rules and requirements should be consistent between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	The proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S249.005	Beachside Villas Motel	Oppose	Rule INr.25 -- Aircraft Testing. - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	Proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and engine testing / Rule INr.25 should comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S250.003	Marco Poetsch	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay. - The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out by superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north and for no extension. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, then the Overlay will be in incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	The Airport Effects Control Overlay stays in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S250.004	Marco Poetsch	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1. - The proposed wording of the Rules will result in far reaching and drastic restrictions on new builds, and will have unintended consequences. - The rules and requirements should be consistent between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	The proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S250.005	Marco Poetsch	Oppose	Rule INr.25 -- Aircraft Testing. - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	Proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and engine testing / Rule INr.25 should comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S251.001	Damon Coursey	Oppose in part	The submitter has holidayed at the campground for 47 years. It's a family tradition and a home away from home. The campground is so beautiful that it would be a huge shame to put in place restrictions which will impact the campground. Strongly urge to reconsider making any changes that would impact the campground.	Object to changes in their entirety.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S252.003	Helena Merschdorf	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay. - The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out by superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north and for no extension. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome.	The Airport Effects Control Overlay stays in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- If the extension takes place to the south, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, then the Overlay will be in incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S252.004	Helena Merschdorf	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1. - The proposed wording of the Rules will result in far reaching and drastic restrictions on new builds, and will have unintended consequences. - The rules and requirements should be consistent between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	The proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S252.005	Helena Merschdorf	Oppose	Rule INr.25 -- Aircraft Testing. - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	Proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and engine testing / Rule INr.25 should comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S253.003	Dominik Berghamer	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay. - The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out by superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north and for no extension. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct	The Airport Effects Control Overlay stays in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, then the Overlay will be in incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S253.004	Dominik Berghamer	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1. - The proposed wording of the Rules will result in far reaching and drastic restrictions on new builds, and will have unintended consequences. - The rules and requirements should be consistent between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	The proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S253.005	Dominik Berghamer	Oppose	Rule INr.25 -- Aircraft Testing. - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	Proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and engine testing / Rule INr.25 should comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S254.001	Dylan Mackie	Amend	The submission queries whether the extension is intended to support larger aircraft. The longer runway does allow them and, as a business, why wouldn't they want bigger aircraft, perhaps not today, but in five years?	If these changes are not to allow larger aircraft, why not have that specified in the plan?
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S254.002	Dylan Mackie	Neutral	The submission addresses the process of communicating changes. Is there regulation around businesses that can advertise about a plan change? The process would be strengthened if any notice, explanatory website etc had to be lodged with a central authority which kept a full record. Examples are given in the submission. This would be of immense use for understanding how these	No decision requested.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					types of changes develop in terms of community awareness and understanding.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S254.003	Dylan Mackie	Neutral	I thank the airport for making provisions for lower emissions aircraft, such as anticipated battery or hydrogen powered craft, but question whether such a goal of lowering emissions will carry over into decisions made in the intervening years around increasing the number of flights or changing aircraft types.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S255.003	John Murray	Oppose	The submitter is a Tahunanui Hills resident and past Board member and Nelson City Council business adviser to the Tahuna Beach Camp Inc (TCBI). The submission refers to: - The 30 day submission period, without meaningful community consultation, is an extremely poor approach, as opposed to working with the Tahunanui Community and affected parties to arrive at a new Masterplan that provides a better balance between the Airport's ambitions and community outcomes. - Evaluation of options under Sec 171(1)(b) RMA: The application has failed to meet the requirements of Sec 171 for the reasons set out below. - Alternative options have not been adequately assessed: NAL has only considered two options. Constructing a brand-new runway on the existing airport site not using the existing runway or constructing a brand new longer runway on a new site. Moving the Airport is a very valid option as in the long term the presumption of "no jets" doesn't fit with a growing City / Region with strong tourism aspirations, and climate change concerns indicate there is significant risk developing at the Airport at the current site. NAL has not considered the use of EMAS (Engineered Material Arresting System) to reduce the length of runway and runoff area required, meaning far fewer people would be impacted by noise or loss of amenity.	The outcome that would best meet the stated objectives of NAL would be to extend the runway to the South but incorporate EMAS to reduce the overall length of land required, thus obviating the need for any reclamation of the Waimea Estuary. Any increased noise would be directed over water, would affect the least number of residents and have the least effect on Nelson Golf Club. As financial viability does not appear to be a concern, any cost implications should be ignored. The Plan Change - Option A, should therefore be rejected as provided.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- Economic modelling is inadequate and has not recognised the substantial costs being imposed on the community: The economic modelling does not adequately describe the Airport operation after development, in comparison to today's operation, and therefore the impact of the development cannot be properly assessed. It would be reckless to approve this plan change, which will impact the community, when there is a high probability that the Airport will not ever undertake the work, either because it's not financially viable or the "yet to be designed electric or hydrogen planes" don't require the increased length of runway as purported. Those economic costs on the community affected by the northern extension have been omitted and not factored into NAL's options assessment, including: 1) Economic effect on businesses 2) Loss of amenity 3) Loss of property value 4) Loss of development potential and associated environmental cost 5) Unquantified effect on health and wellbeing of community The submission refers to the community costs, including the business costs (1) on Tahuna Beach Holiday Park (TBHP) and Nelson Golf Course. In relation to (2) Loss of Amenity from the increased NAL nuisance is creating, neighbouring communities will suffer loss of amenity that hasn't been valued. The submitter refers to the existing noise impacts from the airport, how this will increase and the impacts of this on them as residents. NAL shows a dismissive approach to impacts on the airport perimeter walkway. If not re-instated, that is another cost to recreational users. No economic value has been placed on these amenity values in assessment of between Options A and B, nor the inevitable loss in property value (3) that will be experienced by properties affected.	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- The assessment between Option A and B is flawed: The Multi-Criteria Assessment ("MCA") is flawed and should be disregarded. In reaching this conclusion the submission refers to: - lack of consideration of the issues raised above; - the credibility of a 13 point score difference for landscape values (refer to examples in full submission); - multiple counting of issues with reclaiming the land required for the southern option when scoring economic and feasibility; - speculation over the presence of estuarine soils and their potential for settlement effects appears multiple times in the Geohazards scoring (and speculation should have been removed by testing). - Inadequate investigation has occurred to allow for meaningful cost comparisons: The cost estimates for Option A and Option B, including a contingency allowance, are specified in the full submission. These contingency allowances (of 15.5% to 74.4% of the base cost) render the cost comparisons almost meaningless. The costings relating to the Southern option haven't been investigated properly, compromising any ability to accurately make a cost comparison. NAL has not clearly outlined its intentions: The development proposal appears based on several assumptions which have a high risk of not being true. NAL needs explain how this investment will work, physically and financially, before further consideration is given to disrupting many people in the community. Why NAL needs the new OLS and Aircraft Noise Contours to be in place before the runway extension is constructed is not explained. Changing these designations seems premature and impactful on the community, when the extension may never occur.	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S255.005	John Murray	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S255.003.	If the Plan Change - Option A is accepted then: Any noise level increases (changes in decibel levels) should not be accommodated as there is no proof provided by NAL that this change is needed.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S255.007	John Murray	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S255.003.	If the Plan Change - Option A is accepted then: Noise Airport Noise between 12am and 6am should be banned.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S255.008	John Murray	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S255.003.	If the Plan Change - Option A is accepted then: Consideration given to restricting and/or reducing Airport activity at peak traffic times on State Highway 1 until its accumulative effect is ascertained and understood.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S256.001	William Freeman	Oppose	Council cannot consider this application as it is a shareholder in the Applicant company.	Council appoint an independent commissioner to hear the Plan Change.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S256.002	William Freeman	Oppose	The Plan change seeks to decimate the existing golf course (Holes 1, 9, 10, 18), club house and ancillary buildings, by extending the runway to the north. The submission refers to: - Nelson Golf links being one of the oldest clubs in NZ, its rank and reputation throughout NZ. -The personal impact of the northern extension (and on friends), the submitter having been a member since 2005 and regular player, benefiting their physical and mental health at a course 10 minutes drive from home. - Nelson Golf Course as the only championship course in the Nelson area, and the loss of money raised for local	Plan change be rejected

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					charities (Big Brothers Big Sisters, Fifeshire Foundation, Summit Rescue helicopter, Hospice).	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S257.001	Brett Parr	Oppose	The economic assessment: - is too narrow in scope, - fails to address the economic effects of the runway extension over Tahunanui Beach, - only deals with costs of construction, cost of buying private land, of the options. The north option has significant impact on the beach/holiday park - what is the cost of that vs going south?, and - needs to be more comprehensive in order to provide a better outcome for generations to come.	Decline the application (based on the evidence submitted).
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S258.001	Artur Zaiko	Oppose	The submitters own two properties in Golf Road. The submission refers to: - the short submission period and need for further investigation; - noise and vibration from planes, and the fact existing double glassed windows and 300mm of ceiling insulation is not helping - Nelson Airport's proposal to insulate the houses is good but what if you're outside when a plane lands? - the Airport's lack of a clear plan (the submission includes a transcript of the submitter's questions and answers of a staff member at the airport, refer full submission); - NCC needs to be independent in its research and decision; - approving the extension will destroy Tahunanui as a beautiful place to be and develop, a nice community and its beaches - the airport can extend another side, to the sea.	Council must consider all aspects of this proposal. In general: the statistics of the planes traffic since the airport was built; the noise rules; the risks.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S259.001	Geoff Moffett	Oppose	The submission refers to: - impacts on Nelson Golf Club have not been defined or properly considered, there is no cost/benefit analysis of these impacts within the options - the golf course would be decimated by the plan - loss of an 18 hole facility within 30 minutes of the city, a	Decline the plan change

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					venue for social groups, an important social venue and focal point, and money raised for charities - extension of the runway to the south would have far less impact on the golf course and hundreds of residents of Tahunanui.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S261.001	Noeline Inglis	Oppose	The submission refers to: - the submission period and the detail of information to be analysed by affects residents and the Nelson Golf Club; - many residents and landowners in Tahunanui will be affected by building restrictions, reduced property values, and the ability to enjoy and develop properties inside the described zones - Nelson Golf Club will be precluded from being able to build new access to perhaps a 9 hole course, and building a new club house and facilities will be impossible as most of the remaining land will be within the overlay coloured lines.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S262.001	Dave Hall	Oppose	The submission refers to: - the dramatic & detrimental impact on Nelson's premiere golf course, one of the only private green areas in Nelson; - the many millions of dollars its visitors bring to the Nelson economy; - the negative impact on the health and wellbeing of players, the tourism sector and charities (such as the Cancer Society, the Rescue Helicopter, Nelson Hospice, Big Brothers and Sisters, and Fifeshire Foundation) if it is lost; - the lack of convenient alternative golf courses with the capacity to take on the Club's 700 members, and added traffic congestion if people travel outside of the Nelson region to play golf; - other options available to extend the runway - land south of the runway that would be suitable and substantially cheaper (up to 7 times cheaper) than extending through the Golf Course land.	Decline the plan to extend the runway through the Nelson Golf Club land.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S266.001	Julia Mak	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S266.002	Julia Mak	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S266.003	Julia Mak	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S266.004	Julia Mak	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S266.005	Julia Mak	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO).	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S266.006	Julia Mak	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S266.007	Julia Mak	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S266.011	Julia Mak	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S266.013	Julia Mak	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S267.001	Andrew Dravitzki	Oppose in part	The submitter is involved in the Nelson Business community and fully endorses the fact that Nelson Airport needs to be capable of providing for the local business requirements. Nelson does need the airport to continue to grow and support its local community. The submitter is also a member of the Nelson Golf Club. The course is very well regarded, a key part of Nelsons 'recreational offering", centrally located, the only 18 hole golf club in Nelson City where residents can play competitive golf. To support the northern runway extension, the submitter requires information on: - the need for the extension i.e. why is it required and what are the benefits? - the cost of the northern extension, and alternative solutions which are less expensive and/or disruptive to the community; - Nelson Golf Club compensation for the loss of land/facilities, and any NCC obligations in modifying the current course or relocating the current facility.	Further investigation is to be undertaken and information to be provided before plan change is undertaken which would allow Nelson Airport to pursue northern extension of runway and therefore severely impact Nelson Golf Club in its current form.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S268.001	Elaine Fenton	Oppose	The submitter strongly objects to the extension North which affects the Nelson Golf Club and will also affect submitters family financially and their happiness. The Wellington Airport has over many years successfully extended their runway into Lyall Bay and Cook Strait, so why can't Nelson Airport do the same thing South on land already owned.	Cancel the proposed extension North.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S270.001	Charles Mackie	Oppose in part	The submitter has been a member of the Nelson Golf Club for 4 years and is concerned about the effects of closure of the Club due to the proposed airport runway extension. The submission refers to:	Golf to remain as is with the airport seeking other options for their potential extension.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- his personal and the local community's well-being and benefits from the Club, as a recreational facility and also for its sense of community, enjoyment, and a place to spend quality time; - implications for the accessibility and convenience of golfing opportunities in the region, especially for those who rely on the close proximity of the Nelson Golf Club and given the absence of other courses of comparable quality; - repercussions for the local economy and tourism industry, including the loss of a valuable revenue stream, job losses, the diminished overall appeal of Nelson as a golf destination and its affect on the local economy and reputation of the city. - effects on money for local charities - exploring alternative solutions that would allow the club to continue its operations while addressing the airport's needs. By safeguarding the Nelson Golf Club, you would not only be upholding the interests of its members but also preserving a treasured community asset that contributes to the overall well-being and sense of belonging for many residents.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S273.001	Keith Robertson	Oppose in part	This submission acknowledges the critical importance of the Airport to our region, and that a longer runway is required to accommodate regional growth, future aircraft and safety requirements, but would like NCC to require the applicant to fully explore the option of extending the runway south. The submission refers to: - at this stage limited engineering investigation and feasibility has been completed on either option; - both options should ultimately be decided not by the applicant but by a public consultation process, once both options have been fully investigated, as after all the Airport is a public asset owned by the people of the Nelson and Tasman Regions.	For the applicant to undertake a full and comprehensive feasibility on both airport extension options (north & south). That these options together with the completed engineering and feasibility reports are submitted to the public for consultation before a final decision on the extension is made.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- the Nelson golf club which will be adversely impacted (or destroyed altogether) by an extension north - this offers considerable amenity value to the Nelson region, has a full and active membership, and benefits the community for its usable green space, exercise and enjoyment for an aging population, tourism, charity fund raising, sporting and coaching opportunities for local school children - and these factors should be considered in a full and comprehensive evaluation of both options.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S274.001	Simon Hassan	Oppose	The submitter plays golf (important for his health and well-being) and opposes the proposal to take land from the Nelson Golf Club for the runway extension unless similar quality replacement facilities can be provided adjacent to those parts of the existing course and facilities that will be lost.	Either the airport: (a) lengthen its existing runway to the south, leaving the golf club untouched, or (b) (i) moves its grass runway about 100 metres to the east and gives the land this frees up - together with existing land to the to the west, together with sufficient cash to enable the golf club to (ii) develop replacement golf holes and other facilities (such as clubhouse, greenkeepers' sheds, pro shop, access, car parks, practice areas, etc) to at least the standard of what was lost.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S275.001	John Boyland	Oppose in part	The camping ground is iconic to Nelson - beach, recreation, activities, the ultimate chill out. The submitter spent their childhood year visiting the camping ground and has just been back for third holiday in 3 years. It has amazing activities close by e.g. Natureland, mini golf etc.	Don't interfere with the camping ground.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S276.001	Lynne Cooper	Oppose	The decision is loaded in favour of the north option. Extending south would be the better option even if it is more expensive - there is more flat land, less impact on residents and the golf club. If they want to extend the airport at least make it capable of landing jets. Under the proposal there will be no golf club and residents will be left with homes that are worthless.	A change in the decision to go ahead with the extension.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S277.001	John Blake	Oppose	The submitter has been a member of Nelson Golf club for 18 years, and is opposed to the runway extension north. The submission refers to the technical specifications on length of runway for aircraft that currently operate out of the airport (the Q300 requires 1180m, the ATR requires 1315m and the proposed ES 30 which only holds 30 passengers requires 1100m, which are all under the length of the current airport runway 1347m) and questions why the runway is being extended at all? Why not extend to the south, where the airport is purchasing properties. The submission refers to Wellington extending their runway into the sea. This would have less cost to rate payers and less impact on the local community. and the Golf club which is a community hub.	Oppose the proposal to extend the runway north.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S278.001	P Rene	Oppose	The submitter does not support the extension of the Nelson Airport to the north of its current site, and associated land and spatial precincts, due to reverse sensitivity effects and potential effect the activities of the communities north of the current airport site.	That consideration, be seriously given, that any extension of the existing airport site, spatially be to the south, of its current site.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S280.001	Wayne Black	Oppose in part	Residents in the Outer Limit of Airport Effects Control Overlay will be subject to more noise and larger craft which will impact negatively for those concerned. Also concerned about the potential increase in the noise from more private jet aircraft flying in and out of the airport.	To provide noise mitigation compensation for residents in the Outer Limit of Airport Effects Control Overlay; or Orientate the proposed runway to the north-west to reduce noise for residents in the Outer Limit of Airport Effects Control Overlay.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S282.001	Aaron Webby	Oppose	There has not been enough factual work and research on how the airport extension would affect the whole community of Tahunanui, including the golf course and use of its facilities. The Club provides the submitter with physical and mental exercise.	The Council should refuse the submission altogether.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S283.001	Nelson Transport Strategy Group Nelsust inc.	Oppose	The submitter is not against flying (refer to full submission for reasons for and against this) but does not support extending the runway. Initially at least electric planes are likely to be smaller requiring shorter runways, and the airport has no long term future in this location due to a combination of sea level rise, ground subsidence and sand foundations. The submission refers to: 1) The airport in its current location has no future. Recent information from NIWA has shown that the land is moving down in this area at around 2mm/year. This makes the present sea level rise of 4mm/year actually 6mm per year. The full submission refers to and describes a site specific graph to demonstrate this. The airport was flooded before the new terminal was completed, and subsidence, sea level rise and increased numbers and intensity of storms will mean this will become increasingly common and difficult to protect against. 2) Airport land is liquefaction prone. A significant earthquake will potentially destroy the runway, taxiways and the new terminal. 3) Runway extension allows jets with their extra pollution. Although the present airport administration strenuously denies that the runway extension is to allow jets to use the airport, this would be made easier by the runway being lengthened. The submission refers to fuel efficiency and lower carbon of the turboprop aircraft that currently use the airport and the additional climate warming effects from high altitude emissions from jets. This climate forcing from jets would still occur with "Sustainable Aviation Fuels" as it still results in combustion byproducts including water vapour deposited into the upper atmosphere.	Reject the plan change.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					4) Carbon emissions from building the runway extension are significant. As the ground is basically sand, it will require significant foundations and this comes at a significant carbon cost (e.g. excavation machinery fuel; quarrying, moving and compacting stone; the asphalt/concrete surface). This carbon expenditure is not warranted where the runway will have a limited life. Suggestion that the extension might be necessary for electric aircraft is unconvincing given that electric aircraft will be smaller short range aircraft. 5) Only a decrease in flying is consistent with climate emission reductions. 6) Carbon offsets are false equivalents: Carbon emissions from a fossil fuelled plane take many years to be reabsorbed by trees. We need zero net emissions now to avoid dangerous climate tipping points.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S284.001	Christopher Whitaker	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S284.002	Christopher Whitaker	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S284.003	Christopher Whitaker	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S284.004	Christopher Whitaker	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S284.005	Christopher Whitaker	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S284.006	Christopher Whitaker	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S284.007	Christopher Whitaker	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S284.011	Christopher Whitaker	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S284.013	Christopher Whitaker	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S285.001	Bernadette Whitaker	Oppose	Please see appendix one, two and three from Tahuna Holiday Park submission. It will degrade the Tahunanui community through air pollution, chemical pollution and create slums of the future here in a culturally diverse and relatively low socioeconomic.	Reject the plan.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S286.002	Jacqueline McLeod	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay - The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out by superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north AND for no extension. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the	The Airport Effects Control Overlay must stay in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, then the Overlay will be in incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S286.003	Jacqueline McLeod	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1 - The proposed wording of the Rules will result in far reaching and drastic restrictions on new builds, and will have unintended consequences. - The rules and requirements should be consistent between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	The proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S286.004	Jacqueline McLeod	Oppose	Rule INr.25 - Aircraft Testing - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	The proposed Private Plan Change 30 should be rejected, and engine testing / Rule INr.25 should comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S286.005	Jacqueline McLeod	Oppose	Aircraft Engine Testing All aircraft engine testing must be included. In the case of single-engine aircraft the engine is not "on-wing". The testing of aircraft engines removed from the aircraft must be included. It is neither acceptable nor logical to allow any exclusions from the limits on engine testing.	Delete the definition of "Aircraft Engine Testing".
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S286.006	Jacqueline McLeod	Oppose	The words "Residential activities" encompasses everything carried out on private residential property.	Replace the words "Residential activities" with the words "The occupation of

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					The effect of this definition and proposed Rules REr.65 and REr.65A would mean that all new buildings on private residential property within the Airport Effects Control Overlay would require a Resource Consent. "Building" is defined in the Building Act S8(1)(a) and with few exceptions includes any construction. Decks, artist's studios, children's play-houses, garden sheds and even dog-kennels and bee-hives are all "buildings". As proposed by Nelson Airport Ltd the construction of these would require a Resource Consent.	habitable rooms".
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S286.007	Jacqueline McLeod	Not Stated	A new Rule is required regarding Nelson Airport noise reporting - AIRPz.xxx There are no noise-reporting requirements in the NRMP for Nelson Airport Ltd. The monthly noise-reporting requirements for Port Nelson Ltd ARE set out in the NRMP. Nelson Airport Ltd provides noise-reports to the Nelson Airport Noise Environment Advisory Committee, however these are vague and incomplete. Nelson Airport Ltd should provide noise-reports in a manner and format that is consistent with those provided by Port Nelson Ltd. The onus should be on Nelson Airport Ltd to demonstrate compliance with the noise limits in the NRMP, rather than on residents to demonstrate non-compliance.	That a new Rule is included in the NRMP drafted below. "Nelson Airport Ltd will report quarterly to Nelson Airport Noise Environment Advisory Committee and to Nelson City Council to demonstrate compliance or non-compliance with all the noise limits set out in the NRMP (or its successor), using assessed AND measured.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Planning Maps	S287.001	Jason Maxted	Oppose in part	The submitter opposes extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO) for the following reasons: - The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. - The proposed AECO has been laid out by	The Airport Effects Control Overlay must stay in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north AND for no extension. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, then the Overlay will be in incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	extension at both ends.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S287.002	Jason Maxted	Oppose in part	The submitter opposes the changes proposed to the building controls within the Airport Effects Control Overlay, Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1, for the following reasons: - The proposed wording of the Rules will result in far reaching and drastic restrictions on new builds, and will have unintended consequences. - The rules and requirements should be consistent between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	The proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S287.003	Jason Maxted	Oppose in part	The submitter opposes the roll-over of Rule INr.25 - Aircraft Testing for the following reasons: - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	The proposed Private Plan Change 30 should be rejected, and engine testing / Rule INr.25 should comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S288.001	Dennis Goodman	Support in part	This as a safety issue, and long overdue. For aircraft such as ATR72 the current runway is at least 250 metres short. The submission then refers to: - the runway could be extended up to 100 metres to the	I'd like the Council to support this change.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					southwest, otherwise all or part of the extension will have to go northeast; - all relevant parties need to get their heads together and come up with a solution that is agreed by all parties, AND preserves the golf course as a full 18 hole course, even if some holes are repositioned OR a new golf course is constructed at a new, suitable location e.g. the Wakapuaka sand flats area.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S289.001	Dennis Malcolm	Oppose	The submission includes an attachment titled "Airport North Extension with Southern Link under Runway" which summarises the hopes that Council must have used to come to this plan change. This change is based on hopes and dreams and is all rubbish. It should not be built as the area is sinking and sea level rising.	The Airport should make no change nor should the Council.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S290.001	Linda Atkins	Oppose	Submitter opposes the plan change as it will disturb many households in the area with increased planes and extreme noise 7 days and nights a week all year. The submitter lives near the airport in Golf Rd and it is already very noisy from 6 am to 10 pm or later. Submitter would like to know more details about where it will go to, what times it will be used, will there be larger louder planes, where will the airport assist with double glazing. Submitter thinks the airport should be relocated away from residential areas in the country and away from sea level rising.	Reject the application to extend the runway.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S291.001	Joseph Adams	Oppose	Submitter opposes the extension of the runway north due to the air noise boundary significantly impacting the Tahuna Beach Holiday Park which hosts 1000s of guest a year and has been running for 97 years.	The runway extension should be partly made of sand in the over shot zone like they have done in Queenstown as this will reduce the air noise boundary and not impact so harshly on the Tahunanui community.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S292.001	Sharon Brinsdon	Oppose	The extension makes no sense in the face of climate change. The submission refers to: - Council has declared a climate emergency;	Council rejects the extension proposal.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- the current airport is threatened by sea level rise and flooding; - aviation is a major contributor to emissions, as will be the construction of the extension; - if less emitting planes are developed, there is not enough certainty as to their runway requirements to warrant the major financial and environmental cost of the extension; - impacts on the current golf course and perimeter walking area.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S293.001	Dow Family	Oppose	The submitter's family has been camping at Tahuna beach for 20 years, and prior to this as a child. Tahuna camp is a South Island icon with generations camping year on year, for many it is the sole holiday they are able to afford, and it is a safe affordable family camp that needs to be treasured and protected for future generations. The local economy benefits immensely.	Save this kiwi icon (Tahuna Camp).
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S295.001	Vining Investment Properties Limited	Oppose in part	The submitter has property interests and investments in land and land development in the Tahunanui area, and opposes any part of the proposed plan change and notice of requirement that will adversely affect land use and enjoyment for residential and commercial users in the area, including any changes that will restrict building heights different to current rules, noise effects, and the adverse effects of jet aircraft landing in Nelson which is the logical commercial interest underpinning the construction of a runway extension.	Building height restrictions are not changed.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S296.001	Ocean Views 2004 Limited	Oppose in part	The submitter has property interests and investments in land and land development in the Tahunanui area, and opposes any part of the proposed plan change and notice of requirement that will adversely affect land use and enjoyment for residential and commercial users in the area, including any changes that will restrict building heights different to current rules, noise effects, and the adverse effects of jet aircraft landing in Nelson which is the logical commercial interest underpinning the construction of a runway extension.	Building height restrictions are not changed.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S297.001	Muritai Property Investments Limited	Oppose in part	The submitter has property interests and investments in land and land development in the Tahunanui area, and opposes any part of the proposed plan change and notice of requirement that will adversely affect land use and enjoyment for residential and commercial users in the area, including any changes that will restrict building heights different to current rules, noise effects, and the adverse effects of jet aircraft landing in Nelson which is the logical commercial interest underpinning the construction of a runway extension.	Building height restrictions are not changed.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S298.001	Anthony Vining	Oppose in part	The submitter has property interests and investments in land and land development in the Tahunanui area, and opposes any part of the proposed plan change and notice of requirement that will adversely affect land use and enjoyment for residential and commercial users in the area, including any changes that will restrict building heights different to current rules, noise effects, and the adverse effects of jet aircraft landing in Nelson which is the logical commercial interest underpinning the construction of a runway extension.	Building height restrictions are not changed.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S299.002	Simon Williams	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Nelson Airport Runway Extension, referencing the reasons below: - Nelson Airport is not a nationally significant airport, it's a small regional airport and its current runway is underutilised. - The submission attempts to link safety to the runway length. The airport has been certified for use by New Zealand's aviation approving authority the CAA as fit and safe to operate, and Air New Zealand and other commercial operators (Origin Air, Sounds Air and past operator Jet Star) are all happy and able to operate from it. - Woodbourne, and international aviation hubs at Wellington and Christchurch, are readily capable of taking large multi jet engined planes.	Council acts in the best interest of Nelson and its environs and not allow an unjustified extension to the Nelson Airport runway by declining the Private Plan Change 30 submission.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- The proposal is founded on the need to be ready for the "next generation sustainably powered aircraft". Currently in New Zealand and globally there is no industry wide identified replacement aviation power source to internal combustion and jet engines, and a move to electric or hydrogen solutions is flawed because there is not enough network generation and distribution capacity in New Zealand. The implementation of either needs to be development by Government, not a minor regional ratepayer owned airport company. - The assumption that electrical battery powered aircraft will need longer runways is flawed. By the time commercially viable electric planes are available both the battery energy density and electric motor torque capacity will have evolved to a level consummate with current aviation platforms. - The use of hydrogen as an aviation fuel supply is fraught with uncertainties, due to its highly combustible nature/inherent safety risk, need for an industrial scale generation capacity etc, so hydrogen is very unlikely to be the future fuel of choice for the aviation industry. - Use of biofuel is a much more realistic vision of future aviation power supply, and would not need an extension to the existing runway in Nelson. - The arguments in the submission to extend the Nelson Airport runway are flawed and spurious if not downright deceitful.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S300.001	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	The submitter is a resident in Tahunanui. The submitter has reviewed all the application documentation and provided detailed commentary on: - Planz Consultants report - in particular notes conflicts of interest held by NCC, areas they support, where they question or contend statements or information, and have provided comment on consideration of alternative	Reject PPC change in its entirety.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					options. - Attachment K1, Options Assessment (Noise) - notes that they find this report skewed towards making sure the Northern Extension is the preferred option. Would like to see these findings verified by another Acoustic/Noise expert. - Attachment K2, options Assessment (Noise) - questions a number of statements made in the report. - Attachment M - Airbiz Options Assessment - notes that the Airport are worried about the aerial and chimney on properties on Golf/Parkers Road. The noise will be extreme. - Attachment O - Multi criteria assessment - notes that some weightings are unfair and need to be reassessed. In addition, the submitter refers to: - RESA - the clear distance will be reduced to approximately 240m, being the RESA requirement, which concerns the submitter. - Nelson Golf Club - The loss of holes along with severing the clubhouse from the golf green by losing a large parcel of land to the runway extension will severely impact the Golf Course. If this extension goes ahead it is not just the golf club, golf members and golf visitors to the region that will lose out, but the many clubs and charities that also use the Golf Club Facilities. - Environmental and heritage aspects of Tahuna Bach Camp - These plan changes will diminish the Environmental and Heritage aspects of Tahuna Beach Camp, a campground where affordable summer beach family holiday experiences are synonymous with Nelson. If you allow these NoR and PPC changes to go ahead then you are ignoring this Tahunanui Community.	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S300.005	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	Activities Sensitive to Noise (ASAN) (Residential activities, education facilities, flight training, visitor accommodation, health facility) 'Activities sensitive' is mentioned throughout the PPC and NoR and it seems another tool NAL have used to blanket ban anything they oppose.	Reject - we are a community with these facilities as a right
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S300.006	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	"Aircraft Operations" - Jets are a concern and are not included in this definition.	Reject or state airport operations do not include jets
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S300.007	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	"Building Supplier" - because this is not considered an airport activity	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S300.008	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	"Farming and agricultural supplier" - because this is not considered an airport activity	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S300.009	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	"Garden and landscape supplies" - because this is not considered an airport activity.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S300.010	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	"Office Furniture" - because this is not considered an airport activity	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S300.011	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	"Residential unit: means a single self-contained household unit, used principally for residential activities, whether by one or more persons, including accessory buildings. Where more than one kitchen facility is provided on the site, there shall be deemed to be more than one residential unit." Need to add that this could also include a granny flat, caravan, motor home, sleepout, tiny home or any other unit that is used to reside in.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S300.012	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	"Trade Related Activity" - because this is not considered an airport activity.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S300.013	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	"Visitor Accommodation" - because this is not considered an airport activity.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S300.014	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	"Yard Based Activity" - because this is not considered an airport activity.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.015	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	AD11.3.13 Airport effects overlay: "to protect the airport from reverse sensitivity effects by restricting development of activities sensitive to airport noise" - Reject as too restrictive.	Reject as too restrictive.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.016	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	AD11.3.13 a) Air noise boundary - oppose increase to 65Ldn (from 60Ldn)	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.017	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	AD11.3.13 a) Air noise boundary - new activities are prohibited - oppose.	Reject as too restrictive
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.018	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	AD11.3.13 a) Air noise boundary: "the Airport Operator is also required to manage its operations so that limit specified for the air noise boundary is not exceeded". An external body needs to measure this which includes members of the community.	Reject. An external boy needs to measure this which includes members of the community not the operator.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.019	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	Proposed changes to Chapter 3 - Rules in the plan also restrict the density of housing in ANB to avoid increasing the number of residential units.	Reject as too restrictive
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.020	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11 - Air transport: "The noise and amenity issues in regard to air transport arise from many of the issues discussed in chapter 4". But chapter 4 is not provided therefore reject.	Reject - information not provided.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.021	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1 Air transport a): "managing the effects of noise and other potential adverse effects on the community to appropriate levels". Doesn't say who manages.	Reject - needs to be external body to manage noise effects.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.022	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1 Air transport b): "ensuring land use around the airport does not result in reverse sensitivity effects"	Reject - too restrictive
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.023	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.i "ensure that the development of activities sensitive to airport noise do not preclude or restrain the efficient or effective operations"	Reject - too restrictive

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.024	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.1 "social wellbeing" - mentioned here but not taken into consideration so how can they expect to recognise it in the future.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.025	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.1.ii "to enable the wellbeing, health and safety of the region's people and communities" - mentioned here but not taken into consideration so how can they expect to recognise it in the future and independently review this.	Reject.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.026	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.2 - Reverse sensitivity "Nelson Airport's role and operations are protected from the development of incompatible activities and associated reverse sensitivity effects by: a) avoiding new activities sensitive to airport noise (using overlays) and b) managing intensification of activities sensitive to airport noise (using overlays) through density controls and acoustic treatment (including ventilation". This is totally restrictive by putting a blanket control over the community and what they can do with their homes and their properties including subdividing, renovations, building and the mitigation of acoustic and ventilation measures are being forced on home owners with the onus on them to prove they need it from the Nelson Airport, again where is the external body that will measure this, it should not be the Airport Operator.	Reject - totally restrictive and the airport having a blanket control over people, property and the community and no external body to measure effects.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.027	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.2.i "Nelson airport represents an important national and regional asset that should not be compromised by the development of new or intensification of activities sensitive to airport noise." The Links Golf Course is a national and regional asset and the Tahuna Beach Camp is an environmental taonga and is one of Nelson's valuable heritage sites. Both important national and regional assets that should not be compromised by the NoR and PPC.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.028	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.2.ii "If not carefully managed through land use controls, the development of new, and intensification of existing ... As acoustic treatment and ventilation does not mitigate all adverse effects (particularly on the outdoor environment), it is appropriate to manage development in areas surrounding Nelson Airport in a way that does not result in development (or increased intensity) of land uses that are incompatible with Aircraft Operation." This is totally restrictive by putting a blanket control over the community and what they can do with their homes and their properties including subdividing, renovations, building and the mitigation of acoustic and ventilation measures are being forced on home owners with the onus on them to prove they need it from the Nelson Airport, again where is the external body that will measure this, it should not be the Airport Operator. NAL should not be allowed to use this plan change to silence the community to NAL's future plans by blanket banning any 'activities sensitive'.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.029	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.2.iii "Rules regulating the establishment and / or density of Activities Sensitive to the Airport Noise (ASAN) by reference to the Airnoise Boundary and Airport Effects Control Overlay on the Planning Maps." Another reference restricting what the community can do on their own properties. This provision references the 2 overlay which are based on the extension and therefore submitter rejects.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.030	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.2.iv "Rules requiring acoustic insulation and ventilation as associated with either Replacement or substantial alterations for existing Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise within the Airnoise Boundary and Airport Effects Control Overlay." Another restrictive provision referring to the mitigation measures the community will have to adhere to but NAL is the body that measure this and under this PPC NAL	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					will enforce this but the onus is on the people to prove and NAL may or may not financially assist, all unfair to the community.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.031	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.3 Management of noise from Aircraft Operations and the receiving environment: "Noise from Aircraft Operations should be managed to ensure that a reasonable balance is achieved between the operational needs of the Nelson Airport over time, and the amenity values and well being of the community. What is reasonable balance? Who measures this? Is it an independent body with Community Members on the panel? Wellbeing of the community is not being taken into consideration now, how can this realistically be assessed in the future with the lack of consideration shown now?	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.032	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.3.i Explanations and reasons: "Nelson Airport has produced projected aircraft noise contours for its operations, including expected growth levels. These noise contours form the basis for managing the effects of aircraft noise on the surrounding community in a manner that enables Nelson Airport to meet its operational needs, while also managing effects on the well-being of the surrounding community." If managing the well-being of the surrounding community involves making the occupants housebound with their windows shut in their 'acoustically insulated' house with a 'ventilation' system installed so they get to breathe fresh air whilst trapped in their home, then I reject NAL's idea of managing effects and therefore this policy.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.033	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.3.ii "A specific approach to the measurement of aircraft noise is required because of the nature of the noise effects. The standardised approach of using aircraft noise contours to meet the needs of communities throughout New Zealand has been adapted to provide for managed growth of Nelson Airport over	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					the life of the Plan." What are the measures and how will they be implemented - this is needed in detail, not some brush stroke comment that it is standardised managed by a specific approach.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.034	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.3.iii "Experience indicates that, in the absence of a "best" technique for Reject managing airport noise and the effects of airport noise from Aircraft Operations noise, a range of approaches is needed which is specific to the circumstances of the area. The range of possible responses, and the allocation of responsibilities can best be handled through an ongoing consultative process between the Airport Operator, the Council and the community." This needs to more descriptive, there needs to be many community representatives from different areas elected by the community. What is 'best' technique? What is the consultative process? etc Is this NANEAC or a separate group that will monitor the management and compliance of noise limits?	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.035	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.3.iv "Requirements in Designation DAA2 on the Airport Operator to ensure monitoring, management and compliance with specified noise limits." This contradicts D011.1.3.iii. Now the Airport Operator is to ensure compliance? The Airport Operator can compile the data to be passed on to the Compliance group which includes members of the community, is this NANAEC?	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.036	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.3.v "Requirements in Designation DAA2 on the Airport Operator to prepare and manage noise from Aircraft Operations in accordance with a Noise Management and Monitoring Plan." Which should then be overseen by the Compliance Group, and who is the compliance group?	Reject as is - need to include an independent overseeing body in the provision.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.037	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.3.vi "Requirements in Designation DAA2 on the Airport Operator to prepare and implement an Acoustic Mitigation Programme for eligible Residential units." Eligible residential units? (As mentioned above residential units definition needs to change) Eligible? Any property that is effected as a right should be mitigated. The onus should not be on the owner, they are existing, therefore NAL should offer to remedy without exemption and there should be no end date, as owners/tenants change they still have the right to ask for remedy any building that was existing from date of PPC, and by an independent body not the Airport Operator.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.038	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.4 noise management and mitigation: "The Airport Operator will maintain a Noise Management and Monitoring Plan for airport activities." Not the Airport Operator. It should be an independent body with community elected community members being the majority on the panel.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.039	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.4.iii (although numbers incorrect so reads DO11.1.5.iii): "Regular monitoring of airport noise" - How is this measured? How often is this measured? Please describe "regular" and include how the "monitoring" will be achieved.	Reject - more description needed.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.040	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11.1.4.vi (although numbers incorrect so reads DO11.1.5.vi): "Five yearly independent compliance audits of aircraft noise management and monitoring at Nelson Regional Airport (as set out in Designation DAA2 air noise boundary controls)." Five yearly? No way, it should be yearly. Too long for the community. D011.1.4.iii says regular, and an audit will form part of that regular monitoring, this is totally contradictory and not in my definition of regular.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.041	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11e - Where are the audits, the airport monitoring data, noise complaints from residents, council records on airport records on airport noise, any monitoring and compliance reports as they are not provided as attachments. Where are these reports and audits so we can see how well NAL complies now.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.042	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO11e.2 environmental results anticipated and performance indicators: "No increase in the Low density development of Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise in the vicinity of airport Airport Effects Control Overlay and Airnoise Boundary. Insulated residential units." NAL should have no say as to whether owners wish to add a granny flat or subdivide their section.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.043	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	D015.1.1 - encouragement of infill; and DO15.1.1.i - explanation and reason. Sounds encouraging but the devil is in the wording in red. However I would like to add The Nelson Golf Links and The Tahuna Beach Camp are both nationally and regionally significant environments and both historically valuable to Nelson and will go further to say the camp is one of Nelsons environmental taonga and should be considered sacrosanct as one of Nelson's valuable heritage sites. Therefore I reject the PPC and NoR in all its entirety as they diminish both the NGC and TBC. Infill? Infill will be prohibited under the PPC.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S300.044	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	DO16.1.1.9 Airport zone and DO16.1.1.xv Management of resources by location Because in Chapter 2-Interpretation the airport related activity definition has changed with the definition of what comprises an airport related activity to include anything including retail and commercial activities and industry associated with the needs of airport passengers, visitors and employees, ancillary offices and the aviation activity definition to be included as "including (but not	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					limited to... any activity associated with commercial, recreational ..." and then go further to add in particular definitions: Building Supplier, Farming and agricultural supplier; Garden and landscape supplies; Office Furniture; Trade Related Activity; Visitor Accommodation; Yard Based Activity. These are all commercial activities beyond the scope what we associate with an Airport. This is a red flag that screams competition and makes me believe that NAL have something in the pipeline that they wish to develop and will be in direct competition to the community that same community that NAL prescriptively want to monitor and manage.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.045	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	REr.64 Airport Effects Control Overlay, Airnoise Boundary and Port Effects Control Overlay Minimum site. "REr.64.1 a) In the Airport Effects Control Overlay, Airnoise Boundary and the Port Effects Control Overlay, every residential unit must have a net area of at least 600m2 allocated exclusively to it within the site." It is time to reassess this restrictive 600m2 ruling which is unreasonable in this day. We are encouraging infill so there are more people walking and busing rather than building further out of Nelson and driving in cars. Why is 600m2 still in here as a rule?	Reject and remove
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.046	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	REr.65 Airport Effects Control Overlay - Permitted REr.65 Airport Effects Control Overlay - Non complying Totally restrictive and unfair to make non complying which is essentially prohibiting any new build as no RC will be given. Totally restrictive and unfair to prohibit any new build. To stop the owner of a property building anything on their own land is beyond reasonable. Where is the offer of compensation for doing this? If this went ahead NAL would have to compensate all owners the loss in value of their property due to the increase in aircraft noise and nuisance plus this ruling which will	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					make the land useless and worthless; too loud to be outside to use for enjoyment and unable to be built on; effectively making the land outside of the building footprint worthless. And if owners no longer wish to stay on their property because of these restrictions then NAL should have to pay them out the full valuation of the property as at the date before the new rules take place. What financial contribution does NAL offer owners to install these acoustic insulation and ventilation requirements placed on them to mitigate noise that NAL should keep under control, including the demand of assigning an experienced acoustic engineer. These are financial barriers when really they should be provided by NAL at NAL's cost. These measures are all based on Future aircraft noise contours based on future planes that have not been invented.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.047	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	REr.65A Airnoise Boundary, Activities Sensitive to Noise - Permitted REr.65A Airnoise Boundary, Activities Sensitive to Noise - Prohibited Totally restrictive and unfair to prohibit any new build. To stop the owner of a property building anything on their own land is beyond reasonable. Where is the offer of compensation for doing this? If this went ahead NAL would have to compensate all owners the loss in value of their property due to the increase in aircraft noise and nuisance plus this ruling which will make the land useless and worthless; too loud to be outside to use for enjoyment and unable to be built on; effectively making the land outside of the building footprint worthless. And if owners no longer wish to stay with their property because of these restrictions then NAL should have to pay them out the full valuation of the property as at the date before the new rules take place. What financial contribution does NAL offer owners to install these acoustic insulation and ventilation	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					requirements placed on them to mitigate noise that NAL should keep under control, including the demand of assigning an experienced acoustic engineer. These are financial barriers when really they should be provided by NAL at NAL's cost. These measures are all based on Future aircraft noise contours based on future planes that have not been invented.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.049	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	SCr.71 - for the very same reasons I reject REr.65 and REr.65A	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.050	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	INr.20 - For the very same reasons I reject REr.65 and REr.65A	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.051	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	OSs.7.i Permitted Activities: Tahuna Beach Camp (TBC) is an affordable, summer beach, family holiday destination where basic camping, in tents or caravans, has been a pastime and a privilege enjoyed by generations of families who have come from all areas of New Zealand since this Beach Camp was established in 1926. For some families this is the only opportunity they have to experience the beach, swimming in the sea and enjoying and breathing in the fresh sea air. Not all of us have a bach or live near the sea. TBC is truely an environmental taonga of Nelson. This PPC will totally diminish TBC's use and severely impact their ability to function as a camp to the point that TBC will cease to exist. Camping and short term living accommodation are not permitted and are prohibited from the date the runway is operational. Only replacement of buildings with all the severe restrictions associated is permitted, any new buildings are prohibited therefore making the Camp powerless to upgrade, enhance or improve the camp. Absolutely reject this proposed addition under permitted activities. Where is the plan to re-home the 116 residents of the	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					camp as they will no longer be able to reside at the camp?	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.052	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	OSr.23 Caretaker accommodation. Caretaker accommodation under the AECO is non-complying or prohibited under ANB. Most visitor accommodation providers have managers that live on site.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.053	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	OSr.53 Airport Effects Control Overlay, Activities Sensitive to the Airport. This is a blanket cover that is completely restrictive and unfair. Non- complying in this instance is as good as prohibited as a resource consent will not be granted. To non-comply any new build is unjust, restrictive and unfair. To stop the owner of a property building anything on their own land is beyond reasonable. Where is the offer of compensation for doing this? If this went ahead NAL would have to compensate all owners the loss in value of their property due to the increase in aircraft noise and nuisance plus this ruling which will make the land useless and worthless; too loud to be outside to use for enjoyment and unable to be built on; effectively making the land outside of the building footprint worthless. And if owners no longer wish to stay with their property because of these restriction then NAL should have to pay them out the full valuation of the property as at the date before the new rules take place. What financial contribution does NAL offer owners to install these acoustic insulation and ventilation requirements placed on them to mitigate noise that NAL should keep under control, including the demand of assigning an experienced acoustic engineer. These are financial barriers when really they should be provided by NAL at NAL's cost. These measures are all based on Future aircraft noise contours based on future planes that have not been invented.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.054	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	AIRPz.22 Activities Sensitive to Airport Nose Interesting ... building new is permitted in airport environs precinct.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S300.055	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	Policy AIRPZ.P3 activities in the airport environs precinct. Red flag!	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.059	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	SCr.71A - for the very same reasons I reject REr.65 and REr.65A	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.060	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	INr 20A - For the very same reasons I reject REr.65 and REr.65A	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.061	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	INr.67 - For the very same reasons I reject REr.65 and REr.65A	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S300.062	Melinda Harvey	Oppose	INr.67A - For the very same reasons I reject REr.65 and REr.65A	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S301.003	Linda-Roxy Simpson	Oppose	Removal of payload restrictions and provision of Runway End Safety Areas seems very logical, however the submitter has concern about noise of the planes and effects on residents' amenity values. The Airport has drastically reduced the Current Effects Control Overlay and therefore their exposure to the cost of noise mitigation. Airports and noise go together but being the generator of the noise comes a responsibility to provide mitigation to affected parties. The inclusion of noise insulation i.e., double glazing should remain for the existing Airport Effects Control Overlay.	We do not think the application meets all the requirements to be granted.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S302.002	Nelson Tasman Climate Forum, Transport Group	Oppose	The runway extension is opposed, and the submission refers to the following reasons: 1) Airport needs to be moved: The existing airport location is not tenable. More money should not be spent or more carbon emitted upgrading an asset that will be flooded and cannot be protected from inevitable sea	The Council decline the Plan Change.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					level rise. The airport should be relocated to the Waimea plains. 2) Sea level rise dramatically worse due to vertical land movement: Recent information shows that the airport land is subsiding at this site at least 2mm/year, which means sea levels are coming up half as fast again as previously expected (the submission contains further detail on data and charts). 3) Carbon expenditure of building the extension is incompatible with climate goals: The submission refers to: the NT Climate Forum's Targets Group calculated requirement for a minimum 8.4% year on year emission reductions to meet IPPC 2030 targets; NCC declaring a Climate Emergency; and expending significant amounts of carbon to build the runway extension where it will have to be abandoned is incompatible with carbon reductions needed. 4) We need to travel less, unless and until zero emission aviation is available.: Extending the runway will not encourage us to travel less. 5) Runway extension allows high polluting jets: Jets have higher emissions than turboprops, plus more emission of combustion particles into the upper atmosphere. "Sustainable Aviation Fuels " (SAF) appear to have the climate forcing implications of fossil fuels when used in jets at high altitude. 6) Carbon offsets are not acceptable: Carbon emissions from fossil fuels take time to be taken up by trees, but to stop global heating requires deep CO2 reductions now.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S303.001	Da Neille Fletcher	Oppose	The submitter opposes the loss of the golf course due to the runway extension, and refers to: 1. The golf club is a community in itself, where members play and local business is created. I have built strong personal friendship and commercial connects at the	Would like to see other options which haven't been looked at.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Nelson Golf Club. 2. It has created a wonderful social network for our family. 3. Our business has sponsored the golf club for many years, and this creates positive business networks and commercial flow throughout our Nelson community. 4. A huge range of clubs use the facilities and it has become a hub for groups such Rotary, business breakfast clubs, Lions, book clubs etc. 5. Fundraising efforts mean the local Nelson community benefit immensely. Examples are Fifeshire Foundation and Nelson Tasman Hospice. 6. Our championship course is used by many either on holiday or who come for competitions, which brings tourist dollars to the Nelson community. 7. If this plan goes ahead, travel to Best Island will add to road congestion. 8. Would like to see other options which haven't been looked at in-depth. 9. The club promotes health, community, fun and social situations which feed our mental health, especially for the elderly.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S304.001	Nelson Golf Club Incorporated	Oppose	The submission contains background information detailing the early history of Nelson Golf Club (NGC), recent golfing events, Nelson as a true links course, current membership and wider activities, and the fundamental issue for NGC which is that: - NAL seeks to suggest, incorrectly, that the impacts of its runway extension on NGC are minimal; - the AEE does not acknowledge that the runway extension would cut right through the golf course, rendering it unusable; - the runway extension is an existential threat to the golf course in its current format of 18 holes; - NAL has not assessed this loss to the community, or proposed a solution that would allow NGC to continue to operate. General Reasons for opposing PC30 in its entirety:	Nelson Golf Club seeks that PC30 be declined, refused, or otherwise rejected (primary relief).

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					(a) together with the NOR and/or individually, and in particular the runway extension that they are intended to facilitate, will prevent the ongoing operation of an 18-hole links golf course at the NGC, resulting in the closure of the Club and all the benefits it offers to its members and the wider public; (b) PC30 fails to: i. promote sustainable management of resources, including the enabling of people and communities to provide for their social and economic well-being; ii. protect the historic heritage of the NGC from inappropriate subdivision, use and/or development; iii. achieve integrated management; iv. adequately assess and evaluate the effects on the NGC, its members, and the wider community; (d) in respect of PC30, the s32 report fails to meet the requirements of s32 of the Act. Specific Reasons: (a) Inadequate justification, rationale, basis: There is no sound basis for, or assessment of the necessity of the NoR and PPC 30, to achieve the objectives of providing for the expected needs of future aircraft types and removing operating constraints experienced by existing aircraft to remove reliability. (b) Failure to seek a reduction in RESAs: Wellington International Airport sought a determination on a reduced RESA to its runway extension prior to its RMA process. (c) Failure to consider effects and//or properly access effects on NGC, its members and the wider community: The AEE is erroneous in stating that effects will be "no more than minor and can be appropriately managed by the comprehensive suite of proposed conditions to the	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					NoR and PPC provisions", as the effects on the NGC, its members and the wider community will be significant. This may reflect reference the NGC as an 'occupier' with a transient interest in the affected land, rather than as owner. (d) Inadequate s32 assessment: The adequacy of the s32 assessment is challenged for its failure to properly assess other reasonably practicable options for ensure NGC can continue to operate and the scale and significance of effects of ending NGC, in order to conclude as to what is the "most appropriate" for achieving the purposes of the RMA. (e) Inadequate assessment of alternatives: Refers to S171(1)(b) RMA and consideration of alternative sites. Insufficient and unsatisfactory consideration has been given to alternatives within NAL's assessment, with reference to inadequate consideration of NGC under various "Topics" and other issues with the criteria and methodology which appear to introduce a bias in favour of NAL. (f) Failure to seek reduction of the RSEAs: The AEE does not address whether this option has been explored and the difference it would make to its options and degree of impact. Submission refers to fully exploring extension to the south which would have little or no effect on NGC, and the cost of compensation to acquire NGC's land. (g) Part 2 RMA: Part 2 is relevant to both processes, but its assessment in the AEE is inadequate and flawed as it fails to assess the impacts of the runway extension on NGC, its members and the wider community, and fails to recognise the protection NGC and course as a matter of national importance under s6(f) RMA. (h) Process and conflict interests:	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Refers to NCC refusal to extend the submission period; NCC being conflicted in its decision-making as an owner of Nelson Airport; NCC's failure to take advice and obtain its own reports to assess and potentially submit on the NoR and PPC to advance the interests of its communities (including the golfing community) and ensure robust testing of the proposal; and an email address error in the submission form. (i) Consultation: Engagement with NGC has not been extensive or particularly constructive. If it had been, then the AEE would have identified the very significant effects on the NGC and proposed ways to avoid, remedy, mitigate, offset or compensate those effects. (j) Premature: No compelling reasons have been provided as to why the NoR and PPC needs to proceed ahead of the Nelson Plan review or legislative changes to the RMA. The intended timing of the extended runway appears to be at least 10-15 years away. A better and more integrated outcome would be achieved through the replacement District Plan process.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Planning Maps	S304.008	Nelson Golf Club Incorporated	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S304.001.	Without prejudice to the primary relief sought by NGC: (d) If the above alternatives for Options B, C and A cannot be achieved, then extend the airport zone over the balance of the Nelson Golf Club land and apply the Airport Environs Precinct to that land, with any appropriate modifications so as to enable the Golf Club to have options to develop that land and assist with finding an alternative site to locate to [SEE FULL SUBMISSION FOR MAPS].

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S304.009	Nelson Golf Club Incorporated	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S304.001	Without prejudice to the primary relief sought by NGC: (e) Any further, additional, alternative, consequential, or other relief to address the matters raised in any part of this submission document, but in particular as may be necessary to appropriately avoid, remedy, mitigate, offset and/or compensate for any adverse effects on the Nelson Golf Club, its members and the wider community.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S305.002	Bernadine Goldsmith	Oppose	Submitter opposes the airport runway through the Nelson Golf Course. This piece of legislation that allows government to confiscate land for roads, railway tracks etc on the pretence of future development is a racist piece of legislation. It should have been abolished decades ago. Nelson Golf Course has been operating longer than any of you have been alive and helped out during the war effort to protect our city. N.G.C may be small in membership but large in heart, it deserves to remain the same and it's their land.	Oppose airport runway through Nelson Golf Course.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S306.001	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	Not Stated	Forest & Bird recognises the strategic importance of the airport to the Nelson region but has concerns around this plan change proposal. Forest & Bird accepts that there may be good arguments for extending the runway but cautions against going ahead with investment in a runway extension proposal without a long-term detailed plan of how inundation risks are to be managed. A recent article highlighted that the airport land may be sinking faster than the SeaRise data initially predicted, meaning inundation issues are more pressing than currently thought. Forest & Bird would like to know whether an analysis has been done on the long-term suitability of the site and	That further work be undertaken, or made public on the inundation risks, adaptation options and predicted lifespan of the airport.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					whether alternative sites for an airport have been considered. If after consideration, the current site is preferred, Forest & Bird would like to see adaptation options developed, costed and made public, that avoid impact on the coastal environment. And this be done ahead of any decision to consent a runway extension, or commercial precinct development on the airport site.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S306.002	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	Not Stated	Forest & Bird recognises the strategic importance of the airport to the Nelson region but has concerns around this plan change proposal. A runway extension, commercial precinct and inundation protection works are going to be emissions intensive projects and are particularly problematic if the airport only has a finite life because of future inundation. Forest & Bird would like more surety that such developments have a very long lifespan before they are allowed to proceed. It is not clear from information provided by Nelson Airport whether emissions associated with the airport runway extension and any future commercial precinct development would be included in the Airport's operations emissions offsetting initiative. In addition to offsets, Forest and Bird would like to see a stronger commitment to emissions reductions from Nelson Airport rather than reliance on offsets that are losing credibility with the public. Forest and Bird would like Nelson Airport to commit to further reducing its emissions and influencing Scope 3 emissions (to reduce gross emissions per passenger and per kilo of freight through the airport), such as Christchurch Airport are doing.	Forest & Bird would like conditions imposed related to greenhouse gas emissions.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S306.003	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	Not Stated	Forest & Bird recognises the strategic importance of the airport to the Nelson region but has concerns around this plan change proposal. Forest & Bird accepts that impacts on the physical environment and biodiversity from the runway extension proposal are relatively low with the exception of the destruction of a section of the Marie Stream tributary. Forest & Bird would like to see the Marie Stream tributary reformed around the northern RESA area, so that freshwater habitat is not reduced, and an open stream way is maintained. Forest & Bird would also expect additional compensatory measures that support ecosystem functioning and biodiversity to be carried out, to compensate for the impacts of the development on the short-medium term biodiversity and ecosystem values of the stream. Forest & Bird also have concerns about the future ecosystem and biodiversity impacts from adaptation measures, the development of the commercial precinct, and how the environmental values of Jenkins Creek are to be enhanced.	Forest & Bird would like conditions imposed related to enhancing ecosystem and biodiversity health.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S307.001	Richard Harden	Oppose	The submitter opposes the runway extension. (1) Proceeding with the proposals is contrary to the procedural principles of Section 18A of the Resource Management Act. The Applicant and Nelson City Council have failed to take all practicable steps to use timely, efficient, consistent, and cost-effective processes that are proportionate to the functions or powers being performed or exercised. (2) The hands-off approach of Nelson City Council as a Governing Body, Landowner, and Consent Authority in failing:	For the applicant to withdraw the proposals and work constructively with the community and Nelson City Council to prepare a Notice of Requirement and Plan Change that promotes Part 2 of the Resource Management Act and Section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. Should the proposals proceed as notified, seeks Private Plan Change 30 be declined in its entirety.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					• to undertake a review of the adequacy of the specialist evidence that supports the proposals, • to engage as a landowner to protect its own assets, • as a landowner to actively participate in facilitating consideration of alternative locations, to offset the negative effects of a runway extension to the North, publicly and prior to notification, and • to promote good urban planning set out in Council's strategies, plans and policies that are undermined by the proposals, and by refusing: • to make freely available the information exchanged between the Council and the Applicant in development of the proposals as part of the notification process, • to make this information exchange freely available when requested prior to the close of submissions, and • to give an extension of time to allow the public to review the material and consider making submissions and/or ensure their submissions could fully address areas of concern, has undermined public participation, is not consistent with a fair process, has put the community to unnecessary cost, and has left the submitters with an unreasonable burden to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act. (3) The proposals are inconsistent with the relevant policy statement, including national policy statements, and relevant planning provisions. (4) The proposals will not lead to a better resource management framework than currently in the operative plans. (5) There is an inadequate consideration of the environmental effects of the proposals by the Applicant. (6) There has been inadequate consideration given to alternative sites, routes, or methods of undertaking the work. (7) The proposals will have significant adverse effects on the environment. (8) The proposals will not promote the sustainable	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					management of natural and physical resources as contemplated by Part 2 of the RMA.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S308.001	David Ward	Oppose	The difference in costs between the two options is likely to be much smaller than the Martin Jenkins report indicates, and the overall economic and social benefits to the region would be better if the golf course is kept as is and the runway extended south. The Martin Jenkins report: - Gives an assessment of the significant economic benefit that the existing Nelson Airport gives to the Nelson Tasman region, perhaps 180 million GDP, but does not appear to assess that there will be an increase in that benefit by having a larger airport. - Compares the costs of the options of extending north or south (refer to the full submission for quotes these costs), which raises questions: 1. There is no explanation as to why the contingency, as a percentage of the total, is so much larger for the southern extension than the northern one. 2. Lumping land acquisition and construction costs together is confusing -presumably for the southern option it is all construction, whereas the northern option presumably includes acquisition of land currently owned by the golf club. The effect on the golf club is significant and the costs on it would be considerably more than the figure quoted. - Does not assess the loss in economic benefit to the region in losing an 18 hole championship golf course, or the costs for Nelson golfers travelling further to the other course.	The proposed plan change be refused.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S309.001	Andre O'Sullivan	Oppose	The submitter opposes the extension of the runway as he purchased his home in December 2022. The new aircraft will create added noise, making home conditions unsettled and possibly lowering the value of his home. The submission refers to the miniscule impact of the	Decline the extension of the runway.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					new planes in terms of climate change and lack of scientific evidence.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S310.001	Peter and Alison Walshe	Oppose	No reasons given.	Suggest the runway be extended North as opposed to South.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S311.002	Nelson Tasman Branch - Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of NZ Inc.	Oppose	1) Increasing the current use of the airport can only increase the effects of climate warming when the need to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions is urgent. 2) Climate warming is increasing sea level rise and this in time will swamp the airport, especially as through tectonic activity the land along this northern coastline is sinking. 3) Sea level rise will bring the coastline ever higher and encourage coastal birdlife to occupy sites closer to the airport. The coast is the legitimate habitat of waders and other coastal birdlife. The airport should recognise this and plan for a reduction in use and possible shift to another site. 4) The runway extension and associated use of heavy equipment will cause a considerable rise in carbon emissions but these have not been quantified in the application so we can only assume they will be high. 5) There is a noticeable smell of fuel over a wide area when planes take off and land. Extending the runway further into urban areas will further affect the health of communities living within the exhaust overlay. Depending on the wind this is well over a km.	To decline the application.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S312.001	Tasman Golf Incorporated	Oppose	Submitter supports the Nelson Golf Club and its concerns about the proposed plan changes and the effect it will have on the club. Specifically, the loss of golf course land that will reduce the club's capacity to serve its members, the golf community, and the wider Tasman community. Golf has a significant and positive impact on the Tasman	Tasman Golf is advocating that: - Golf is acknowledged as a growing sport and recreation that requires facilities like Nelson Golf Club to be retained in their full capacity as part of the network of golf facilities to meet future demand. - Any decision regarding the future of Nelson Golf Club considers impact to the

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					region. This impact is realised through social, environmental, economic and community outcomes for the region and its people. Advocating for golf on the current Nelson Golf Club site to be an integral part of Nelson's long-term future. Golf is a growing sport and is contributing towards the vision of sport being the heart of the community. Golf contributes significantly to the health and wellbeing of all ages. Golf is demonstrating care for the environment.	wider golf network and stakeholders. - Any decision regarding the re-purposing, re-location, or reduction in the golfing footprint for current facilities needs to take into account the information raised in the submission and employ extensive consultation with the golf community.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S313.001	Nelson Aviation College	Support	Nelson Aviation College's (NAC) core business activity is to train pilots who eventually move onto operate regional turbo-prop aircraft such as those operated by Air New Zealand into Nelson Airport. NAC believes that Nelson Airport Limited's proposed Private Plan Change (PPC) and Notice of Requirement (NoR) provides clarity and certainty to the Nelson community around intentions for future use, development, and effective management of the airport as a nationally and regionally significant infrastructure asset for the Nelson-Tasman region. Extending the operational runway length will ensure that over the next 30 years the aeronautical capacity of the airport and runway system can operate safely and efficiently. The PPC and NoR will ensure increased operational resilience and reliability to enable forecast demand and accommodate future aircraft types. It will enable an efficient, flexible and sustainable approach to developing airport infrastructure, facilities and services. Changes to the Airnoise Boundary will minimise the effects of aircraft noise impacts on the surrounding community as far as practicable. This provides certainty	Support the Private Plan Change.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					as to the parameters under which our own activities, such as night and instrument flight training, can occur. NAC views the proposals as a solution to reliability and resilience issues for Nelson Airport as well as a way to ensure that in future, sustainably powered aircraft piloted by the students that they train, will be accessible to people in the Nelson-Tasman region.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S314.001	Carole Rodden	Oppose	Objects to the changes in their entirety.	That the runway be extended North as opposed to South.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S315.001	Paul Dalzell	Oppose	The submitter opposes the provisions of the proposed private plan change. The implementation of the proposed change will render the Nelson Golf Course unplayable due to the loss of a number of course holes plus the removal of the Club House. It is unlikely that compensation would be sufficient to replace the course within the Nelson City Council environs. There is no obvious site for reestablishment of an 18 hole premier golf links course within 20 minutes drive of the current site.	That the Nelson City Council declines the application for the terms proposed in the Publicly Private Plan Change 30 for Nelson Airport runway extension.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S316.001	Mary Harley	Oppose	If an extension is required Option B would be preferred. The Option A development would mean the end of Nelson Golf Club. As a City we need to have recreational spaces especially such as a high end golf destination, for local and visiting golfers. It is a top course and has over the years had many changes to benefit the airport neighbour.	The southern extension Option B would be preferable. Otherwise, NCC takes a long term view of the effect of taking the Northern extension Option A.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S318.001	Golf New Zealand	Oppose	Submitter supports the Nelson Golf Club and its concerns about the proposed plan changes and the effect it will have on the club. Specifically, the loss of golf course land that will reduce the club's capacity to serve its members, the golf community, and the wider Tasman community.	Tasman Golf is advocating that: - Golf is acknowledged as a growing sport and recreation that requires facilities like Nelson Golf Club to be retained in their full capacity as part of the network of golf facilities to meet future demand. - Any decision regarding the future of

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Golf has a significant and positive impact on the Tasman region. This impact is realised through social, environmental, economic and community outcomes for the region and its people. Advocating for golf on the current Nelson Golf Club site to be an integral part of Nelson's long-term future. Golf is a growing sport and is contributing towards the vision of sport being the heart of the community. Golf contributes significantly to the health and wellbeing of all ages. Golf is demonstrating care for the environment.	Nelson Golf Club considers impact to the wider golf network and stakeholders. - Any decision regarding the re-purposing, re-location, or reduction in the golfing footprint for current facilities needs to take into account the information raised in the submission and employ extensive consultation with the golf community.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S320.001	JAM Trust/Glenns Vacancies Ltd	Oppose	REr.65 and REr.65A. Level threshold should be 69dB Ldn. 40dB Ldn is unachievable.	Airport should be liable for all mitigation costs.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S320.002	JAM Trust/Glenns Vacancies Ltd	Oppose	REr.65 and REr.65A. Level threshold should be 69dB Ldn. 40dB Ldn is unachievable.	Ongoing payment for reduced business opportunity.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S320.003	JAM Trust/Glenns Vacancies Ltd	Oppose	REr.65 and REr.65A. Level threshold should be 69dB Ldn. 40dB Ldn is unachievable.	Permission to maintain existing buildings in order to permit full potential use.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S320.004	JAM Trust/Glenns Vacancies Ltd	Oppose	REr.65 and REr.65A. Level threshold should be 69dB Ldn. 40dB Ldn is unachievable.	Threshold should be 69 dB Ldn.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S322.001	Margaret Cooney	Oppose	Global warming is here to stay and increase. The sea is rising, the land is falling. This area is swamp with very high water table. Submitter had no idea that the proposed airport runway	More group/community consultation - seems hurried with little time for submissions.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					extension was a possibility, or a reality. The impact on the submitters living environment will be significant and adverse. This plan is already producing negative mental health impact and sleepless nights. The land and house would be rezoned with airport restrictions. The adverse impact would be enormous: * significant noise impact * excessive fumes - air pollution * being trapped inside with mechanical air ventilation * significant house and land devaluation * no longer a healthy living environment with adverse impact on mental health Please consider the negative impact on our community and Tahunanui. The runway extension going southwards would have less impact on people and housing community.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S322.002	Margaret Cooney	Oppose	Global warming is here to stay and increase. The sea is rising, the land is falling. This area is swamp with very high water table. Submitter had no idea that the proposed airport runway extension was a possibility, or a reality. The impact on the submitters living environment will be significant and adverse. This plan is already producing negative mental health impact and sleepless nights. The land and house would be rezoned with airport restrictions. The adverse impact would be enormous: * significant noise impact * excessive fumes - air pollution * being trapped inside with mechanical air ventilation * significant house and land devaluation * no longer a healthy living environment with adverse impact on mental health	Further investigation for runway extension to move south: - Too many negatives for community and its welfare - Tahunanui is a jewel in the crown for Nelson - Too many adverse impacts - global warming real and advancing

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Please consider the negative impact on our community and Tahunanui. The runway extension going southwards would have less impact on people and housing community.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S323.002	Vincent Cunliffe	Oppose	Safeguards a valuable recreational resource within Nelson city. Submits that the runway extension is at the opposite end over the estuary.	The runway extension over the Nelson Golf Course is not allowed.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S324.001	Veronica Hippolite-A'Court	Oppose	PC30 must be withdrawn and renotified once the technical information has been thoroughly tested/reviewed by an appropriately qualified and experienced group of independent processionals, which will also serve to provide an appropriately transparent and robust process that avoids perceived conflicts of interest of Council. Reasons for the submission include: - Recreational values: The supplementary information provided by the applicant highlights inadequacy of PC30 and the NOR with regard to the assessment of the actual and potential effects on recreational values. The most significant impact of PC30 and NOR is on recreational values. - Cultural Values Another inadequacy of PC30 and NOR is that a Cultural Impact Assessment has not been prepared and submitted with the documentation. - Freshwater and Coastal Values Until such time as the supporting technical reports have been properly reviewed it is impossible to establish what the effects are on freshwater, ecology and the coastal marine area. This would lead to a more balanced	That PC30 be declined.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					consideration of the options. - Natural Hazards The specialist information provided by the applicant has not been reviewed by independent consultants. Nor has there been any particular provisions that recognize the serious future risks associated with this location. - Conflicts of Interest and Transparency Understand that the Consent Authority has not yet had any of the specialist technical information provided by the applicant peer reviewed as a part of assessing the adequacy or accuracy of the information provided. It is the role of the Consent Authority to administer a transparent and rigorous process on behalf of the community of interest, not solely on behalf of the applicant.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S325.001	Chris Keyse	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club. The Club, the course and the sport are key features of the submitters exercise, recreation, social activities and well-being. The Nelson Golf Course is also well used by a large club membership, open to members of the public, and international tourists. Nelson Airport's plan would drive a wedge into the heart of the current golf course, decimating it, and reducing it to second rate. Or worse, force its closure. There is no spare land owned by the golf club to redesign and accommodate the lost holes. Nelson Golf Course and club have no alternative appropriate land space that it could shift to in Nelson City. Would also like serious consideration given to the fact that the Nelson Golf Course is an historic golfing, sporting, and tourist taonga of Nelson City and the Tasman region.	Reject the Private Plan Change 30 for the Nelson Airport Runway Extension.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					The very definition of a "links" golf course is to provide a protective natural buffer and "green space" between the sea and the Nelson suburbs and industry, including the current airport. Climate change and threatening water tides and tables is a critical issue for Nelson. It is ideal to put low risk activities, such as a links golf course, in an increasingly vulnerable area. Extending the airport runway by the distance proposed would be putting big money into infrastructure in an increasing risk area. Contrary to the NZ Coastal Policy Statement (2008). Astounded that the airport plans to further encroach on Nelson's top tourist and recreational areas and attractions. Has a social and economic impact assessment report been prepared?	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S326.001	Carl Snelgrove	Oppose	Nelson City Council have not provided sufficient time for public review of the extensive documents included in the submission. As a major shareholder in the airport the submitter does not believe that any review will be impartial and a commissioner to oversee the process should have been appointed. The proposed loss of Nelson's Golf Course will negatively impact the 700+ members who regularly use the greenspace providing health, wellbeing and social benefits. There is no other facility within the Council area which provides this benefit, members would need to travel introducing a personal financial burden as well as impacting already congested roads and adding to carbon emissions through increased use of vehicles. The Club also host a number of Charity functions as well as providing facilities regularly used by some 70 community groups. Nelson's Golf Course is nationally renowned and attracts thousands of visitors a year bringing much needed	Further consideration should be given to the need for a runway extension in the first place, taking into account the current research indicating that the current airport is sinking by over 3mm a year and what the impact of this will be on the existing airport infrastructure in 20 years without the additional weight of a runway extension and associated infrastructure. If it is determined to be needed, then extending South should be considered as the preferred option as it is likely to be a much cheaper solution than extending North with less impact to people and the environment.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					tourist revenue into the Region. Would also raise the financial and bureaucratic impact to residents to the North who should this plan be approved would need to submit requests for changes to their properties through the consenting process which the airport authority would have the right to object to.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S328.001	Sally Moore	Oppose	A Nelson Airport northward runway extension is not a good option for the future of Nelson. The proposed runaway extension will render Nelson Golf Course unusable and impact heavily surrounding homes and businesses.	That the Council does not approve the Plan Change. The Airport has choices - to go South, to go out of town. Options which have not been explored. The Golf Club has no choices so Council needs to consider all the implications of Nelson City losing this wonderful facility.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S329.001	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	Focus of the background information is on a north and south extension, discounting the south - the southern option will have vastly less community and people effects. Both options have visual effects. The designation could be addressed by a partial north and south extension. This appears not to have been addressed or considered. The Holiday Park has long been a valued open space and recreational areas. Infrastructure and accommodation will be at worst lost and at best severely constrained. The Holiday Park is part of the history of Nelson - historic heritage as per S6 of the RMA has not been recognised or provided for. PC30 and the NOR: - do not meet the purpose and principals of the RMA (Part 2) and has significant effects under section 7(c) and 7(a) - offends the NPS-UD, NTFDS 2022 and Intensification Action Plan 2020 - potentially offends the NPS-FW and NZCPS	Reject PC30 in its entirety.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- do not give effects to the Nelson Regional Policy Statement - do not contain sufficient provisions regarding freshwater environments and stormwater runoff effects, or gives sufficient regard to flooding and coastal erosion - do not provide a full analysis under S32 of RMA - have inadequately mapped freshwater values and the coastal marine area - have an absence of a cultural impact assessment Consultation is considered to be inadequate with the Beach Camp. PC30 and the NOR justification is questionable and is supported by inadequate information, particularly around the social and economic impacts on the Beach camp., the wider Tahunanui area and recreational values in general. Noise effects proposed are considered to be substantial, significantly impacting on the health and well being of the receiving environment, in particular the Holiday Park. The designation area is unsuitable for the purpose of Airport runway given sea level rise and climate change. No technical reports or peer reviews carried out by the consent authority before notification - lacks the rigour of a robust and transparent process.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.005	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Annual Aircraft Contour (AANC)" This provision is vague and leaves control in the hands of the Airport Operator and does not allow for public input.	Reject provision
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.006	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Acoustic Certificate" - The requirements are onerous and unreasonable - the adverse effects of airport operations and noise should be avoided, remedied or mitigated by and at the cost of the Airport Operator, not by the receivers of the Airport Noise.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.007	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Activities sensitive to Airport Noise" The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities, that is unreasonable and does not constitute sustainable management of the resources they represent. It gives primacy to Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.008	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Aircraft Operation" The website for the change says that neither designation nor the Plan Change is to cater for jets - but "jet" falls within the definition of "Aircraft".	Reject or state that jets are excluded and will not be catered for in either Plan Change rules, or designation.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.009	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Air Noise Boundary" 65 DBLdn is inappropriate as a level as it significantly increases the geographical extent of aircraft noise on the receiving environment.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.010	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO) Again, the level is inappropriate, and the AECO significantly increases the area affected as compared to the provisions of the Nelson Resource Management Plan.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.011	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Airport related activity" This provision in effect creates a new commercial/residential zone for the benefit of the Airport, but also for the benefit of the Airport in commercial terms - in that it says it allows for an "ancillary activity" providing support to Nelson Airport or an aviation activities - the range of activities go far beyond providing for the reasonable needs of the Airport and will create a retail and commercial (inter alia) node with effects potentially on other zoned retail (and other) areas. The provision is unlimited as to extent. The provision exhibits no relationship with the activity of an airport.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.012	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Automotive and marine supplies" What has this got to do with an airport or activity related to? It constitutes another example of retail/industrial expansion by the Change.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.013	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Aviation Activity" Uses the words "associated with", "but not limited to" certain activities. It is not unlimited as to activity and not relevant to or appropriate for an airport.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.014	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Building Supplies" Again, not relevant to an Airport Operation	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.015	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Farming and agricultural supplies" Again, not relevant to an Airport Operation	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.016	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Food and beverage outlet" It is proposed for "sale to the general public" - not limited to Airport patrons. Again, extending a retail node not associated with an airport i.e., "the general public."	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.017	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Future Aircraft Noise Contours" It is not known what those are or might be. A District Plan should be certain in its terms not vague.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.018	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Garden and Landscape supplies" These are not related to the operations of an airport.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.019	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Office facilities" These are clearly not ancillary to airport operations nor necessary to them - i.e. solicitor or accountant offices.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.020	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Office furniture" This is simply another retail provision unassociated with Airport Operations.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.021	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Recreation activities" This is a wide-reaching activity - nothing associated with Airport Operations.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.022	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Trade related" This is a very wide "catch all" provision - and allows for activities not related in any way to an airport or its operations.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.023	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Visitors' accommodation" Again this has nothing to do with Airport Operations.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.024	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Yard based activity" Again this has nothing to do with Airport Operations.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S329.025	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	General as to Chapter 2 The definitions sought to be added indicate that the Applicant wishes to extend the use of its land as a retail industrial and commercial node in the guise of providing for the Airport and its operations. This is inappropriate.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S329.026	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	Administration AD11.2.iii The provisions seek to create an Airport Zone and Airport Area - however, the range of activities proposed go far beyond an "Airport" or being associated with or necessary to an airport.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S329.027	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	Chapter 3 - "Air Noise Boundary" (ANB) and "Airport Effects Control Overlay" (AECO) The provision explains that the ANB is extended from Parkers Road into the Holiday Park and land surrounding. i) Within ANB new "sensitive activities" are prohibited (for which no resource consent can be given), density is restricted, and insulation. And ventilation is required because of the Airport activities. The provisions pass the responsibility (and cost) of noise attenuation and management to landowners including of existing lawful activities, for the benefit of the Airport. The provision does not constitute sustainable management.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.028	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	DO11.1(a) Refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". But appropriate to/for whom? How can the levels proposed be "Appropriate" if they result in a landowner (existing) having to insulate and ventilate their building to meet the needs of the Airport. The provision "kneecaps" existing land areas for future development, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximize activities on its own land at the expense of other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.029	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	DO.11.1 "Fleet options that decarbonise aviation" What are they? And where are the provisions in either the designation or the Plan Change that require this?	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.030	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	"Reverse Sensitivity" While the words are used in the provision and "recognises the impact of the airport on the community nearby" - the provision does nothing about it, and to the contrary gives primacy or protection from noise not to the community to the Airport over existing lawful and established activities.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.031	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	DO.11.1.2 (iii) and (iv) Refer to further regulating establishment and/or density or activities sensitive to ASAN by reference to Air Noise Boundary and Airport Effects Control Overlays, on the Planning Maps and further requiring acoustic insulation and ventilation in relation to either replacement or substantial alteration for existing activities sensitive to Airport noise. (i) The maps show ANB and AECO which are gross in terms of their extent and effect on existing areas including the Holiday Park.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.032	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	DO.11.1.3.1 "Manage the wellbeing of the surrounding community" The proposal and the Change simply pass the obligation of noise management onto the surrounding community,	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.033	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	DO.11.1.3 (ii) "To meet the need of the community" Whilst the existence of an Airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or the designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land use constraints - community needs are not met in that regard.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.034	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	DO11.1.3 (vi) "Mitigation in the designation" There are no appropriate "mitigations" in the designation it will merely lay a "dead hand" on the golf course land, and yet further constraints on other land.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.035	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	DO11.1.5.(i) Annual Noise Plan In fact, the Annual Noise Monitoring Committee will disappear, in favour of an "Annual Noise Plan" over which the Airport Operator has total control.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.036	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	DO11(e) - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO) This Objective will have huge effects on all of the Holiday Park and a large part of Tahunanui would be caught by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.037	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	DO15 This Objective will have huge effects on all of the Holiday Park and a large part of Tahunanui would be caught by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.038	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	DO11.1.4 This provision disestablishes the Airport Noise Environment Advisory Committee in favour of an "Annual Noise Management report and Airport Noise Management and Monitoring Plan" - the latter appears to be non-consultative and has only 5 yearly independent compliance audits. Given the effect of Airport Operation on the community this is not appropriate.	Reject. Re-establish Airport Noise Advisory Committee with powers - members to include Council, Community representatives with community as a majority of members.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.039	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	DO15.1(ii) Urban Form The provision states that "urban form must be integrated with the provision of regionally significant infrastructure". In fact, it should be the other way around significant (new) regional infrastructure including runway extension should be "integrated with existing urban form".	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.040	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	DO15.1.1 Encouragement of infill This policy seeks to "avoid reverse sensitivity effects on nationally and regionally significant infrastructure" and "infill generally provides for greater intensity of use and development where effects can be appropriately managed." The "effects are not from the infill, but from the Airport Operations and extension.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.041	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	DO16.1.1(g) Refers to development of the Nelson Airport "as well as operational areas and facilities for administrative commercial and industrial activities associated with the Airport are provided for". But the zone includes activities beyond that association and are seeking to crate a new commercial/industrial/retail zone.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.042	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	Chapter 5, Airport Zone. This zone should relate to the Airport and its operations. It should not allow for an industrial, commercial office facility retail facility recreation education facility zone. Uses should be limited to Aviation activity.	Reject in its present form. Limit to Aviation Activity.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S329.043	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	OSs.7.i Permitted activities The provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but a close reading says that is not the case in either the Airport Effects Control Overlay or Air Noise boundary where special rules apply to buildings - leaving camping and short-term living (including cabin, caravan, motorhome) not permitted - but non-complying	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Camping and short-term living become prohibited once the runway extension under DAA1 is operational. This has a huge effect on the regionally (and significant) facility of the Holiday Park.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S329.044	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	OSs23 Caretaker accommodation This provision makes caretaker accommodation in the AECO - non-complying, and with the Air Noise Boundary prohibited. This provision is untenable, many businesses including the Holiday Park have to have onsite caretakers.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S329.045	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	OSs53 This provision makes replacement, or substantial alteration of an existing building containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and activities not so are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property owners' rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control not the obligation of the other landowners. If there is to be a provision such as this then: (i) the obligation to carry out the works and the cost of them should be borne by the Airport and (ii) the obligation should relate to all residential and established residential type and existing user, no matter what the zoning, and wherever established.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S329.046	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	OSs53A Within the Air Noise Boundary, replacement or substantial alteration require works to be done (at the cost of the landowner). And if the condition is contravened then the activity if prohibited. New Airport noise activities or construction of a building to accommodate such are prohibited. It has huge and	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					adverse effect on residential landowners. If there is to be a provision such as this then: (i) the obligation to carry out the works and the cost of them should be borne by the Airport and (ii) the obligation should relate to all residential and established residential type and existing user, no matter what the zoning, and wherever established.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.055	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	Compliance Rule and Rule Table These achieve nothing in terms of avoidance, remedy or mitigation in terms of adverse effects.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S329.056	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	DO.11.1.5 This provision disestablishes the Airport Noise Environment Advisory Committee in favour of an "Annual Noise Management report and Airport Noise Management and Monitoring Plan" - the latter appears to be non-consultative and has only 5 yearly independent compliance audits. Given the effect of Airport Operation on the community this is not appropriate.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S329.057	Tahuna Beach Camp Incorporated	Oppose	OSsr.2.1 The Plan provision requires reference to both the Schedule and the Rule table (from the NRMP) - the laying on of the new rules makes the changes of even greater effect.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S330.001	Wendy Drummond	Oppose	Topography: The area proposed is low lying and vulnerable to sea-level rise. Quality of life for surrounding properties and the 1549 landowners, occupiers and statutory agencies: a) Noise levels will be increased and unacceptable. b) Fumes from aircraft will have a detrimental effect on surrounding properties. c) Height restrictions will impinge on surrounding properties.	To prioritise ecological and social sustainability. The community living around the airport are entitled to a healthy living environment. It is not tenable to expect people to live inside their houses with windows closed. To decline the Private Plan Change.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Environmental Sustainability: This proposition is not environmentally sound. We need to reduce the incineration of fossil fuels.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S330.002	Wendy Drummond	Oppose	Quality of life for surrounding properties and the 1549 landowners, occupiers and statutory agencies: a) Noise levels will be increased and unacceptable. b) Fumes from aircraft will have a detrimental effect on surrounding properties. c) Height restrictions will impinge on surrounding properties.	To hold public meetings to provide information.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S331.001	Gary Chalmers	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson golf club. Submitters understanding that the proposed changes will completely ruin the golf course and destroy the club. As such, in total opposition to this plan. Intends to play golf as long as they are able, if lucky that might be twenty years, but aside from that, would also like their children and grandchildren to have the same opportunity to play golf. Submitter started in 1970, so it really is a game for life.	Submitter strongly feels that the Council has taken an ill advised and improperly planned approach to this issue. Understands that little investigation of the "southern" option has been done. There are obviously issues with that option, but many of them are the same in both directions, e.g. noise pollution, liquefaction, sea level rise and erosion etc. That such a magnificent facility as the current course could be thrown away in the name of progress is abhorrent.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S332.001	Terry Stanton	Oppose	Opposed to all the relevant provisions as it is ill considered. The submitter is located about 100m from the northern end of the proposed runway. Very concerned about fumes and noise. Reasons provided: - Southern vs northern may not be either/or - reasons given for rejecting the southern extension are very thin. - How this affects Tahunanui - the lower entrance fly path will certainty make for an uncomfortable experience for residents and visitors.	Submission refers to detail on: a) Points of difficulties with Airport proposal b) Southern vs northern c) How this affects Tahunanui d) The moral question e) Information vs disinformation f) Further information vs disinformation g) Other options? h) Civil aviation flight planes

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- The moral question - affected residents are offered amelioration rather than compensation. Only fair that the Airport should leave an offer to buy open to disgruntled residents. - Information vs misinformation - questions submission period and residents awareness of the proposal. Delay might be the sensible option. - Other options - a causeway to Rabbit Island. - Civil aviation flight planes - will limit nearest building height to 5m, and 10m at motor camp. Conflict of interest with Airport running advertising campaign. If we're going to be a smart little city, we need to put our thinking caps on.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S333.001	Nicky Borras	Oppose	The revenue earning largest motor camp in the southern hemisphere is definitely under threat of closure - the Golf Club and popular camp may have to move? And where to? Runway extension - Fill up the channel as Asian countries do to create land, or have a long runway elsewhere, bus into airport. Better still, be brave, be a tall poppy and insist on small commuter planes - status quo. Cost effective and keeps local economy happy.	No decision specified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S334.002	Hubert Martin	Oppose	- Noise - unpleasant and dangerous. - Loss of recreation space. - Rising sea level and impact on airport. - Cost of buying out houses. - Cost of extension for the community. Extend airport to south - Monaco will be uninhabitable/uninsurable in the future.	Extend airport to south.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S335.003	Rachel Zahner	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been	The Airport Effects Control Overlay must stay in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					laid out to allow for an extension to the north and an extension to the south. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, or if no extension takes place, then the Overlay will be incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S335.004	Rachel Zahner	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Airnoise Boundary, REr.65.1, REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1 - The proposed wording of the rules means that the new construction of most ancillary buildings, such as a studio, sleep-out, she-shed, play-house would no longer be a Permitted Activity. - The reduction of the target indoor level to 40 dBA Ldn is not necessary. - There are technical errors in the proposed Appendix 19.1 - Consideration must be given to consistent rules between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	That the proposed changes should be declined, and that the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S335.005	Rachel Zahner	Oppose	Rule INr.25 concerning engine testing - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far higher than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	That the proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and the engine testing / Rule INr.25 comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S335.007	Rachel Zahner	Oppose	Compass Swing rule - The testing of aircraft compasses should be subject to	That the Notice of Requirement and the proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected and that Council require the

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					the same rules as the testing of aircraft engines. - The proposed new rule does not address the emissions nuisance.	following controls on compass swinging: - It must be carried out downwind of the nearest residential area. - The noise level must comply with INr.25 unless: * The affected residents are given 24 hours prior notice. * The procedure is carried out between 9 am and 3 pm on schooldays.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S336.001	John Russell	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S336.002	John Russell	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S336.003	John Russell	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S336.004	John Russell	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S336.005	John Russell	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S336.006	John Russell	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S336.007	John Russell	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S336.011	John Russell	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S336.013	John Russell	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S337.001	Kim Wood	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S337.002	Kim Wood	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S337.003	Kim Wood	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S337.004	Kim Wood	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S337.005	Kim Wood	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S337.006	Kim Wood	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S337.007	Kim Wood	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S337.011	Kim Wood	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP. Submitter would like Nelson to keep the Tahuna Holiday Park just as it is, no changes.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S337.013	Kim Wood	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S338.003	Clare Robinson	Oppose	By only extending the runway north the extension has a significant impact on the ongoing viability of the Nelson Golf Club (NGC). NGC is providing many Nelsonians with health and wellbeing opportunities by/through friendship, support, fitness, and community activities. If the northern extension is approved its negative impact to the submitter would be driving 30km to another course, extra fuel consumption, extra costs, driving on roads that are already clogged up, all having a negative environmental impact.	To make Nelson Airport amend its application to include a southern extension.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Only considering the northern option produces the worst outcome. Why hasn't a southern extension (or a combination of northern and southern) been included?	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S338.004	Clare Robinson	Oppose	Concerned about the development of the greater Tahunanui area. Has the Council carried out an economic study on the negative impacts on Tahunanui as a result of the northern extension?	To inform the public in laymens terms, what the impacts / limits will be on Tahunanui if the proposed plan change (Airport Zone) is granted.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S339.002	Gabrielle Hervey	Oppose in part	The submitter is a member of both the Golf Club and participates in some of the community groups. Strongly objects to the Nelson Airport Ltd's plans to extend their runaway through Nelson Golf Club. The Nelson Golf Club has been in existence for over 125 years. Over its history has accommodated the airports plans and agreed to various requests. The last few decades have seen mutterings about runway extensions but a "land swap" was mentioned as compensation. This latest plan has progressed with very little consultation and absolutely no suggestions of any mitigation. Nelson would lose the only 18 hole Championship Course in Nelson. Hundreds of people's health and wellbeing would suffer, and even more people would lose a community hub. People would lose their jobs. The owner of the land NGC is barely mentioned in the document. The Airport plans as submitted would leave the club house stranded. A decimated Golf Course would not be operable as all holes on the seaward side of the runway would not be accessible to players. Everyone wants a fit for purpose airport. Can this happen and still have a championship golf course alongside? Of course. But there needs to be some	No decision specified.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					adjustment to the plans to allow them to continue to co-exist.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S340.001	Christina Encinias	Oppose	Objects to the plan to extend the airport runway through Tahuna Holiday Park. Already plenty of planes fly over our homes and businesses. Nelson and the surround area need to keep the Tahuna holiday camp in its entirety.	Relook at the options i.e. expanding over the water (sea) rather than demolish such a lovely family holiday park.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S341.002	Lee Willelts	Oppose	The proposed runway extension to the north will impede recreational golf. The golf course is a meeting place for many people and groups, and it brings money to the Nelson Community. There will be additional noise for general public with planes flying closer to homes, businesses and roads. The runway could extend South which wouldn't impede the Golf course and surrounding residence and businesses.	The runway extension be completed to the South.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S342.002	Kathryn Orange	Oppose	1. Extending the runway will: - render Nelson's only 18-hole championship golf course unusable, and significantly affect its members, visitors, community groups and users of its facilities. - adversely affect visitors and holidaymakers to the Tahunanui Beach camp due to increased noise from takeoffs and landings, who it they do not return will have a negative impact on the Nelson economy. - make use of the nearby recreational facilities, parks and beaches unpleasant and noisy due to lower aircraft approaching the runway getting closer and louder. 2. Extending the runway over Nelson's golf course and rendering it unusable will significantly increase CO2 emissions due to users needing to travel out of town to enjoy the game of golf. 3. Nearby golf courses do not have the size and capacity to increase their membership, and all other local courses are only 9-hole courses. Nelson will lose many events, and therefore visitors and families, that the current 18-hole championship course attracts to the region.	PC30 be declined. If in fact the runway extension is required, to explore in detail the option to extend in the Southern direction, towards the estuary where the adverse effect on "people" in the Nelson community will not be as significant and the cost will be cheaper than extending across the Golf course when considering compensating current residents.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					4, Extending the runway over Nelson's golf course will adversely affect the health and wellbeing of many current user groups of what is currently one of the largest useable green spaces in the city, and of residents living nearby affected by increased noise and stress associated with the extension close to residential and other local community spaces. 5. Nelson charities will lose funding.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Planning Maps	S343.001	Peter Hay	Oppose	The submitter lives adjoining the golf course and opposes the Notice of Requirement provision DAA1 for reasons of: i) Property values ii) Landscape values iii) Pollution iv) Loss of Nelson Golf clubhouse v) Devastation of Nelson's golf course vi) Other options for extending the runway have not been properly assessed - refers also to the Multi Criteria Analysis, comparative costings, use of an Engineered Material Arrestment System (EMAS).	That the Council reject the NOR (and proposed Airport Zone) and request that the Nelson Airport Ltd be made to reassess the option to extend the runway south and/or a combination of a north/south extension.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S343.003	Peter Hay	Oppose	The submitter opposes PPC 30 with respect to the building controls proposed to apply within the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Airnoise Boundary, and as set out in the proposed Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1. The submission refers to: - The proposed wording of the rules means that the new construction of most ancillary buildings, such as a studio, sleep-out, granny flat, play-house would no longer be a Permitted Activity and would require a Resource Consent and a Building Permit to construct such a building "containing an activity sensitive to Airport Noise". - That the reduction of the target indoor level to 40 dBA Ldn is not necessary. - That there are technical errors in the proposed Appendix 19.1 - That consideration must be given to consistent rules	The proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S344.002	Douglas Thornley	Oppose	Strongly opposes the plan to extend the runway north as it affects the submitter for the following reasons: 1. The destruction of the 125 year Nelson Golf Course. 2. Will affect social life, health, well being and budget. 3. Play on this course for over 20years. 4. Playing Golf keeps submitter physically fit and mentally alert and active in the community. 5. The course is only 5 minutes from submitters home. Going to another course would mean fuel consumption would rise, not good for the planet or congestion on the roads. Concerns for the Tahunanui community: 1. Increased noise over Tahunanui affecting a built up area and schools. 2. The disturbance to the largest camping ground in the Southern Hemisphere. 3. The detriment caused to Tahunanui beach one of the safest and most popular beaches in Aotearoa. 4. Will also affect fundraising for charities with the loss of the Golf Club. 5. The amount of compensation needed to achieve this proposal has the potential to affect rates. 6. Fails to see how the proposal will achieve anything for our community as it will not make the airport an international one and we already have many flights using it. 7. Alternative would be to move the airport to Rabbit Island. 8. I object to the brevity of the time allowed to make submissions and for true consultation to take place.	No decision specified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S345.001	Jillian Smith	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S345.002	Jillian Smith	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S345.003	Jillian Smith	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S345.004	Jillian Smith	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S345.005	Jillian Smith	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S345.006	Jillian Smith	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S345.007	Jillian Smith	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S345.011	Jillian Smith	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S345.013	Jillian Smith	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S345.015	Jillian Smith	Oppose	Objects strongly to any changes proposed. Submitter does not want to see any changes to Tahuna Holiday Park or any loss of community homes.	Look at extending airport in opposite direction, away from Tahuna Holiday Park and residential housing,
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S346.001	Rebecca Sheehy	Oppose	The submission refers to: - Nelson's Golf Club, it being a historical part of the Tahuna and Nelson community (a community hub) and the health and well-being benefits of the game of golf for different age groups and the submitters; - the Club's hard work to provide a top-quality course for the top of the South Island, having invested in staff and modern machinery to look after the land. - upgrading of the Clubhouse facilities and catering, and their use by a vast range of Community groups who find the location and ease of parking very appealing and convenient, and the café as a venue also for walking groups and cyclists. - the Clubhouse hosting conferences, shows, business meetings, celebrations, company do's, charity events, funerals, award ceremonies, residents of retirement villages etc - the token gesture at looking at the southern option, which would not have such a huge impact on the golf club, the wider Tahanunui community, and long-term housing problems by limiting potential for building development to go up - before any decision is made there should be more comprehensive/realists costing of the Airport's requirements for both options and this should include financial compensation to Nelson Golf Club which is not currently shown.	Decline both submissions.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S347.001	Kevin Newton	Oppose	These proposals will have a profound effect not only on those residents and the Nelson Golf Club that lay directly in the path of the proposed runway extension, but also on the wider Nelson community.	Refuse the Proposed Plan Change without any leave for the applicant to appeal.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					The submission refers to: - the single biggest impact will be on the operations of the Nelson Golf Club and its clubhouse, its use by members, visitors, community groups, and for charity fundraising etc - the lack of alternative golf facilities of similar quality and with capacity to take 700 additional members.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S348.001	Margaret Davidson	Oppose	Reasons for objecting: - Not being able to play golf on the Nelson Golf Club course would impact negatively on submitters fitness, wellbeing and regular social connection with other members of the club. - Significant negative impact on the local environment and more widespread noise pollution for the golf club members and all residents and businesses in Tahunanui. - Nelson Golf Club is the only championship course in Nelson and attracts golfers from all over New Zealand. - Nelson Golf Club course and clubroom facilities are used by about 70 local groups and organisations to which I also belong, providing considerable benefits to the local community and economy.	The Council rejects the proposed private plan change.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S349.002	Angela Low	Oppose	Submitter is a golf player at the Nelson Golf Club. Health and wellbeing would be impacted - golf is very beneficial to physical fitness, soul and support networks. The alternative would be to go to Greenacres Golf course which would be very negative in terms of added traffic congestion, costs and further greenhouse gases emitted through the extra driving. The loss of the Nelson Golf Club would be a major step backwards and impact our already stretched health system.	Would like to see the Airport authorities investigate extending the runway south to negate affects.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Another concern is the impact on the Tahunanui area itself and of relevance is that Tahuna beach has recently been lauded as one of NZs best. Who wants to go on holiday and be bombarded with endless overhead plane noise. Tourists need somewhere to stay and if the runway goes north, building restrictions would compromise any extra accommodation needed for these guests together with the unsatisfactory noise levels for existing accommodation.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S350.002	David Low	Oppose	Submitter is a golf player at the Nelson Golf Club. Health and wellbeing would be impacted - golf is very beneficial to physical fitness, soul and support networks. The alternative would be to go to Greenacres Golf course which would be very negative in terms of added traffic congestion, costs and further greenhouse gases emitted through the extra driving. The loss of the Nelson Golf Club would be a major step backwards and impact our already stretched health system. Another concern is the impact on the Tahunanui area itself and of relevance is that Tahuna beach has recently been lauded as one of NZs best. Who wants to go on holiday and be bombarded with endless overhead plane noise. Tourists need somewhere to stay and if the runway goes north, building restrictions would compromise any extra accommodation needed for these guests together with the unsatisfactory noise levels for existing accommodation. In time the runway will probably need extending further still, and by then extending south will be the only option, therefore it seems pointless extending north with all the problems associated with that when longer term the runway will be extending south anyway as the only option.	Would like to see the Airport authorities investigate extending the runway south to negate the affects.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S351.002	Jacobus Ham	Oppose	Objects to the extension of the runway at the north end, as it will adversely affect residents and many other businesses in the area. Believes that any extension if required, should be to the south end of the runway. This will have far less impact on the community and any ecological effects relatively minor to reclaim the seabed in the south direction.	Reconsider an extension to the South direction where it will have much less impact on local residents or businesses.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S352.001	Alexander Smit	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S352.002	Alexander Smit	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S352.003	Alexander Smit	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S352.004	Alexander Smit	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S352.005	Alexander Smit	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S352.006	Alexander Smit	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S352.007	Alexander Smit	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S352.011	Alexander Smit	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S352.013	Alexander Smit	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S352.015	Alexander Smit	Oppose	Changes jeopardise growth of an iconic holiday park. There are other options that can be explored, such as extension over water. Unreasonable noise levels and building restrictions devaluate property and people's livelihood. We don't need electric planes, there are no known environmental benefits.	Reconsider changing extension away from camp, towards the sea.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S353.004	Blair Riordan	Oppose	Submitters family own the golf pro-shop and coaching business located at the Nelson Golf Club. The extension of the runway to the Northern end would completely change/destroy the current golf course layout and separate the Nelson Golf Club buildings from the rest of the land which would destroy the submitters current business. The positive physical, mental and social value that these members get from playing golf is so important to their lives and their happiness. Would like the commissioners	The airport do more research into the affects on the community of this change.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					to seriously consider the effect that this would have on the generally older population of the golfing community and therefore the potential stress on already stretched health services. The submitters business (Total Golf) provides income for five different families and assists with three others. The Nelson Golf Course and all of its facilities make up a combination that is unique to the Nelson area. The championship golf course, the large clubhouse and café that can hold groups of 200 or more, a golf pro-shop that competes with any in the country and can meet any golfers needs, the unique location and the practice facilities mean the Nelson Golf Club is a destination. There are lots of considerations around the benefits of the Airports proposed changes but at what cost. There will be huge cost and many trade offs for many in the whole community not just the golfing community. The impacts of loss of business and employment from the whole organisation will be significant and feed into all areas of the whole community and negatively affect young Nelson born families. Appreciates the careful considerations of commissioners but please consider the direct and immediate loss for the community not just the potential gains for the future.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S353.005	Blair Riordan	Oppose	Submitters family own the golf pro-shop and coaching business located at the Nelson Golf Club. The extension of the runway to the Northern end would completely change/destroy the current golf course layout and separate the Nelson Golf Club buildings from the rest of the land which would destroy the submitters current business.	That it be considered that the airport extension should be at the Southern end of the runway.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					The positive physical, mental and social value that these members get from playing golf is so important to their lives and their happiness. Would like the commissioners to seriously consider the effect that this would have on the generally older population of the golfing community and therefore the potential stress on already stretched health services. The submitters business (Total Golf) provides income for five different families and assists with three others. The Nelson Golf Course and all of its facilities make up a combination that is unique to the Nelson area. The championship golf course, the large clubhouse and café that can hold groups of 200 or more, a golf pro-shop that competes with any in the country and can meet any golfers needs, the unique location and the practice facilities mean the Nelson Golf Club is a destination. There are lots of considerations around the benefits of the Airports proposed changes but at what cost. There will be huge cost and many trade offs for many in the whole community not just the golfing community. The impacts of loss of business and employment from the whole organisation will be significant and feed into all areas of the whole community and negatively affect young Nelson born families. Appreciates the careful considerations of commissioners but please consider the direct and immediate loss for the community not just the potential gains for the future.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S353.006	Blair Riordan	Oppose	Submitters family own the golf pro-shop and coaching business located at the Nelson Golf Club. The extension of the runway to the Northern end would completely change/destroy the current golf course layout and separate the Nelson Golf Club buildings from	That if the extension plan is for the future of the Nelson area then that considerations should be given to moving the airport completely to another location.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					the rest of the land which would destroy the submitters current business. The positive physical, mental and social value that these members get from playing golf is so important to their lives and their happiness. Would like the commissioners to seriously consider the effect that this would have on the generally older population of the golfing community and therefore the potential stress on already stretched health services. The submitters business (Total Golf) provides income for five different families and assists with three others. The Nelson Golf Course and all of its facilities make up a combination that is unique to the Nelson area. The championship golf course, the large clubhouse and café that can hold groups of 200 or more, a golf pro-shop that competes with any in the country and can meet any golfers needs, the unique location and the practice facilities mean the Nelson Golf Club is a destination. There are lots of considerations around the benefits of the Airports proposed changes but at what cost. There will be huge cost and many trade offs for many in the whole community not just the golfing community. The impacts of loss of business and employment from the whole organisation will be significant and feed into all areas of the whole community and negatively affect young Nelson born families. Appreciates the careful considerations of commissioners but please consider the direct and immediate loss for the community not just the potential gains for the future.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S354.001	Allison O'Donnell	Oppose	Not being able to play golf at the Nelson Golf Club in Bolt Road. Submitter has done this for the past 34 years, it is a huge part of their life. Seen huge benefits to people in	No decision specified.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					general when employed in the office at the golf club. It is very good for mental and physical health. It would be a disgrace for the Nelson area to lose such a green space. The golf club services more than just the golf community with huge amounts of people meeting at the clubhouse.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S355.001	William Rooney	Oppose	The submitter has been a member of the Nelson Golf Club for 33 years and opposes extension of the Nelson airport runway to the north as it would render the Nelson golf course and golf club unusable. He uses the clubhouse and course on average 4 days per week, which is a great source of exercise and social contact. The course is a very highly regarded championship links course by New Zealand Golf - the Submitter has played a NZ Interprovincial Masters tournament, a NZ Amateur, NZ Seniors and 2 South Island Seniors events - and holding these events has brought hundreds of participants. As Treasurer of the Nelson Cancer Society, the value of its golf fundraising event is recognised as the Nelson Cancer Society is reliant on fundraising and donations for its income. Loss of the golf club and course would be enormous for both the Submitter and his friends.	Decline the Nelson Airport runway extension.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S356.001	Nancy Davis	Oppose	The submitter belongs to the Nelson Golf course and play 3 times per week. She refers to the club as her primary place for exercise, sport and a meeting place for friends, its convenience (10 minutes) from home, and there being no other golf course of this calibre in Nelson City area. It would be a huge loss not only to golfers in this area but also throughout NZ, as well as to social and community groups which use the club.	That the Council do not extend the airport runway northwards but rather, consider if necessary, extend southwards.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S357.001	Valerie Wilson	Oppose	The submitter has been a member of the Nelson Golf Club for the past 24 years, plays there regularly each week, and opposes extension of the Nelson airport north into land owned by the Nelson Golf Club for reason that: - this would ruin the use of the Nelson Golf Club for its 700 members and visitors;	No decision requested.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- she could no longer play golf as other courses are a greater distance from home, and this would cause her to lose the social contact with friends at the club and cafe; - for several years the submitter has run an art gallery in the Nelson Golf Club cafe allowing local artists to display their work, and this would cease if the airport was extended and the club rooms become unusable; - her Sunday golf group which caters for new, old and young players would become impossible at any other venue. - the beauty and tranquility of Tahuna beach would be ruined by a lower flight path; - people would no longer want to use the Tahuna motor camp.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S358.001	Paul Benner	Oppose	No reasons given.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S359.002	John D0w	Oppose	The submitter is an active member of Nelson Golf Club, and opposes extension of the airport runway onto the Nelson Golf Club land as it will: - ruin an outstanding recreational facility; - deny the submitter the opportunity to keep playing the sport he loves; - cut the golf course in half, obliterating 5 holes and leaving the clubhouse on one side of the runway and the remaining hole on the other side with no access between them; -obliterate the irrigation pond, practice range and greenkeepers sheds and render the golf course unfit for use. The airport proposal grossly underestimates the recreational value the golf course provides for members and the many thousands of users each year.	Refuse the application.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S360.003	Ronald O'Reilly	Oppose	1. Extending the runway to the north would result in closure of the Nelson Golf Club. The Nelson Golf Club is the Submitter's main source of physical activity, the main provider of social activity for her and many of her retired men and women friends where for some the	1. Request that a proper, in-depth financial analysis be carried out by Independent, qualified experts to investigate thoroughly the costs involved in both northern and southern extension, including the cost of

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					social gatherings are the highlight of the week. 2. By extending the runway to the south Nelson airport could achieve its long-term goals while leaving the Nelson Golf Club intact. Southern extension = Long Term Goals + Nelson Golf Club.	reparation to the Nelson Golf Club for the northern extension proposal. 2. Request that a proper, in-depth report by carried out by independent, qualified experts to identify and where possible, quantify, the benefits that Nelson Golf Club provides to the city of Nelson. 3. Give full consideration to both costs and benefits when deciding on the recommendations from Council.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S360.004	Ronald O'Reilly	Oppose	1. Extending the runway to the north would result in closure of the Nelson Golf Club. The Nelson Golf Club is the Submitter's main source of physical activity, the main provider of social activity for her and many of her retired men and women friends where for some the social gatherings are the highlight of the week. 2. By extending the runway to the south Nelson airport could achieve its long-term goals while leaving the Nelson Golf Club intact. Southern extension = Long Term Goals + Nelson Golf Club	Convene a hearing of all interested parties, so that the views of the Nelson Golf Club and those who oppose the Private Plan Change and Runway Extension can be heard in public.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S361.002	Carol O'Reilly	Oppose	- Extending the runway to the north would result in closure of the Nelson Golf Club. The Nelson Golf Club is the Submitter's main source of physical activity, the main provider of social activity for her and many of her retired men and women friends where for some the social gatherings are the highlight of the week. - By extending the runway to the south Nelson airport could achieve its long-term goals while leaving the Nelson Golf Club intact. Southern extension = Long Term Goals + Nelson Golf Club	Convene a hearing of all interested parties, so that the views of the Nelson Golf Club and those who oppose the Private Plan Change and Runway Extension can be heard in public.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S361.003	Carol O'Reilly	Oppose	- Extending the runway to the north would result in closure of the Nelson Golf Club. The Nelson Golf Club is the Submitter's main source of physical activity, the main provider of social activity for her and many of her retired men and women friends where for some the	1. Request that a proper, in-depth financial analysis be carried out by Independent, qualified experts to investigate thoroughly the costs involved in both northern and southern extension, including the cost of

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					social gatherings are the highlight of the week. - By extending the runway to the south Nelson airport could achieve its long-term goals while leaving the Nelson Golf Club intact. Southern extension = Long Term Goals + Nelson Golf Club	reparation to the Nelson Golf Club for the northern extension proposal. 2. Request that a proper, in-depth report by carried out by independent, qualified experts to identify and where possible, quantify, the benefits that Nelson Golf Club provides to the city of Nelson. 3. Give full consideration to both costs and benefits when deciding on the recommendations from Council.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S362.001	Barry Robertson	Oppose	Objects to Council claiming land from the golf club and moving towards a residential area. There appears to be a large area of land to the south of the airport that would be less obstructive to the community.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S363.001	Alan Cockrell	Oppose	Submitter opposes the proposed private plan change in its entirety because: a) there is no assessment of the loss of economic benefit to the region in losing the 18 hole championship golf course. b) options for the extension are not adequately costed to understand the proposal to extend north. c) other solutions are available to achieve a more holistic outcome for the region.	Reject the proposed private plan change 30, and that the airport be instructed to consider options in conjunction with affected organisations and groups including NGC, Tahunanui residents, campsite management etc.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S364.002	Brian Oldridge	Oppose	Submitter has been a member of the Nelson Golf Club for over 15 years. This has been good for his health and meeting new people. Losing this club will not be good for the community of Nelson with all the fund raising the club gets for many charities in the area.	Reject the application.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S365.001	Gregory Galway	Oppose	The submitter is employed by Nelson Golf Club so his livelihood is threatened. It would decimate the golf course.	Reject the application.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S366.001	Richard Flemming	Oppose	No reasons given.	Reject the application.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S367.001	Graeme Wilson	Oppose	The submitter uses Nelson Golf Course. The extension of the airport north would: - ruin the Nelson Golf Club (loss of the historic golf course being a backward step for the future of Nelson) and the Tahunanui area; - totally ruin the fairways and render the club house, land and caretakers facilities useable; - affect the Submitter's recreation and social life as it would not be feasible to travel in and out of Nelson for golf. The extension of the Airport south makes much sense. It would not affect so many residents and would allow the popular golf course to remain. Compare it to the very successful port reclamation where acres of land was reclaimed, creating a very useful business area.	That the airport extends south into the Monaco area by reclaiming the land there.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S368.001	Christine Pitcaithly	Oppose	The submitter has been a golf club member for the past 20 years and takes to the course 3 times a week. She opposes all provisions of the proposal which adversely affect the current operation of the Nelson Golf Club. As NCC continues to promote active transport as a priority for the city, it would be a retrograde step to withdraw this operation (if the course was to close) for all those visiting to actively participate at Nelson's only 18 hole championship course.	All changes which would adversely affect the current operation of Nelson Golf Club be declined.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S369.001	Connor Winter	Oppose	Submitter has been a member of the Nelson Golf Club for 17 years and is also an employee of the Nelson Golf Club. The proposal will decimate the golf course, which is the Submitter's closest accessible golf course Golf Club and one held dearly to his heart, put him out of a job, and result in loss of access to all 700 members and visitors.	Reject the application.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S370.001	John Douglas	Oppose	Submitter has been a member of Nelson Golf Club for 45 years, and opposes an extension of the Nelson Airport runway to the north. Submission refers to: - The legacy of the golf course and the length of time it has existed and the hope it remains. - The golf course and club have brought the submitter fond and lasting memories and friendships, their "happy place". - A runway extension to the north will wreck the golf course and render it virtually unusable. Refers to loss of 5 golf holes; split of remaining 13 golf holes and the course amenities and infrastructure (the clubhouse, pro shop, practice putting green, practice chipping green, driving range, cart shed, driveway and carpark); likely impact on the golf course irrigation system; access between remaining 13 holes, the greenkeepers facilities and the golf course. A split where the golf course is on one side of the runway and the amenities on the other is totally unmanageable and unusable. - If the golf course closes there is significant impact on the community. Refers to in excess of 700 members; being the only 18 hole golf course in Nelson; significant visitor numbers; hosting of charity events; hosting national championship events; facilities used by over 70 Community Groups; loss of jobs for office staff, catering staff, pro shop staff and green keeping staff. - The Martin Jenkins final report of 27 February 2023 "Nelson Airport runway extension economic benefits of airport and assessment of runway extension options" does not discuss reparations to the Nelson Golf Club apart from land acquisition at market rate. Refers to	The northern runway extension be removed from consideration and that the Resource Management Plan and Notified Private Plan not be changed to include any possible runway extension to the north.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Wellington Airport paying Miramar Golf Club over $40 million in reparations for impact and loss of amenities. Similar reparation to the Nelson Golf Club would alter markedly the comparison between a north versus south runway extension. - The community living adjacent to the runway extension and beneath the flight path will be directly affected. Refers to planes closer to properties and increased noise, and whether people pushing for change live in the Tahunanui community. - The Martin Jenkins report discusses a possible tunnel for Point Road. There is a reclamation precedent in the estuary with the formation of the Stoke Bypass. Reclamation of Point Road would have less impact than that and is an obvious option with a southern runway extension. - Insufficient investigation has been undertaken, the figures are skewed in favour of the northern runway extension, the Martin Jenkin report is solely about costs, and has not sufficiently considered the needs of the local golfing community and Tahunanui residents. It smacks of money ahead of existing property owners' needs.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S371.002	Warren Tilley	Oppose	The submitter has been a member of Nelson Golf Course for 50 years. The Nelson Airport runway extension as in its proposal form will distinctly affect the use of Nelson's golf course, making it unfit for use and drastically affecting the Submitter's health and well-being. Further investigation should be given to extending the runway south.	Reject the application from the Nelson Airport.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S372.002	Eve Clarke	Oppose	The extension of the runway is strongly opposed: - 700 members lose their course and history - community groups such as Special Olympics lose a facility to run programs	Extend the runway south not north. Explain the full gains of extension of the runway and if its worth the loss of the

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- Youth golf will die in central nelson without an 18-hole course. - Nelson will be left with 2 18 courses and will affect tourism and money into the region.	Nelson Golf Club.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S373.001	Oke Blaikie	Oppose	The Nelson Golf club is unique with its over 700 members, many organisations use its facilities and a star attraction for thousands of golfing visitors from all over the globe. The prospects of the club being established elsewhere are nil.	Private plan change withdrawn.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S374.002	Nelson Branch NZIIA	Oppose	he NZIIA Nelson Branch meets at the golf club as a venue for 100 guests each month. The loss of this will have major negative implications for the organisation.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S376.001	Wendy Wallis	Oppose	The extension of the airport runway will have an extensive impact on the lives of Tahuna holiday park residents and all residents within a 5 mile radius.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S377.001	June Ord	Oppose	Object to the changes in their entirety to extend the airport runway through Tahuna Holiday Park.	Please relook at other options i.e. expanding south over the water rather than north over people.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S378.002	Russell Parks	Oppose	The submitter is resident in Beach Road and is already subject to noise and fuel droppage from overhead planes. The extension should be to the south where there is no limit on length; limited residents in the flight zone; no limitations on existing residents; less impact on existing and future dwellings; only a few dwellings in Monaco Pt affected.	The extension should be to the south.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S379.002	Allan Robinson	Oppose	Submitter opposes the runway extension because: - the noise level is high now, so bigger planes will have bigger engines; - will mean the golf course will go; - high level of noise will mean less people would want to stay at the camp; - it would spoil the whole area.	No decision requested.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S380.002	Tracey Beatty	Oppose	Object to the changes in their entirety to extend the airport runway through the Tahuna campground. Wants Nelson to keep the Tahuna Holiday Park camp in its entirety.	Please relook at other options, may be towards the sea so people don't lose their homes.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S381.001	Rudy Hursman	Oppose	Object to the changes in their entirety. What will happen to the permanent residents that live there.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S382.001	Melodie Prescott	Oppose	Object to the changes in their entirety. Keep Tahuna Holiday Camp in its entirety.	Please relook at other options i.e. expanding over the sea so people don't lose their homes.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S383.001	Mary Owl	Oppose	Object to the changes in their entirety. Lets keep the Tahuna Holiday Park.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S384.001	Dorothy Hambly	Oppose	Object to the changes in their entirety. Think of the permanent residents and holiday makers.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S385.001	Stephen Russell	Oppose	In its entirety.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S386.001	Louise McDougall	Oppose	The submitter is a resident at Tahuna Beach Camp. The camp is a very popular destination for holiday makers and is home for a large number of residents. Concerned about the effect PPC30 may well have on what many have known as home for many years. Many are retired people who do not have the resources required to rent or buy a one in the current market. Tahuna Bean Camp is an icon of Nelson and has been good for the general economy.	No decision requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S387.001	Sheryl Beasont	Oppose	I object to the changes in their entirety.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S388.001	Keith Swift	Oppose	Tahuna Beach camp should not be regarded as an open space. A village of 131 people living there permanently. No consideration has been given to noise reduction for these people, most are single-income people and elderly.	I am opposed to all changes to PPC30. Noise reduction for this village of people has to be considered as aircraft noise is already loud.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S389.001	Barry Smith	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S389.002	Barry Smith	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S389.003	Barry Smith	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S389.004	Barry Smith	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S389.005	Barry Smith	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO).	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S389.006	Barry Smith	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S389.007	Barry Smith	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S389.011	Barry Smith	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S389.013	Barry Smith	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S390.001	Lindsay Twiname	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club. The submission refers to: - The personal impact of the loss of Nelson's golf course: Runway extension would destroy Nelson's golf course and club house, Nelson's sole 18 hole golf course for over 100 years, and this would be a lost to members as well as to the public of the Nelson region and visitors to Nelson; Golf is a big part of the submitter's life and her overall well-being, and she enjoys the physical exercise, social connections, good friendships and the mental stimulation of playing 3 times per week, and also joins in with the various social events held in the club house for members and the public; without Nelson's golf course and as other courses are not easily accessible, she would no long play golf. - The current economic benefit of Nelson's golf course: It is of championship standard and attracts visitors from around the world, hosts many national competitions and charity golf events, and is one of Nelson's significant tourist attractions. The loss of the golf course would result in a loss of tourist dollars which fund local businesses as well as Nelson City Council. If charity funding opportunity was lost, these charities would need to seek funding elsewhere in the Nelson community and/or reduce their services. - Community benefit of the golf course's club house: Is the venue of choice for about 70 Nelson community groups; offers ample parking which is essential for older	Reject Nelson Airport Ltd application.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					people; spacious and has modern sound/video systems; can cater for multiple groups; has cheap hire cost. Without the club house, many community groups would be struggling to find the same quality facilities with ease of access, at a similar low price. - Undeclared extra cost to ratepayers: Runway extension is through privately owned land so NAL would need to buy the land at a fair and agreed value. This has not been included in NAL's costings. Compensation would be substantial and is an additional cost to ratepayers, who should be fully informed of this. - Misleading costings provided by NAL? Proper costings, including a geotech report, seem to be done for a runway extension to the north, however the costings supplied for a runway extension to the south are not based on a proper onsite geotech report. NAL may have therefore not provided equally-researched and justifiable costings to consider the two options. - Unsuitability of the airport and golf course land: Subject to liquefaction, sinking whilst sea levels are rising; proposed runway extension may have a very short useful life and be an enormously costly exercise for ratepayers to bear. - Conflict of interest: Nelson City Council is a 50% owner of Nelson Airport Ltd, it should not be hearing submissions and should have appointed independent Commissioners.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S391.001	Catherine Hiku	Oppose	Submitter is a permanent resident at the Tahuna Beach Holiday Park and objects to PPC30 in its entirety. The extension north will have a major impact on us here and for all the residents in the surrounding areas.	A southbound extension, Extend over water not people.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S392.001	Peter Calvert	Oppose	Disagree with the proposed changes and the effect it will have on Tahuna.	No decision requested.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S393.001	Gary Walton	Oppose	Proposed changes will affect the residents of Tahuna, Tahuna Holiday Park (THP) and the Nelson Golf Club. The submission refers to: - the prohibition of camping and short-term living; - no new buildings within the "airnoise boundary"; - effect on the viability of THP (THP is an iconic holiday destination to many NZers and overseas travellers but its viability will be affected with no upgrades and maintenance reductions); - severe restrictions (loss of 5 holes) on Nelson Golf Club.	Suit alternative options (southern end).
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S394.001	Clara Narbey	Oppose	Submitter objects to the changes in their entirety. As a person directly affected by all these changes (the submitter lives in the air noise zone, red) they will be adversely affected, and quality of life affected. The reason for living permanently at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park will be absolved.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S395.001	Nicholas Narbey	Oppose	Property rights are diminished, compensation is not discussed, and abuse of natural rights. Submitter's property is in the red zone and is closely affected.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S396.001	Alison McKeown	Oppose	Airport noise, including the effect it will have on the Tahuna beach campground.	The airport extension goes the opposite direction from Tahuna beach.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S397.001	Rosslynn Murrell	Oppose	The submitter lives within the air noise boundary.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S398.001	Janene Taylor	Oppose	The submitter, who opposes the private plan change and airport runway extension, refers to: - It directly affects her and others who are residents of the Tahunanui suburb and who are residing within the proposed areas that will have increased noise and restricted building and planting of trees. - The Tahuna motor camp already experiences a high level of air noise traffic which some temporary visitors/tourists find to be discouraging. The proposed plan is going to make this worse and may require the Submitter to move her home to another site.	Recommend further research into the effects the runway extension will have on flight zone residents and Tahunanui holiday park business, tourism and residents.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- The Airport needs to consider the social impact on people who live in the area and who may have lowered property value. - Only increase to runway should be towards the south, by land reclaim, and at the same time creating a nicer cycle lane alongside the runway toward Richmond . - Several domestic regional airlines have folded in the past. Is Nelson airport even worthwhile extending at all as only Air NZ and a few Wellington flights that use it and far less than years ago.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S399.001	Tina Thomas	Oppose	Opposes the extension of the runway, and proposal in its entirety, due to: - the imposed restrictions, - impacts to the Park's financial viability, - diminished enjoyment of the area, and - significant impact on many residents, employers and holiday makers.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Planning Maps	S399.003	Tina Thomas	Oppose	Opposes the air noise boundaries due to: - the imposed restrictions, - impacts to the Park's financial viability, - diminished enjoyment of the area, and - significant impact on many residents, employers and holiday makers.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S399.005	Tina Thomas	Oppose	Opposes the building and landscape restrictions, due to: - the imposed restrictions, - impacts to the Park's financial viability, - diminished enjoyment of the area, and - significant impact on many residents, employers and holiday makers.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S400.001	Helen McGrath	Oppose	The submitter is a semi permanent resident of the holiday park. The airport plans would destroy a much-loved place, for	No decision requested.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					its residents and the large number of campers who enjoy this lovely place. It is really a jewel in the Councils crown.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S401.001	Margaret Calvert	Oppose	The submitter objects on any alteration which will affect the Tahuna Park camping ground.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S402.001	Ann Gale	Oppose	No reasons given.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S403.001	Veronica Griffiths	Oppose	No reasons given.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S404.001	Bruce Bell	Oppose	The runway extension to the north will have too much impact on people's living situations and holiday plans, simply not worth it for reasons given (i.e. lower emissions aircraft).	Decline this extension or look at alternatives to the south.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S405.001	Patrick Simpson	Oppose	All provisions are opposed. To seek approval for this entire application 10 to 15 years before the proposed changes are required is completely wrong.	Delay application for 5 years at least, to allow time for more accurate and up-to-date information and estimates to be supplied at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S406.002	Ann Moulder	Oppose	Submission refers to: - lack of detailed consideration of other options and locations; - no account taken of the long term impact of climate change and the impact of the airport land sinking; - impacts on the health of the golf course members.	That the application is declined. If not declined, then the extension should be considered to the south so the golf club can be retained and there is significantly less impact on the wider community.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S407.001	Alastair Cotterill	Oppose	The Submission states that the proposal: - will have major implications of Tahunanui community; and any extension of the airport should be an increase of noise over water, not over people; - doesn't recognise the serious impact it will have on Tahunanui beach camp and its residents; - will have a vast effect on the golf course.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S408.001	Robert Stevenson	Oppose	The Submission refers to: - The plan change is a complex issue. Not enough	More time with proper community engagement needs to happen before this plan change is considered.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					information has been provided, and what is is difficult to digest and interpret. - The process has been rushed and with a short time for submissions.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S408.004	Robert Stevenson	Oppose	A broad range of retail, industrial and service businesses should not be allowed under the change of zoning. Nelson Airport only needs to service the aviation sector.	No unrelated business on Airport land.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S409.002	Jeanne Core	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club. The submission refers to: - Deep concern for the future of Nelson Golf Club which has served the community for over 100 years and is the heart of many people's social, mental and physical wellbeing and brings thousands of people and dollars to Nelson. Losing it would diminish Nelson's liveability. - The golf course's support of charities in our area, through head gartering their meetings to hosting fundraising events, in the last year alone over $250,000 was raised. - The club being the only 18 hole course in Nelson, and the effect of its loss on Nelson's liveability and as a destination for many tourists. - Moving and expanding a noisy business such as an airport closer to thousands of homes, many motels and our beaches cannot make Nelson a better place. - The loss of the huge green space and noise buffer provided by the Nelson golf course would be devasting to the lives of so many people.	Decline the private plan change for the Nelson airport runway extension in its entirety.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S410.001	M.T Watson	Oppose	The potential substantial financial and social upheaval this would cause to Tahunanui locals in general, park tenants and holiday visitors.	Investigate in depth why runway extension cannot go to the south end.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S411.001	Vanessa Maguire	Oppose	The Submitter: - Opposes the proposal due to increase pollution, environmental damage to bird life and nature, with not enough evidence to support the consequences of the plan change. - Questions her safety being put at risk, with Flood zones, new project 2zero? A stressful process that has already been on going with the pump situation in the area. - Already has double glazing which is not enough to be woken up at 6am on sat/sat. Is affected by noise levels and pollution. The air filter she installed has to be cleaned on a weekly basis. - Believes lots of neighbours are renting so not enough notice to owners of the property. - Considers the process is being rushed, without enough consulting of the people that will be affected the most, and in language not easily understood. - What controls are being looked at to cap these noise hours?	Allow more time to invest and collate the factors involved before any changes are made.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S411.005	Vanessa Maguire	Oppose	The Submitter: - Opposes the proposal due to increase pollution, environmental damage to bird life and nature, with not enough evidence to support the consequences of the plan change. - Questions her safety being put at risk, with Flood zones, new project 2zero? A stressful process that has already been on going with the pump situation in the area. - Already has double glazing which is not enough to be woken up at 6am on sat/sat. Is affected by noise levels and pollution. The air filter she installed has to be cleaned on a weekly basis. - Believes lots of neighbours are renting so not enough notice to owners of the property. - Considers the process is being rushed, without enough consulting of the people that will be affected the most, and in language not easily understood.	Market value needs to be offered before the proposal devaluates properties that will be affected.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- What controls are being looked at to cap these noise hours?	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S411.006	Vanessa Maguire	Oppose	The Submitter: - Opposes the proposal due to increase pollution, environmental damage to bird life and nature, with not enough evidence to support the consequences of the plan change. - Questions her safety being put at risk, with Flood zones, new project 2zero? A stressful process that has already been on going with the pump situation in the area. - Already has double glazing which is not enough to be woken up at 6am on sat/sat. Is affected by noise levels and pollution. The air filter she installed has to be cleaned on a weekly basis. - Believes lots of neighbours are renting so not enough notice to owners of the property. - Considers the process is being rushed, without enough consulting of the people that will be affected the most, and in language not easily understood. - What controls are being looked at to cap these noise hours?	Market value needs to be offered before the proposal devaluates properties that will be affected.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S412.001	Carole Simpson	Oppose	The submitter supports extending the airport from the southern end of the runway, leaving the iconic camping ground alone so that many holiday makers will continue to have a restful enjoyable safe campers park.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S413.001	Colin Oldroyd	Oppose	We have enough noise, we don't need more. Nelson doesn't need a bigger runway, it would inconvenience a lot of people.	Nelson doesn't need a bigger runway.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S414.001	William Moulder	Oppose	The submitter opposes the application and notice of requirement over the golf course land, and refers to: - Not enough detail on other options. - New information with regard to climate change and the sinking of the land e.g. why can't the southern end be extended in conjunction with the new sea walls that will be needed?	Decline the application.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- More information and research needed on: population growth and passenger growth; the type of aircraft in the future; the capacity of flights with existing runway and infrastructure; and the likelihood of Nelson being always a feeder airport using smaller aircraft with a larger number of flights e.g.: Christchurch used to fly 747 aircraft now they use 737s.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S415.001	Diane Varey	Oppose	The submitter opposes the increase in size of the Nelson airport and the impacts of planes on a far-reaching residential area from Richmond - Tahunanui. Lessons from Queenstown airport should be examined - the negative effects of having an airport in a busy residential area is very detrimental. Refers to noise pollution, low-lying land and risks to leisure users of land surrounding the airport.	Move the airport from a residential area to a suitable distance from Nelson.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S416.003	Bruno Zahner	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out to allow for an extension to the north and an extension to the south. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, or if no extension takes place, then the Overlay will be incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	The Airport Effects Control Overlay must stay in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S416.004	Bruno Zahner	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Airnoise Boundary, REr.65.1, REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1 - The proposed wording of the rules means that the new construction of most ancillary buildings, such as a studio, sleep-out, she-shed, play-house would no longer be a Permitted Activity. - The reduction of the target indoor level to 40 dBA Ldn	That the proposed changes should be declined, and that the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					is not necessary. - There are technical errors in the proposed Appendix 19.1 - Consideration must be given to consistent rules between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S416.005	Bruno Zahner	Oppose	Rule INr.25 concerning engine testing - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far higher than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	That the proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and the engine testing / Rule INr.25 comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S416.007	Bruno Zahner	Oppose	Compass Swing rule - The testing of aircraft compasses should be subject to the same rules as the testing of aircraft engines. - The proposed new rule does not address the emissions nuisance.	That the Notice of Requirement and the proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected and that Council require the following controls on compass swinging: - It must be carried out downwind of the nearest residential area. - The noise level must comply with INr.25 unless: * The affected residents are given 24 hours prior notice. * The procedure is carried out between 9 am and 3 pm on schooldays.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S417.003	Ruth Zahner	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out to allow for an extension to the north and an extension to the south. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome.	The Airport Effects Control Overlay must stay in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- If the extension takes place to the south, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, or if no extension takes place, then the Overlay will be incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S417.004	Ruth Zahner	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Airnoise Boundary, REr.65.1, REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1 - The proposed wording of the rules means that the new construction of most ancillary buildings, such as a studio, sleep-out, she-shed, play-house would no longer be a Permitted Activity. - The reduction of the target indoor level to 40 dBA Ldn is not necessary. - There are technical errors in the proposed Appendix 19.1 - Consideration must be given to consistent rules between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	That the proposed changes should be declined, and that the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S417.005	Ruth Zahner	Oppose	Rule INr.25 concerning engine testing - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far higher than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	That the proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and the engine testing / Rule INr.25 comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S417.007	Ruth Zahner	Oppose	Compass Swing rule - The testing of aircraft compasses should be subject to the same rules as the testing of aircraft engines. - The proposed new rule does not address the emissions nuisance.	That the Notice of Requirement and the proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected and that Council require the following controls on compass swinging: - It must be carried out downwind of the nearest residential area. - The noise level must comply with INr.25

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
						unless: * The affected residents are given 24 hours prior notice. * The procedure is carried out between 9 am and 3 pm on schooldays.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S418.001	Jill Southon	Oppose	The submission refers: - The Airport company has not consulted with affected parties in good faith. NAL should work with the community through good faith consultation rather than try and impose its will on the Tahunanui community -- after all, ratepayers of Nelson/Tasman own NAL. - The proposed Airport Zone is grossly permissive, allowing NAL to have unfettered development opportunity quite unrelated to aviation activity. - The proposal imposes unreasonable restrictions on properties within the Airport Effects Control Overlay. - NAL is not showing any sense of respecting its social licence to operate.	The Airport should be extended to the South where any increase in noise will be over water, not over people.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S419.001	Resilienz Ltd	Oppose	This submission relates to the strategic approach to long-term airport viability, the statement of environmental effects regarding settlement and sea level rise, and matters of noise mitigation and costs associated with same. Resilienz Ltd has an extensive background in the design, project management and cost management of construction projects (although not of airport infrastructure), and over a decade of involvement in the development and application of climate-related strategies. This proposal is opposed because they consider it has been promulgated with inadequate consideration of important strategic implications associated with airport construction and operation in the	Decline this application in its present form.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					mid- to late- 21st century. The submission refers to: 1. Further entrenching the establishment of an airport in what is essentially the wrong place from a potential future inundation perspective, especially to cater for technology (electric aircraft) whose parameters and viability are far from well established or understood. 2. The prudence of long-term planning of major infrastructure and of the necessity to commit, incrementally if need be, to the development of necessarily different forms of infrastructure in response to changing circumstances. It is unwise to perpetuate, even incrementally, major infrastructure that is inappropriate for its foreseeable future. 3. It is not viable to incrementally relocate an airport. 4. Circumstances have changed radically in the past 50 years, notably with regard to the varied impacts of climate change on low lying coastal properties, and on the medium-to-long term viability of almost all economies, aviation, and energy supplies. 5. Discussion in the proposal of alternatives has focused on combinations of northern or southern extensions of the runway - there is no meaningful discussion of the merits or otherwise of whether the airport should be relocated. 6. Sweeping assurances given in 16.1.4 Section 7 regarding adverse effects associated with flooding and stormwater being "avoided, remedied or mitigated through detailed design and subsequent regional consenting pathways" are not accepted. 7. The limited level of consideration of: a) Medium to long term effect of sea level rise and the compounding effects of land settlement. b) The likely low viability of defending the airport against the effects of sea level rise c) The failure to adequately appraise the proposal	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					through the "climate lens" required by Nelson City's Long Term Plan.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S420.001	Joanna Santa Barbara	Oppose	The submitter opposes the runway extension and the submission refers to: 1. The need to reduce the amount of aviation emissions in New Zealand now. There is a strong tendency to imagine that we can deal with the climate crisis by technological innovation, with no necessity to change our behaviour. One of the necessary changes is simply flying less. 2. Technology is insufficient. Numerous technological innovations are being developed to reduce aviation emissions. They are insufficient to do the job at this point, and action is required now. 3. Carbon budgets. Government has calculated national carbon budgets of allowable emissions to attempt to stay under 1.5 degrees of warming. Nelson Tasman Climate Forum has calculated the Nelson and Tasman share of this. It will be vital for infrastructure projects such as the runway extension to estimate the embodied, operational and maintenance emissions of proposals, and these can then be considered alongside carbon emissions budgets to cover all emission purposes of the region. With an added allowance for growth, emissions in both Nelson and Tasman must decline at an annual rate of about 9% a year, and the need of a runway extension must be considered in the context of these constraints. 4. Carbon offsets cannot be used to absolve 'sins of emission'. We must tackle the difficult tasks of burning less fuel and using less cement, and to think of carbon offsets as reversing some of our historical emissions while getting on to the job of reducing our current emissions speedily.	Reject the proposed private plan change.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					5. The site of the airport is too vulnerable to warrant further infrastructure investment, with a limited life space due to sea level rise and vertical subsidence.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S421.001	Denis Davis	Oppose	The submitter strongly objects to this proposal in its entirety, and asks why the ground to the South in the estuary is not reclaimed where it would have less disruption on established housing areas rather than extending to the North. The submission refers to: - As a Tahunanui homeowner, the detrimental effect on the value and ability to sell his property e.g. getting resource consent which the airport would have the authority to object to. - As a member of the Nelson Golf Course, it is a well known fact that exercise and mixing with individuals in the community plays an important role in mental and physical health and destroying Nelson 18-hole championship course is to no--one's benefit. - Geotech report: there was no site visit; why is reclaiming not an option; report needs to be open and transparent. - Nelson City Council bought all the houses at the South end in the 1960s with the intention of the runway going South. - The costs to proceed with the proposal and whether $32 million is believable. - Nelson Golf Club owns its land, it is not the NCC, TDC or Nelson Airport's land to bulldoze through the middle of.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S422.001	Barry Thompson	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed change as: 1. There are other alternatives; and 2. It will ruin the Nelson Gold Club property that has been in existence for approx. 125 years. Extending the runway south: - Will remove a lot of the problems of: 1. Noise 2. Runway Length 3. Zoning and existing designations to the North	Airport investigates and proceeds with a plan to not extend its influence to the North, but instead look to extending their runway and flight path to the south, into the shallow tidal seawaters.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					affecting or damaging a large area of residential housing. - Allow the Golf Club and residential area to the North and East of the Airport to remain "as is". - Could be easily lengthened with little interference to the residential areas close to the Airport in a simple cost effective manner - the Submitter understands that many years ago the residences on the road to Monaco (to the south of the Runway) were removed and a prohibition placed on building in this area for an intended runway lengthening to the south. Modern changes to aircraft design over the next 10+ years may leave the existing airport as satisfactory for use or perhaps a short extension to the South may suffice.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S423.001	Matthew Grimes	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club, and a PGA trainee professional who has lots to do with the current juniors at Nelson Golf Club. In opposing the runway extension to the north the submission refers to: - Loss of lifelong relationships that for the Submitter started as a junior golfer. - Loss of opportunity for junior golfers - having a golf course means kids aged between 5-18 have full access to a world of skills, growth and most importantly, fun, in a location 10-20 minute bike from home or school, and where they will learn not only how to play golf but a range of skills such as communication, etiquette, manners and the ability to form friendships. - Loss of employment for the Submitter and other staff members who works at Total Golf which is located at Nelson Golf Club. The Submitter would be forced to leave the region to complete study and continue on the path as a PGA member. - Loss of business for Total Golf. Total Golf has been owned and operated by the Riordan family for the last 6 years, countless amounts of hard work has gone into	Extend the runway to the south, move the whole runway to another location, or don't extend it at all.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					making it what is today, and it is the only company in Nelson that offers golf lessons, club fitting and a driving range. This will also heavily impact on clientele, far beyond Nelson Golf club and into all clubs around Tasman. - Effect on the current staff of Nelson golf club, people such as the greenskeepers, café staff and management etc. who play a huge part in the happiness and wellbeing of the 700+ members at Nelson Golf Club. There is no certain future for the club if the runway is to extend to the north and all these jobs may be lost.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S424.001	Anthony Finnigan	Oppose	No reason is given for alternatives not being considered. This option has such a massive detrimental effect on so many people, citizen and visitors alike.	The matter be referred back until the applicants can show all parties concerns have been considered.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S425.001	Tahunanui Community Hub	Oppose	In relation to the planning process the submission refers to: - the total disregard and connection to engage with the Tahunanui community; - what was the selection criteria for the 1549 affected landowners, occupiers and statutory who received the notification letter? - every form of engagement was online - this does not work with a large % of our community; - there were no hard copies until the third week of four for consultation; - there has also been no in-person drop-in sessions to describe the ramifications of the plan changes on the residents and business owners in Tahunanui; - the submission form is incredibly hard to understand; - considering the volume of data and legalese speak of information , one month for submissions is too tight. Queries whether NCC have a clear vision and focus for Tahunanui Community, and refers to: - the last report was formally done in 2004, 20 years ago. - the past 2 years have seen different ad hoc policies implemented as a wider Nelson Vision, with little to no regard and engagement with the Tahunanui Seaside	In person Community drop-in sessions in Tahunanui.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Village, its residents and business owners, The submission refers to: the recent August 2022 rain event; Covid; the cost of living crisis; the housing crisis; Tahunanui having all of Nelson's Emergency housing; a primary school with a transient roll of students; the Tahunanui Community Hub under immense pressure; mental health, drug issues and general community dysfunctionality; being one of the lowest socio-economic communities in NZ - and the great concern that the stress this engagement process has put on community members. A letter in a letterbox, or saying information is online, is not engagement. The submitter supports the growth of the Nelson Airport, but believes a "collaborative approach" with the community to create buy in is also beneficial. In relation to the Extension of Runway format and overlays, the submission questions: - why the proposed runway extension is north vs south? - whether a shared approach been considered, taking land from both ends of the current runway? - who came up with the new Proposed Airnoise Boundary and Proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay? - why EMAS has not been considered, which would reduce the area required of land needed to provide a safe buffer? - whether there has been consideration to activities in the Tahunanui Beach Reserve, such as sporting and community events? - Tahunanui Beach was named as one of the best beaches in the world and is arguably the largest recreational area in Nelson/Tasman - has there been a study into the effect on this incredible space and its 1000s of users? - whilst houses and property can be mitigated for, what about the "kiwi lifestyle" and the enjoyment of BBQs with friends, family and neighbours in one's backyard?	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- the possibility of adding a Granny flat for older family members? - the right to develop one's own property? - whether a buy-out option has been considered for most affected, such as in place with Port Nelson? - if Nelson Airport has no plans to be an International Airport, then why are they requesting the right to add extra retail, hospitality, accommodation and light industrial? Many of these businesses and services are already located in Tahunanui, less than 5 minutes from the Airport. The ramifications and restraints the Plan Change has on Tahunanui businesses is unacceptable. Value the airport as our neighbour and don't wish to stymy its potential. Ask that both Nelson Airport and Nelson City Council take the time to engage with the most affected community, be transparent and be neighbourly. Support both the Nelson Golf Club and Tahuna Holiday Park in being able to continue their operations.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S425.003	Tahunanui Community Hub	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for S425.001.	Guidance in how to fill out submissions, many were overwhelmed.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S425.005	Tahunanui Community Hub	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for S425.001.	Longer engagement to ensure all those affected aware. Engagement with Iwi started 2022, why not Tahunanui as neighbours?
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S425.007	Tahunanui Community Hub	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for S425.001.	Appears rushed, 10-15 yrs out but decision to be made now.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S426.001	John and Sally Gilbertson	Oppose	The Submitters have been residents of Tahunanui for the past 35 years, and in 1997 developed a Motel in Golf Road (within the airport overlay). While supporting the Airport's wish to develop their business to provide the city with a safe modern gateway, the Submitters do not support their application as it stands for reasons that:	No decision requested.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					• They live in a neighbourhood which will be seriously affected, and there has been poor engagement with the people of Tahunanui and a rushed timeframe for submissions; • Much of the report supplied by NAL is based on modelling on aircraft technology that has not yet been developed, therefore its reliability is questioned. • The plan change will give NAL control over a large part of the community, and it will affect how people can develop their property by placing restrictions on any alterations or additions they may wish to make, therefore the value of their property. • In the Future Development Strategy (2022), Tahunanui was identified as being an important location for multi-storey redevelopment, with the provision of intensified housing, tourist accommodation, and related businesses. This proposal gives the control of this future development to NAL • The NAL proposal removes one of the current overlays effectively reducing the number of residences and businesses affected - this skews the figures being used for weightings applied to the North and South and reduces the number of properties that would be eligible for any mitigation funding.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S427.001	Monika Rudolf	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S427.002	Monika Rudolf	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S427.003	Monika Rudolf	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S427.004	Monika Rudolf	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S427.005	Monika Rudolf	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S427.006	Monika Rudolf	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S427.007	Monika Rudolf	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S427.011	Monika Rudolf	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S427.013	Monika Rudolf	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S427.015	Monika Rudolf	Oppose	Submitter works at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park and lives in Tahunanui. It would be the downfall for the Park and its residents.	Relook at extending in the opposite direction (south) where no housing or camp is affected.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S428.001	Ian Lash	Oppose	Opposes the extension north into the Nelson Golf Club course as this is a facility used by Nelsonians and a large number of visitors.	Full and exhaustive investigation into a southern extension.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S428.003	Ian Lash	Oppose	Opposes the extension north into the Nelson Golf Club course as this is a facility used by Nelsonians and a large number of visitors.	Consideration be given to a full relocation of the airport in view of predicted inundation of the area due to climate change.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S428.005	Ian Lash	Oppose	Opposes the extension north into the Nelson Golf Club course as this is a facility used by Nelsonians and a large number of visitors.	Take full cognisance of the impact on the golf club facilities.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S428.007	Ian Lash	Oppose	Opposes the extension north into the Nelson Golf Club course as this is a facility used by Nelsonians and a large number of visitors.	Seek detailed engineering possibilities that would not impact on the ecology of the area.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S429.001	Matthew Jones	Oppose	Submitter has been a member of the Nelson golf club for well over 30 years and strongly opposes the plans for the runway extension: - The golf club has been around for 125 years and is an important asset for the Nelson region. - Nelson City is really struggling at the moment and the prospect of us losing another asset is very short sighted. Nelson needs reasons for people to come here, the golf club is one of those reasons.	Needs to be more discussion and study into the fact that the southern end of the runway seems like more of a realistic option.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S430.001	Kelvin Gardiner	Oppose	The submitter has played golf at Nelson for 58 years. The championship golf course, privately owned and funded by its members, and which has been in operation for over 100 years, will be ruined by extending the runway to the North. The submission refers to the following: - The Nelson Golf Club doesn't even seem to get a mention. The championship course brings in a lot of people to Nelson and in turn revenue for the airport. The value stated for the Northern option would not even cover the golf club cost which isn't mentioned.	No decision requested.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- Very little mentioned of the Southern end which would take the noise away from Tahuna. - The golf club has 700 members and the club house has 70 plus groups using it. One option was offered to the club, a "hard swap" to the west of runway, but no one gave any thought to access. - The short time given to answer a very unacceptable proposal. - The whole process will cost the club a lot of money and the whole process seems very unfair.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S431.001	Charles Gribble	Oppose	The people do not want this.	We do not need a bigger runway.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S432.001	Kelvin Gardiner	Oppose	The submitter is part owner of a dwelling on Parkers Road Tahuna, and is opposed to the Northern extension of the runway because of the following effects on his property: - more noise; - the change in building requirements, with resource consents being required for everything; - property devaluation. There doesn't seem to have been a very extensive investigation of going to the South? Or extension at both ends? It seems a bad decision to cut into the Nelson Golf course, which has been here for over 100 years, is a great asset to our town, is a championship course and has many large tournaments, and brings people through our airport. Going North as proposed must surely be a shocking noise factor for all of Tahunanui.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S433.001	Lynda Guilliard	Oppose	From a personal perspective, Nelson Golf Club has provided the submitter with a purpose and new direction post-retirement. Playing golf at this club has had a huge positive impact on physical and mental health. Like so many other older members (and all	Reconsider the changes proposed for Nelson Airport and runway. Further investigate options that will not impact on Nelson's Golf Course, which would include further investigation into extending the

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					members) playing golf is quite unique in providing a game that is manageable physically over several hours duration. The companionship, new friendships and sense of achievement is of immense value. There is huge concern as to how membership at another club would cope with increased numbers. It would be a great loss to so many, to lose what Nelson Golf Club offers and provides for the community.	existing runway to the South.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S434.003	Anthony Rowe	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay. - The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out by superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north and for no extension. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, then the Overlay will be in incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	The Airport Effects Control Overlay stays in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S434.004	Anthony Rowe	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1. - The proposed wording of the Rules will result in far reaching and drastic restrictions on new builds, and will have unintended consequences. - The rules and requirements should be consistent between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	The proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S434.005	Anthony Rowe	Oppose	Rule INr.25 -- Aircraft Testing. - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the	Proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and engine testing / Rule INr.25 should comply with NZS 6802.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S435.001	Peter Simpson	Oppose	Extending the runway at the southern end of the airport would be less upheaval for residents living in the north end area of airport. Less Noise.	Extend runway to the southern end runway instead of northern end.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S436.001	Michelle Johnson	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S436.002	Michelle Johnson	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S436.003	Michelle Johnson	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S436.004	Michelle Johnson	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S436.005	Michelle Johnson	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S436.006	Michelle Johnson	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S436.007	Michelle Johnson	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S436.011	Michelle Johnson	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S436.013	Michelle Johnson	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S437.001	Christopher Bayard	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club and plays at least one round a week Its great for his physical and mental wellbeing, and to make a lot of close friends in the community.	That the airport extends to the south instead of destroying a golf course that has been so beneficial for the community for many years and will continue to be beneficial for years to come.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S438.001	Blake Fountain	Not Stated	For the sake of golf, the camp and locals.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S439.001	Vyonna Rickerby	Oppose	The submitter opposes the runway extension affecting Tahuna Holiday Park and its permanent residents. She lives in the red zone, has invested her life savings into buying her caravan, and has a comfortable and enjoyable lifestyle in Tahuna Holiday Park.	Look at other options i.e. extending runway over water and not over people.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S440.001	Brian and Lois Kennedy	Oppose	1) There are insufficient hard facts to establish whether either the changes to the air noise boundaries or runway extensions are justified. 2) We have had involvement with Tahuna Beach Camp for 15+ years. The last 4 years in particular have seen massive improvements and the proposed amendments have huge potential to destroy the progress made.	Reject outright both applications from the Airport.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S441.001	Stephen Glover	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S441.002	Stephen Glover	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S441.003	Stephen Glover	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S441.004	Stephen Glover	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S441.005	Stephen Glover	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO).	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S441.006	Stephen Glover	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S441.007	Stephen Glover	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S441.011	Stephen Glover	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S441.013	Stephen Glover	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S442.001	Diane Mihaere	Oppose	The submitter has for 9 years lived on a permanent site at Tahuna Holiday Park, within the orange line shown on the map, and fully opposes the Nelson Airport runway extension. The submission refers to: - Noise, which is already extremely annoying, and will get worse/unbearable from noisy aircraft coming over on the hour; - The camp land was bequeathed to the Nelson Community to enjoy.	Would like to see the extension happen but not at the expense of the community. The airport could be moved, or the runway extended to other side where the sea is.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S443.001	Georgina Syme	Oppose	No reasons given.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S444.001	Vivienne Ade	Oppose	The submitter opposes extension of the airport runway through Tahuna Holiday Park and wants Nelson to keep Tahuna Holiday Park in its entirety.	Relook at expanding south (over water) rather than north (over people).
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S445.001	Allanah Strong	Oppose	I want people to carry on enjoying their vacation in the Tahuna Holiday Park.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S446.001	Deane Dunlop	Oppose	There is no transparency. The submitter lives in the red zone and does not have answers to how this will definitely affect the permanent residents. Would the holiday park be safe from any other things in the future? If this is a one off and the security of the park to remain the same for the future?	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S447.001	Angela Dickinson	Oppose	The submission refers to the following considerations: a) Golf: Golf attracts many visitors. Nelson Golf Club is 125 years	Amendments to both designation and zoning should not be approved. Current designation and mixed zoning should

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					old, has the only 18 hole championship course in Nelson and hosts a significant number of national events. To lose such a facility would be a major blow to the community, the economy and the general status of Nelson as a tourist destination. Nelson is the 3rd largest city in the South Island and would be the only regional city of this size with no 18 hole golf course. b) The Community: The golf course and its facilities are used extensively by many community groups. To extend the runway north and render the golf course unusable would be a major loss to the community, and it would de-value the property and/or business of every resident in Nelson. More residents and visitors would be affected by noise. 'Acoustic insulation' is questioned as a solution. Most Kiwis enjoy an outdoor lifestyle - should those residents near the airport and Tahunanui now stay indoors? c) The Airport: The Airport Authority appears to be focused solely on extending the runway to the north, based primarily on cost & ease of construction - neither are valid reasons to destroy the golf course. The proposal actually states that an extension within the Waimea was 'discarded on the basis of being grossly costly and inefficient (essentially fanciful)'. While a longer runway may well bring certain benefits, there is always more than one solution to any problem. The submitter is extremely concerned that the Airport Authority appears to be presenting this as the case, with the full support of the City Council. d) Options: There are several options which do not appear to have been fully explored/considered, including, but are not limited to and/or any combination of, the following: a. Extend the runway to the south	remain in place.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					b. Extend the runway partially to the south and partially to the north c. Change the alignment of the runway to include some reclaimed land north of Monaco & utilise less of the Golf Club land d. Increase the frequency of flights to achieve the projected level of demand, with the added benefit of a better service to users of Nelson Airport e. Allow the Golf Club to utilise the grass runway to reinstate holes that would be lost with the northern extension and ensure that there is access to the newly modified course west of the runway.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S448.001	James Dayman	Oppose	Council is being requested to make a "concrete", binding decision on an application that is full of "ifs and maybes" that are pure conjecture i.e. increased noise levels, aircraft weight, length of runway requirements, takeoff altitudes etc.	Defer any decision until proven criteria can be supplied by the applicant with regard to: - actual noise levels from "in service" commercial aircraft of the size and type that will be used at Nelson Airport; - actual stats on take-off altitudes and attitudes having due regard to load, weather conditions; - actual stats on required runway length. When the above can be supplied, then make decisions about changes to air noise corridors and the impacts they will have on the community and businesses at large.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S449.001	Robert McKirdy	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club. The proposal to extend the Nelson Airport runway only to the north is rejected. The Council needs to ensure that the Airport Authority considers all realistic alternatives, in keeping with the needs and expectations of the whole Nelson community, golfers, residents and visitors alike, while at the same time allowing for future aviation needs and realistic improvements to aircraft technology 15 to 20 years from now and beyond. The submission refers to the submitters reasons for	Amendments to the zoning should not be approved. Current mixed zoning should remain in place. All options, the submitter's as well as others, must and should be explored.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					moving to Nelson; the history and value of the golf course to them, the Club and golfing community; and their personal involvement in the aviation industry. The planned runway extension, taking over and spoiling the Nelson golf course, is not the only option available. Not only should other options be examined, but that a more detailed impact assessment should be carried out taking into consideration all or part of the following: 1. The effects of global warming and projected sea rise in 15 years time and beyond References the impacts and costs of raising the height of the existing runway, the disruption to flights over an extended period of time, and survival of Nelson airport services if the runway was inoperable for weeks or months on end. 2. The viable alternative of an extension both South and North of the current runway by up to and approximately 100 to 150 metres at each end, thus minimising the effect on both the golf course and the residents on the flight paths. 3. Building a new airport South of the city on mainly agricultural land. References benefits of a new runway well above projected future sea level rise, reduced impact on dwellings on the flight path, a purpose built/future proof installation for passengers and freight to cater for future needs as this area grows, re-build and land acquisition costs balanced by the sale of existing airport land for residences and commercial opportunities, community growth and enhancement, economic growth and new prosperity in a vibrant expanding community.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S450.001	Steven Curnow	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S450.002	Steven Curnow	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S450.003	Steven Curnow	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S450.004	Steven Curnow	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S450.005	Steven Curnow	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S450.006	Steven Curnow	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S450.007	Steven Curnow	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S450.011	Steven Curnow	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S450.013	Steven Curnow	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S451.001	Phoenix Gale-Bisdee	Oppose	No reasons given.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S452.001	Bronwyn Gale	Oppose	No reasons given.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S453.001	Carol and Terry Hargadon	Oppose	The submission opposes extension of the runway that would decimate the vibrant recreational and community base that the Nelson Golf Club provides, and refers to: - the significant role of the Nelson Golf Course in the submitters' lives, for golfing, social events and, as the Women's Captain (2021-2022), with an active role on club committees; - the course and its clubhouse as a central hub for many service groups, businesses, and large community events, playing a vital role as a sporting venue, fostering community connections, and providing spaces for gatherings and activities.	The Submitters are all for positive growth and infrastructure improvements in the Nelson area but believe more investigation should be conducted regarding the expansion of the airport runway to the south. Thorough assessments and studies are important to understand the potential social, financial and ecological impacts, benefits, and the feasibility of such a large project. According to documents held by the Nelson Golf Club Board the estimated cost of going through the Golf Club land is at least 7 times more expensive than expanding the runway to the south. That is not even considering the social impact on the wider community if the Nelson Golf Club was to be fractured by expansion of the Airport runway.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S454.001	Marjorie Webby	Oppose	No reasons given.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S455.001	Sharon Kenning	Oppose	The submitter ran the camp cafe for 2.5 years and has invested life saving to become a permanent resident. The airport runway extension would devastate the submitter and a lot of residents in camp.	Relook at other options i.e. expanding south (over water) rather than north (over people).
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S456.001	Geoffrey Wells	Oppose	No reasons given.	Relook at other options.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S457.001	Michelle Robertson	Oppose	The submitter would like Nelson to keep Tahuna Holiday Camp in its entirety.	Relook at other options i.e. expanding south (over water) rather than north (over people).
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S458.001	Karen Tuffery	Oppose	The submitter would like Nelson to keep Tahuna Holiday camp like it is.	Re-look at extending over where no houses are.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S459.001	Ian Crighton	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S459.002	Ian Crighton	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S459.003	Ian Crighton	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S459.004	Ian Crighton	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community".	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S459.005	Ian Crighton	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S459.006	Ian Crighton	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S459.007	Ian Crighton	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S459.011	Ian Crighton	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S459.013	Ian Crighton	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S460.001	Wendy Munro	Oppose	The submission refers to: - Tahuna holiday park will be affected - loss of revenue to Nelson businesses - loss of property values for both the permanent residents at the camp and for residents residing in nearby suburbs	That Nelson Airport look at other options for extending the runway that do not have such a big impact on the camp at Tahuna and the surrounding residential areas and Nelson City itself who rely on holiday makers over the summer season.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S461.001	John Taplin	Oppose	No reasons given.	Relook at other options i.e. expanding runway south (over water) rather than north (over people).
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S462.001	Anthony Mills	Not Stated	The submitter has been a member of Nelson Golf Club for about ten years, and enjoys the comradeship, the challenge, and the exercise. The airport proposal to extend the runway to the North would: - destroy the golf course; - render the clubhouse unusable, for both members and local community groups There is a viable and cheaper alternative i.e. an extension to the south. In the late 1940s it was decided to extend the runway to the south, and houses on the road to Monaco were compulsorily purchased and demolished to allow for the extension. The ground work for a southern extension is already in place and the	Reject the application and instruct the airport management if necessary to come back with a viable proposal to extend the runway to the south with an honest time frame.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					airport should pursue this option. The submission refers to Wellington airport taking over part of the Miramar golf club, at cost to the airport of $20million in compensation. Since the Nelson Airport is 50% owned by the city this would put a huge burden on the rate payers and the increased landing fees would undoubtedly lead to an increase in air fares to and from Nelson. Discussions with Air New Zealand indicate that new aircraft are likely to be introduced within seven years, so the time scale of 10 to 15 years given by the airport would seem to be an attempt to mislead those affected.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S463.001	Brian Thornalley	Oppose	The submitter opposes the golf course being taken for airport use, and refers to Nelson Golf course being: - the only 18 hole course in the City; - a big green space that may be gone forever; - here 30 years before the airport so it should have preference; - for the submitter, a source of exercise and camaraderie with family and friends.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S464.001	Euan Milne	Oppose	The submitter has been a member of Nelson Golf Club (NGC) for 23 years, and opposes the proposed Private Plan Change 30 and NOR for Nelson Airport Runway Extension in its entirety, with particular reference to the extension through NGC land, the rezoning of NGC land to Proposed Special Use, and the failure to adequately avoid to the effects of the NOR and PC30 to the ongoing operations of NGC. The proposed runway extension will result in loss of 5 holes of the course, practice areas, the newly installed irrigation water storage area, green keepers facilities, and the hub of NGC, our Clubhouse. This will mean the end of NGC, which has occupied the current land for over 110 years, has hosted many important tournaments at local and national level, has 1 of only 9 true links and top 40 golf courses in NZ and the only 18-hole	Reject publicly notified Private Plan Change 30 for Nelson Airport runway extension. In favour of the airport being able to operate for many years to come but not enough evidence has been provided to support the PPC being adopted.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					championship course in Nelson, has 700 active members who would be adversely affected, and has over 70 community groups and charities benefitting from use of the clubhouse and facilities. The submission questions information in the applications, for example: - the need to future proof the Airport for new airplanes that require longer runways, without proof that such planes exist or in fact require longer runways; - the environmental report outlining options of extending North through the Nelson Golf Club owned land or to the South towards the estuary, with the preferred option being the North - a more in-depth study of the impacts on the environment and users of the surrounding area should be undertaken by an independent body to determine the true impact of either option; - there is little detail as to the cost of their proposal or what remuneration could be offered to compensate the NGC for the loss of its land and facilities, and in construction of the runway and associated facilities.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S465.002	Dianna Hambleton	Oppose in part	NCC has a conflict of interest as a major shareholder and landowner of the Nelson Airport Ltd.	Nelson City Council to exempt themselves from the submission process given their direct conflict of interest as shareholder and landowner of Nelson Airport Ltd. Independent Commissioners need to be appointed.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S465.003	Dianna Hambleton	Oppose	Amendment through a "specific Airport Zone" cannot be made if it has a detrimental affect to the Nelson Golf Course and neighbouring houses all of which are privately owned.	The Private Plan Change request to the Nelson Resource Management Plan from the Nelson Airport Ltd, with the purpose of "providing a clear planning framework regarding activities anticipated within the airport designations through a specific Airport Zone; and ensuring the contemporary role and function of the Airport is recognised in terms of its strategic importance to the Nelson-Tasman

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
						region and country"; cannot be made if it has detrimental effects.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S466.001	Paul Dowers	Oppose	It will ruin a 18 hole championship golf course, the clubhouse pro-shop, practice area and the many groups that use these facilities will be greatly affected. The runway can go south. The future of planes will be lighter more economical therefore shorter runways.	Not to allow any of this to proceed.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S467.001	Conal Atkins	Oppose	The planned changes to the current zoning and the ultimate decimation of the Nelson Golf Club (NGC) due to the expansion of the airport runway would severely impact not only the golfing community but the community at large. The submission refers to NGC being inclusive and welcoming to the general population within the greater Tasman area, and the club providing a meeting place for many different groups and older people who use its facilities. We should be looking at ways to reduce our carbon footprint and foster the growth of green spaces. The proposal will remove a space which caters for recreational walkers, cyclists and golfers, provides a venue for various community groups to enjoy their creative endeavours, and attracts and supports all manner of flora and fauna which typifies a coastal environment. As guardians of the future, take a measured, reflective and considered view of what makes a city and its surrounding places safe, attractive, diverse and environmentally friendly.	Please review your plans to allow both the golf club (in perhaps a changed format) and airport to coexist.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S468.001	Jo Fergusson	Oppose	The submitter is a member of the Nelson Golf Club, and refers to Nelson Golf Course: - giving women of all ages a chance to learn a new sport, socialise and meet new people, having a positive impact on these women's health and wellbeing;	No decision requested.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- being an easy drive from Nelson city, Stoke, Tahunanui and Richmond, whereas the current cost of living crises making fuel more expensive means many members may not be able to afford a longer trip out of the region; - benefitting many older men and women who play 18 holes of golf; - its clubhouse being utilised by many community groups. This is an amazing asset and one we must retain for the benefits it provides to so many current and future club users.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S469.001	Robin White	Oppose	By extending the runway North it will have such a significant impact on the Nelson Golf Club. It will be impossible to continue as a viable club and recreation facility for the Nelson community. Personally the impact of losing NGC would mean: further travel to play golf (fuel costs, carbon emission, road congestion); lost friendship, fitness and support; and impact on submitters tourist accommodation in central Nelson as we have a large number of groups staying to play/enjoy Nelson's only championship course.	NCC needs to carry out a full economic study on how this will affect the area.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S469.003	Robin White	Oppose	By extending the runway North it will have such a significant impact on the Nelson Golf Club. It will be impossible to continue as a viable club and recreation facility for the Nelson community. Personally the impact of losing NGC would mean: further travel to play golf (fuel costs, carbon emission, road congestion); lost friendship, fitness and support; and impact on submitters tourist accommodation in central Nelson as we have a large number of groups staying to play/enjoy Nelson's only championship course.	NCC needs to explain to their ratepayers full and frank details so everyone can understand the implication of a northern extension and how this will affect all residents in the Greater Tahunanui area and beyond.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S469.005	Robin White	Oppose	By extending the runway North it will have such a significant impact on the Nelson Golf Club. It will be impossible to continue as a viable club and recreation facility for the Nelson community.	NCC fully investigate a Southern Extension instead of a Northern Extension - including the costs involved in compensation that would have be paid to the NGC if the

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Personally the impact of losing NGC would mean: further travel to play golf (fuel costs, carbon emission, road congestion); lost friendship, fitness and support; and impact on submitters tourist accommodation in central Nelson as we have a large number of groups staying to play/enjoy Nelson's only championship course.	Northern option continued.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S470.001	Judith McKenzie	Oppose	The submitter has been a golfer for more than 25 years and for 15 years a member of Nelson Golf Club. The submission refers to: - the club being a crucial part of the submitter's life both mentally and physically; - the growth of the club; - being extremely fortunate to have a facility such as this at their doorstep, and to see it fully utilised by so many Nelsonians; It would be devastating to lose this facility, for the submitter and the wider public.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S471.001	Michael McQuade	Oppose	Use your own land for extension to runway, not natural private land. The submission refers to the history of Nelson Golf Club's purchase of land and development of Nelson's only 18-hole golf course, the submitters' love of the course, and free junior coaching programmes available to local students and colleges.	The beauty of golf is to use land in its natural "form" undisturbed as much as possible.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S472.001	Alison Phillips	Oppose	If the airport must be extended go south over mudflats. Why ruin Nelson Golf course and recreation facility.	NCC fully investigate a southern extension and forget northern which would have such a negative impact on Tahunanui, the golf course, accommodation and the camp.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S473.001	Tautalaimoega Meleisea	Oppose	The submitter states that golf is her favourite sport, and Nelson Golf Club her happy place. It is her exercise, supports her well-being, and provides great social, physical and mental benefits. Her well-being will be impacted without this facility.	Refuse application. The Airport, if required, should extend the runway south rather than onto the Nelson Golf Club's land and close to the Tahunanui residents at the northern end of the runway.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					The submission refers to: - if the golf course land is taken, the Council must build a new facility of equal quality or better; - why is a southside extension development not being explored? - the current location of the club is very accessible, and its facilities support a lot of charities, community, and social events; - the Nelson course is the only championship course in the Nelson region and should not be put at risk. - has there been work done on developing the airstrip in Motueka to a large functioning airport or for Blenheim to be extended?	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S474.001	Michael Law	Oppose	The submission refers to: - property devaluation: purchased dwelling with the view of overlooking the golf course and the airport extension will negate this; - more noise of the aircrafts taking off, landing, taxiing etc; - loss of the Golf Club due to the extension, affecting the submitter as a member of Nelson Golf Club, with associated benefits of exercise, wellness and socialising, and difficulties with going to another golf club; - more people unemployed, and affect on Nelson College who use the facilities; - Nelson Golf Club as a great asset for Nelsonians.	Not stated.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S475.001	Debbie Armatage	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S475.002	Debbie Armatage	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S475.003	Debbie Armatage	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S475.004	Debbie Armatage	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S475.005	Debbie Armatage	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S475.006	Debbie Armatage	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S475.007	Debbie Armatage	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S475.011	Debbie Armatage	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S475.013	Debbie Armatage	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S476.001	Joy Scotson Shackleton	Oppose	The submitter rejects changes to the proposed designations and the Plan Changes that will have an impact on her immediate residential neighbourhood and the recreational areas that she and others frequent. Although Nelson Airport plays an important role in the Greater Nelson and Top of the South regional	That Nelson Airport adopt the approach taken by Queenstown Airport and include EMAS, and that any extension be made toward the south, over estuary and not over the Tahunanui and beach community.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					economies, Nelson Airport should work in a more consultative and conciliatory approach to its neighbouring community in Tahunanui to arrive at a new Masterplan that provides a better balance between the Airport's ambitions and community outcomes. The submission refers to Queenstown Airport's extensive community engagement and new Masterplan (May 2023) for consultation, and its inclusion of EMAS (Engineered Material Arresting System). Alternative options have not been assessed under Nelson Airport's proposal. The use of EMAS to reduce the length of runway and runoff area has not been considered. An EMAS is an accepted substitute for a RESA. NAL has not recognised the substantial cost being pushed onto the surrounding community, including: - economic effect on businesses, - loss of amenity, - loss of property value, - loss of development potential and associated environmental cost, and - unquantified effect on health and wellbeing of community. 1. NAL has not recognised any economic impact on surrounding businesses: The submission refers to effects on Tahuna Beach Holiday Park and neighbouring communities that will suffer loss of amenity that hasn't been valued, including the airport perimeter walkway. 2. NAL is dismissive of the loss of amenity that will occur to residents within the Air Noise Boundary: The submission refers to NAL's solution of providing acoustic insulation, sealed windows and ventilation effectively making residents prisoners in their own homes, unable to enjoy outdoor activities and gardening; and loss in property values due to restrictions imposed on properties within the Air Noise Boundary	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					and the Airport Effects Control Overlay. NAL is not offering property owners any buy-out right at full market values which is unfair. 3. NAL have ignored the impact to Quality of Life that an airport extension to the north will ultimately have on residents and visitors to the Tahunanui community: The submission refers to residents reduced quality of life due to the persistent noise, people placed in a state of limbo, and reluctance to make property improvements. The outcome that would best meet the stated objectives of NAL would be to extend the runway to the south but incorporate EMAS to reduce the overall length of land required, therefore removing the need for any reclamation of the Waimea Estuary. Any increased noise would be directed over water and would affect the least number of residents and visitors to Tahunanui and it's beachside community.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S477.001	Lynley-Ann Boyd	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S477.002	Lynley-Ann Boyd	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S477.003	Lynley-Ann Boyd	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S477.004	Lynley-Ann Boyd	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S477.005	Lynley-Ann Boyd	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S477.006	Lynley-Ann Boyd	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S477.007	Lynley-Ann Boyd	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S477.011	Lynley-Ann Boyd	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S477.013	Lynley-Ann Boyd	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S478.001	Josephine Fulton	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S478.002	Josephine Fulton	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					"appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S478.003	Josephine Fulton	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S478.004	Josephine Fulton	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S478.005	Josephine Fulton	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S478.006	Josephine Fulton	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S478.007	Josephine Fulton	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S478.011	Josephine Fulton	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S478.013	Josephine Fulton	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S478.026	Josephine Fulton	Oppose	There is a housing crisis. Residents have no security or own their terms to reside in the holiday camp.	Extend the runway in the opposite direction.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S479.001	William Fyfe	Oppose	Submitter strongly opposes extending the airport runway to the north into the Golf Club and the rezoning of the Golf Club land. This would mean the demise of a 125 year+ club which provides sport and social activities for a large number of Nelsonians. It would mean Nelson	Revisit the extension of the runway to the south - this is a more expensive option but would still be cheaper than having to compensate the Golf Club for the loss of

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					would not have a championship golf course within the City.	land and use of its facilities.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S479.003	William Fyfe	Oppose	Submitter strongly opposes extending the airport runway to the north into the Golf Club and the rezoning of the Golf Club land. This would mean the demise of a 125 year+ club which provides sport and social activities for a large number of Nelsonians. It would mean Nelson would not have a championship golf course within the City.	Require the airport to be more specific in the type of planes it requires a longer runway for.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S479.005	William Fyfe	Oppose	Submitter strongly opposes extending the airport runway to the north into the Golf Club and the rezoning of the Golf Club land. This would mean the demise of a 125 year+ club which provides sport and social activities for a large number of Nelsonians. It would mean Nelson would not have a championship golf course within the City.	The Council should consider the Golf Club in the context of how it services Nelsonians.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S479.007	William Fyfe	Oppose	Submitter strongly opposes extending the airport runway to the north into the Golf Club and the rezoning of the Golf Club land. This would mean the demise of a 125 year+ club which provides sport and social activities for a large number of Nelsonians. It would mean Nelson would not have a championship golf course within the City.	The Council should consider the impact on tourism should the Golf Club cease to exist.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S480.001	Carol Tilley	Oppose	By extending the runway to the north, Nelson will be without an 18 hole Championship golf course. For over 50 years the submitter, thousands of golfers, non-golfers and visitors have used all the facilities of Nelson's Golf Course. It is vital for our physical, social and mental wellbeing to continue this in the future.	Refuse the application.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S481.001	David Duggan	Oppose	The present proposal completely fails to take account of the value to Nelson and users of the Nelson Golf Course and its importance to the City in terms of recreation, tourism and green space.	That the proposed runway extension be both to the south and north and not limited to the north only as proposed.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S482.001	Tomoko O'Brien	Oppose	The submitter immigrated to NZ from Japan. When they first arrived, they had no friends and no job. A golf course member helped the submitter to start playing	That Council should reject both submissions from Nelson Airport. That there are no plan changes which would

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					golf. The submitter is very far away from family but has made many friends at Nelson Golf Club. It will be very disappointing to lose such a historical 18 hole golf course.	affect the current operation of Nelson's Golf Club.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S483.001	Kevin Charles	Oppose	The Nelson Airport Runway Extension to the north will have a huge impact on the Nelson Golf Club community, and charities. If the Nelson Golf course closes one would have to travel to Greenacres on already congested roads, and many members will not be bothered.	Has the option of going South been thoroughly explored? Even if the cost is greater the wellbeing of the residents of Tahunanui, the Motor Camp, members of the Nelson Golf Club and all the community groups that use the facility must be taken into account.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S484.001	Susan Le Grange	Oppose	Moving the airport actively closer to suburban life, school, beach and the golf course, club rooms etc does not make sense. This does not contribute to a 'healthy living environment' for the many thousands of people, local and visitors make use of the spaces mentioned. While understanding the airport's needs, moving all closer to long established residential and recreational facilities which are a major attraction to Nelson is not a good plan. The destruction of the golf course and clubrooms is very short sighted.	More thought given to a runway extension to the south and maybe some ingress into a small part of the golf course.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S485.001	Maria Slappendel	Oppose	It is not okay to cut the golf course in half. The airport extension should go south. Less people are affected and no new golf course needs to be established.	Decline both submissions.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S486.001	Jennifer Norton	Oppose	The proposed runway extension to the north would be the death knell of a 125 year old club and only championship golf club in the city. The submission asks where over 700 members will go, suggests that taking away the ability to play golf at the Nelson Golf Club is akin to the Council digging up Trafalgar Park or Saxton Field, and urges Council to think of the large number of people who will become club-less.	Reconsider the decision to extend north into the golf club land. Going south would not impact the large number of people who will be affected by this decision and if the golf club did extend further out along the coast how would it be accessed?
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S487.001	John Dow	Oppose	The submitter opposes extension of the airport runway onto Nelson Golf Club (NGC) land as it will ruin an outstanding recreational facility and his opportunity to play golf. Refers to cutting the golf course in half and	Refuse application.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					lack of access between remaining holes and the clubhouse; the loss of 5 holes, the new irrigation pond, the practice range and greenkeepers shed rendering the course unfit for use; and the proposal under-estimating the recreational value of the course for member and visitors.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S488.001	Jean Allan	Oppose	The golf course as it now stands would not be able to function as a championship course. As a retired person and a member, the golf course provides the submitter with meaningful exercise and social contact. Nelson Golf Course is an important asset beyond that of a golf facility. It enhances the natural resources of the Tahunanui area and provides facilities for the physical and cultural well-being of the population of greater Nelson.	Council should not allow these changes. Council needs to consider the wider ramifications that these proposed changed would bring about.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S490.001	Michael Hatrick	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the effects of the runway extension on present residents, the golf course and surrounding business. Refers to extensive research and consultation by qualified professionals engaged with evidence reporting. The current proposal is flawed and inaccurate. Site meeting and evaluation must be enacted.	That this plan be revisited with ample time and consultation from all concerned parties.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S491.001	Jewel Mellor	Oppose	The submitter currently cycles to the Nelson Golf course and enjoys meeting friends and family at the Club. They enjoy playing golf at the club, using the facilities and supporting the club and their employees. If the submitter had to move to another golf course in the region, they would either have to drive on roads that very busy or would no longer be able to play this sport.	The submitter would like the Council to stop this plan change and look at extending the airport runway south rather than onto the Nelson Golf Club.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S492.001	Rosemary Ross	Oppose	It will destroy the Golf Course. The submitter loves their golf. Have belonged to Nelson Golf Club 30+ years. Noise levels for houses surrounding airport.	The Council should decline both submissions.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S493.001	Jillian Robertson	Oppose	The submitter loves their golf club and does not want it to change. Noise would increase for the submitter on the	It makes much more sense for the airport to go south and make no disruption to the Golf Course.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					hill, and they would be inconvenienced having to travel further.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S494.001	Jamie Morris	Oppose	The submitter opposes extension of the airport through the Nelson Golf Club, and refers to: - other options that have not been suitably explored such as extending the runway South; - NGC membership, who cannot simply move to another club as the facilities do not exist, and NGC as an essential community hub; - the runway through the middle of NGC will cut the clubhouse off from the course and this is outrageous and unfair; - NGC as an asset to Nelson, bringing visitors and income for retail and hospitality.	Explore the option of extending the runway south instead of the proposed plan. This will have a vastly less intrusive effect on Nelson Golf Club and the residential properties on Golf Haven Way, Otterson Street, Golf Road and Parkers Road.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S495.001	Young and In Sook Jung and Kang	Oppose	It is essential not to overlook the factors that can influence a golf course. If the golf course quality is poor, it is unlikely that many visitors will choose to come. Ultimately for a golf course to attract a larger number of visitors, it needs to maintain high standards. This, in turn, can contribute to an increase in airport passenger traffic.	What if we consider the suggestion of expanding the runway to seaside in Monaco? Although it may have an impact on coast and the natural environment, it could be a viable solution if we carefully plan and prepare for associated expenses. Instead of completely eliminating the golf course, we would explore alternatives, that minimise the negative effects.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S496.001	Sarah Smith	Oppose	The submitter plays golf 2 to 3 times a week, it provides exercise and friendship with the many people. This is the only 18 hole course in Nelson.	The Council should decline both submissions. The extension if required must be to the south - more land and less affected people etc.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S497.001	David Harley	Oppose	The submitter has been a member of the Nelson Golf Club for approx. 20 years and opposes destruction of Nelson Golf Course with extension of the runway to the north. The submission refers to: - the golf course provides for the Nelson community and is a world class facility for its 700 members and 10,000 visitors annually; - Council should be embracing a facility that provides	That they revisit the runway extension plan and complete an in depth and full study on extending the runway south, including the impact on the golf course and nearby communities.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					home to 70'ish community groups and raises thousands of dollars annually for charity; - it is a significant economic and social contributor to the Nelson economy; - it has been great for physical and mental wellbeing; - there will be significant time and expense to travel to Motueka or Best Island to continue playing golf.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S498.001	Lynda Rackley	Oppose	Golf is important to the submitter for exercise and social aspects. The course is mostly flat unlike Waahi Taakaroa (city course) that has a major hill to climb. Due to health reasons, the submitter is unable to play there. Then cost of petrol to travel to Greenacres makes it become too expensive. Nelson Golf Club is the only 18 hole course in town.	Decline both submissions. Recommends the airport extend south over the estuary at Monaco.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S499.001	Marilyn Davis	Oppose	The submitter lives in Nelson and this golf course is the only 18 hole course. The submitter needs this course for recreation and health, not the Maitai.	Decline both submissions. Recommends the airport to go South.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S500.001	Elizabeth James	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S500.002	Elizabeth James	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S500.003	Elizabeth James	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S500.004	Elizabeth James	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S500.005	Elizabeth James	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S500.006	Elizabeth James	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S500.007	Elizabeth James	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S500.011	Elizabeth James	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP. The Tahuna Holiday Park has been the submitters home for 11 years and does not wish for it to change. The noise is just bearable now - don't want anymore. Think it is extremely unreasonable to propose such an upheaval over such a vast area. Maybe the airport needs to move.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S500.013	Elizabeth James	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S501.001	Vincent van Beek	Oppose	The submitter lives within a 2km radius of the airport and is a member of the Nelson Golf club. He is not opposed to the airport extending its capacity, and supports attempts to find a suitable solution, but are concerned at the lack of regard shown to the users of the recreational spaces, the residents and business owners of the Tahunanui area. The submission refers to: - whilst residents in Monaco would be equally affected	No decision stated.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					by a southern extension option, there would be far fewer residents, and no recreational areas such as the golf club and motor camping grounds, affected; - there has been a distinct agenda to extend north, without due and fair consideration to a southern extension, with budgeted figures disproportional, unsupported by fact or data, and not including all costs and dispensations required; - the short submission period. 1. Noise - residents already experience from the airport from the regular take offs and landings, and the early morning engine tests, but this will change and be an invasion on the northern properties; - double glazing and sound insulation will not remove any of the noise vibration which will be intensified by aircraft by the fact of the aircraft being 20-30 metres lower over the area; - beach users would also notice increased disturbance. 2. Effect on NGC Members: - Nelson Golf Club members will be affected - refers to NGC as the only championship club within the Nelson region; player health and well-being; generation of funds for local community, and the inaccessibility of alternative courses 3. Environment: - travelling to other locations for golf will impede an already struggling infrastructure, add approx. 300-400 extra traffic movements through the area, and increase greenhouse gases. 4. Facilities: - refers to community groups, high schools etc which use the NGC facilities 5. Compromise: A fellow golfer, a chartered civil engineer, has submitted	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					an alternative solution - why has the Airport and Council not thought to compromise with all the affected parties.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S502.001	Kameran Clarke	Oppose	As an employee of Nelson Golf Club, the submitter believes this will have an effect on their job in the future to come. The submitter has always played at the club since they started back in 2011 and they have seen the place grow in all areas such as the cafe, the driving range and especially the golf course. Nelson Golf Club is the only 18 hole course in the Nelson region and is in a great location for retirees and school kids with its location.	Council should reject both applications.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S503.001	Rene Snow	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the effect of the compulsory taking of golf course land and facilities, and refers to: - The impact that loss of the course will have on the physical, mental and social life of her and her family, surrounding residents, and visitors that the region depend upon for income. - The clubhouse and golf course would be rendered unusable. _ The walking and cycling tracks which NCC has put vast amounts of monies into would be rendered useless. - Users of the clubhouse and its facilities would also be affected, with particular mention of her granddaughter with Cerebral Palsy. - Increased noise levels would be of concern to residents in the Tahunanui area. - There has been little or no forward thought to monies already spent, now to be wasted, by NGC, NCC and the Airport Authority on the upgrading of fencing, security and cycle paths. - Loss of income to NGC, Nelson City and the greater Nelson area and its tourism from in excess of 10,000 visitors using the golf course in the last twelve months.	The extensions proposed for the Nelson runway be put on hold until further investigation and consultation into other alternatives. This should be looked into with credible reporting and well informed decisions made. Due thought, consultation of qualified professionals be employed to look into alternative opportunities for the extension, alteration and change to Nelson airport runways and surrounding areas that would be affected. Not just the easiest way!
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S504.001	Anthony Watkins	Oppose	The submission refers to: 1. It would destroy our 18 hole World Class Championship Golf Course by taking away 5 holes, the clubhouse, irrigation pond, practice range, greenkeepers	As a staff member, player, and community group user of Nelson Golf Club the submitter strongly objects to the PPC, and it should be rejected in full.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					sheds and surrounds, and by denying access to the golf course land and remaining area of the golf course. 2. NGC has 700 active members, it welcomes visitors (10,000 visitors in the past year) and hosts many national events (examples given) that bring huge dollars into the Nelson region. 3. Seven Charity Golf days are held on average per year (examples given). If the golf course closes this have a significant knock-on effect to these charities. 4. With over 70 different community groups that currently use our facilities regularly (examples given). 5. NGC plays a huge part in the physical and mental health and wellbeing of both members and these community groups. Closing the course would further burden the health sector. 6. NGC is the only 18 hole Championship Course. Other courses in the area do not have capacity to take NGC's membership but are located in the Tasman. For a city of this size, Nelson would be the only one not to have a 18 hole Champion course within its boundaries. 7. The Airport has not been transparent around the option of extending south, with little or no effect on the Golf Course, and has not fully allowed for the cost of buying or compensating for the NGC land and facilities. Our estimate is that the proposal is at least seven times more expensive than going south. 8. NGC has owned its land for 125 years, long before the Airport. The Airport has gone to great lengths to mitigate adverse effects of the extension on neighbouring property owners by offering extra sound proofing and heat pump options, but with no solutions offered to NGC. The Airport has applied rezone land that does not belong to them - this is a flawed process as	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					NGC has now incurred large costs in legal advice. This is bullying tactics. Council is clearly conflicted, and should have stopped the process immediately or declined the application at the first reading of it at Council. 9. Process and Conflict issues. Council is clearly conflicted as part owner of the airport. Refers to a request for and correspondence from NCC with respect to extending the submission period. Process compromised by wrong email address on the submission form. 10. NGC land is usable green space, adding to the overall aesthetically pleasing appearance of Nelson City, and it should be retained as is.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S505.001	Deborah Allais	Oppose	This proposed change has been submitted with little consideration to the great impact that this will have on the local community. Taking away a large recreational space, reducing the quality of the environment and living area only to increase financial gain to the airport with a large loss to Nelson's natural attractiveness. The Nelson Golf Club has been an important part of the submitters family's life bringing a healthy balance and social wellbeing. We underestimate the importance of open spaces and sport for mental health. Future developments do not necessarily mean better or improved. Sadly, this seems to be the case.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S506.001	John Gifkins	Oppose	Submitter is opposed to the runway going north over the golf course. Refers to taking away his and others enjoyment of golf, and use of the Club House and cafe by many different groups and organisations. People invited to Nelson say flying over the course is amazing. Would not enjoy playing at other courses due to more expensive travel. NGC is the only championship course in the Nelson region. Feels for all those people in Tahunanui if this is moved north.	The submitter would like to see why the runway could not be moved south.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S507.001	Annelies Doornbos	Oppose	Chapter 2 Activities sensitive to Airport Noise The definition includes dwellings, schools, preschools, visitor accommodation (including short-term living accommodation), camping grounds and health facilities. That is unreasonable, does not constitute sustainable management of resources, and gives primacy to the Airport over existing resources.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S507.002	Annelies Doornbos	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1(a) District Wide Objectives DO11.1(a) refers to "policies managing the effects of noise to more appropriate levels". To whom it would be appropriate is not defined. How can levels be "appropriate" if they result in an existing landowner having to insulate and ventilate their homes to meet the needs of the Airport? The provision hobbles existing areas for future development but, at the same time as restricting activities on other land, the Airport seeks to maximise activities on its own land at the cost of other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S507.003	Annelies Doornbos	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3.1 "Managing the well-being of the surrounding community". The proposal simply passes the obligation of noise management on to the surrounding community, and either prohibits or severely constrains activities by and within that community.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S507.004	Annelies Doornbos	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11.1.3(ii) "To meet the need of the community". Whilst the existence of an airport does do that, neither the Plan Change or Designation do that - in fact the opposite occurs in terms of noise and land constraints.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S507.005	Annelies Doornbos	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO11(e) - There is to be "NO increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO).	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S507.006	Annelies Doornbos	Oppose	OSs 7.1 Permitted Activities This provision indicates that camping and short-term living accommodation are permitted activities - but close reading reveals that this is not the case within either the Airport Effects Control Overland or the Air Noise Boundary where special rules apply to buildings - means these activities are not permitted but become prohibited once the runway extensions under DAA1 is operational. This has huge effect on the regionally (and potentially significant) facility at Tahuna Beach Holiday Park,	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S507.007	Annelies Doornbos	Oppose	OSsr 53 Provision makes replacement or substantial alteration of existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to Airport noise lawfully established before the Change becomes operative as permitted only if works are done (at the cost of the landowner) - and so activities are non-complying. This is a huge constraint on residential and other property rights. It is up to the Airport to keep its operation noise under control, not an obligation on other landowners.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S507.011	Annelies Doornbos	Oppose	Tahuna Beach Holiday Park is well-established and valued open space and recreational area that delights thousands of visitors, as well providing for the well-being and needs of its residents. Consultation with TBHP personnel and residents has been poor/virtually non-existence. Nose effect will be substantial, significantly impacting the health and well-being of Tahunanui and beyond, particularly TBHP.	Reject

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S507.013	Annelies Doornbos	Oppose	Chapter 5 DO15 - There is to be "No increase in activity sensitive to Airport Noise" in the Airport Effects Control Overlay (AECO). Objective will have huge effect on the Holiday Park and large parts of Tahunanui would be restricted by this.	Reject
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S507.026	Annelies Doornbos	Oppose	The initial cost of expansion will be more, but it means both the Airport and the Holiday Park keep contributing at full capacity to the local economy in the long term.	Look more into alternatives of expanding into the sea/south, so it won't effect the economic contribution of either the Airport and the Holiday Park.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S507.028	Annelies Doornbos	Oppose	No specific reasons provided.	Consult with the residents in the affected area and the Holiday Park.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S508.001	Henry Hall	Oppose	1. NAL has not considered, either fairly or to any reasonable degree, the impact of their proposed runway extension on the public. Assessments can only be made when impacted parties are clearly identified. The proposal will carve right through the middle of the Nelson Golf Course to the degree that it will be rendered unusable as an 18 hole golf course. Users of NGC have not been considered and no mitigation measures for any impacts have been considered or offered. 2. How important is a Golf Course to Nelson? Submission refers to exercise and social benefit of golf on health and well-being for the people who use this facility, including visitors, and notes that in Nelson there are no alternatives. 3. No consideration of the financial impact to the people and businesses of Nelson has been made. NGC is a destination, national tournaments are played there, and it is host to the Nelson Festival of Golf. Some time ago this was assessed as bringing around $350,000 into the local economy (source Nelson City Council). 4. The NGC is host to a number of Charity events (i.e.	Reject the Proposed Private Plan Change.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					the Cancer Society, Nelson Rescue Helicopter, Nelson Hospice), raising hundreds of thousands of dollars each year. This would be lost with no alternative course in Nelson. 5. From a personal perspective the impact of not being able to use the golf course is significant. Refers to physical exercise, loneliness and mental health. 6. Lack of fair and reasonable consideration of alternatives. The Geotech report which is used to bolster the case for extending the runway north not south was a desktop report with no site visit and no on-site testing. A more thorough report process would have been appropriate given the importance of the decision. 7. The Geotech report cites potential liquefaction issues as a reason for not going South. Refers to Geological Map of the Nelson-Richmond Urban Area (attached to submission) that demonstrates that land both ends of the runway is of the same composition. Conclusions drawn are misleading. 8. Cost. There is no mention in the proposals of likely compensation costs for NGC. Refers to a period of negotiation and perhaps arbitration where a compensatory figure is decided, and the $31m being paid by Wellington Airport to Miramar Golf Course. The proposal is incomplete and misleading without these costs included.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S509.003	Darryl Ware	Oppose	Extension of the Airport Effects Control Overlay. - The location of the boundary is on the 2050 projection of the 55 dB Ldn contours, and thus is completely theoretical. - The proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay has been laid out by superimposing the noise contours for both an extension to the north and for no extension. - If the extension takes place to the north, then the	The Airport Effects Control Overlay stays in its current location until the Airport makes a decision as to whether any runway extension will be at the northern end or the southern end, or a shorter extension at both ends.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					Overlay will not be in the correct location at the southern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place to the south, or if there is no extension, then the Overlay will not be in the correct location at the northern end of the aerodrome. - If the extension takes place partly to the north and partly to the south, then the Overlay will be in incorrect at both ends of the aerodrome.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S509.004	Darryl Ware	Oppose	Airport Effects Control Overlay, Rules REr.65.1 and REr.65A.1 and Appendix 19.1. - The proposed wording of the Rules will result in far reaching and drastic restrictions on new builds, and will have unintended consequences. - The rules and requirements should be consistent between the Airport Effects Control Overlay and the Port Effects Control Overlay.	The proposed changes should be declined, and the status quo should prevail to REr.65.1 and Appendix 19, until the revision of the Nelson (or Nelson / Tasman) Resource Management Plan occurs, and a process of consultation and submission takes place at that time.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S509.005	Darryl Ware	Oppose	Rule INr.25 -- Aircraft Testing. - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - Aircraft engine testing is specifically within the scope of NZS 6802. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those recommended by NZ Standard 6802.	Proposed Private Plan Change 30 be rejected, and engine testing / Rule INr.25 should comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S510.001	Matthew Did not state	Not Stated	The submitter would like to voice their concerns and to know what my entitlements are in regard to my property and surroundings e.g. noise, sound proofing, double/triple glazing, traffic, parking on our street, heating (fires), and any further limitations that may affect their property with the extension.	No decision requested.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S511.001	Garry Chester	Not Stated	Not supplied.	No decision requested.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S512.001	Marty Miller	Oppose	No reasons stated.	No decision stated.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S513.002	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Chapter 2 - Meaning of Words - "Aircraft Engine Testing" - There is no logical reason to exclude the testing of aircraft engines when removed from the aircraft from the agreed noise limits. - The testing of single-engine aircraft would be exempt from the agreed noise limits. - The testing of aero engines is the single largest cause of complaint.	Delete this provision.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S513.003	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Chapter 2 - Meaning of Words: "Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise" - "Residential activities" is all encompassing and will have unintended consequences. - "Residential activities" could include the occupation of facilities by domestic pets. - "Residential activities" includes children's play facilities, domestic workshops, artist's studios, etc	Replace "Residential activities" with "The occupation of habitable rooms".
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S513.004	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Chapter 2 - Meaning of Words: "Aircraft Operations" - There is no logical reason for there to be any exclusions. - NZS 6805 (Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning) Makes no provision for any exclusions. - Having exclusions complicates the automated measurement of noise. - At Nelson Airport the exclusions make little difference to the Ldn (90 day) measurement/assessment.	Delete the words "for the purposes of.....airport elsewhere."
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S513.005	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Chapter 2 - Meaning of Words: "Pasques" - All provisions in NZS 6805 are stated in Pasques. - Pasque arithmetic is easily understood by all. - Decibel arithmetic is beyond the ability most lay-persons.	Retain the meaning of Pasques in the chapter.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- The basis of the dB is poorly understood by most, including a noise-expert (unnamed). - The graph provided is an extremely useful tool for the lay-person to understand the relationship between Pasques and Db.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.006	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Chapter 3 - Interpretation: AD11.3.13 Airport effects overlays - This is not a matter of "reverse sensitivity" - that phenomenon is already well controlled by the minimum lot requirement for each residential unit. - This is not a matter of protection "addition people" from the noise nuisance. - This is a matter of Nelson Airport Ltd wishing to move its business of launching and landing aircraft 370m closer to a long-established residential area. - The wording is an attempt to ban new houses in the Airport Effects Control Overlay, even where the minimum lot area criterion is satisfied. This is counter-productive to the provision of affordable healthy homes.	Delete the words "and to protect the airport ..... effects of airport noise" and to retain the words "new residential units".
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S513.007	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Chapter 5 District wide objectives and policies: DO11 Air Transport - It is complex, couched in legalese, and difficult to understand. - Again, it brings up the red-herring of "reverse sensitivity".	Set aside DO11 pending consultation with the affected parties and a plain-language explanation of its intent.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S513.008	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Chapter 7 - Residential: Policy RE1.4 - The concept of "Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise" is too broad and lacks any acceptable definition.	Retain the existing wording of this policy.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.009	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Rule REr.65 Residential Zone - The concept of "Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise" is too broad and lacks any acceptable definition. - "Building" is defined in the Building Act and with few	Retain the original wording in the Column "Item", to word the preamble thus "Within the Airport Effects Control Overlay, and within the Airnoise Boundary, construction or substantial alteration of a building is

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					exceptions includes any construction. Artist's studios, children's play-houses, and even dog-kennels are all "buildings", which under the proposed wording would require a Resource Consent.	permitted if:" Delete the section under "Discretionary/Non-complying" which reads "New activities...non-complying."
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.010	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Suburban Commercial Zone: New Rule SCr.71 - The concept of "Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise" is too broad and lacks any acceptable definition. - The intent appears to be the restrict any new building such as a detached office building.	Set aside Rule SCr.71 pending consultation with the affected parties.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.011	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Rules relating to Overlays on Planning Maps: Rule INr.67/was INr.71 - The concept of "Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise" is too broad and lacks any acceptable definition. - "Building" is defined in the Building Act and with few exceptions includes any construction. Artist's studios, children's play-houses, and even dog-kennels are all "buildings", which under the proposed wording would require a Resource Consent.	Retain the original wording in the first column, to word the preamble thus "Within the Airport Effects Control Overlay, and within the Airnoise Boundary, construction or substantial alteration of a building is permitted if:" Delete the section "Discretionary/Non-complying" which reads "New activities...non-complying."
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.012	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Chapter 11 - Open Space and recreation zone: Rule OSs7.1 Permitted Activities and Caretaker accommodation. - The provisions attempt to impose draconian limits on the provision of short-term visitor accommodation and caretaker facilities.	Retain the original wording of Rule OSs.7.i .
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.013	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Rule OSr.53 Open Space Recreation Zone - The concept of "Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise" is too broad and lacks any acceptable definition. - "Building" is defined in the Building Act and with few exceptions includes any construction. Artist's studios, children's play-houses, and even dog-kennels are all "buildings", which under the proposed wording would require a Resource Consent.	Retain the original wording of Rule OSr.53.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.014	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Conservation Zone: Rule COr.21 - The concept of "Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise" is too broad and lacks any acceptable definition. - "Building" is defined in the Building Act and with few exceptions includes any construction. Artist's studios, children's play-houses, and even dog-kennels are all "buildings", which under the proposed wording would require a Resource Consent.	Retain the original wording of Rule COr.21.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.015	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Airport Zone AIRPz.25 permits the construction of new office buildings in the Airport precinct which is an activity that Nelson Airport Ltd is attempt to restrict elsewhere! AIRPz.29 - Aircraft Engine Testing (was Rule INr.25) - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - The enclosure within which nocturnal engine tests are carried out is rudimentary and inadequate. - As far as we have been able to ascertain, the limits imposed by Rule AIRPz.29/Rule INr.25 are bespoke and have not been sourced from any Standard, or Court decision. These limits fail to address the underlying nuisance. - The noises of "airport activities except from aircraft taxiing and in-flight are within the scope of " NZ Standard 6802; clearly engine testing is one of those activities. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those set out in NZ Standard 6802.	The proposed Private Plan Change 30 should be rejected, and aircraft testing/Rule INr.25/Rule AirPz.25 should comply with NZS 6802.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.016	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	AIRPz.30 - New Rule for Compass Swings - The testing of aircraft compasses, or for that matter any aircraft test procedure, should be subject to the same rules as the testing of aircraft engines. - The proposed new rule does not address the emissions	The Notice of Requirement and the proposed Private Plan Change 30 should be rejected and that Council should require the following controls on compass swinging.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					nuisance. - Nelson Airport Ltd has not obtained from Air New Zealand Regional Maintenance Ltd (its tenant) any proposal by which this procedure can be carried out in a way which ameliorates the nuisances. - If the nuisances cannot be ameliorated, then the procedure must be carried out in a way which causes the least nuisance to the least number of people.	o It must be carried out downwind of the nearest residential area. o The noise level must comply with INr.25 (AIRPz.29) unless the affected residents are given 24 hours prior notice, and the procedure is carried out between 9am and 3pm on schooldays.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.017	Lewis Solomon	Support	AIRPz.40 - Aircraft Noise Management - The measurement of aircraft operational noise should be all-inclusive. - Having any exclusions complicates the automated measurement of aircraft operational noise.	Accept the Rule AIRPz.40
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.018	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	AIRPz.44 - Radiofrequency exposure levels - While I applaud Nelson Airport for addressing this issue, it is an extremely technical area which is poorly understood by most.	Set aside the Rule pending a peer-review by an independent expert.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Appendices	S513.019	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Appendix 19 - Acoustic insulation requirements - The Appendix is already over-complicated and should be simplified rather than adding another layer of complexity. - There is no appreciable difference between the noise issues in the Airport Effects Control overlay/Airnoise Boundary and the noise issues in the Port Effects Control Overlay/Port Inner Noise Boundary. - There is no apparent reason why the insulation requirements for the Airport Effects Control Overlay/Airnoise Boundary and the Port Effects Control Overlay/Port Inner Noise Boundary cannot be identical. This would simplify the application of the requirements for residents, building designers, Council staff and builders. - The insulation requirements for the Inner City Zone, while not identical to the requirements in the Airport	Set aside the changes to Appendix 19, and engage in a process of consultation with all affected parties, with the aim of simplifying and where possible unifying the requirements.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					and Port Zones, is similar, and with consideration may be able to be made identical to those Zones.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.020	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Rule REr.65A, Residential Zone - The concept of "Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise" is too broad and lacks any acceptable definition. - "Building" is defined in the Building Act and with few exceptions includes any construction. Artist's studios, children's play-houses, and even dog-kennels are all "buildings", which under the proposed wording would require a Resource Consent.	Delete Rule REr.65A.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.021	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Suburban Commercial Zone : New Rule SCr.71A - The concept of "Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise" is too broad and lacks any acceptable definition. - The intent appears to be the restrict any new building such as a detached office building.	Set aside Rule SCr71A pending consultation with the affected parties.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.022	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Rule INr.67A: - The concept of "Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise" is too broad and lacks any acceptable definition. - "Building" is defined in the Building Act and with few exceptions includes any construction. Artist's studios, children's play-houses, and even dog-kennels are all "buildings", which under the proposed wording would require a Resource Consent.	Delete Rule INr.67A.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.023	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Chapter 11 - Open Space and recreation zone: Rule OSr.23 Permitted Activities and Caretaker accommodation. - The provisions attempt to impose draconian limits on the provision of short-term visitor accommodation and caretaker facilities.	Retain the original wording of Rule OSr.23.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S513.024	Lewis Solomon	Oppose	Rule OSr.53A Open Space Recreation Zone - The concept of "Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise" is too broad and lacks any acceptable definition.	Delete Rule OSr.53A.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- "Building" is defined in the Building Act and with few exceptions includes any construction. Artist's studios, children's play-houses, and even dog-kennels are all "buildings", which under the proposed wording would require a Resource Consent.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S514.001	Iona Mellor	Oppose	The submitter will be made redundant. As a cafe worker at the club, they see the positive impact the club has on the community and the importance to thousands of people.	They build south over the creek because the figures to rebuild do not reflect the millions of dollars it will cost to pay out the club, residents of houses on Golf Lane and the campsite, all of whom will be greatly affected.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S515.001	John Hambleton	Oppose	The submitter has been a member of the Nelson Golf Club (NGC) for the past 14 years, has 23 years of experience, directly involved as a consultant, contractor, and senior manager in the airline industry, and had 4 years as the Chief Executive of Eagle Airways and then 8.5 years as Chief Executive of Air Nelson early 2009. The submission addresses matters relating to: - Nelson Golf Club and its Contribution to the Community: NGC has been part of Nelson for 125 years and today is an 18-hole, par 72 Championship Golf Course that is rated in the top 40 of New Zealand's 400+ golf clubs and, with 700 members, is the largest Golf Club across the Top of the South and West Coast. The club is a significant contributor to the community, region and its economy. The submission refers to the users of the club, the excellent golf course and facilities sponsored over generations, being a significant contributor to health and wellbeing in our community, and the success of NGC being in its proximity to Nelson City. - Process for Private Plan Change: Public Notice 10 June The submission refers: to the size of the applications and supporting documents and their technical complexity; the importance of air services to access Nelson/Tasman;	Reject the proposed Private Plan Change30 to extend the Nelson Airport Runway until: - Nelson Airport has remedied its failure to fully investigate the opportunities to mitigate the impacts of the proposed plan on the Nelson Golf Club in line with the process completed in 2005. This to include consultation as necessary with Nelson City Council in conjunction with the Nelson Golf Club regarding lands owned by them the end of the peninsula, but not leased to the Airport, that may provide additional opportunities to mitigate the impacts of the plan, as part of the solution. - Nelson Airport has reviewed the opportunities to reduce the impacts of the noise boundaries on the surrounding community. This through the potential of the hybrid option and the review of RESA requirements to mitigate the strip length and the application of a 60 DBA level in setting up the noise mitigation programmes for ASAN reverse sensitivity land use controls. - Nelson Airport has carried out any further work required to confirm an

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					the difficulty for people whose houses and lifestyle is to be impacted, the golf club and its members, or the holiday park to understand the proposal; the balance of power that lies with the Airport in its resources, understanding of the process and ownership as a Council Controlled organisation; the need for urgency when, dependent on future aircraft types, the extension if it happens is 10-15 or more years away; the short submission period; and the need for independent decision-making (Commissioners) given NCC's shareholding in the airport and ownership of airport land. - Response to the Private Plan change: The future extension of the runway in the 2022- 2050 timeframe is opposed because: - It does not adequately take account of the social and economic impacts of NAL's proposal. - Neither the 2011 Nelson Airport Master Plan and its 2016 update identified a need to increase the length for current aircraft types, and occasional offloads alone would not justify extending the runway. - It is not compliant with (stated national policy statements, objectives and policies - refer to the submission) as by destroying the golf course it does not adequately preserve or enhance the amenity and conservation values of the area, and fails to deliver on the need to remedy or mitigate the conflicts between adjoining land uses. In this regard the submission refers to the mitigation offered to residents within the noise boundaries but the lack of mitigation for the golf course when this will be split in two and dislocated. The plan is silent on what is to happen to these facilities and the land they sit on. - It fails to minimise the effect of aircraft noise impacts on the surrounding community as far as practicable whilst also minimising adverse environmental and cultural effects. - Under the north extension option the runway is very close to houses facing Parkers Road, significantly	objective assessment that determines if the sealed runway provides adequate capacity now and in future plus any other work necessary to allow release of land including the area of grass runways on the Western side of the current runway plus the coastal strip, extending from the Golf Club to the neck of the peninsula covering the land leased from Nelson City Council to the airport. - Nelson Airport has carried out the necessary analysis to determine the actual RESA required.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					impacting those properties due to noise levels and the thrust from jet engines taking off towards the south. - Plan Change Request: The submitter refers to: - Impacts on the open space and recreation zone as it applies currently to land on the peninsula beyond the airport land, and the likelihood NCG would require access to the NCC land at the head of the peninsula that is not leased to the airport. Proposed changes of zoning make it more difficult to implement mitigation of effects on the golf course i.e. a land swap. This issue needed to be dealt with by NAL, NCC and NGC before the plan proposal was submitted. - The ASAN reverse sensitivity land use controls over property owners are harsh and should not be applying below 60 DBA considering the lower noise levels of next generation electric and hybrid aircraft or there being no intent to cater for jet aircraft on scheduled services into Nelson. The Submission comments on several specific aspects of the PLANZ application documentation including in relation to: - Performance reasons for extension - Runway Extension - Opportunity for Mitigation: - Alternative Options - Economic Analysis - Consultation and Notification The proposal is only intended to meet Airport needs and shows a total lack of understanding of the important contribution by NGC to Nelson's social and economic wellbeing. This plan needs to ensure any extension of the runway to meet the needs of Nelson /Tasman also retains an 18 hole championship golf course with its economic and social benefits and minimises any impacts on the camping ground and homeowners.	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Planning Maps	S515.005	John Hambleton	Oppose	Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S515.001.	Reject the zoning changes over golf club land and the Grass runway area and coastal strip to ensure it all remains as "open Space and Recreation" zoning.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S516.001	Nelson Airport Noise Action Council Inc	Amend	A new rule is required regarding Nelson Airport noise reporting - AirPz.xxx, for reason that: - There are no noise-reporting requirements in the NRMP for Nelson Airport Ltd. The monthly noise-reporting requirements for Port Nelson Ltd ARE set out in the NRMP. - Nelson Airport Ltd provides noise-reports to the Nelson Airport Noise Environment Advisory Committee, however these are vague and incomplete. Nelson Airport Ltd should provide noise-reports in a manner and format that is consistent with those provided by Port Nelson Ltd. - The onus should be on Nelson Airport Ltd to demonstrate compliance with the noise limits in the NRMP, rather than on residents to demonstrate non-compliance.	That a new Rule is included in the NRMP drafted below: **Nelson Airport Ltd will report quarterly to Nelson Airport Noise Environment Advisory Committee and to Nelson City Council to demonstrate compliance or non-compliance with all the noise limits set out in the NRMP (or its successor), using assessed and measured data**.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S516.004	Nelson Airport Noise Action Council Inc	Oppose	NANAC opposes the roll-over of Rule INr.25 - Aircraft Engine Testing - also referred to as AIRPz.29, and addresses the following reasons in their submission: - The volume of complaints received by Nelson Airport Ltd about engine testing at night demonstrates that the current rule is not fit for purpose. - The enclosure within which nocturnal engine tests are carried out is rudimentary and inadequate. - As far as we have been able to ascertain, the limits imposed by NRMP Rule INr.25 are bespoke and have not been sources from any Standard, or Court decision. These limits fail to address the underlying nuisance. - The noises of "airport activities except from aircraft taxiing and in-flight are within the scope of" NZ Standard	That proposed Private Plan Change 30 should be rejected, and aircraft testing/Rule INr.25/Rule AirPz.29 should comply with NZS 6802.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					6802; clearly engine testing is one of those activities. - The limits imposed by the current Rule are far less stringent than those set out in NZ Standard 6802.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S516.005	Nelson Airport Noise Action Council Inc	Oppose	NANAC opposes the new rule for Compass Swings (Magnetic Compass Calibration), also referred to as AIRPz.30, and addresses the following reasons in their submission: - The testing of aircraft compasses, or for that matter any aircraft test procedure, should be subject to the same rules as the testing of aircraft engines. - The proposed new rule does not address the emissions nuisance. - Nelson Airport Ltd has not obtained from Air New Zealand Regional Maintenance Ltd (its tenant) any proposal by which this procedure can be carried out in a way which ameliorates the nuisances. - If the nuisances cannot be ameliorated, then the procedure must be carried out in a way which causes the least nuisance to the least number of people.	The Notice of Requirement and the proposed Private Plan Change 30 should be rejected and that Council should require the following controls on compass swinging. o It must be carried out downwind of the nearest residential area. o The noise level must comply with INr.25 (AIRPz.29) unless the affected residents are given 24 hours prior notice, and the procedure is carried out between 9am and 3pm on schooldays.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S516.006	Nelson Airport Noise Action Council Inc	Oppose	Chapter 2 - Meanings of Words: "Aircraft Engine Testing" - The testing of aircraft engines which have been removed from the aircraft is likely to be no less noisy than their testing while mounted on the aircraft. - Such testing should be carried out in a purpose-built test bay which should be acoustically insulated. - The exclusion is illogical.	The definition of Aircraft Engine Testing should be deleted.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S516.007	Nelson Airport Noise Action Council Inc	Oppose	Chapter 2 - Meanings of Words: "Aircraft" Operations" - NZS 6805 (Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning) does not allow for any exclusions as to what comprises aircraft operational noise. - Having exclusions complicates the automated measurement of aircraft operational noise. - The exclusions proposed would in general have little	The words "for the purposes of...." to "...airport elsewhere" should be deleted from the definition.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					effect on the assessed or measured Ldn which is energy-averaged over a 90-day period.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S516.008	Nelson Airport Noise Action Council Inc	Support in part	NANAC supports part of Private Plan Change 30 that relates to the replacement of Rule INr.39 by Rule AIRPz.40, for the following reasons: - The current Rule NRMP INr.39.e exempts certain flights from the measurement of the 90-day Ldn. - Proposed rule AIRPz.40 will remove most of these exemptions and simplify the automated measurement of aircraft operational noise. - Almost exclusively these flights are very rare and the inclusion of the noise from these will have little effect on the overall Ldn (90 day) measurement.	NRMP Rule INr.39 should be replaced with Rule AIRPz.40.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Planning Maps	S517.001	Air Training Corps Association of NZ	Support	The ATC headquarters are located at 1 Dakota Street and its Confidence Course is located on Trent Drive just over the Jenkins Creek bridge. The submission outlines the history and mission of the ATC as a valuable service to the youth of Nelson. The submitter supports the Airport zoning on the Planning Maps under PC30 as it includes ATC facilities at both sites within the Airport Environs Precinct ('AEP'), however it requests amendment of the Airport Zone definitions and rules to clarify that ATC activities are intended to be permitted by associated rules within the precinct and to enable replacement accessory buildings in the future.	Retain Planning Maps which identify the ATC site facilities as Airport Precinct Environs as proposed by PC30.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S517.002	Air Training Corps Association of NZ	Amend	ATC considers it activities can be considered "educational" as it relates to the proposed definition for "Airport Related Activity", and its comfortable that the existing use of the facilities on the site are permitted. However, it wishes its activities to be excluded from the definition of Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise (ASAN) which is proposed to apply to educational facilities. As ATC activities are an existing use fully compatible with airport operations, a small amendment to the definition	Amend proposed definition for 'Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise' (as follows) to exclude the ATC training/educational activities from being considered 'noise sensitive': Activities Sensitive to Airport Noise (ASAN) means: 1. Residential activities; or

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					would be appropriate and would allow Rule AIRPz.24 to be applied and ATC existing activities to be considered permitted.	2. Educational facilities, including preschools but excluding: (a) Educational facilities or training associated with Industrial activities, or Trade related activities; and (b) Flight training (including accommodation with a flight training facility), Trade related Activity training or other Industrial activity related training facilities located within the Special Purpose Airport Zone; and**(c) NZ Cadet force units** 3. Visitor accommodation; or 4. Health facility.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S517.003	Air Training Corps Association of NZ	Amend	The definition of Airport Related Activity needs amendment to include NZ cadet force units and training activities. ATC activities are considered ancillary rather than providing specific support or services to the airport, and a small amendment to the definition of Airport Related Activities is requested to ensure its activities are included.	Amend definition of "airport related activity" as follows: Airport Related Activity means an ancillary activity or service that provides support to **or is complementary to** Nelson Airport or an Aviation Activity. This includes:..... 4. police stations, fire stations, health facilities and educational facilities **including NZ Cadet Force units**;
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S517.004	Air Training Corps Association of NZ	Amend	The submission refers to closure of a wing of ATC HQ buildings (owned by NAL) in Dakota Street, and the need for a replacement building. The new rules may cause this project to become significantly more difficult and costly to achieve due to higher minimum floor levels (Rule AIRPz.48) - existing ground level is approx. 1m below the proposed datum. It would be preferable that a new accessory replacement building be exempt from the proposed minimum floor level rule, noting its use primarily for 3.5 hours once a week and as it is not considered to be 'significant infrastructure' to airport activities.	Amend rule AIRPz.48 (as follows) to enable new accessory buildings to be constructed at existing floor levels: Building is permitted if: **a) It is a replacement accessory building constructed at or above the same floor level as the existing principal building; otherwise;** b) The ground level (excluding water bodies) is 15.35m NCC Datum or above; or ground level ... [the rest of the rule continues as proposed in the notified version].

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S517.005	Air Training Corps Association of NZ	Support	The submitter wishes to continue the maintain the concourse area, including mowing, landscaping, small amounts of earthworks and small structures. This is considered to be covered by the proposed rules and other zone rules in PC30 are therefore supported. The submitter supports all other AIRPz Objectives, Policies and Rules, with other consequential amendments mentioned in earlier submission points.	Support all other AIRPz Objectives, Polices and Rules.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S518.001	Derek Drysdale	Oppose	The Submitter is President of the Nelson Golf Club Inc, and his submission is accompanied by a 482-signature petition. The Submitter is strongly opposed to both PC30 and DAA1, DAA2 and DAA3 because of the sense of loss if the golf club is taken away and the detrimental effect it would have on many hundreds of people. The submission refers to: - We have invested millions of dollars over many years and built the Nelson Golf Club (NGC) into a flourishing facility, a championship sporting venue which Nelson can be proud of, is rated #36 out of 384 courses in NZ and has hosted many national championships which bring hundreds of thousands of dollars to our region (refer to the full submission for detail on the events hosted). - NGC is not a Members only club, and we regularly host school children and our golf professionals host junior coaching. This is what NGC is all about, raising standards amongst our youth and keeping our seniors healthy in mind and body. We do not want to lose this. - This proposal will literally destroy our golf club that has been on this site for 125 years. The golf club will be completely decimated and unfit for use, and the submission refers to a number of holes being lost, the rest of the holes being left without access, lose of the clubhouse, professional's shop, storage sheds, practice	We the undersigned are writing to strongly reject the above Notice of Requirement and Private Plan Change in its entirety. The Airport, (if required) should extend the runway South rather than onto Golf Club land and close to the Tahunanui residents at the northern end of the runway. The council should refuse both applications.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					range, green keeper's sheds, and the irrigation dam built only 4 years ago at great expense. - The proposal to extend the runway will take away a huge part of Nelson history, and will affect the health and well-being of many. The submission refers to our 740 strong membership, the hundreds of visitors to the course, users of our clubhouse and facilities (which has been built into a Community Hub with a large carpark for patrons, and is used by over 70 community groups, retirement homes, recreational users, conference and family celebrations etc) - refer to the submission for full description of its community use and benefits. - Nelson Airport has offered mitigation packages such as double glazing and heat pumps to all residents that will be affected by the proposed extension, and yet nothing has been offered to NGC who own all land that the airport seeks for this. - Nelson Airport has stated in their submission that "discussions with Nelson Golf Club have been active and constructive". This is totally refuted. At no time have we felt anything constructive for NGC has arisen out of our discussions with the Airport. We seem to be the biggest loser, and our history and our place in the community seems to mean nothing. - The option for a runway extension to the south has been declined for different reasons, one of which is the threat to flora and fauna, but surely the threat of noise and pollution to humans with an extension to the north is far more worrying? - The health and mental benefits of playing golf are well founded. An article in Golf & Health is quoted, and highlights the importance of having a golf facility available. "Golf provides mental wellbeing benefits, research highlights that golf can help individuals improve their	

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					confidence, self-esteem and anxiety levels. Physical activity is a proven treatment for depression and anxiety. It helps prevent anxiety, depression and dementia. Golf itself is known to provide a number of benefits for individuals with mental health issue, without any of the side-effects associated with medications". - With an ageing population golf is one sport that people can play well into their eighties, supporting good health from playing and socialising.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S520.001	GP Investments Limited	Oppose in part	Regarding the definition for "airport related activity". This part of PC30 has implications affecting the whole of the NRMP and go well beyond the stated scope and purpose of PC30. Careful consideration of this change, along with multiple other changes to Chapter 2 (Meaning of words), is critical to ensure there are no adverse impacts on the sustainable management of natural and physical resources across the City, such as with Schedule N and the Industrial Zone. There is no publicly available information available that adequately demonstrates that a technical review of these impacts, and the associated effects, has been undertaken prior to public notification of PC30.	Reject this change until such time as adequate consultation has been undertaken with the community and impacts are adequately reviewed as a part of a robust and adequate Section 32 process. Amendments to this definition may be necessary as a part of ensuring there are no adverse and unforeseen implications.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S520.002	GP Investments Limited	Oppose	DO16.1.1(9) The Airport Zone provides for activities that go beyond the scope of those described in DO16.1.1(9), being activities that do not all need to be associated with or provide for the needs of the Airport. This is more clearly set out within DO16.1.1.xv and evident with the proposed deletion of policy IN1.4 (chapter 10).	Reject this change or make amendments to ensure the policy is consistent with the explanation.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S520.003	GP Investments Limited	Oppose	IN1.4: The deletion of this policy highlights the intended change to the purpose and function of the Airport Zone to provide for a range of commercial and industrial activities that are not directly related to the Airport.	Reject change

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S520.004	GP Investments Limited	Amend	IN2.5.vi: The road into the Airport, given its stated function, is a public space and this should be reflected in the stated method.	Insert the word 'public' between the word major and road.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S520.005	GP Investments Limited	Oppose	AIRPZ.3: This part of the description does not sufficiently express the intent of the Zone to provide for some commercial and industrial activities that are not related to the Airport.	Reflect, or amend to ensure the purpose and intent of the Zone is accurately described in the context of the wider planning framework.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Objectives	S520.006	GP Investments Limited	Oppose	AIRPZ-O2: This objective of the does not sufficiently express the intent of the Zone to provide for some commercial and industrial activities that are not related to the Airport.	Reflect, or amend to ensure the purpose and intent of the Zone is accurately described in the context of the wider planning framework.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Policies	S520.007	GP Investments Limited	Oppose	AIRPZ.P3: This policy does not sufficiently express the intent of the Zone to provide for some commercial and industrial activities that are not related to the Airport.	Reflect, or amend to ensure the purpose and intent of the Zone is accurately described in the context of the wider planning framework for both commercial and industrial zones (including Schedule N).
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S520.008	GP Investments Limited	Oppose	AIRPz.20: The provision for water body bank maintenance in this Chapter is unusual and not in accordance with the wider planning framework. This is either a freshwater rule or a coastal marine area rule so more appropriately addressed elsewhere in the NRMP. Likewise, the provision for natural hazard works landward of mean high-water springs, this is also an activity not addressed in other zone chapters. Given the forecasted impacts of sea level rise, and the current position of MHWS up the landward boundary, it is also difficult to foresee what exactly this new rule seeks to provide for. In addition, it is critical that bank maintenance does not impact negatively on flooding flows. Given this, it is considered inappropriate for such works to become a permitted activity (i.e. without such engineering design being scrutinised).	Reject changes

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S520.009	GP Investments Limited	Oppose	AIRPz.26: The provision for trade related activities within the Airport Zone is considered to provide an inefficient use of the Airport Zone which should be set aside for the activities that relate directly to or support the Airport and the aviation industry.	Reject and delete the provision for trade related activities.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S520.010	GP Investments Limited	Oppose	AIRPz.48: Given the proximity of the Airport to the coastal marine area and the confluence of various streams, appropriate consideration must be given to the effects of coastal hazards and sea level rise. Furthermore, it is important to the wider community that the associated rules are consistently applied in accordance with best planning practice.	Amend to ensure the implications of coastal hazards and inundation are appropriately applied in this rule in accordance with best planning practice.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S520.011	GP Investments Limited	Oppose	Whole of Chapter 15: This new chapter has not followed the current structure and framework of the NRMP. Many of the new rules are not provided with 'assessment criteria' and 'explanation' which is how the current plan is structured. As a change to the NRMP, PC30 must necessarily read clearly and follow this framework. To do otherwise is not in accordance with good resource management practice. These matters should have been considered and addressed prior to public notification as the changes requested above are no able to be fully considered by the wider public.	Reject PC30, or Amend to ensure it contains assessment criteria and explanatory material in support of each new rule.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Planning Maps	S520.012	GP Investments Limited	Amend	Airport Precincts: The provision for development of the Core Airport Precinct west of the main runway is considered to be questionable given the absence of practical access and isolation from the roading network.	Reduce the area of the Core Airport Precinct and provide for only specific aviation activities.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S520.013	GP Investments Limited	Oppose	PC30 does not meet the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 (Part 2) in its current form. PC30 does not give effect to the NZCPS (s75(3)(b)) and the Nelson Regional Policy Statement (s75(3)(c)). The section 32 assessment is considered to be incomplete and inadequate. The efficiency and effectiveness of PC30 has not been analysed at the level	Reject PC30.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					of detail that corresponds with the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S520.016	GP Investments Limited	Oppose	There is no publicly available information available on PC30 that demonstrates the technical assessments supporting PC30 have been appropriately reviewed as part of the formal process being administered by the Consent Authority. Aside from being unusual for processes of this particular importance with wide reaching implications, this is of particular concern given the need for a transparent and fully robust process when dealing with an application whereby conflicts of interest arise.	Place PC30 on hold to provide the opportunity for all supporting technical assessments to be reviewed by an appropriately qualified and experienced team of independent experts. Unfortunately, even this process will necessarily occur after the end of the public submission process so creates a situation whereby the public are not able to review those assessments before deciding which parts of PC30 to become involved with.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S520.017	GP Investments Limited	Oppose	Appendix 24 - Designations, DAA1.3: The provision for signage such as billboards is considered to relate to matters more appropriate to be addressed a district wide basis, particularly given the public nature of the site and the provision for electronic/commercial billboard on this site.	Reject provision for commercial billboard signage.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S520.018	GP Investments Limited	Oppose in part	Regarding the definition for "automotive and marine supplier". Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S520.001.	Reject this change until such time as adequate consultation has been undertaken with the community and impacts are adequately reviewed as a part of a robust and adequate Section 32 process. Amendments to this definition may be necessary as a part of ensuring there are no adverse and unforeseen implications.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S520.019	GP Investments Limited	Oppose in part	Regarding the definition for "building supplier". Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S520.001.	Reject this change until such time as adequate consultation has been undertaken with the community and impacts are adequately reviewed as a part of a robust and adequate Section 32 process. Amendments to this definition

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
						may be necessary as a part of ensuring there are no adverse and unforeseen implications.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S520.020	GP Investments Limited	Oppose in part	Regarding the definition for "farming and agricultural supplier". Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S520.001.	Reject this change until such time as adequate consultation has been undertaken with the community and impacts are adequately reviewed as a part of a robust and adequate Section 32 process. Amendments to this definition may be necessary as a part of ensuring there are no adverse and unforeseen implications.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S520.021	GP Investments Limited	Oppose in part	Regarding the definition for "food and beverage outlet". Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S520.001.	Reject this change until such time as adequate consultation has been undertaken with the community and impacts are adequately reviewed as a part of a robust and adequate Section 32 process. Amendments to this definition may be necessary as a part of ensuring there are no adverse and unforeseen implications.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S520.022	GP Investments Limited	Oppose in part	Regarding the definition for "garden and landscape supplies". Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S520.001.	Reject this change until such time as adequate consultation has been undertaken with the community and impacts are adequately reviewed as a part of a robust and adequate Section 32 process. Amendments to this definition may be necessary as a part of ensuring there are no adverse and unforeseen implications.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S520.023	GP Investments Limited	Oppose in part	Regarding the definition for "industrial activity". Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S520.001.	Reject this change until such time as adequate consultation has been undertaken with the community and impacts are adequately reviewed as a part of a robust and adequate Section 32 process. Amendments to this definition

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
						may be necessary as a part of ensuring there are no adverse and unforeseen implications.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S520.024	GP Investments Limited	Oppose in part	Regarding the definition for "office facilities". Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S520.001.	Reject this change until such time as adequate consultation has been undertaken with the community and impacts are adequately reviewed as a part of a robust and adequate Section 32 process. Amendments to this definition may be necessary as a part of ensuring there are no adverse and unforeseen implications.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S520.025	GP Investments Limited	Oppose in part	Regarding the definition for "office furniture". Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S520.001.	Reject this change until such time as adequate consultation has been undertaken with the community and impacts are adequately reviewed as a part of a robust and adequate Section 32 process. Amendments to this definition may be necessary as a part of ensuring there are no adverse and unforeseen implications.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S520.026	GP Investments Limited	Oppose in part	Regarding the definition for " trade related activity". Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S520.001.	Reject this change until such time as adequate consultation has been undertaken with the community and impacts are adequately reviewed as a part of a robust and adequate Section 32 process. Amendments to this definition may be necessary as a part of ensuring there are no adverse and unforeseen implications.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Definitions	S520.027	GP Investments Limited	Oppose in part	Regarding the definition for " yard based activity". Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S520.001.	Reject this change until such time as adequate consultation has been undertaken with the community and impacts are adequately reviewed as a part of a robust and adequate Section 32

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
						process. Amendments to this definition may be necessary as a part of ensuring there are no adverse and unforeseen implications.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S520.028	GP Investments Limited	Oppose	AIRPz.50: Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S520.010.	Amend to ensure the implications of coastal hazards and inundation are appropriately applied in this rule in accordance with best planning practice.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Rules	S520.029	GP Investments Limited	Oppose	AIRPz.51: Reasons are as set out for Submission Point S520.010.	Amend to ensure the implications of coastal hazards and inundation are appropriately applied in this rule in accordance with best planning practice.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S521.001	Ella Gale-Bisdee	Oppose	No reasons specified.	No decision specified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S522.001	Peter Falvey	Oppose	The submitter opposes extension of the airport runway onto Nelson Golf Club (NGC) land, as a resident of Tahunanui and as a member of NGC. 1. Resident of Tahunanui Suburb - As a resident of the suburb whose property lies close to the flight path and adjacent to the airshed (orange) boundary, the submission refers to: - the detrimental effect on the quality of life as noise levels increase (reflected in the new airshed boundaries), and double glazing and insulation of affected properties will go a little way towards ameliorating this; - the effect of increased noise levels and lower flight paths on the amenity of beach areas, children's play areas and the sports fields; - effects on the residents and campers in Tahunanui Camp, and potential loss of this facility; - impact on property values. 2. Member of Nelson Golf Club: The submission refers to: - loss of 5 holes, the new irrigation pond, practice	The Private Plan Change which governs the runway extension must either be amended or withdrawn.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					fairway, clubhouse, greenkeepers shed etc, and inability to access remaining areas of the course, will render the championship links NZ #35 rated course unusable; - the submitter's loss of benefits from a club very accessible to home i.e. loss of healthy exercise, social interaction, involvement in tournaments etc that are good for him both physically and mentally; - the overall offering of NGC to the Nelson Tasman community - refer to the full submission for details on the significance and accessibility of the course, overall membership, community use, golf programmes, tournaments, charity events, visitors, contribution to the local economy, its value as a large open green space, and perimeter walkway etc.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S523.001	Mary Orr	Oppose	Lets keep Tahuna Holiday Park.	No decision specified.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S524.002	Robert Schmuke	Oppose	The premise put forward by the Airport Authority for the need to extend the Nelson Airport runway is disingenuous at best. The submission refers to: - The present commercial aircraft that operate from the runway are NOT limited in terms of performance, other than when marginally affected in 30+degree/0kt wind conditions. - The two consultant reports on aircraft that could be operated in the future using sustainable power - hydrogen/batteries - are equally unrealistic and there are NO aircraft powered by these methods even remotely close to production. These reasons have allowed the Airport Authority to expend huge financial resources and cause the major disruption/closure of the Nelson Golf Course. There are many holes in the decision to expand the runway north instead of south, and there seems to have been no consideration of paying the Golf Club for losing their facilities which are a community hub.	No decision specified.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					What are we doing with this proposal and who benefits? The population of Nelson and its visitors are well-serviced by the present airport and its new terminal and will continue to be.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S525.008	Stephen and Stephanie Graham	Oppose	The Submitter understands the need for the Nelson Airport runway to be extended, but objects to the runway being extended to the north (i.e., as opposed to the south) based on the incomplete 'economic' assessment undertaken by MartinJenkins. Specifically, that assessment only considers the direct costs in comparing the northern and southern runway extension options and does not quantify (or even consider) the wider indirect costs (which are arguably considerably higher for the northern option). In undertaking their assessment, MartinJenkins consider three criteria - the 'economic costs'; GDP and employment creation; and ability to achieve Nelson Airport's objectives - and they conclude that the northern option is preferred as being more economically efficient due it its 'relatively lower economic cost of construction'. However for any economic assessment to identify the 'economically efficient' option, all costs (and benefits) need to be considered (i.e., including both direct and indirect costs) -- otherwise the assessment is incomplete and cannot be used to reliably draw a conclusion regarding the economically efficient option. MartinJenkins do not include any indirect costs, often referred to by economists as negative 'externalities'. The submission gives examples of potential negative externalities, which will have flow-on effects on GDP and employment: - The costs of soundproofing properties. - The loss of value to property owners north of the airport due to reduced control of their properties in terms of being able to alter their house (e.g., by building up a level).	Strongly recommend that a more in-depth analysis is undertaken that includes the negative indirect/externality costs of each extension option and that this analysis is used to inform the decision regarding which direction to extend the runway.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- Reduced construction of high-rise apartments in the Tahunanui area, affected under the northern option given planes will be flying lower in that area. - Businesses in close proximity to the new flight path will presumably not be able to expand and build upwards. - Loss of revenue to local businesses in the Tahunanui area (e.g., motels, restaurants, the local motor camp etc) brought on by a drop in the number of visitors coming to the area given the increased noise and visual pollution caused by the northern extension. - Significant income will be taken away from businesses that benefit from the many visitors who come to play the Nelson Golf Course each year. - The significant cost of relocating 60+ community groups that use the NGC Clubhouse. The submission also records concern with some of the direct costs quoted in the MartinJenkins report that if corrected would support the southern option.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S525.009	Stephen and Stephanie Graham	Oppose	We raise concern with the approvals process for the runway extension more generally given there appears to be a serious conflict of interest with Nelson City Council being both involved in the approvals process as well as a major shareholder in Nelson Airport.	The decision regarding the extension of the runway should be made by an independent authority that has no vested interest in the outcome.
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S527.002	Helen Doherty	Oppose	The submitter is a Member, Player, or Community Group user of Nelson Golf Club (NGC), and objects to the Airport's applications: 1. It would destroy our 18-hole World Class Championship Golf Course. The submission refers to holes, the club house and other facilities taken away, and lack of access to the remainder of the course, meaning the golf course will be no longer fit for use. 2. NGC welcomed in excess of 10,000 visitors in the past year. The submission refers to national events held, which bring huge dollars into the Nelson region. 3. On average we hold seven Charity Golf days per year	No decision specified.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					(example given) so there would be a huge knock-on effect to these charities if NGC was forced to close. 4. The over 70 different community groups that currently use our facilities (examples given) would be left with nowhere to meet. 5. NGC plays a huge part in the health and wellbeing of members and community groups. 6. Nelson would lose its only 18-hole Championship Course, and the Maitai course which is flood prone does not have capacity to take on NGC's members. 7. NGC owns the land (has done so for over 125 years, before the Airport was even constructed) that the Airport is currently trying to rezone and ultimately take from the Club for a runway extension. The Airport has not been transparent about the costs of extending to the south, taking into account that they will need to buy the NGC land, making extension through the golf course at least seven times more expensive than going south. 8. The Airport has gone to great lengths to mitigate adverse effects of the extension on neighbouring property owners through extra sound proofing and heat pump options, but has not offered any solutions to NGC.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S528.001	Michael Doherty	Oppose	The submitter is a Member, Player, or Community Group user of Nelson Golf Club (NGC), and objects to the Airport's applications: 1. It would destroy our 18-hole World Class Championship Golf Course. The submission refers to holes, the club house and other facilities taken away, and lack of access to the remainder of the course, meaning the golf course will be no longer fit for use. 2. NGC welcomed in excess of 10,000 visitors in the past year. The submission refers to national events held,	No decision specified.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					which bring huge dollars into the Nelson region. 3. On average we hold seven Charity Golf days per year (example given) so there would be a huge knock-on effect to these charities if NGC was forced to close. 4. The over 70 different community groups that currently use our facilities (examples given) would be left with nowhere to meet. 5. NGC plays a huge part in the health and wellbeing of members and community groups. 6. Nelson would lose its only 18-hole Championship Course, and the Maitai course which is flood prone does not have capacity to take on NGC's members. 7. NGC owns the land (has done so for over 125 years, before the Airport was even constructed) that the Airport is currently trying to rezone and ultimately take from the Club for a runway extension. The Airport has not been transparent about the costs of extending to the south, taking into account that they will need to buy the NGC land, making extension through the golf course at least seven times more expensive than going south. 8. The Airport has gone to great lengths to mitigate adverse effects of the extension on neighbouring property owners through extra sound proofing and heat pump options, but has not offered any solutions to NGC.	
Proposed Airport Plan Change 30	Plan Change in general	S529.001	Gary Davis	Oppose	The submitter has been a member of Nelson Golf Club (NGC) for 22 years, and opposes the Airport extending their runway to the north as it will leave NGC without sufficient land for the golf course. NGC owns the land and its various facilities, and there are no alternative areas of land in Nelson City that would be suitable for repositioning the golf course. The submission refers to:	There is an alternative, to extend the runway to the south rather than the north, and this would retain harmony with the NGC and still enable the Airport to operate as they are proposing. This would not affect the large number of residents to the North and the camping ground can be retained on its current site.

Plan Section	Plan Provision	Submission Point	Submitter	Position	Summary of Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested
					- NGC is a wonderful asset for Nelson and surrounding areas. - NGC operates independently and does not seek any form of financial support from NCC. - NGC has a membership of over 700 people, over all ages and most being citizens of Nelson City, for whom golf is an important part of their lives. - NGC employs a number of personnel, all paid an income. It would be a tragedy if Nelson City lost this fantastic facility. Our city planners realise the importance of golf within communities. Nelson is very fortunate to have a fully developed 18 hole course, used for Championship Level Tournaments, and with its high quality playing surface supported by its own water scheme established 4 years ago. The NGC land is just as important to NGC and the Citizens of Nelson as it is to the Airport.	