



TIMARU PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN HEARING STREAM B
SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF JOHN EVANS

1. My name is John Evans. I am a farmer based in both the Timaru and the Waimate District. I am also the Southern South Island representative on the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association of New Zealand Committee.
2. I am opposed to the restrictions imposed on non-commercial small, fixed-wing aircraft through GRUZ-R14. Further, I do not consider the changes in the s 42A report adequately address the issues raised.
3. My airstrip is used on an as-required basis by myself and friends, including for training and fertiliser application. The level of activity on the airstrip depends on the weather, farming activity and other time commitments.
4. The number of private aircraft has remained steady over the decades within the Timaru district, as has the number of private recreational airstrips. There has been no increase in the scale/intensity of activity in respect of private recreational aircraft or airstrips. Therefore, there is no need or justification to increase the regulations in this area.
5. Further, there is no evidence of there ever having been an issue with aircraft noise in Timaru, let alone non-commercial small fixed-wing aircraft.
6. Aviation is already heavily regulated by the CAA which imposes various limits on pilots for safety. This naturally restricts how often and when we can fly, further making a sudden major increase in activity unlikely.
7. I made a LGOIMA request with the Council to try and get more information on the basis for imposing the restrictions of GRUZ-R14. I outline the full request and response in my evidence. However, in summary, there were no complaints or any information which showed small fixed-wing aircraft were causing an amenity issue.
8. I did receive some information in response to my request. This information was email communications between the planner and external consultant discussing the

rule. The planner and consultant were discussing a substantially higher movement limit than was proposed in GRUZ-R14. It is unclear why the movement limit was reduced in the notified proposed district plan.

9. The planner and consultant also discussed separating regulations related to airstrip from helicopter landings as they create very different types of noise. These discussions are not reflected in GRUZ-R14 but make sense as fixed-wing and rotary-wing aircraft create very different noises, with rotary-wing aircraft being substantially louder.
10. I have looked carefully at the proposed rule and have compared it to noise contours for aircraft. Based on the frequency of use of airstrips for non-commercial use in the Timaru area (typically no more than an average of two movements a day) and the noise small fixed-wing aircraft actually make, no setback would be required to stay below a 55dB Ldn contour. In other words, the noise non-commercial small fixed-wing aircraft actually make is minimal and does not affect amenity values.
11. Imposing GRUZ-R14 would have significant negative impacts on the region including:
 - a. Reducing the ability for students to train in non-airport environments;
 - b. Reduce support of conservation and biosecurity;
 - c. Reduce places to land which can be problematic in an emergency;
 - d. Reduce emergency and natural disaster resilience;
 - e. Limit aircraft being used as a legitimate mode of transport;
 - f. Reduce recreation values for aviators; and
 - g. Subject landowners to legal and financial burdens to either apply for a resource consent or establish existing use rights.
12. GRUZ-R14 imposes unnecessary restriction on the Timaru District aviation community despite there having been no evidence of any issue with this activity in the past.
13. I seek for non-commercial, small, fixed-wing aircraft to be excluded from the setback and movement limits of GRUZ-R14.

Dated: 23 July 2023