

Airport Noise Liaison Committee Report

1 January – 31 December 2018



Revision Schedule			
Revision No	Date	Prepared by	Reviewed by
A	01 March 2019	Jessica Royal, Environment Advisor, CIAL	Felicity Blackmore, Development and Compliance Manager, CIAL

© Christchurch International Airport Limited

All rights reserved

No part of this document may be copied, photocopied or reproduced in any form or by any means without permission in writing from Christchurch International Airport Limited.

Contact Details:

Christchurch International Airport Limited
PO Box 14001
Christchurch 8544
New Zealand

Phone: **+64 3 358 5029**
Facsimile: **+64 3 353 7730**
christchurchairport.co.nz

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	List of Defintions, Acryonms & Authors	2
	1.1 Definitions	2
	1.2 Acronyms	2
	1.3 Authors	2
2	Statutory Requirements	3
3	Committee Composition	3
4	ANLC Recommendations	4
	4.1 Airport Noise Management Plan	4
	4.2 Acoustic Treatment Programme	4
5	Noise Complaints Summary	4
	5.1 Aircraft Operations and On-Aircraft Engine Testing	5
	5.2 Christchurch Flight Paths Trial	9
6	Complaints Process and Review	9
7	Appendix A: District Plan Rule 6.1.6.2.7.3	10

1 LIST OF DEFINTIONS, ACRYONMS & AUTHORS

1.1 DEFINITIONS

Aircraft Operations	<p>Also referred to as 'Operational Noise' (refer Section 6.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the landing and take-off of aircraft; and b) aircraft flying along any flight path associated with a landing or take-off. <p>For the purposes of Rule 6.1.6 Activity specific noise rules, it excludes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) aircraft operating in an emergency for medical or national/civil defence reasons; b) air shows; c) military operations; d) Antarctic operations; e) helicopter operations; f) aircraft using the airport as an alternative to a scheduled airport elsewhere; g) aircraft taxiing; and h) aircraft engine testing
On-Aircraft Engine Testing	The testing of engine on aircraft.

1.2 ACRONYMS

ANLC	Airport Noise Liaison Committee
ATC	Air Traffic Control
ATP	Acoustic Treatment Programme
CAA	Civil Aviation Authority
CAC	Canterbury Aero Club
CCC	Christchurch City Council
CIAL	Christchurch International Airport Limited
GCA	Garden City Aviation
NMP	Noise Management Plan
NSS	New Southern Sky
PBN	Performance Based Navigation

1.3 AUTHORS

Name	Role
Jessica Royal	Environment Advisor, Christchurch Airport

2 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

In accordance with rule 6.1.6.2.7.3 d(i) and (ii) (see appendix A) of the Christchurch District Plan, Christchurch International Airport (CIAL) is required to prepare an Airport Noise Liaison Committee Report by 6 March 2018 and annually thereafter to the Christchurch City Council (CCC). This report must contain the following information:

- The composition of the committee;
- Summaries of the Committee's consideration of matters specified below:
 - The preparation, review and updating if required of the Airport Noise Management Plan (NMP);
 - The preparation, review and updating if required of the Acoustic Treatment Programme (ATP);
 - Any community concerns regarding noise from aircraft operations and engine testing;
 - Liaison with, and provision of relevant information to the community;
 - Complaints received over the previous year in respect of noise from aircraft operations and on-aircraft engine testing, and any actions taken in response to those complaints; and
 - Reviewing, and updating if required, the procedures associated with noise complaints received over the previous year.

3 COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

In accordance with rule 6.1.6.2.7.3 of the District Plan, Christchurch Airport (CIAL) established an Airport Noise Liaison Committee (ANLC) in March 2017. Since their formation, the committee has met on a quarterly basis.

ANLC includes the following members:

Name	Role
Laurie McCallum	Chair
Sam McDonald	Christchurch City Community Board Representative
Linda Chen	Christchurch City Community Board Representative
Kirsten Rayne	Christchurch City Council Environmental Health Officer
Justin Tighe-Umbers	Board of Airline Representatives
Bruce Rule	Isaac Conservation and Wildlife Trust
Rhys Boswell	Christchurch International Airport
Felicity Blackmore	Christchurch International Airport
Jessica Royal	Christchurch International Airport

4 ANLC RECOMMENDATIONS

In accordance with 6.1.6.2.7.3 (c.) (iii) and (iv), the ANLC may consider and make recommendations to CIAL on:

- Noise Management Plan (NMP) as required by Rule 6.1.6.2.7.1 and
- The preparation, review and updating if required of the Acoustic Treatment Programme and its implementation as required by Rule 6.1.6.2.7.2

4.1 AIRPORT NOISE MANAGEMENT PLAN

In accordance with the District Plan, the Noise Management Plan has been prepared by suitably qualified and experienced persons. It was circulated to the ANLC for consideration and recommendations before it was finalised 1 June 2018. Two months following submission, the Christchurch City Council identified some minor issues in the NMP. CIAL worked with the CCC to address these issues and finalised the NMP on 8 October 2018. CIAL continues to manage Aircraft operations and On-Aircraft Engine Testing in accordance with the NMP.

4.2 ACOUSTIC TREATMENT PROGRAMME

In accordance with the District Plan, the Acoustic Treatment Program (ATP), has been prepared by the airport operator in consultation with the ANLC. CIAL issued the first draft of the ATP to the ANLC for review on the 17 July 2017. The updated and final version of the ATP was distributed to the ANLC for review and comment on 30 July 2018.

In accordance with rule 6.1.6.2.7.2 b(i) Christchurch Airport is required to make offers for acoustic treatment or advice with 24 months of 6 March 2017. The initial offers of acoustic treatment and advice were sent to the applicable dwelling owners on 5 March 2019.

Each year after 6 March 2019, within 12 months from the date, Christchurch Airport will formally offer acoustic treatment to dwelling owners as specified in the District Plan to any additional residential units that meet the requirements at that time.

5 NOISE COMPLAINTS SUMMARY

In accordance with rule 6.1.6.2.7.3 c(v), (vi) and d(ii) the noise complaints summary below details:

- Complaints received over the previous year in respect to noise from aircraft operations and on-aircraft engine testing; and
- Any actions taken in response to these complaints.

The noise complaint summary also includes a summary of noise complaints received in relation to the Christchurch Flight Paths trial. (refer to section 5.2).

Complaints relating to aircraft operations and on-aircraft engine testing have been separated from the complaints relating to the Christchurch Flight Paths Trial. All names and addresses have been omitted for privacy purposes.

5.1 AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS AND ON-AIRCRAFT ENGINE TESTING

Complaints have been grouped by the type of operation and aircraft. In summary, 38 complaints were received from 20 individuals during the period 1 January to 31 December 2018, excluding complaints relating to Christchurch Flight Paths Trial.

Type of Operation	Type of Aircraft	Number of Complaints	Actions Taken
Low Flying Aircraft	Jet	13	2 complaints were received from one individual concerned by low flying jets on one night. CIAL went to Airways to evaluate the evening of concern. It was found that due to unusual poor weather on that evening freight aircraft had to fly over the complainant's area, when they wouldn't normally, to safely land at the airport. Complainant was appreciative of the detailed feedback.
			2 complaints were received from one individual concerned that aircraft are not flying in accordance with the Noise Management Plan. CIAL worked with Airways to provide as much information possible to address his concerns. After many emails between CIAL and the complainant, he decided that he was unhappy at the speed of response and did not want any further communication. CIAL explained that gathering information from multiple sources, Airways and several aircraft operators, inevitably takes time and that the Airport has done its best to respond as quickly as possible. CIAL encouraged the complaint to continue to register his feedback but as he no longer wished to receive an explanation this was our final correspondence. CIAL has not has received any further complainants from this individual.
			3 complaints were received from one individual who was concerned about low flying military aircraft. CIAL rang this complainant to talk through his concerns and his feedback was passed on to Airways.
			Complainant concerned by large aircraft flying low especially late at night and early in the morning over the past month. CIAL went to Airways who analysed months' worth of aircraft movements and found that, in 1 month, 4 flights (all jets) over flew her area due to westerly winds. Airways found that there has been no increase or change in flight schedules or types of aircraft flying into Christchurch. This information was given to the complainant whom was satisfied with the response.
			2 complaints were received from 2 individuals at the same residence concerned about the high volume of low flying aircraft and believed the noise contours were being breached. CIAL called to address both their concerns, where they explained they were long term residents of their area and have noticed the noise and volume of the aircraft steadily increasing so had purchased a noise logger to monitor noise levels to determine whether noise levels

		<p>breach the noise contours. CIAL contacted their acoustic engineer consultants to provide advice and a leaflet to help explain the noise limits at Christchurch Airport and the way aircraft noise is monitored. Airways were also contacted to provide feedback and found that there was nothing out of the ordinary about the approaches noted as particularly noisy. Airways put the increase in noise, on these days down to aircraft flying instrument approaches in low cloud weather conditions to allow for safe flying in these conditions.</p>
		<p>3 complaints were received from one individual. This complainant has continued to lodge noise complaints regarding aircraft noise which he believes is related to the flight paths trial. CIAL has provided him with as much information as possible including details of the trial and specific information about flight paths, contextual and technical information from Airways via CIAL. CIAL has asked for him to provide more specific information including times and types of aircraft as his complaints are general and difficult to provide feedback on. The complainant has been provided with flight path maps showing a comparison between pre-trial and during trial flights showing that traffic patterns have remained the same with some streamlining of flight paths which have mainly directed flights away from his home. The complainant also was invited and agreed to attend a meeting with Airways and CIAL, however decided not to attend once the meeting was scheduled. CIAL explained that he could also raise his concerns at the next ANLC meeting if he preferred but the complainant has not responded.</p>
Turbo-Prop	6	<p>3 complaints were received from one individual.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First and second complaint were in relation to low flying aircraft. CIAL explained this was a Sounds Air single engine turbo-prop which over-flew his home when landing in north easterly conditions on Runway 02 which occurs around 30% of the time. This flight arrives to Christchurch Airport during the day. 2. Third complaint was in relation to a light twin turboprop involved in the flight calibration of Christchurch Airport navigation aids. CIAL explained that these flights are infrequent (once every 1-2 years), but necessary to ensure that current flight procedures are safe and accurate.
		<p>2 complaints were received from one complainant concerned that aircraft are flying in non-permitted areas. CIAL explained the variability of approaches due to instrument landing systems, visual approaches and weather conditions causing aircraft to fly over many parts of the city. It was explained that this is permitted providing aircraft follow Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) rules.</p>
		<p>Complainant concerned by a low flying aircraft. Contact was attempted via phone and email but incorrect contact information was provided.</p>

Light Aircraft	2	2 complaints were received from one complainant in relation to constant low flying aircraft over the course of 2 ½ hours on one night. CIAL explained that Canterbury Aero Club (CAC) had 4 staff in training (being the maximum allowed on one night) completing circuits at the same time on the night in question. Air Traffic Control (ATC) had to instruct the use of non-standard right hand circuits from runway 02 due to aircraft traffic. At the same time, there was a laser strike at New Brighton, so ATC had to direct traffic to circle in the same area until the situation was resolved. CIAL explained that this was an abnormal occurrence. Complaint understood and was pleased with the investigation and response.
Helicopter	4	<p>3 complaints were received from one individual.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first complaint was in relation to the large number of helicopters flying over her area. Complainant is on the Garden City Aviation (GCA) helicopters flight path and is bothered by scenic trips. CIAL worked with Airways to see if it was viable to incorporate more variation to helicopter flight paths overall. It is not always appropriate to request changes to flight patterns based on an individual complaint. As a result, Airways and GCA are hesitant to make changes due to operational challenges at this time. 2. Second complaint was in relation to a Military helicopters flight path. A map showing the flight path was given. It was explained that the New Zealand Defence Force are not required to follow civil rules, but they will conform to at least the minimum requirement. 3. Third complaint in relation to GCA Annual Open Day. Complaint asked if helicopters could fly over farmland avoiding residential properties and that the neighbourhood be informed before future events. CIAL have passed on this advice to the GCA. <p>Complainant was concerned by low flying military helicopter and aircraft traffic in the area. A map showing the flight path was given. It was explained that the New Zealand Defence Force are not required to follow civil rules, but they will conform to at least the minimum requirement. Complainant is located close to the Westpac Rescue Helicopter pad near the hospital and is on the approach to Runway 29. Consequently, CIAL explained the nature of aircraft operations in his area.</p>
Multiple	3	2 complaints were received from one complainant requesting specific information in relation to the Flight Path Trial. Airways and CIAL worked together to provide this information. After some time, complainant contacted the Airport again to complain about noise in his area due to a change in aircraft operations. Airways and CIAL met with the complainant to explain that the flight path changes were likely to have little to no effect to his area and to explain the reasons for implementing the trial, why planes overfly the city and other aircraft noise related issues.

			<p>Complainant was comforted that the proposed changes to the flight paths would have minimal effect to his area and has gained an understanding of aircraft operations at the airport.</p> <p>Complainant concerned by low flying aircraft in general. CIAL worked with Airways to explain that many different types of aircraft transit over this area uncontrolled and typically flying visual flight rules. It was suggested that the complainant address queries with the CAA.</p>
Engine Testing	Turbo-Prop	10	<p>Complainant did not wish to be contacted, however CIAL encouraged him to register more feedback or contact us directly if he wishes to discuss his concerns.</p> <p>Complainant concerned by engine testing at night. No engine testing occurred at the exact time of the complaint but details of the engine testing occurring that night were provided.</p> <p>Complaint received via CCC regarding two engine tests believed to be exceeding the contour limits. Details of the engine testing, an explanation of how the location of engine tests is selected, an explanation of how noise is measured and the rules as per the District Plan were provided.</p> <p>Complainant concerned by engine testing at night and early morning. Details of the engine test and an explanation of the restrictions on engine testing as per the District plan were provided.</p> <p>6 complaints were received from one complainant concerned with early morning engine testing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first 4 complaints were addressed by providing details of: engine testing, information on CIAL’s engine testing management software, the restrictions on engine testing as per the District plan and a link to the noise website where the public can see all the engine tests undertaken in the past week. 2. On the last two complaints, the complainant asked not to be contacted however on the 2nd occasion, CIAL provided more specific information regarding the engine test. The complainant was invited to contact us directly should he wish to discuss his concerns.

At every ANLC meeting, a summary of noise complaints and follow up actions is provided to the members. To date, the ANLC is satisfied the Airport is following the complaints procedure and is approving of CIAL’s current approach to resolve noise complaints. The process of providing explanations and meeting with complainants aims to alleviate concerns and will continue to be pursued where possible. The ANLC will continue to provide feedback or give recommendations on methods to improve the process at as required.

5.2 CHRISTCHURCH FLIGHT PATHS TRIAL

In accordance with rule 6.1.6.2.7.3 c(ii) CIAL liaised with the ANLC to provide relevant information to the community on the Christchurch Flight Paths Trial.

On 9 November 2017, Airways New Zealand, the Board of Airline Representatives New Zealand (BARNZ), Christchurch Airport (CIAL) and New Southern Sky (NSS) commenced a trial of Performance Based Navigation (PBN) flight paths in Christchurch. PBN is a global air navigation standard, being introduced in accordance with international guidance and New Zealand government policy. The 12-month flight path trial is for arrivals to Christchurch only and is part of NSS, a 10-year Programme led by NZ Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), which is introducing major changes to New Zealand's aviation system to make air travel smarter, quicker, safer and more sustainable. The PBN approach paths selected for the trial were the product of consultation between Airways New Zealand, BARNZ, CIAL and NSS. The philosophy adopted when selecting the flight paths was to achieve a level of consensus by balancing the technical and operational needs of the trial, with an aim to moderate the overall noise effects on communities.

Feedback from the community was actively and continuously sought throughout the 12-month trial, through channels including announcements in news media, a dedicated website (www.christchurchflightpathstrial.co.nz) which featured information about the trial, a feedback form and a phone number to call. Any response to an inquiry included encouragement to keep sending feedback and to share the information and website address with others who might also be able to offer feedback. CIAL made clear throughout the trial that every piece of feedback would get a response and would be considered. Following the midpoint of the trial (6 months) the trial partners released an interim report, which provided summaries on the operational data, noise data, community feedback and interim recommendations. Following the end of the trial on 8 November 2018, the full report is currently being prepared and is expected to be finalised by April 2019.

134 flight paths feedback responses were received from the community. Some were found not to be PBN related, however they provided an opportunity to engage with community members to address their concerns and these responses have been included in the noise complaint summary. This leaves 81 complaints from 46 separate complainants, as well as 17 neutral/undecided and 18 positive responses at the end of the trial. Bespoke responses, including location specific information and maps, were provided by CIAL in conjunction with Airways and the remaining trial partners, to every individual via email, phone and in person. The feedback will be incorporated into the final report.

The ANLC were kept updated on progress and community feedback received throughout the 12-month trial at quarterly ANLC meetings. Once finalised, the interim report was circulated to the committee and the final report will similarly be circulated on its completion.

6 COMPLAINTS PROCESS AND REVIEW

In accordance with rule 6.1.6.2.7.3 d(ii) and c(vi) of the District Plan the ANLC may consider and make recommendations the current noise complaints process and procedures.

Section 7 of the Noise Management Plan details the noise compliant process and complaints register. Outside of the NMP review process the ANLC has recommended the process of meeting with complainants where resolution has not been made via email and/or phone communications should continue to be pursued when and where possible.

7 APPENDIX A: DISTRICT PLAN RULE

6.1.6.2.7.3

6.1.6.2.7.3 Airport Noise Liaison Committee

- a. Within 6 months of 6 March 2017, an Airport Noise Liaison Committee (the Committee) shall be established and operated by the [airport operator](#).
- b. The [airport operator](#) shall:
 - i. invite the following parties to appoint members of the Committee:
 - A. two representatives appointed by the [airport operator](#);
 - B. at least two members of Christchurch City Community Boards (as representatives of the community) appointed by the [Council](#);
 - C. one Environmental Health Officer appointed by [Council](#) (non-voting);
 - D. two representatives appointed by the Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand; and
 - E. one representative appointed by the Isaac Conservation and Wildlife Trust.
 - ii. provide facilities and administrative support for the Committee in order that it can meet not less than twice annually.
- c. The Committee may consider and make recommendations to the [airport operator](#) on:
 - i. Any community concerns regarding noise from [aircraft operations](#) and [engine testing](#);
 - ii. Liaison with, and provision of relevant information to the community;
 - iii. the preparation, review and updating if required of the Airport Noise Management Plan as required by [Rule 6.1.6.2.7.1](#);
 - iv. the preparation, review and updating if required of the Acoustic Treatment Programme and its implementation as required by [Rule 6.1.6.2.7.2](#);
 - v. complaints received over the previous year in respect of noise from [aircraft operations](#) and on-aircraft [engine testing](#), and any actions taken in response to those complaints; and
 - vi. Reviewing, and updating if required, the procedures associated with noise complaints received over the previous year.
- d. The [airport operator](#) shall provide by 6 March 2018, and annually thereafter, a report to the [Council](#) regarding the following:
 - i. the composition of the Committee; and
 - ii. summaries of the Committee's consideration of the matters specified in [Rule 6.1.6.2.7.3 c.](#)

Link to: [Christchurch District Plan Rule 6.1.6.2.7.3.](#)

