

Airport Noise Liaison Committee Report

1 January – 31 December 2019



Revision Schedule		
Revision No	Date	Prepared by
A	06/03/2020	Jessica Royal, Environment Advisor, Christchurch International Airport

© 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 Definitions, Acronyms & Authors	2
	1.1 Definitions	2
	1.2 Acronyms	2
	1.3 Authors	2
2	Statutory Requirements	3
3	Committee Composition	3
4	ANLC Considerations and Recommendations	4
	4.1 Christchurch Flight Paths Trial	4
	4.2 Airport Noise Management Plan	4
	4.3 Acoustic Treatment Programme	4
	4.4 Noise Monitoring Report	5
	4.4.1 Verification Noise Measurements	5
5	Noise Complaints Summary	6
	5.1 Aircraft Operations and On-Aircraft Engine Testing	6
6	Complaints Process and Review	14
7	Appendix A: Christchurch District Plan Rule 6.1.6.2.7.3	14

1 LIST OF DEFINITIONS, ACRONYMS & AUTHORS

1.1 DEFINITIONS

Aircraft Operations	Also referred to as 'Operational Noise' (refer Section 6.1) <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. For the purposes of Rule 6.1.6 Activity specific noise rules, it excludes: <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
Noise Measurements	In-situ noise measurements of actual noise levels using either semi-permanent noise monitoring terminals or hand-held equipment (sound level meters).
Noise Monitoring	Monitoring of noise levels (generally with respect to assessing compliance with the Christchurch District Plan), using both noise measurements and calculated noise levels.
On-Aircraft Engine Testing	The testing of engine on aircraft.

1.2 ACRONYMS

AANC	Annual Aircraft Noise Contour
AIPNZ	Aeronautical Information Publication New Zealand
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
CHL	Christchurch Helicopters Limited
CIAL	Christchurch International Airport Limited
DP	Christchurch District Plan
GCA	Garden City Aviation
NMP	Noise Management Plan
NMR	Noise Monitoring Report
NMT	Noise Monitoring Terminals
PBN	Performance Based Navigation
SID	Standard Instrument Departure

1.3 AUTHORS

Name	Role
Jessica Royal	Environment Advisor, Christchurch International Airport

2 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

In accordance with Rule 6.1.6.2.7.3 d(i) and (ii) of the Christchurch District Plan (DP) (see Appendix A), Christchurch International Airport (CIAL) is required to prepare an Airport Noise Liaison Committee Report by 6 March each year 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:
 - Any community concerns regarding noise from aircraft operations and engine testing;
 - Liaison with, and provision of relevant information to the community;
 - 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);
 - 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 Christchurch District Plan, CIAL established an Airport Noise Liaison Committee (ANLC) in March 2017. The committee is required to meet not less than twice annually. In 2019, the committee met on the 18th of February and 12th of August.

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 CONSIDERATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

- Liaison with, and provision of relevant information to the community, including the Christchurch Flight Paths Trial,
- The preparation, review and updating if required of the Airport 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

Similarly, in accordance with Rule 6.1.6.2.5 a(iii) (D) and section 6.1.2 of the Airport Noise Management Plan (NMP), the location of the Noise Monitoring Terminals (NMT) as required to verify noise measurements is to be decided in consultation with the ANLC.

4.1 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 throughout the Christchurch Flight Paths Trial. The 12-month trial ended on 8 November 2018 and the final report was completed on the 29th of August 2019 and published on the Christchurch Flight Paths Trial website until the 31st of December 2019 www.christchurchflightpathstrial.co.nz. The report can now be found on the Christchurch Airport Website: <https://www.christchurchairport.co.nz/about-us/sustainability/noise/>. The final report provides summaries on the operational data, noise data, community feedback and final recommendations.

4.2 AIRPORT NOISE MANAGEMENT PLAN

In accordance with the DP, the Noise Management Plan (NMP) 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. Based on further recommendations for the CCC, CIAL updated and finalised the NMP in May 2019.

CIAL continues to manage Aircraft operations and On-Aircraft Engine Testing in accordance with the NMP.

4.3 ACOUSTIC TREATMENT PROGRAMME

In accordance with the DP, the Acoustic Treatment Program (ATP), has been prepared by the airport operator in consultation with the ANLC. The 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 within 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 DP to any additional residential units that meet

the requirements at that time. No further dwellings were added to the schedule following the 2018 Noise Monitoring Report (NMR). As an outcome of the 2019 NMR, one additional residential unit meets the requirements and has been added to the schedule. The initial offer of acoustic treatment will be sent to the applicable dwelling owner by 6 March 2021.

4.4 NOISE MONITORING REPORT

4.4.1 VERIFICATION NOISE MEASUREMENTS

Rule 6.1.6.2.5a (iii)(D) of the Christchurch District Plan sets out that the calculated Annual Aircraft Noise Contour (AANC) shall be verified by noise measurements carried out in accordance with the Airport Noise Management Plan (NMP). Section 6.1.2 of the NMP states that verification measurements are to be carried out no less than every three years and the location of the Noise Monitoring Terminals (NMT) is decided in consultation with the ANLC. CIAL chose to undertake noise measurements in 2019 because:

- the last noise measurements were conducted two years ago in 2017, and
- the Regional Policy Statement Air Noise Contour review is currently underway.

The ANLC were consulted regarding the location of the two NMT's during the ANLC meeting held on the 12th of August 2019. Details of the NMT's locations and noise verification measurements can be found in the 2019 Noise Monitoring Report (NMR).

5 NOISE COMPLAINTS SUMMARY

In accordance with Rule 6.1.6.2.7.3 c(v) of the Christchurch District Plan 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.

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, the actions taken for each complain are included in the table. In summary, 57 complaints were received from 31 individuals during the period 1 January to 31 December 2019.

Type of Operation	Type of Aircraft	No of Complaints	Actions Taken
Low Flying Aircraft	Jet	22	2 complaints were received from one individual concerning jets overflying her home in the early hours of the morning. Both complaints were found to be early morning Trans-Tasman flights and were following established routes. Complainant has resided at her home for several years and is not normally bothered aircraft noise. CIAL requested Airways to investigate the flights in question; they did not find a cause for increase in noise. This information was passed on the complainant who agreed to get in contact with the Airport should she be affected by aircraft noise in future. CIAL has not received any further complaints from this individual.
			Complainant called to raise her concerns about low jet aircraft near her home and to understand what effect the Performance-Based Navigation (PBN) flight paths might have on aircraft noise in her area. CIAL explained that planes were using the cross runway due to prevailing wind conditions. CIAL also explained that the complainant's home is a considerable distance from the nearest PBN path. The PBN flight paths will direct traffic away from her home, however she will continue to notice aircraft using instrument landing systems and visual approaches.

Type of Operation	Type of Aircraft	No of Complaints	Actions Taken
Low Flying Aircraft (cont.)	Jet (cont.)	22	<p>Complainant was bothered by a low flying jet aircraft and was concerned that planes were taking a more direct route over residential areas to land on the runway. CIAL investigated and found that this plane was using the cross runway due to prevailing wind conditions. CIAL also contacted Airways to provide feedback. Airways found that planes flying near the complainant's home would be flying visual approaches which usually require aircraft to track via 4 nautical miles final however, the approach can be and is shortened in priority traffic scenarios. Pilots may request to tighten the procedure through the Christchurch Approach Radar and Christchurch Tower will allow if this can be done safely. This information was passed on to the complainant who was appreciative of the response.</p> <p>4 complaints were received from one individual. 3 related to low flying jets at late at night/early morning and 1 related to a low flying jet in the early evening.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On the first occasion the noise was related to a freighter aircraft landing on a shortened runway 02/20 due to runway maintenance works. - The next three occasions were related to 'Sofia' the NASA aircraft during take-off or landing. <p>The nature of both type of operations were explained to the complainant. Due to the nature and number of complaints from this individual, they were also invited to attend a meeting with CIAL to address his concerns. The complainant has not responded, and no further complaints have been received.</p> <p>Complainant enquired about the low flying jet aircraft arriving from Australia and whether these aircraft would follow PBN approaches in future. CIAL investigated and found at the time of the complaint there were 4 arrivals, none of which flew PBN approaches. CIAL also explained that more information regarding the types and volumes of aircraft using PBN would be detailed in Flight Paths Trial final report which was released in August 2019.</p> <p>Complainant was concerned about low flying jets using the cross runway. CIAL explained that the change in runway use was due to Airfield paving and turning extension works occurring at Runway 02/20 (main runway). A schedule of the Airfield works was provided. The complainant was appreciative of the response. Accordingly, CIAL then updated the public website to include an explanation of the scheduled Airfield maintenance works and how this would occasionally necessitate the use of the cross runway.</p> <p>Complainant called concerned about low flying jet aircraft using the cross runway and overflying his house late at night/early morning over the course of two nights. CIAL explained that the change in runway use was due to Airfield paving and turning extension works occurring at Runway 02/20 (main runway). A schedule of the Airfield works was provided. The complainant was understanding of the requirement to carry out airfield works.</p> <p>Complainant lodged a complaint regarding low flying jet aircraft in the early morning. The complainant did not wish to be contacted, however CIAL encouraged her to register more feedback or contact us directly if she wishes to discuss her concerns.</p>

Type of Operation	Type of Aircraft	No of Complaints	Actions Taken
Low Flying Aircraft (cont.)	Jet (cont.)	22	Complainant concerned about a loud jet aircraft using the cross runway and overflying his home in the morning. CIAL explained that the change in runway use was due to Airfield paving and turning extension works occurring at Runway 02/20 (main runway). A schedule of the Airfield works was provided.
			Complainant called to voice concerns regarding a jet aircraft over flying her home in the evening. CIAL requested Airways to investigate who explained that the standard instrument departure this aircraft flew has a built-in turn that is normally 4 nautical miles upwind. However, the turn is sometimes altered by the radar controller for a variety of reasons. Most commonly this is for air traffic management purposes to ensure moving aircraft aren't in conflict with each other. The airport advised the complainant that on this occasion the aircraft was directed to turn earlier than standard procedure to ensure the aircraft was at a safe flying distance from other aircraft in the airspace.
			Complainant was concerned that aircraft were using the cross runway when no north west winds were blowing. CIAL explained that the change in runway use was due to Airfield paving and turning extension works occurring at Runway 02/20 (main runway). A schedule of the Airfield works was provided.
			<p>4 Complaints were received from one individual relating to low flying jets using the cross runway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On the first occasion the noise was related to a jet aircraft landing on the cross runway due to runway 02/20 maintenance works. - The next two occasions were related to jet aircraft landing on the cross-runway due to north westerly winds. - On the last occasion noise was believed to be related to engine testing but was a freighter aircraft taxi or departure. <p>Details surrounding the use of the cross runway and freighter aircraft operations were provided to the complainant.</p> <p>This complainant has lodged complaints relating to all types of aircraft operations. As a result, the complainant was invited to attend a meeting with CIAL to voice his concerns. The complainant agreed to meet but has since not responded the times and dates proposed. CIAL also invited the complainant to attend the next ANLC meeting. The complainant has not made contact since November 2019.</p>
			Complainant was concerned about a low flying jet aircraft overflying their home. The aircraft was following one of the PBN flight paths to land onto Runway 02. This flight path was created at the mid-way point of the Christchurch Flight Paths Trial to share aircraft noise across two PBN flight path approaches from the west onto Runway 02. One of these flight paths tracks close to the complainant's home. CIAL explained that they would continue to notice aircraft on this path for approximately half of the PBN approaches and the remainder would follow the alternate path. CIAL also explained that not all aircraft approaches follow PBN flight paths as visual approaches and standard instrument procedures also occur.

Type of Operation	Type of Aircraft	No of Complaints	Actions Taken
Low Flying Aircraft (cont.)	Jet (cont.)	22	Complainant was concerned about a military aircraft's flight path. The aircraft turned low over his area and appeared not to be following standard procedures. CIAL requested more information from Airways who found that on this occasion the controller had, in error, cancelled the Standard Instrument Departure (SID) before the requirement to turn the aircraft. Airways spoke to the controller regarding the error. This information was passed on to the complainant.
			Complainant enquired about the variation in the western approach paths onto runway 02 and why aircraft turn over the residential areas when it appears they can turn further north which is less of a nuisance to the complainant. CIAL provided information regarding the PBN flight paths and explained that two PBN approach paths on to runway 02. The shorter track has alleviated the volume of traffic flying over the Rolleston area and aircraft using PBN routes are now split to share noise across 2 approach paths.
	Turbo-Prop	4	Complainant concerned about a low flying turbo-prop in the morning. CIAL contacted Airways who investigated and found that the aircraft was travelling from Wellington to Christchurch and flying a Standard Instrument Procedure but turning earlier than usual under air traffic controls direction. CIAL explained that there is a lot of variation in this aircraft's choice of approach path, so the noise is unlikely to be continually bothersome. The complainant was appreciative of the response.
3 complaints received from one individual regarding low flying turbo prop aircraft near his home throughout the day. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On the first 2 occasions the complainant did not wish to be contacted however CIAL encouraged him to register more feedback or make contact directly should he wish to discuss his concerns. On the third occasion the complainant was concerned about a turboprop using the cross runway in 13km/hr nor' westerly winds. CIAL requested more information from Airways who explained that the cross runway becomes the duty (or main) runway when nor' west winds are consistently 15 knots or higher. However, there are scenarios where the wind speed is less or more than 15 knots, but the cross runway is not the duty runway. This is when nor west wind is not predicted to last longer than an hour or the wind direction has changed recently and due to the positions of the aircraft in the sky the Air Traffic Controllers need to continue directing them onto the current runway in use until the backlog is cleared. Then they can instruct aircraft to turn at the right time in order to line up with the duty runway.			
Light Aircraft	2	Complainant was concerned that she is on the flight path of small aircraft, transiting near her home several times a night. CIAL found this that these events were in relation to the Canterbury Aero Club (CAC) Training school where students are required to complete night flying training as it is a requirement to obtain their pilot's licence. CIAL explained that the CAC have a self-imposed curfew of 10pm in the winter months and 11pm in the summer months to reduce disturbance to affected residents. Complainant was understanding of the need for night flying.	

Type of Operation	Type of Aircraft	No of Complaints	Actions Taken
Low Flying Aircraft (cont.)	Light Aircraft (cont.)	2	Complainant lodged a complaint about noise he believed was engine testing but on investigation was found to be 3 small CAC planes completing circuits as part of night flying training requirements. CAC training school student's complete night flying training as it is a requirement to obtain their pilot's licence. CIAL explained that the CAC have a self-imposed curfew of 10pm in the winter months and 11pm in the summer months to reduce disturbance to affected residents.
	Helicopter	1	Complainant concerned that helicopters were overflying her home at dangerously low levels. This individual has raised concerns regarding helicopter safety on multiple occasions over the past 3 years. CIAL has met with this complainant to explain that the helicopter operations in question are safe and pose no risk to her safety. CIAL has also worked with Garden City Aviation (GCA) to alter the helicopter flight paths to avoid overflying her home where possible and are in the process of adjusting the current helicopter approaches to the GCA heliport in the Aeronautical Information Publication New Zealand (AIPNZ). Despite these measures being in place there are infrequent instances where helicopters (mainly itinerants) do overfly this individual's home at low but safe altitudes. CIAL is likely to continue to receive complaints from this individual.
	Multiple	9	<p>Complainant concerned about low flying aircraft near her home after 10pm at night and believed the cause was aircraft flying the PBN flight paths. CIAL investigated and found that it was unlikely that the PBN flight paths change would be the cause of the noise as her home is some distance away from the nearest path. The noise was found to be it was freighter aircraft departing Christchurch Airport between 10pm-12am.</p> <p>Complainant called to raise concern regarding one night's aircraft traffic transiting over her home in the early morning/late evening. CIAL explained that the cross runway was in use due to Airfield paving and turning extension works occurring at Runway 02/20 (main runway). A schedule of the Airfield works was provided. The complainant was understanding of the need for runway works to occur.</p> <p>3 complaints received from one individual regarding low flying aircraft transiting her home in the morning and evening. CIAL explained on all three occasions the aircraft were either landing on Runway 02 using one of the PBN flight path procedures or using standard instrument procedures to arrive or depart from Runway 02/20. It was explained that the PBN tracks reduce the amount of traffic in her area but that aircraft following standard instrument procedures and visual approaches/departures will continue to transit near her home.</p> <p>Complainant called the Airport to complain about many low flying aircraft overflying her home during the day. Complainant wished to remain anonymous and declined a follow up.</p>

Type of Operation	Type of Aircraft	No of Complaints	Actions Taken
Low Flying Aircraft (cont.)	Multiple (cont.)	9	2 complaints received from one individual concerned about low flying aircraft overflying his home in the morning and evening. On both occasions the aircraft were departing Runway 20 to take off into south westerly or westerly winds following Standard Instrument Departures (SID) turning near or over the complainant's home.
			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.
Engine Testing	Jet	2	Complainant concerned by loud engine noise in the early evening. CIAL investigated and found that the noise was caused by two high powered Hercules C130 engine tests. Information regarding engine testing requirements, day/early evening scheduling where possible and the Antarctic programme were passed on to the individual.
			Complainant concerned by an engine test in the evening. CIAL investigated and found that this was a medium powered Hercules C130 engine test. Information regarding engine testing requirements, day/early evening scheduling where possible and the Antarctic programme were passed on to the individual.
	Turbo-Prop	10	5 complaints were received from one individual bothered by early morning engine testing. On all 5 occasions the 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. This complainant also lodged several complaints in 2018. On all occasions CIAL has attempted to engage but the complainant only responds by lodging new complaints.
Complainant concerned by a sudden loud noise that lessened to a similar but quieter noise. CIAL investigated and explained the noise in question was a turbo prop carrying out a high-power engine test. The noise tapered off as it was run at medium and low powers. CIAL explained that this test coupled with unfavourable wind conditions contributed to noise.			

Type of Operation	Type of Aircraft	No of Complaints	Actions Taken
Engine Testing (cont.)	Turbo-Prop (cont.)	10	<p>4 complaints received from one individual in relation to turbo prop engine testing in the early morning and at night.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The first complaint was in relation to an early morning engine test. CIAL investigated and found only an idle test occurring at this time with no other discernible factors at play. As a result, CIAL requested more information. The complainant responded to explain that he was generally bothered by all aircraft noise and was unhappy with the way noise is managed at the airport. CIAL invited the complainant to meet to discuss his concerns, the complainant agreed but is yet to confirm his availability. - The second two complaints were lodged at the same time relating to two instances of engine testing: one at night and one early the following morning. On these occasions the complainant did not wish to be contacted. CIAL provided detailed information related to his most recent complaints and continued to encourage the complainant to take up the offer to meet. <p>The last complaint was in relation to an early morning engine test. CIAL provided details of the engine test and again encouraged the complainant to take up the offers to meet and discuss concerns. CIAL has not received a response to the request to meet.</p>
	Multiple	1	<p>Complaint was received via the CCC, where the complainant was concerned about engine testing in the early morning over the course of a few days.</p> <p>CIAL investigated and found on the mornings in question there were between 2 to 3 engine tests occurring between the specified times. These were made up of high-power turbo-prop tests for less than 5 minutes and idle-power jet tests between 10- and 20-minutes duration. It was also observed that on some nights wind direction would have been a contributing factor to the increased noise level. CIAL passed on this information to the CCC and offered to speak with the complainant directly. CCC let the complainant know the details and asked them to get in touch with CIAL directly if they have any further questions.</p>
Low Flying Aircraft & Engine Testing	Multiple	1	<p>Complainant rang the airport to voice concerns over engine testing and general aircraft movements. No specific times or dates were provided.</p> <p>Complainant did not wish to receive any follow up from CIAL.</p>
Hovering	Helicopter	2	<p>Complainant was concerned about helicopters hovering near his home.</p> <p>This helicopter activity was due to increased police presence following the March 15th shootings. CIAL provided the complainant with the schedule of helicopter trips over the next week and explained that the police would need to be contacted directly should he want for more information regarding the details of their movements.</p>

Type of Operation	Type of Aircraft	No of Complaints	Actions Taken
Hovering (cont.)	Helicopter (cont.)	2	Complainant called the airport to voice concerns over two helicopters hovering over her property. CIAL explained that the movements were in relation to Christchurch Helicopters (CHL) students completing night training. CIAL then contacted Air Traffic Control (ATC) who spoke with the CHL pilot instructor. The instructor was able to move the helicopters to a less intrusive area that evening. The complainant believed that there was a regulation that limited helicopter operations in this area. CIAL called the complainant the following day to explain the rules surrounding helicopter operations. Complainant was concerned that this activity would become an ongoing issue. CIAL then spoke with CHL to pass on her concerns and to request more information around helicopter night training. The following information was then passed on to the complainant: CHL carry out night flying as it is a requirement for students to obtain their Commercial Pilot Licence. The CHL pilot instructors are aware that the noise bothers the complainant and as a result avoid over flying her home where possible. However, helicopters completing night training must overfly this area when runway 20 is in use for safety and operational reasons. This feedback was passed on to the complainant. The complainant had further questions surrounding other types of airport noise thus the Airport offered to meet the complainant to discuss all her concerns. The meeting was rescheduled due to illness. Following this complainant then decided the meeting was no longer necessary at this stage. The complainant was encouraged to contact CIAL at any time if she wishes to take up the meeting offer again.
	Drone	1	Complainant wished to inform the airport about an instance of drone activity near the end of the main runway occurring the prior day. CIAL was unaware of the drone's activity and it was not authorised. CIAL thanked the complainant for reporting this incident and explained that the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) rules do not permit this kind of activity near any Airport. CIAL was appreciative that the complainant made contact and asked that if she continues to notice drone activity near the Airport to call the CIAL Integrated Operations Centre immediately so that CIAL and ATC can investigate during the incident.
Unknown	Unknown	2	2 complaints received on the same day from one individual in relation to noise believed to have come from the airport. CIAL investigated and found that there were no engine tests or aircraft transiting near the complainant's home at those times. Thus, the noise was assumed to be the take-off, landing and /or taxiing or freighter aircraft. CIAL encouraged the complainant to describe the noise in more detail so that more accurate feedback could be provided. The complainant did not respond to the request.

At the ANLC meetings, a summary of noise complaints and follow up actions are provided to the members for discussion and comment. For future meetings, the ANLC have requested the summary to be sent out one week in advance of the meeting and committee members will raise any queries or concerns as required in the meeting.

6 COMPLAINTS PROCESS AND REVIEW

In accordance with Rule 6.1.6.2.7.3 c(vi) of the Christchurch District Plan the ANLC may consider and make recommendations to CIAL on the current noise complaints process and procedures.

Section 7 of the Noise Management Plan details the noise compliant process and complaints register. To date, the ANLC is satisfied the Airport is following the complaints procedure as outlined in the NMP.

Outside of the NMP review process the ANLC continue to recommend the process of meeting with complainants where resolution has not been made via email and/or phone communications should be pursued where possible. The ANLC will continue to provide feedback and/or give recommendations on methods to improve the process as required.

7 APPENDIX A: CHRISTCHURCH 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](#).

