

**MINUTES OF THE RANIGORA AIRFIELD ADVISORY GROUP****At the Rangiora Airfield****5.30 pm on Wednesday 23 October 2024****PRESENT**

- Steve Noad (Chair)
- Chris Brown (WDC)
- Keith Vallance
- Buzz Harvey
- Ian Mcphail
- Bruce Drake
- Duncan Roxborough (WDC)
- Joan Ward
- Scott James
- Rob Kittow
- Dave Harnett

**WELCOME**

- Opened the meeting at 5:30 pm

**Item****1. APOLOGIES**

- Owen Stewart (WDC)
- Paul Williams (Councillor)

**2. INTRODUCTIONS**

A recent restructuring within the Council has resulted in Duncan Roxborough replacing Grant Macleod at these Advisory Group meetings. Duncan is now also Owen's direct manager.

**3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES dated Wednesday, 26 June 2024 and Wednesday. 25 September 2024**

**Moved: Buzz Harvey**

**Seconded: Rob Kittow**

**4. MATTERS ARISING**

Airfield Gates

- **Completion and Operation:** The airfield gates are now fully operational with all issues resolved. Chris highlighted that the primary purpose of these gates is to enhance security and control access to the airfield.
- **Out-of-Hours Access:** Owen has reached out to known users who need access to fuel after hours and provided them with access cards. If there are others who need access, they can contact Owen to arrange for a card. In emergency situations requiring out-of-hours access, individuals can contact the Council's after-hours service, which has a process in place for such scenarios.
- **Keypad vs. Swipe Card Access:** Rob inquired about the possibility of using a keypad in addition to swipe cards. Chris explained that while pin code access can be implemented, it lacks the ability to track and monitor who is accessing the gates, unlike the card system which provides this capability pin codes can also be easily transferred to people.
- **Access Issues:** Rob mentioned that his company sometimes needs evening access and cannot always contact Owen at night, making it difficult without a card. He suggested that it would be beneficial if the front yellow gate could have a remote control like the other gates and if it could be automated to open for exiting.

	<b>Action/s</b> Investigate if a remote can be made available for the main yellow gate Investigate if the yellow gate can be automated for exiting.	<b>Who?</b> Owen Owen
5.	<b>MAINTENANCE</b> <b>Taxiway Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chris explained that the situation is more complex than initially anticipated. The airfield is classified as a HAIL (Hazardous Activities and Industries List) site due to potential fuel contamination. This classification requires resource consent for any digging and requires soil sampling as this will help determine requirements for future works. Discussions with Council planners are ongoing to determine how to proceed. The plan is to potentially bring in soil this year as/if needed, and next year Tonkin Taylor will conduct testing and develop a contamination management plan. This plan will guide how to handle the soil when work is undertaken. Meantime Owen has plans in place for taxiway remediation (of the bare areas) to commence with urgency. Noted season is not ideal and things are burning off already.</li> <li>Rob pointed out a discrepancy between the quoted distance of the taxiway and the distance mentioned in the aeronautical study. He requested to see the plan for clarification.</li> </ul> Joan explained that the width of the runway is designed to allow for future-proofing. Chris noted that the group has approved the plan, but there have been multiple versions, so we can resend this out.	
	<b>Action/s</b>	<b>Who?</b>
	Bring plan of taxiway back to the group at next RAAG showing the runway safety distance width as there is confusion.	Owen
6.	<b>HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</b> <b>AIP Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Steve advised the landing plate has been sent out to everyone, some people have not received this so feedback could not be provided today. Steve advised he will resend this out and members are to provide feedback to Owen within 2 weeks (06/10) so he can investigate and report back at the next RAAG meeting.</li> <li>Buzz raised concerns about Number 21, which prohibits low-level circuits during dual training. He mentioned that several people are unhappy with this restriction. Buzz also questioned Number 27, stating that there is no legal reason for this regulation. However, other members disagreed with his assessment. Buzz suggested adding in no orbits when on finals which other members agreed with.</li> </ul> <b>SMS Manual Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Steve raised concerns that this has taken some time. Chris advised a spreadsheet that has comments and actions on it will be presented later in the meeting and the priority of actions can be moved around if required, and also noted where we are still awaiting feedback from others (e.g. CAA).</li> </ul>	
	<b>Action/s</b>	<b>Who?</b>
	Steve to resend the landing plate/AIP Members are to comment back to Owen within 2 weeks on the landing plate (06/11) who will capture comments and bring updated draft at the next meeting.	Steve Owen

<b>7.</b>	<b>AIRFIELD INCIDENTS</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was an incident at the regional competition that occurred, this was a non-competition aircraft and has been put through CAA which is looking into it.</li> <li>• Low-flying complaint was received in the Estuary and Mike Kwant is following it up – no further action by the Group.</li> </ul>	
	<b>Action/s</b>	<b>Who?</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>NOISE COMPLAINTS</b>	
	None	
	<b>Action/s</b>	<b>Who?</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE GROUP REPORT</b>	
	None	
	<b>Action/s</b>	
<b>9.</b>	<b>GENERAL</b> <b>Aeronautical Study</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Duncan mentioned that several projects emerged from the aeronautical study, such as fencing, access control, taxiway, and roadway improvements. While some of these projects have been implemented, others remain pending/to be decided.</li> <li>• Chris noted that the Council initially sent out the study for consultation but received only two responses. Consequently, the CAA sent it out again for further consultation. Chris also mentioned that about two years ago, the Council resolved to become a qualified aerodrome, a decision that was brought to the RAAG at that time.</li> <li>• This study was triggered by various movements and incidents that prompted the initial study. However, given that this was two years ago, it is necessary to take this back to the Council to confirm if they still wish to proceed with this.</li> <li>• Members expressed that they do not recall being consulted on this matter and requested to see the report that went to the Council, indicating their support for the decision. The matter is currently with the CAA, and follow-up is needed to determine its status and report back to the group.</li> </ul> <p>It was noted that review of qualifying aerodrome intentions (or CAA requirements/instructions) may need reconsideration now that many of the improvement actions from the Aeronautical study are already implemented or in the process of being implemented.</p> <b>Instrument Flight Procedures for Rangiora (for discussion)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steve sent out a proposal for an instrument flight approach for the Rangiora Airfield. He explained that the approach would come in from the coast on the non-traffic side, although it was noted that this is currently on the wrong side (the diagram needs mirroring)</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The primary reason for needing this is its value for training purposes. The group generally saw no downsides to this proposal, aside from the potential cost of a survey that the Council might need to cover</li> <li>•Steve mentioned that Owen has obtained a price for the survey. Owen to investigate any potential negatives and associated costs, and report back to the group with his findings.</li> <li>•The group is to provide feedback to Owen within 2 weeks (06/11) on this so he can investigate and report back at the next RAAG.</li> </ul> <p><b>Landing Fees Increase 2024</b></p> <p>Chris presented on a recent restructuring that occurred in the Greenspace Team at the Council and that Owen now sits within the Strategic and Special Projects Unit. This aims to provide better programming and project management assistance for the numerous projects at the airfield.</p> <p>Landing Fees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Chris explained that the Council had approved an increase in landing fees from \$10 to \$12 per day, which was supposed to be implemented on July 1st. However, this change was not implemented as planned. The last time the Council reviewed fees and charges, there had been no increase for 12 years.</li> <li>•Members were unaware of the fee increase and felt that users should be given sufficient notice. It was agreed to implement the new fees on December 1st, 2024, with communication to be made through the newsletter and directly to those affected.</li> <li>•Questions were raised about whether fees would be reviewed annually. Chris confirmed that fees would generally increase annually in line with the Consumer Price Index (CPI), although this implementation would depend on the actual movements.</li> </ul> <p><b>Fees Review Process</b></p> <p>Chris presented how the fee review process works. He explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council staff would develop options, based on feedback to date, industry research, and relevant local context.</li> <li>• We will look at the structure of lease charges and landing fees</li> <li>• Review the funding model for the airfield.</li> <li>• Send out for public consultation this includes airfield users and ratepayers– everyone will have the opportunity to be heard by a panel of staff and elected members.</li> <li>• Council staff will then review feedback and modify options</li> <li>• Report will then be taken to Council to consider and approve.</li> </ul> <p>This process will be completed by December 2025</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•There are numerous questions to consider when reviewing fees, making it challenging to reach a consensus.</li> <li>•A question was raised about what constitutes a fair and reasonable contribution by a ratepayer to the airfield is it a 60/40 split? Chris advised we need to compare with other councils, acknowledging the unique nature of the airfield and the community.</li> <li>•Currently, there is no charge for aprons, but this is one of the areas where options and answers are needed. Buzz mentioned his plans to extend his apron</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>soon and expressed concern about potential impacts from future charges. He requested a discussion with Chris to address this issue.</p> <p><b>Airfield Prioritised Actions Spreadsheet Presentation (Owen)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•A summary taken from the spreadsheet outlining only the current high priority actions for the airfield was presented, showing project details, priorities, timelines, and current statuses. Some items are classified as Business As Usual (BAU), highlighting the high-priority tasks Owen handles. The goal is to provide updates at RAAG meetings, allowing members to track project progress and identify any at-risk or on-track projects.</li> <li>•Chris noted that the sewer and water project is not listed on the summary items presented tonight. There are several consented, unconsented, and unknown connections. Once the project is completed, a number of the existing septic systems will be decommissioned. This is a significant project with associated costs for those wishing to connect or remain connected, necessitating a communication plan.</li> <li>•The sewer line currently extends only to the toilet at the far end, with connection costs varying based on the hangar locations. The line follows the road, but there was a question about rerouting it near the runway. Duncan explained that the current route is due to planned road replacement, but alternative routes could be considered if they are more cost-effective.</li> <li>•Joan advised that budgets for 25/26 are being set now.</li> <li>•Rob raised concerns about the budget he reviewed and the need for the group to understand both the budgeted and actual figures. Chris offered to arrange for someone from our accounts team to come out and explain the budget details to the group, ensuring clarity and understanding.</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Action/s</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Bring original report to RAAG showing when Council approved to become a fully qualified aerodrome.</li> <li>•Bring minutes that show if RAAG supported the decision to become a qualified aerodrome.</li> <li>•Follow up with CAA – come back with a process and a timeline for the Aeronautical Study report.</li> <li>•Bring back the quote for the survey (associated with Instrument approach) to the next meeting – and arrange for plan to be updated if required.</li> <li>•Questions to be sent to Owen within 2 weeks to provide answers at the next meeting for instrumental flight procedure proposal.</li> <li>•Look into the negatives of instrumental flight procedures and costs.</li> <li>•Communicate landing fee increases and provide at least one month's notice (so working to implementation from 01<sup>st</sup> of December).</li> <li>•Conversation with Buzz about potential apron charging due to work he is looking at undertaking.</li> <li>•Budget presentation to occur at an upcoming RAAG meeting so the group can understand this in more detail.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Who?</b></p> <p>Owen</p> <p>Owen</p> <p>Owen</p> <p>Owen</p> <p>Owen</p> <p>Owen</p> <p>Owen</p> <p>Chris/Buzz</p> <p>Owen</p>

**Meeting closed at 1914.**

**Next meeting 5:30pm on Wednesday 27 November 2024**