MINUTES OF THE RANGIORA AIRFIELD ADVISORY GROUP HELD AT 5.30 PM ON WEDNESDAY, 25 FEBRUARY 2026, IN THE CANTERBURY AERO CLUB ROOMS AT THE RANGIORA AIRFIELD, MERTON ROAD, FERNSIDE

PRESENT

Steve Noad (SN) [Chairperson]	Bruce Drake (BD)
John Dugdale (JD)	Buzz Harvey (BH)
Rob Kittow (RK)	Iain McPhail (IM)
Keith Vallance (KV)	Philip Redmond (PR) [Deputy Mayor]
Owen Stewart (OS) [Waimakariri District Council]	

GUESTS IN ATTENDANCE:

Duncan Roxborough (DR) [Waimakariri District Council]

Thea Kunkel (TK) [Waimakariri District Council]

1. WELCOME

The Chairperson welcomed the members present and declared the meeting open at 5.30 pm.

2. APOLOGIES

None

3. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group – 23 July 2025

Moved: S Noad Seconded: B Harvey

THAT the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group:

(a) **Confirms,** as a true and accurate record, the circulated Minutes of the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group meeting held on 23 July 2025.

CARRIED

3.2 Minutes of the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group Workshop – 26 November 2025

Moved: B Harvey Seconded: S Noad

THAT the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group:

(a) **Confirms,** as a true and accurate record, the circulated Minutes of the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group workshop held on 26 November 2025.

CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING (From Minutes)

To be dealt with as part of the meeting.

5. MAINTENANCE

5.1 Irrigation Proposal

DR provided an update on the water and wastewater upgrade works associated with servicing the Rangiora Airfield (airfield) and the Daniel Smith development. Stage 2 of the contract, extending water and wastewater services along Priors Road, was currently underway, with Stewart Civil completing the works. This stage brought services to the airfield boundary. Stage 3 would involve extending the pipelines further into the Daniel Smith development, with that portion of the work funded entirely by the developer. A separate contract would then deliver the services across the airfield, including reconnecting to the tank and replacing existing septic tanks with small pump stations. This package was scheduled to go out to tender next month, and drawings were presented to the group.

DR noted the importance of managing construction impacts on the operational airfield, including minimising disruption to vehicles and aircraft. Engagement with the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) was ongoing to ensure compliance with relevant requirements, particularly regarding open trenching. The scope also included minor upgrades to the airfield's electrical network to rationalise existing connections and provide power to the new pump stations. The original Council budget for the airfield's share of the project was $1.9 million over three years (now four). Current forecasts indicated costs would be significantly below budget. This was due to conservative earlier estimates of water demand, reduced water requirements for the airfield, a higher cost share being allocated to the Daniel Smith development, and tender prices to date coming in below earlier projections.

SN questioned whether the CAA were being cooperative. OS noted that the current CAA advisory material limited open trenches on aerodromes to 30 metres, even though they were 30 centimetres wide. However, the trench for this project would be approximately one metre wide to accommodate water, wastewater, and potential irrigation services. Staff had discussed this with CAA and advised that a wider trench was necessary for the scope of works, with a maximum open length of 100 metres proposed. To ensure safe aircraft movement, 700 mm-high cones would be used instead of the standard 1-metre cones. Measurements taken confirmed that the lowest aircraft wing height (approximately 950 mm on the single Comanche) provided sufficient clearance. Staff also assessed smaller microlight aircraft in the vicinity and confirmed that, based on the proposed trench alignment, these aircraft would still be able to manoeuvre around the works.

OS further noted that while trenching alongside the taxiway was expected to be manageable, work in the central taxiway area may present more challenges. He had reviewed this with the affected operators and confirmed that if the trench were positioned along the centreline of the taxiway, aircraft on either side should still be able to access their hangars. Disruption in this area was expected to be limited to approximately two to three days. However, a formal Communication Plan would be provided to ensure all airfield users were informed in advance of the works and any temporary access constraints.

SN raised a concern regarding the presence of underground infrastructure, including known power cables running across the runway and through the site. OS confirmed that these services had been identified and would be considered as part of the works. Before any construction began on the airfield, the Council would undertake a comprehensive locating of underground services, noting that existing drawings were often inaccurate. BD's local knowledge of the site had been sought, and he would likely be engaged further during detailed planning to support accurate identification and management of underground assets.

DR presented diagrams illustrating the alignment of the upcoming works. Stage 2 of the contract concluded at the corner of the airfield, and the next contract, soon to be released for tender, would bring water and wastewater services onto the airfield. The proposed route ran along the hangar side of the main 07/25 taxiway, diverted around the fuel installations and their associated stormwater drainage, and then continued through the central area to reconnect with the existing tanks. Once completed, the airfield would be supplied from the Rangiora town water network, and wastewater would discharge into the Rangiora scheme, ultimately conveying flows to the ocean outfall.

DR also noted an opportunity to retain and repurpose the existing consented well, which currently provided limited irrigation near the jet fuel pumps. The well had a reasonable daily allocation and flow rate, and with the new town supply being a restricted connection at the end of the scheme, retaining the well for irrigation was considered beneficial. As part of the trenching works, there was scope within the existing budget to install irrigation lines and upgrade the well with a new pump. Indicative plans show irrigation extending along two sections adjacent to the main 07/25 taxiway, to irrigate the taxiway. The system would use automated pop-up sprinklers operating at night when the airfield was inactive.

BD enquired whether the greywater scheme would service the septic tank at the Black Hangar. DR advised that it would not at this stage; however, the system has been designed to allow a future connection if required. The line extended a considerable distance and currently terminates near the end of the hangars. This meant that any new builds or conversions in that area would have relatively straightforward access to connect to the system.

RK questioned the future of existing private septic tanks and the process for connecting them to the new scheme. DR explained that the new system had been sized to allow for future connections from private septic tanks if owners choose to connect. Properties with existing compliant and consented septic systems may continue to operate them as they are. Any future connection to the new scheme would be at the cost of the individual hangar owner.

BH asked why the taxiway would be irrigated and not the runway. OS advised that using the new town water supply for irrigating the runway would require a significantly larger pump, pipework, and development contributions, making this option uneconomical. However, irrigating the taxiway remained feasible using a smaller on-site pump in combination with the existing well supply.

BD noted that irrigation required a resource consent from Environment Canterbury and asked whether the Council would be applying for the consent. DR confirmed that the Council would need to confirm the legal requirements for irrigation and obtain any necessary resource consents. Monitoring obligations would apply in the same manner as for other consent holders.

Responding to a question from IM, OS explained that obtaining consent would depend on how available water resources are allocated to other users. The feasibility of securing a consent would therefore depend on the remaining allocation within the relevant water management zone.

BD observed another well located near the half-round hangar, which some believe may be of higher quality than the existing well in use. Historical information suggested that this second well was installed but never utilised. It was reported that a previous operator had installed a substantial irrigation pump on the well and had pumped from it for several years without any noticeable drop in water level, indicating a strong and reliable supply. It was also suggested that the well may be artesian, with water historically sitting approximately one foot above the pipe level.

RK suggested investigating the well near the half-round hangar as a potential primary irrigation source. DR confirmed that this could be assessed. He noted that approximately six wells were recorded in the database in the vicinity of the airfield, and potentially more. Data for these wells had been reviewed as part of the assessment of alternative water supply options. Further investigation into these additional sources would be undertaken as planning progresses.

DR sought clarification from the RAAG on whether, provided the work remained within the existing budget, there was a preference to explore irrigation of both the taxiway and the runway. Members indicated support for further investigation, without suggesting that full runway irrigation was required at this stage; however consideration might be given to seeing if irrigating at least one side and centre of the runway might be feasible as an additional capacity.

BH commented that if water availability were limited, priority should be given to irrigating the runway; however, if sufficient supply exists, irrigating both areas would be beneficial. RK noted that the taxiway was not a designated operational strip but rather an area used for aircraft movement, and maintaining adequate grass cover on it remained important for overall airfield condition and usability.

OS commented that one of the ongoing challenges with the existing taxiway was the difficulty in establishing and maintaining grass cover. As part of the wider remediation works, areas of rough ground would be excavated, topsoiled, and re-grassed. He observed that several previously identified problem areas had naturally recovered following recent rainfall and reduced taxiway use. Grass trials undertaken on one of the least fertile areas of the airfield demonstrated that regular watering alone was sufficient to achieve strong grass growth. Given this, and to maintain the taxiway in good condition, it was suggested that installing irrigation would be beneficial. This would support consistent grass establishment and long-term surface quality.

DR noted that a meeting with Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) was still to be arranged to discuss firefighting water-supply capacity. The intention was to understand which water sources were available to the fire service and whether there were opportunities for the Council to provide limited on-site water storage to support the fire service's needs. It was confirmed that the airfield was supplied beyond the town network and was therefore on a restricted supply. As a result, there was no standard firefighting hydrant on the airfield. Hydrants on Merton Road were available but primarily intended for flushing, though FENZ could use them if required. Staff want to ensure the fire service was fully aware of all static water supplies and hydrant options available to them in the event of an incident. The existing on-site supply, including the tank used for filling monsoon buckets, would continue to be maintained to support firefighting operations.

5.2 Taxiway Drainage

DR noted that it was apparent that some sections of the taxiway had ongoing drainage problems. Although these issues were not part of the current contract, a separate budget within the airfield activity had been allocated to address them. The Council’s engineering team had undertaken a site walkover with OS to assess the affected areas and was proposing the installation of new drainage infrastructure to help alleviate the issues as part of the water and wastewater upgrade works.

OS reported that high-point and low-point profiling had been completed at approximately eight or nine locations to determine where drainage infrastructure would be most effective. The first proposed location was near the corner of the aero work apron, an area with a long history of water pooling. Staff undertook a site walkover with Bruce Duff to review historical drainage patterns. The proposed solution involved installing a trafficable grate to capture surface water and directing it into an underground soak pit. All proposed soak pits were redesigned to be trafficable. A second location had been identified beside Phil’s half-round hangar, where runoff from the car park consistently collects. A new soak pit was proposed

to address this issue. A third site involved an existing exposed soak pit near Hangar 74. The hangar owner had requested that it be covered, noting that the Council had previously intended to infill it. Profiling indicated that the pit should be repositioned slightly before being reconstructed as a covered soak pit.

BD questioned whether the uneven and undulating section of taxiway between Pat's hangar and Kevin Dore's hangar would be levelled as part of the drainage improvements. OS acknowledged that this area had long been rough and, while it was not in the current scope, confirmed that it would need to be reviewed as part of the drainage and surface remediation work.

RK asked whether levelling the area between the two hangars would prevent water from flowing through it, given that water would always seek the lowest point. OS noted that there was approximately 1.4 metres of fall from Phil's hangar to the proposed soak pit location, so water would continue to move downhill as expected.

IM observed that rather than creating a channel, which would be unsuitable for aircraft to taxi through, the intention was to regrade the area to a smoother, more even slope. This would allow water to disperse more evenly across the surface while still draining to the lowest point, resulting in a safer and less hazardous surface for aircraft operations.

OS noted that the ability to level and reinstate areas would depend on the material excavated during installation of the sewer and water supply pipework. Historically, the soil removed from these areas was not suitable for reuse without screening, so it was unlikely to be used as-is for infill. An additional challenge was sourcing suitable topsoil to bring onto the airfield. At this stage, staff were assessing how much of the existing soil could be screened and reused to support reinstatement works.

OS further noted that the topsoil removed during the JCS hangar excavation was of unexpectedly high quality, with depths of up to 600 mm before reaching harder material. This stockpiled topsoil was now stored in the lower corner of the site and was intended for use in repairing the bare areas, where it would provide a significant improvement over the current condition.

SN questioned whether topsoil from the MainPower stadium stockpile could be brought onto the airfield. OS advised that soil testing of the wider airfield area identified one location (the S5 site) with cadmium levels slightly above acceptable limits. Although this was a single spike, it prevents the southern section of the airfield from being excluded from the contaminated-ground designation. As a result, bringing in external topsoil remains challenging, and staff continue to work through options for managing soil supply within these constraints.

DR explained that the entire airfield was currently shown as "yellow" on the Contaminated-Land Register, indicating it may be contaminated due to its historical use as an airfield. The staff's aim was to apply a more targeted, practical approach by identifying only the areas with actual contamination risks, such as locations where fuel has been stored or handled, so that future work would involve a lighter compliance burden. However, recent soil testing identified one elevated cadmium result at the S5 test site. Although this was a single spike, it prevented the full southern portion of the airfield from being removed from the potentially contaminated classification. Testing also detected hydrocarbons in another area, which aligns with the location of the former motocross track. This area would also need to remain identified as potentially contaminated so that any future works there follow the appropriate procedures.

OS clarified that the presence of identified contamination did not preclude the use of the soil, but it did require a different management process. Although soil sampling had already been completed across the wider area, the locations with elevated results would need to follow a specific management regime before any earthworks could proceed. Testing would commence once the Site Management Plan, required to authorise global earthworks, was finalised. This plan set out the testing requirements and processes that must be followed before the soil could be used.

Responding to various questions, DR explained that the forthcoming Site Management Plan would set out the procedures and controls required when undertaking earthworks in areas with potential contamination. The plan would guide what to do if unexpected materials were uncovered during excavation. In most cases, contamination would not be visually obvious, so each time significant trenching or excavation was proposed, a contaminated-land specialist would review the history of that specific location.
If there was no reason to suspect past contamination, work could proceed under an "unexpected discovery protocol," which outlined the steps to follow if materials such as asbestos or fuel residues were encountered. However, if works were planned in an area known to have had activities such as underground fuel storage, additional testing and specific management measures would be required.

IM asked for the approximate volume of soil available on the site. OS advised that approximately 1,000 m³ of material was currently stockpiled. In terms of requirements, the initial assessment for taxiway dig-outs indicated a need for approximately 636 m³ of soil. However, because grass had naturally re-established in many of those areas, the current approach was to infill with topsoil, compact the surface, and re-grass rather than undertake full dig-outs. As a result, the required volume had reduced significantly.

The CRAC area remained a priority for excavation and reinstatement. Staff estimate that approximately 150 m³ of soil would be required for that section alone, with additional quantities needed if levelling works proceed in adjacent areas.

5.3 Taxiway Remediation and runway/taxiway grassing

OS provided an update on the grass-species trials undertaken to support upcoming taxiway and runway remediation works. Following earlier feedback, seed was sourced from several suppliers, including Luisetti Seeds, Pine Gould Guinness, and other South Island growers. Suppliers recommended a mix including brown top, ryegrass, and several fescue varieties. Trials were carried out on site. Kentucky bluegrass was also tested after being suggested as a potentially suitable spreading species; however, while it initially produced strong leaf growth, it was slow to germinate and had since died off without irrigation, indicating it was not suitable for local conditions. Other fescue varieties had performed well, with healthy growth and strong root structures.

A representative from Pine Gould Guinness completed an independent, blind assessment of the trial plots last week. Staff were awaiting the final report, which would inform the recommended seed mix. Given the current condition of Runway 07/25, particularly the southern section, which was weedy with significant bare patches, staff propose re-sowing the runway from the southern boundary through to the northern side of the central section. To protect the surface in the interim, the crosses and chevrons would be removed later this week, and aircraft would be directed to use only the central 10-metre-wide strip. This would allow the southern area to rest and the northern section to remain operational while new grass establishes. Re-sowing would proceed once temperatures were suitable and the final seed-mix recommendations were received.

Responding to a question from PR, OS noted that the previous runway reseeding undertaken with Avanex cost approximately $40,000, and similar costs may be expected for the upcoming programme.

RK noted that reseeding was needed soon, as the coming month offered ideal seasonal conditions. Delaying the work beyond this period would reduce the likelihood of successful establishment. He questioned the need for further input from members.

IM observed that a similar discussion took place a year ago, but the project stalled, and the optimal sowing window was missed. As a result, the airfield would be in significantly better condition today had the work proceeded then. Members acknowledged that the matter had been discussed extensively over a long period and that there was general support for proceeding with the proposed works.

OS clarified that approximately two-thirds of the runway would be reseeded in the upcoming programme, with the remaining one-third kept active to maintain operations. The intention was to return to the untreated section next year, depending on how well it performs. He noted that the northern third of the runway appeared more resilient, likely due to the presence of stronger natural grass species there. If this section continued to hold up well, it may not require the same level of intervention as the southern portion. In that case, reseeding efforts may focus on the areas showing the most deterioration, allowing the healthier section to regenerate naturally.

Subsequent to further discussion, it was agreed as follows:

Moved: R Kittow Seconded: B Harvey

THAT the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group:

(a) **Agrees** that the runway/taxiway grassing project proceeds as recommended by Council staff in the current growing season.

CARRIED

5.4 Site Management Plan for Global Earthwork Consent

Refer to 5.1 and 5.2 above.

6. HEALTH AND SAFETY

6.1 WDC correspondence to CAANZ regarding assistance with circuit safety

OS reported that the Council's Chief Executive requested a letter be prepared for the Director of CAA outlining the airfield's efforts to manage on-field safety and influence behaviour in the surrounding airspace. The letter highlighted ongoing concerns, including aircraft cutting in, failure to follow published circuit procedures, and inconsistent radio calls. Input was sought from SN, who provided additional points for inclusion. The CAA responded, acknowledging the concerns and confirming that CAA intended to work with the Aero Clubs to engage with pilots and improve circuit behaviour. The CAA also sent a senior Safety Advisor to meet on-site and discuss practical steps CAA could take.

It was suggested that CAA visit the airfield during busy weekends to observe operations firsthand. This would allow them to speak directly with pilots whose actions may be contributing to safety issues, to influence behaviour through education rather than enforcement. It was noted that previous attempts by local safety representatives to address these issues had not always been well-received. CAA had begun periodic weekend visits, with a representative on site a few weeks ago to observe activity and engage with users.

BD questioned whether CAA, through its collection of occurrence reports (including 005s and ARCs), could identify the source of circuit-related issues. OS advised that the CAA had now provided all the data collected since 2015. In total, approximately 190 incidents were reported. SN had begun an initial analysis of the data, but the dataset was extremely dense and difficult to work with in its current form. They would try to extract meaningful insights from the data. Although the CAA had not provided detailed feedback, they had indicated that focusing on radio procedures, circuit compliance, and general understanding of right-of-way and sequencing would reduce incidents by around 90%. With that in mind, it was likely that the airfield community would need to carry out our own analysis, identify the highest-risk event types, and prioritise them.

SN observed that the provided dataset did not include tail numbers, making it impossible to determine whether incidents involve helicopters, microlights, or general aviation aircraft. As a result, specific groups could not be singled out. The focus, therefore, was on analysing pilot behaviour rather than attributing matters to particular sectors, as all groups contribute to incidents to some degree. It was noted that if any group were consistently involved, targeted engagement with their training leadership would be appropriate. However, the next step was to begin analysing, so the Safety Team could resume its work and identify key concerns. OS also suggested running an evening presentation at MainPower Stadium to share incident examples, encourage discussion, and support learning across the user community. The long-term aim was to foster a culture in which pilots feel comfortable reporting incidents and sharing experiences without fear of blame. The focus was on continuous improvement, consistent with safety-management principles. Over time, the goal was to encourage regular voluntary reporting.

6.2 Cables across Ashley River

OS reported that MainPower had advised that they would shortly begin installing the new 66 kV cables across the Ashley/Rakahuri River. They had confirmed they would not be fitting visual markers to the cables, despite earlier discussions about the risks, given that the area had historically been used for landing. OS had confirmed that there were no regulations preventing aircraft from landing on the riverbed, and that the standard 500-ft rule applied unless landing or taking off. OS further noted that two pylons had already been erected; however, the pylons were only 16 meters high, and the trigger for a Civil Aviation Rule Part 77 notification was 60 meters.

SN suggested holding an educational briefing for the microlight aircraft fraternity who use the Ashley/Rakahuri Riverbed for landing and take-off, to make them aware of the new cables.

PR questioned MainPower's reluctance to install visual markers on the new cables. OS explained that MainPower maintained that visual markers on the new cables would require significant design changes to the pylons. OS consulted the CAA officer responsible for Part 157 assessments, who advised that if there were concerns about the absence of markers, an aviation-related concern should be submitted. This would allow CAA to review the matter, even if the installation did not strictly meet Part 157 criteria, particularly given the area's regular low-level activity.

7. AIRFIELD INCIDENTS

7.1 TieUpp take-off incident and number filling update

OS reported that he was notified on Saturday afternoon about the TieUpp incident and attended the site to inspect the aircraft. It appeared the aircraft lined up near the runway centreline for take-off, became briefly airborne over the lower leg of the "07" marking, then settled back onto the surface. The spat struck the lower crossbar of the "07", compressing the nose strut; the spat then dug in, causing the nose leg to be forced rearwards. This resulted in damage to the nose leg support structure and cracking in the lower fuselage.

Photographs had been taken, and a pilot report had been requested from TieUpp, but it had yet to be received.

OS had been attempting to source hydrated lime to fill the affected area, as required under the airfield's contract and policy. Bulk supply had proven difficult to secure despite enquiries with multiple contractors, including Fulton Hogan, Taggarts, and others. Only small 20 kg bags appeared to be available, which were not practical for the required volume of approximately 22 cubic metres at each end of the runway.

Responding to a question from BH, OS provided further information on the use of hydrated lime, noting that it was treated to assist in breaking down soil and clay, as required under Council specifications. Due to difficulties sourcing hydrated lime in bulk, OS visited the quarry near Kaikoura to explore alternative material options. Still working on it as a priority.

7.2 Runway incursion causing a go-around

SN notified OS that an airfield user wished to carry out the calibration of his spray system south of the airfield and asked whether this would be acceptable. Unfortunately, OS was not on-site at the time; however, he checked who the pilot was and, based on that, agreed. Ordinarily, he would have developed a Safety Plan; however, due to the circumstances, he did not follow the usual planning process. During the activity, the Council received complaints from neighbours regarding aircraft manoeuvring. SN escorted the team back, but they had no radio communication while out on the field and were effectively operating independently. The pilot visually checked for traffic on short finals and, seeing none, proceeded onto the runway. Unfortunately, two aircraft were on approach. One aircraft avoided the vehicle, and the second was required to go around.

OS had requested that the person involved in the incident complete an investigation to fully understand the circumstances. Going forward, any short-notice requests of this nature would not be entertained. OS would ensure all future calibration activities were planned in advance to prevent a recurrence of this type of runway incursion.

8. NOISE COMPLAINTS

OS reported that a noise complaint was submitted through the Councils Customer Services website. The complainants reported being woken at approximately 6am, during a holiday weekend, by a helicopter operating at low level and flying repeatedly back and forth over their house. They requested information on the airfield's operational limitations and the relevant provisions of the District Plan. OS subsequently provided a full response, outlining that airfield operations and explained that pilots were generally aware of nearby residents, and that aircraft may legally operate below 500 feet when on approach to land. He also advised the complainants that he would speak with local operators to remind them, where practicable, to maintain an appropriate height when approaching the airfield. While he could not influence transient operators, he could reinforce expectations with local users.

OS advised that the complainant replied today with a positive, appreciative email, acknowledging the effort made to address their concerns. They recently moved to the area and were aware of the airfield but found the repeated low-level helicopter movements particularly disruptive. The complainant was satisfied with the response and did not wish to escalate the matter further.

OS noted that he was considering establishing a user group for residents around the airfield, as previously discussed with individuals who had raised noise concerns. There was a strong indication that such a group would be welcomed, helping residents feel informed and heard and supporting better community relations.

9. GENERAL BUSINESS

9.1 Governance Review Update

DR advised that an email update was previously circulated to members. However, following the last meeting with the RAAG, staff presented the group's preferred options to the Council and shared this information with members. A draft report to the Council had now been completed and would be circulated to the RAAG as soon as possible. The Council would consider the report at its meeting on 3 March 2026.

9.2 91/95 fuel Installation Update

OS reported that the work with Allied was progressing well. Allied was working through the final design requirements for installing 91 and 95 fuel tanks on-site. From a technical and physical installation perspective, Allied had indicated that supply and installation were manageable. The main challenge appeared to be administrative. Allied would prefer to issue a single invoice to either the airfield or a designated party on the airfield. Hence, a process would need to be developed to manage cost allocation, potentially through individual cards or another internal system. This would be worked through once the supply arrangements had been finalised.

BH enquired where the fuel tanks would be installed. OS confirmed that the proposed location for the tanks would be near the public toilet area, providing sufficient space for the fuel truck to back in and service them.

IM questioned why 91- and 95-fuel tanks would be installed rather than just 95-fuel tanks. OS noted that some users, such as TieUpp, used 91 octane.

IM noted that, while progressing the fuel supply arrangements, consideration should be given to avoiding the installation of 91 octane. Providing 91 may create operational risks, as it could be mistakenly used in situations where 95 was required. Although aircraft that require 95 could safely use 95 in place of 91, the reverse was not true. Installing 91, therefore, had the potential to introduce avoidable safety and maintenance issues.

PR enquired whether the Council would charge Allied for the fuel facility site. OS explained that the Council had previously faced challenges in managing fuel storage on the airfield, particularly due to the need to limit petrol storage in individual hangars. While storing fuel in hangars was convenient and inexpensive for users, it exposed the Council to liability risks. To address this, the proposal was to frame the installation of the new fuel facility as part of a broader risk-mitigation approach. The District Plan required that all refuelling occur on a hard stand, so the suggestion was that Council fund the installation of one. Allied, as the supplier, would then provide the tank and bunding. This arrangement would create a practical quid-pro-quo: OS to review further and seek a Council decision on the fuel installation and fuel charging administration, and respective capital contributions and ground lease charges.

9.3 Qualifying Aerodrome Update

DR noted that the CAA met with Councillors earlier this month for a briefing. The Council requested the presentation before meeting with the RAAG. The CAA had since offered to deliver the same presentation to the RAAG as a follow-up session at 5.30pm on 19 March 2026.

9.4 Ashley River stopbank upgrade and secondary stopbank proposal -Environment Canterbury

SN noted his disappointment that the RAAG was not advised of ECan's proposal regarding the secondary stopbank sooner. DR observed that the matter was relatively new to both staff and Councillors. As soon as this information came to light, staff began engaging with ECan to understand the implications, particularly given the scale of the planned investment. There had been no intention to withhold information from the RAAG. Instead, staff had been gathering as much detail as possible so that this meeting could provide a clear and accurate update on ECan's proposal.

ECan advised that the stopbank upgrade programme was an eight-year project to upgrade the Ashley River Scheme from the Okuku confluence through to the coast. The work included improvements to the existing primary stopbanks and consideration of additional secondary stopbanks farther out. These secondary banks were intended to redirect water back toward the river in the event of a primary stopbank failure, helping to prevent wider flooding and reduce downstream impacts.

DR tabled maps sourced from the landowner consultation material currently being used by ECan. ECan was undertaking community engagement, including door-knocking property owners upstream who may be affected by the proposed stopbank options. Potential impacts on landowners vary. Some properties may fall inside the proposed secondary stopbank, meaning they would still be subject to flooding if the primary bank failed. In other cases, a secondary stopbank may be constructed directly on private land. Five stopbank configuration options were being considered. The maps illustrated the potential effects on both the airfield and the proposed airpark development. Several of the proposed schemes would significantly affect the proposed airpark development.

SN questioned whether substantial investment in the proposed airpark development was viable in light of the new stopbank infrastructure, considering that parts of the development may later be compromised or washed out.

DR noted that the Council's immediate concern related to the planned renewal of the road adjacent to the airfield. Staff were concerned that any changes to the stopbank in this area could affect the new road, either through construction traffic using it or through stopbank works being carried out over it. However, ECan had provided some assurance that, if works proceed in this location, they would prefer to construct toward the river rather than over the road corridor.

RK observed that the proposed stopbank options had implications for all hangar owners at the airfield. DR agreed, noting that during discussions with ECan, it was highlighted that both the airfield owners and individual hangar owners were potentially affected. ECan had asked how the RAAG would prefer them to engage with airfield users, whether communication should occur through the group or via another method. This would need to be considered to ensure effective and inclusive engagement with all affected parties.

BD expressed concern about the potential impact of the proposed stopbank options on insurance coverage, given the high value of the aircraft and hangars on the site. Many hangars represent substantial personal investment, and any change that increases flood exposure could substantially reduce their value. Members agreed that property values could decline sharply if the area were designated as a secondary stopbank zone or otherwise as a higher-risk area.

The RAAG then discussed the various proposed stopbank options and the potential breakout. It was agreed that the proposed stopbank options would affect all hangar owners on the site. It was suggested that this information be shared publicly with all hangar owners at this stage, so they would be aware of what was being considered and could begin assessing the potential implications. It was also suggested that ECan be requested to brief the airfield users, given the potential impact on property, investment, and future planning. DR to provide RAAG feedback to ECan.

9.5 Taxiway re-opening

OS reported that consideration was being given to re-opening the taxiway on the eastern side of TieUpp, and to removing the bollards and shifting the gate to maintain parking access. This was being considered because the final hangar on that strip was expected to be built this year, leaving only an 11-metre gap between the hangar corner and the boundary fence. Without adjustments, this could create a significant choke point.

Questions were raised about the long-term presence of TieUpp at its current location. OS confirmed that discussions had been held with Doug Anderson to understand potential relocation options. However, relocating TieUpp would require displacing existing tenants from his hangars, making it a complex issue.

BD expressed concern that TieUpp had expanded to four aircraft, with indications of a possible fifth. They also hold NZQA approval to establish a formal flight school, which may further increase activity and space requirements. OS shared the concerns raised; hence, staff met with Mr Anderson to better understand the operator's plans and to outline the challenges the Council may face if the operation continues to expand into a more intensive training-type facility. At this stage, discussions remain unresolved.

The RAAG discussed the challenges experienced with aircraft taxiing around Lots 17 and 18 due to increased aircraft movements and vehicle parking. It was previously agreed that a sign would be installed to advise that the vehicle bay should only be used as a loading zone, and a 'give way to aircraft" sign would be installed to assist with aircraft movements in this area. It was also suggested that the area be fenced off as part of the Fencing Plan, with a gate to be installed. Agreed, it was worthwhile exploring the option of east taxiway re-opening; OS to look further into options and return with info to the group.

9.6 Airpark Development

OS reported that Dan Smith had been requested to indicate where he would like airfield access for his nearly completed hangar. No response had been received to date. However, it was now understood that Mr Smith was working through the implications of the secondary stopbank proposals before progressing any further development decisions, which explained the delay.

DR noted that discussions were ongoing regarding land swaps and servicing arrangements, and further negotiation would be required. A meeting had therefore been requested with Mr Smith for next month, particularly as more information was now available about the costs within the private development agreement, which would form part of those discussions.

9.7 Hangar development at the west end

Regarding hangar development at the West End, OS circulated an email in late December 2025 seeking feedback on the proposal. There seemed to be some uncertainty about the nature of the proposed development, and it was assumed that it may be a maintenance hangar, which could create congestion challenges.

OS explained that two key considerations were discussed regarding the proposed hangar layout. The first related to orientation: the new hangar could not be positioned parallel to the existing row, as this would significantly restrict access to the Black Hangar and create operational constraints. A compromise layout had therefore been developed, with the hangar positioned at a slight angle, unlike the adjacent hangars, but aligned to maintain safe access. This layout preserved the required 20-metre clearance at the hangar corner while allowing aircraft to enter and exit efficiently. OS confirmed that the hangar would occupy the four available sites of similar size in that area. To achieve the angled placement, the footprint was adjusted to be slightly narrower and deeper, allowing it to fit within the designated space without creating a choke point.

Responding to a question from BH, OS noted concerns that the proposed hangar placement could create congestion for helicopter operations, particularly regarding safe arrival and departure paths and potential conflicts with aircraft parked in the final row of hangars. This matter was discussed with Black Hangar, who indicated that the layout would not impede his operations and that adequate approach and departure space would remain. Discussions were also held with Black Hangar about the potential removal of trees along the western boundary, assuming the land-swap arrangements with Daniel Smith proceed and the Council took ownership of that area. They confirmed that removing the additional trees would significantly improve visibility and manoeuvring space, thereby reducing the likelihood of congestion.

SN questioned why the proposed hangar could not be positioned further back toward the stopbank. OS explained that the top-right corner of the site was already hard up against the boundary fence, limiting how far the structure could be shifted. Discussions had been held with the prospective builders about incorporating a concrete apron extending outward from the hangar. This would allow helicopters to land further out and then be moved into the hangar, helping to maintain safe operational space despite the constrained footprint.
OS to work with the leaseholder to get the building corners marked out so the members could review on-site.

9.8 Roading Development

DR confirmed that the Council would proceed with the planned road works, as ECan had provided assurances that there was no immediate impediment arising from the stopbank proposals. ECan confirmed that any future stopbank construction would occur on the river side of the existing bank. On the southern side, works would remain in the current alignment. On the northern side, ECan advised that when the road was rebuilt, some excavation would be required to ensure stormwater drained northward rather than toward the hangars. They had requested that no work occur within 7.5 metres of the toe of the stopbank; the current road design already meets this requirement.

The purpose of presenting this information was to ensure the RAAG was aware of upcoming activity and constraints. It was noted that coordination would be essential, as sections of the road would need to be closed during construction, resulting in temporary disruption.

NEXT MEETING

The next Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group meeting was scheduled for 5.30 pm, on Wednesday, 25 March 2026.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 8.35 PM.

CONFIRMED

_____
Chairperson

_____
Date