

MINUTES OF THE RANGIORA AIRFIELD ADVISORY GROUP HELD AT 5.30PM ON WEDNESDAY, 26 FEBRUARY 2025, IN THE CATERBURY AERO CLUB ROOMS AT THE RANGIORA AIRFIELD, MERTON ROAD, FERNSIDE

PRESENT

Steve Noad (SN) [Chairperson]	Buzz Harvey (BH)
Rob Kittow (RK)	John Dugdale (JD)
Bruce Drake (BD) [Left at 6.35pm]	Joan Ward (JW) [Councillor] [Left at 6.50pm]
Paul Williams (PW) [Councillor] [Left at 7.10pm]	Owen Stewart (OS) [Waimakariri District Council]

GUESTS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chris Brown (CB) [Waimakariri District Council]	Duncan Roxborough (DR) [Waimakariri District Council]
---	---

1. WELCOME

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

2. APOLOGIES

THAT the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group

- (a) **Received** and sustained apologies for leave of absence from Keith Vallance and Ian McPhail.

CARRIED

3. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group – 27 November 2024

BH requested that the Minutes of the previous meetings be circulated to members sooner after meetings.

Moved: Buzz Harvey

Seconded: B Drake

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 27 November 2024.

CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING (From Minutes)

4.1 Taxiway Edge Limit Markings

OS confirmed that the markings have been done.

4.2 Finalisation of the Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP)

OS had received feedback from the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) about the proposed amendment required AIP, which had been completed. OS have added the following comment: *“Caution. Expect wind shear operating off Runway 28 and landing on Runway 10.”*

OS noted that the survey for the runway's magnetic headings found that the magnetic heading for 04-22 was actually 31 degrees and 15 minutes, which was closer to 30 degrees than 40 degrees. Hence, the runway heading would change to 03, and the opposite reciprocal heading would be 21.

OS noted that the proposed runway heading would be changed in the AIP, a communication would be sent to all the airfield users, and he was considering temporarily painting white numbers on the end of the runway.

SN suggested that the information should also be published in Vector Magazine to advise pilots about flying outside the district.

4.3 Runway and Strip Design and AIP

OS highlighted the following NZAIP amendments for the Rangiora Airfield:

- (1) Remove light grey taxiway
- (2) Insert taxi limit line
- (3) Add no aircraft parking area and label at RWY 10 threshold
- (4) Shift hanger location northeast to actual location to accommodate no parking area
- (5) Add numbers 13 and 14
- (6) Add windsock symbol for 25 threshold location. Removed displaced threshold markers as required after OLS survey results
- (7) Shift displaced threshold markers to new distance (144m)
- (8) Shift the location of the windsock to the actual location
- (9) Change number to 19m and relocate to allow for windsock location on plate
- (10) Relocate arrow to clear of runways strip to allow runway to be positioned on the plate
- (11) Change runway strip dimensions to 62m
- (12) Insert grass runway inside strip dimensions. Dimensions of runway 1120m X 38m
- (13) Insert grass runway inside strip dimensions. Dimensions of runway 563m X 23m
- (14) 30m starter extension at the end of runway 07
- (15) 10m starter extensions at end of runways 10, 04, 28 and 22
- (16) 30m starter extension at the end of runway 25
- (17) Remove tree symbols

Responding to a question from BH, OS confirmed that the runway threshold would be moved to accommodate the 10m and 30m strips at each end. The displaced threshold was based on the obstacles found. A marker board had been installed to mark the end of the runway, and the displaced threshold had three markers, so there was a clear delineation. Also to be included was the width of runway 04/22, based on group ratings, which OS was working with Errol Smart on.

OS explained the calculations used as the basis for the runway design and the advisory material referenced. The design was based on the notion of having a 07/25 left and right. However, if there was no need for a left or a right closed, then the full width of the runway would be 38 meters. The calculations were done using the Cresco as the largest wingspan and widest undercarriage airplane frequenting the Rangiora Airfield. The strip had to be widened by a meter each side to 62 meters to allow for a left and right, and the OLS survey had considered the 62-meter wide strip.

4.4 IFR extra costs

OS advised that he liaised with Ian Andrews from Aviation NZ, and they were considering whether they would be able to provide additional funding. He had canvassed users to ascertain if there was anybody who would be interested in contributing; however, only one organisation had been prepared to contribute. The challenge for the Rangiora Airfield was the OLS survey, which became a one in 40, not a one in 20 slope. This would include many trees on private land to the east of the Airfield, which would need to be removed or cut

down to allow for an instrument approach. The OLS survey would be required every five years at an estimated cost of \$5,000.

Blackmaps was providing Aeropath with all of the survey data for the VFR OLS approach survey. Aeropath would then advise OS what additional information was required for them to be able to construct an instrument approach. However, OS was concerned about the extensive logistical arrangements and costs in constructing an instrument approach. Also, property owners could not be compelled to cut or remove trees on private land to enable the construction of an instrument approach.

BH questioned the benefit of the Rangiora Airfield having an instrument approach. OS explained that it was a government-driven initiative through Aviation New Zealand to provide funding to smaller airfields to develop instrument approaches. This would improve their resilience in terms of Civil Defence emergency responses. Also, there would be a potential benefit for training organizations. The OLS survey would be required every five years at an estimated cost of \$5,000, which was not covered by grant funding.

JD enquired if the Rangiora Airfield would have to deal with much more air traffic once the instrument approach was established. OS confirmed that the increase in air traffic was expected to be minimal.

JW noted that this should be considered part of the long-term strategy for future-proofing the Rangiora Airfield. CB pointed out that the proposed instrument approach would have to be designated in the Council's District Plan to ensure that the trees on private land were being maintained to OLS standards at an approximate cost of \$50,000 to \$100,000. The Airfield Advisory Group requested OS confirm the amount of grant funding to be received to assess whether developing an instrument approach was financially viable.

5. MAINTENANCE

5.1 Taxiway Update

Refer to Item 4.1 of the Minutes.

5.2 Fencing Plan and Legislation

Refer to Item 9 of the Minutes.

5.3 Airfield Survey Results and Runway Headings

Refer to Item 4.3 of the Minutes.

5.4 Potential Taxiways Change - East of TieUpp Aviation

CB explained that challenges were being experienced with aircraft taxiing in this area due to the increase in aircraft movements, which has led to some conflict. The Council was investigating a long-term solution for the operation of this area of the airfield because the number of movements was expected to increase.

However, the Council needed to provide a short-term solution to address the challenges currently being encountered, as good communication between users seemed to have been under stress. As part of the short-term solution, the use of the nearby vehicle bay being used by TieUpp Aviation as parking should be clarified. Other leaseholders have raised a concern that the vehicle bay was supposed to be used as a loading zone and not a parking area.

The Airfield Advisory Group agreed that the vehicle bay should only be used as a loading zone, as there was sufficient parking elsewhere on the airfield. OS was requested to investigate the basis of the hanger's sublease to TieUpp Aviation, i.e., recreational or business. The Airfield Advisory Group expressed a concern regarding a business being operated at that part of the airfield.

5.5 Runway and Strip Design and AIP

Refer to Item 4.3 of the Minutes

5.6 Results of Runway Heading Survey

Refer to Item 4.3 of the Minutes

5.7 OLS Work Update

Refer to Item 4.4 of the Minutes

6. HEALTH AND SAFETY

- BH confirmed that the health and safety planning for the Canterbury Recreational Aircraft Club (CRAC) Open Day was completed.
- SN confirmed that the updated Safety Management Manual and Fly Neighbourly SMS was circulated to all members in December 2024. The following amendments were suggested to the Safety Management Manual:
 - Include 'easy-to-read' bullet points at the start of the document.
 - References to AMSL, it should be. AGL
 - 3.5.6 – *"not all required radio transmissions are made by pilots, so an Active Watch is required to detect the aircraft that are on approach"* may be confusing.
 - 3.11.4 – *"essential vehicles for aviation"* should be amended to include vehicles for fuel and emergency services.
 - 5.4.1 - *"Helicopter operators are not to undertake this type of training activity when the field is busy"*.
 - 9.2.3- *"180° autos and notifying taxing and landing aircraft should remain clear"* should be reworded.
 - 14.5.1 – *"Rangiora traffic is only transmitted at the beginning of the transmission"* was correct.
 - Fire – reference should also be made to vehicle and airplane fires.
 - Include information regarding aircraft parking.
 - It was confirmed that emergency Services should be contacted first in an emergency, and the airfield manager (MSO) should be contacted first in a lesser emergency.

7. AIRFIELD INCIDENTS

No incidents have been reported; however, there was a possible incident of a pilot flouting the runway closure. SN would be dealing with the matter.

8. NOISE COMPLAINTS

OS reported that he had received a noise complaint from property owners on Priors Road, Fernside. OS met with the property owner to explain why airplanes might not depart the airfield on the centre line. The property owner was, however, not satisfied and requested that the runway be realigned. He escalated the matter to CB. JW noted that the runway had been designated for 60 years and would not be realigned.

9. EXECUTIVE GROUP REPORT

SN advised that the Executive Group had met with CB regarding the airfield fencing. CB noted that he had discussed the matter with the Council's Chief Executive and would request information from the CAANZ, after which he would draft a response to the Executive Group.

10. FINANCE AND GENERAL

10.1 Fuel Supply Access

BH explained that he had made further inquiries regarding the possible installation of a mogas dispensing unit at the Rangiora Airfield. The advice received from GOfuel was not to have a mogas installation at an airfield due to the system of quality assurance associated with 91 and 95 grade fuel. Therefore, the only option for the airfield seemed to be a mobile fuel tank, which was not ideal due to health and safety concerns. Also, not all airfield users had access to a fuel tanker. BH noted that the Council did not wish for fuel to be stored in hangars. However, there seemed to be no incentives or alternatives.

CB commented that the Council could erect a “dangerous goods shed” for the storage of fuel; however, users were unlikely to use the shed.

10.2 Fees and Charges Review Process

CB reported that the Council had commenced reviewing the fees and charges. SO was gathering information to inform the process and would keep the Airfield Advisory Group updated on the matter.

10.3 Budget Update

CR summarised the proposed Rangiora Airfield Budget for the 2025/26 financial year. He elaborated on the following:

- Increased general operation costs, such as surveys, equipment maintenance, vehicles, consumables, and ground works.
- The proposed budget of \$3,000 a year for depreciation would be reviewed to include the cost of renewing various assets at the airfield. The challenge was that some Council-owned assets had passed their depreciation date.
- Internal recovery costs increased significantly due to capturing actual shared costs such as Council's Customer Services, property, and finance.
- There was an increase in legal costs associated with dealing with all the development proposals and lease agreements.
- Although there seemed to be fewer Capex projects in the 2025/26 financial year, some of the projects that commenced in the current financial year were expected to extend to the 2025/26 financial year, especially the water and wastewater projects. It was anticipated that the water and wastewater projects would be spread over a number of financial years. The forecasted cost of the projects was approximately \$1.9 million; however, the current budget was only \$1.3 million, so an additional \$500,000 had been requested from the Council.

Responding to BH's question, CB explained that the income from landing fees and leases had been reduced in the 2025/26 budget to better reflect past performance.

CB urged the Airfield Advisory Group to submit a submission to the Council's 2025/26 Annual Plan.

10.4 Airfield Prioritised Actions Spreadsheet, Progress Report AMSO

OS was requested to circulate the Airfield Prioritised Actions Spreadsheet to the Airfield Advisory Group for discussion at the next meeting.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group was scheduled for 5.30pm, Wednesday, 26 March 2025.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 7.30PM.

CONFIRMED

Chairperson

Date