

Lorraine Clark representing Auckland The Plane Truth

Today I speak on behalf of the many Auckland residents who have had their environmental and financial existence compromised by a commercial enterprise that has support of its actions from both local and central Government.

I will show that Auckland International Airport Ltd, Auckland Council, Airways NZ, the CAA and the Government of NZ have together conspired against Auckland residents in order to implement radical changes to Aviation, primarily for the benefit of big business.

Background:

On March 11th 2011, after what appears to have been a simple Powerpoint presentation by Air NZ to the Aircraft Noise Community Consultative Group (ANCCG), Sir Noel Robinson, the so-called independent Chair of the ANCCG recommended that the members adopt Air NZ's proposal for airspace redesign in Auckland. ¹

Those present at this meeting, Sir Noel Robinson included, were all likely beneficiaries of the proposed changes. Noel Robinson was reported at that time boasting of his burgeoning landing arrangements with Air NZ at his Kapiti Coast Airport. ANCCG membership then comprised representatives of South Auckland Local Boards, Manukau City Council and the Aviation industry, including representatives of the powerful lobby group BARNZ, which represents all major Airlines coming to NZ.

In order to address the discriminatory nature of this situation, a radical makeover of the ANCCG is required. The community must be represented by its own experts, and an equitable balance be achieved between community and industry representation. In addition, the Chair must be totally independent of the aviation industry.

Effects:

In March 2013, I became increasingly aware of noisy aircraft above our then home in Royal Oak. By April this was causing significant distress. I

Air NZ Navigation Procedures Gordon to Gullery.

remarked that we appeared to have a beacon on our roof. This was not far from the truth, as we were close to a major waypoint on the Smart Approach track, which, unbeknown to us, was being trialled. Planes flew above our property at a precise point of entry and departure, day in, day out. I was also repeatedly woken in the middle of the night.

I rang the Council and was advised that aircraft were not within their jurisdiction. I later found, via information gained under the OIA, that on the wishes of the Smart Approaches stakeholders, a deliberate plan had been formulated and agreed to by members of the ANCCG, Council and Auckland Airport to keep the general public in the dark as to what was occurring in the skies above Auckland. Because of their membership on the ANCCG, Local South Auckland Boards and Auckland Council were party to this plan. Those in the know included a Manukau City Councillor and a Senior Officer of Environmental Health. The above is fully supported by correspondence supplied under the OIA. The recommencement of Smart Approaches will without doubt prove ruinous for many thousands of Auckland residents.

Actions by Auckland The Plane Truth:

- Two well attended public meetings were held, with many local and some national politicians present along with representatives of the Airport, Airways NZ and BARNZ. At both these meetings the stakeholders were shouted down by those present for their arrogant and entitled stance.
- A submission was made on the Unitary Plan, which was subscribed to by a significant number of Auckland residents
- A petition for a rule change was made to the CAA late 2013, which resulted in the CAA commissioning Castalia to produce a report that clearly outlines the likely detrimental effects on the community.² There follow quotations from this report:
 - a. “If the flight path moves from over lower value homes to over higher value homes there may be a net loss due to the effect of noise on house prices.” This loss in value to homes now under new flight paths has been scientifically quantified in

many studies at 11.8%, a figure that rises once the altitude is below 3,280ft.

- b. "Different sectors benefit at different levels. The largest net benefits of the proposals in the Plan are attributed to the operators and users of large airlines."
- c. "[Under the heading 'Costs borne by others']: Noise. Changing the flight path to pass over a more densely populated area will mean that more people are negatively affected and could cause a net loss – most likely in high density areas such as Auckland and Wellington."
- d. "The net noise effect is difficult to quantify. The bespoke nature of the topography and geography of each airport and flight path combined with an unknown actual outcome in each situation means we do not know if this is positive or negative. Change will, however, lead to opposition to new flight paths as those who lose will object while those who gain will not."

Large numbers of residents Auckland-wide have regularly made complaints to the Airport, the CAA and Airways NZ. These complaints have not been dealt with in a manner befitting the seriousness of the situation in which many now find themselves. Sleep is regularly disturbed, causing significant health issues for large numbers of the population. Daytime environmental amenity is seriously impacted for many residents, in particular those who work from home, care for young children, or are retired.

In conclusion, this activity is outright theft of community wealth. Remedies cannot be entrusted to those who have a commercial interest in the continuing perpetration of this activity.

Noise study Dr Peter Milner³

Peter Milner graduated in Mechanical Engineering at Leeds University (UK) in 1967. He trained with Dowty Mining Equipment Ltd and then worked for Rolls Royce (Bristol Engine Division), where he was involved in the design of the engines for the Harrier Jump Jet and Concorde. After returning to Leeds to read for a PhD in the cold-forming of brittle alloys, he became Lecturer

Aircraft Noise in Auckland City (Read verbatim)

and then Senior Lecturer in Applied Mechanics at Teesside Polytechnic (now University of Teesside), Middlesbrough, U.K. During his 19 years there he gained a BA in Mathematics with the Open University and became interested in helping 'resistant' technical students to succeed at maths.

Whilst a visiting Senior Lecturer in Mechanical Engineering at the University of Auckland in 1991, he decided to settle here, and then lectured full-time at that institution until December 1994. From 1995 he held concurrent 50% appointments as Senior Lecturer in Mathematics, and Electrical and Mechanical Engineering at Unitec, and Senior Tutor in Mechanical Engineering at Auckland University, until he decided to take early retirement from full-time teaching and research in 1998 for health reasons. He continued to teach taught part-time at Auckland University until June 2012, and from 2004 to 2011 he was coordinator, examiner and lecturer on their Summer School Mechanics 121 course (primarily for 'accelerated pathway' students).