

---

**2018 Airspace Proposals**  
**— final airspace changes effective 8 November 2018**

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
2018 Wellington control zone .....	2
2018 Nelson airspace review .....	5
2017 Christchurch control zone .....	8
2017 Timaru MBZ changes.....	11
Other airspace changes .....	15
Appendix A – Timaru MBZ northern boundary.....	24

## Introduction

This document provides a summary of airspace proposals for permanent change made over the period from late 2016 until April 2018.

The values in the table following each proposal indicate the CAA assessed effect for IFR and VFR aircraft operations – positive (+), negative (-). This is a general assessment of effect as the actual effect will vary considerably, dependent on the aircraft type and operation.

All altitudes in this document are expressed in terms of above mean sea level (AMSL), unless otherwise stated.

Consultation was completed in May 2018.

The airspace changes detailed in this document will be effective from 8 November 2018.

The following table illustrates the airspace letter codes and associated abbreviations used in this document.

Type of airspace and alpha code	Abbreviation
Control area (NZA...)	CTA
Control zone (NZA...)	CTR
Restricted area (NZR...)	-
Danger area (NZD...)	-
General aviation area (NZG...)	GAA
Mandatory broadcast zone (NZB...)	MBZ
Military operating area (NZM...)	MOA
Parachute landing area (NZP...)	PLA
VFR transit lane (NZT...)	-
Low flying zone (NZL...)	LFZ
Common frequency zone (NZC...)	CFZ
Visual reporting point	VRP

## 2018 Wellington control zone

For earlier consultation, development and details of the final changes, refer to the documents published on the CAA website – Airspace Reviews page, 2018 Wellington CTR Amendment – <http://www.caa.govt.nz/airspace/airspace-review/>.

This section summarises the submissions received in relation to the '2018 Wellington control zone amendment – Final airspace changes' document published 26 April 2018. Submissions closed 7 May 2018.

Wellington control zone changes	
1. Wellington CTR/C redesign	
<b>Proposal</b>	<p>The introduction of new performance-based navigation (PBN) procedures at Wellington aerodrome also required a review of the existing controlled airspace designation and classification.</p> <p>Following this review, Airways proposed the following controlled airspace changes for Wellington aerodrome and environs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reduction in size of Wellington CTR to be as small as practicable to protect the instrument flight paths and reclassify as Class G the airspace that is not required;</li> <li>• re-alignment of Wellington CTAs on the south-eastern boundary of amended Wellington CTR to align with the new CTR boundaries;</li> <li>• designation of seven new control zone sectors for air traffic management;</li> <li>• existing Porirua VFR transit lane redesigned to align with new CTR boundaries;</li> <li>• new VFR transit lane to be designated in the vicinity of Baring Head;</li> <li>• two new VRPs – Grenada and Makara Peak;</li> </ul>

Wellington control zone changes			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>four VRPs disestablished – Kaukau, Makara Beach, Railway Station, Tawa College.</li> </ul>		
<b>Feedback</b>	There was only one submission received in response to the Wellington CTR and CTA final airspace change proposals which supported all but one of the proposed changes.		
<b>Result</b>	The Wellington CTR, CTAs, VFR transit lanes and VRPs are amended as proposed.	<b>Proposal effect from current</b>	
		<b>IFR</b>	<b>VFR</b>
		Minor +	Minor -
2. NZG 674 Baring Head upper limit			
<b>Proposal</b>	The boundary of the Wellington CTR in the vicinity of Baring Head is moved northwards of the coastline. This would restrict the current access to airspace below the Wellington CTA/C lower limit of 2500 ft eastwards of the Wainuiomata River for hang gliders/paragliders operating within the Baring Head GAA. It was requested that the upper limit of NZG674 be raised to 1000 ft to allow hang gliders/paragliders further climb before entering the Baring VFR transit lane enroute to the hills west of the Orongorongo River, and eastwards to the Wairarapa, when weather conditions permit.		
<b>Feedback</b>	<p>The requested change to the upper limit of NZG674 was referred to Airways to consider and advise if it was possible.</p> <p>Following consideration, Airways advised that air traffic controllers would not be able to manage a higher upper limit because the departures radar controller could not assure vertical separation from the GAA by departing aircraft. Options to ensure vertical or lateral separation from the GAA would be limited as vectors would not be available as the aircraft would be below minimum vectoring altitude at that stage of the departure.</p>		
<b>Result</b>	The upper limit of NZG674 remains at 600 ft.	<b>Proposal effect from current</b>	

Wellington control zone changes			
		IFR	VFR
		Nil	Minor -
3. Consequential change to Wellington CTA/C alphanumeric codes			
<b>Amendments</b>	Due to the volume of airspace changes within NOTAM briefing area 6, i.e. Wellington and Nelson, the number of alphanumeric codes available for new or amended CTAs became limited. To resolve this issue, the alphanumeric codes have been rationalised and all the Wellington CTA/C codes have been amended. Aside from the minor amendment to the boundaries of Wellington CTA/C (detailed above) to align with the new Wellington CTR/C, no changes have been made to existing airspace.		

## 2018 Nelson airspace review

For earlier consultation, development and details of the final changes, refer to the documents published on the CAA website – Airspace Reviews page, 2018 Nelson and Marlborough airspace review – <http://www.caa.govt.nz/airspace/airspace-review/>.

This section summarises the submissions received in relation to the '2018 Nelson and Marlborough airspace review amendment – Final airspace changes' document published 23 April 2018. Submissions closed 4 May 2018.

<b>Nelson and Marlborough airspace review changes</b>	
<b>1. Nelson controlled airspace redesign</b>	
<b>Proposal</b>	<p>The introduction of new performance-based navigation (PBN) procedures at Nelson aerodrome also required a review of the existing controlled airspace designation and classification.</p> <p>Following this review, Airways proposed the following controlled airspace changes for Nelson region:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reduction in size of Nelson CTR/D to be as small as practicable to protect the instrument flight paths, redesign control zone sectors – Instrument, West and East sectors – to align with new CTR boundaries, and reclassify as Class G the airspace that is no longer required;</li> <li>• disestablish all existing Nelson CTA/D;</li> <li>• designation of nine new Nelson CTA/D;</li> <li>• boundary amendments to NZA632 Christchurch CTA/D;</li> <li>• existing Tasman VFR transit lane disestablished;</li> <li>• new VFR transit lane to be designated in southern portion of Nelson CTR/D;</li> <li>• two VRPs, Boulder Bank and Richmond, renamed Boulder and Racecourse respectively;</li> </ul>

Nelson and Marlborough airspace review changes			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>three new VRPs – Branford, Golden Mill, Matai Dam;</li> <li>three VRPs disestablished – Marybank, Richmond, Saddle Hill.</li> </ul>		
<b>Feedback</b>	<p>There was one submission received in response to the Nelson final airspace change proposals. The submission requested an amendment to the north-eastern boundary to enable existing model aircraft activity to be completely outside the control zone.</p> <p>The location of model aircraft activity is on the outside boundary of the redesigned CTR. Unfortunately, with the limited time remaining to cut-off for VNC publication, a full assessment of any proposed boundary changes would not be possible.</p> <p>Additionally, model aircraft operations could still continue under the provisions of Part 101, with ATC authorisation. The location is outside the new Instrument sector so can be managed without any further restrictions.</p>		
<b>Result</b>	The Nelson CTR, CTAs, VFR transit lane and VRPs are amended as proposed.	<b>Proposal effect from current</b>	
		<b>IFR</b>	<b>VFR</b>
		Major +	Minor -
<b>2. Motueka MBZ</b>			
<b>Proposal</b>	The eastern boundary of NZB682 amended to align with controlled airspace changes.		
<b>Feedback</b>	There was nil feedback received to the proposed changes.		
<b>Result</b>	NZB682 boundaries are amended as proposed, and the alphanumeric code is changed to NZB683.	<b>Proposal effect from current</b>	



Nelson and Marlborough airspace review changes			
		IFR	VFR
		Nil	Nil
<b>3. Motueka CFZ</b>			
<b>Proposal</b>	<p>Nelson Aviation College requested that the boundaries of NZC687 Motueka be extended. Following consultation, the original proposed airspace was amended to extend to the east to align with the new Nelson CTR/D boundaries, and northwards to Separation Point.</p> <p>Due to the enlarged size of the CFZ, it was also proposed to change the RTF call sign from 'Motueka traffic' to 'Tasman traffic' to differentiate between traffic operating within the Motueka MBZ and the wider CFZ.</p>		
<b>Feedback</b>	There were no further submissions received in regard to the proposed changes.		
<b>Result</b>	NZC687 Motueka is disestablished and replaced by new CFZ, NZC684 Tasman. Frequency remains the same as before, 127.3 MHz. The RTF call sign is changed to 'Tasman traffic'.	Proposal effect from current	
		IFR	VFR
		Nil	Minor +

## 2017 Christchurch control zone

For earlier consultation, development and details of the final changes, refer to the documents published on the CAA website – Airspace Reviews page, 2017 Christchurch CTR Amendment – <http://www.caa.govt.nz/airspace/airspace-review/>.

This section summarises the submissions received in relation to the '2017 proposed amendment to Christchurch control zone – revised design – airspace user consultation' document published 10 January 2018. Submissions closed 22 February 2018.

<b>Christchurch control zone changes</b>	
<b>1. Christchurch CTR/C</b>	
<b>Proposal</b>	<p>The proposed changes submitted in late 2016 were deferred to address issues which had been raised by airspace users during CAA's consultation.</p> <p>Airways' revised design proposed the following changes to the originally requested airspace:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• boundary amendments to proposed CTR to simplify the design;</li> <li>• western boundary moved further east;</li> <li>• boundaries of the Eyrewell VFR transit lane amended to align with new CTR boundaries;</li> <li>• the following VRPs to be disestablished: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cashmere High School (disestablishment not previously requested)</li> <li>• Pine</li> <li>• Prebbleton</li> <li>• Two Chain</li> </ul> </li> <li>• the following new VRPs to be designated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridge</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Christchurch control zone changes								
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Land Fill</li> <li>· Mandeville</li> <li>· Pond</li> <li>· City sector disestablished;</li> <li>· consequential change to the boundaries of Rangiora, Banks Peninsula and Canterbury CFZs to align with the amended CTR.</li> </ul>							
<b>Feedback</b>	<p>There were six submissions received. The main area of concern raised by three submitters was the disestablishment of the City sector and the effect on VFR operations.</p> <p>Airways advised that the City sector is '<i>no longer fit-for-purpose in a PBN environment as the location impedes use of more efficient instrument flight procedures.</i>'</p> <p>Airways intends to develop internal procedures and/or VFR departure paths to enable or avoid the CBD overflights with the new CTR, and is working with local operators to achieve this.</p>							
<b>Result</b>	<p>The controlled airspace and VRP changes as detailed in the revised design document are made as proposed.</p> <p>Eyrewell VFR transit lane is disestablished.</p> <p>New VFR transit lane, NZT859 Swannanoa, is designated as proposed in the revised design document.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Proposal effect from current</th> </tr> <tr> <th>IFR</th> <th>VFR</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Minor +</td> <td>Minor +</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Proposal effect from current		IFR	VFR	Minor +	Minor +
Proposal effect from current								
IFR	VFR							
Minor +	Minor +							
<b>2. Christchurch CTA/C</b>								
<b>Proposal</b>	<p>To provide containment for the RNAV (GNSS) RWY 11 approach the following amendments were proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· minor adjustments to the CTA/C lower limit 1500 ft/2500 ft boundary. The original proposal for this boundary change</li> </ul>							

Christchurch control zone changes			
	<p>placed the boundary directly overhead Forest Field aerodrome which would have had a negative effect on circuit operations at the aerodrome; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>new CTA/C with a lower limit of 2000 ft AMSL overhead Forest Field aerodrome to contain the RWY 11 approach.</li> </ul>		
<b>Feedback</b>	There were no submissions received in regard to the proposed CTA changes.		
<b>Result</b>	The Christchurch CTA/C boundaries are amended as proposed, and new Christchurch CTA/C designated as requested.	<b>Proposal effect from current</b>	
		<b>IFR</b>	<b>VFR</b>
		Minor +	Minor +
3. Rangiora and Banks Peninsula CFZs			
<b>Proposal</b>	In addition to the boundary amendment to align with new CTR boundaries, the Canterbury Airspace User Group requested extensions to Rangiora and Banks Peninsula CFZs to seaward of the coastline, with Banks Peninsula extending northwards to the Waimakariri River mouth.		
<b>Feedback</b>	There was no submissions received in regard to the proposed CFZ changes.		
<b>Result</b>	Rangiora and Banks Peninsula CFZs are amended as requested.	<b>Proposal effect from current</b>	
		<b>IFR</b>	<b>VFR</b>
		Nil	Minor +

## 2017 Timaru MBZ changes

For earlier consultation, development and details of the final changes, refer to the documents published on the CAA website – Airspace Reviews page, 2017 Timaru MBZ Amendment – <http://www.caa.govt.nz/airspace/airspace-review/>.

This section summarises the submissions received in relation to the '*Proposed final changes to Timaru mandatory broadcast zone – airspace user consultation*' document published 23 November 2017. Submissions closed 21 December 2017.

<b>Timaru MBZ changes</b>	
<b>1. Timaru MBZ</b>	
<b>Proposal</b>	<p>In February 2017, Air Nelson requested that the Timaru MBZ be extended to encompass the RNAV (GNSS) approaches at Timaru aerodrome. The request also included three additional MBZs with lower limits of 2500 ft, east of Timaru MBZ, and 4500 ft to the north (seaward of the coast) and south of the extended MBZ.</p> <p>The lower limit of transponder mandatory airspace in the proposed Timaru MBZ would be raised to 1600 ft AMSL to enable non-transponder equipped aircraft to carry out a standard overhead join at Timaru aerodrome. The three new MBZs would be completely transponder mandatory.</p> <p>The proposed changes were deferred to address issues which had been raised by airspace users during CAA's consultation, primarily in relation to the airspace around Rangitata Island aerodrome.</p> <p>At the CAA workshop held in October 2017 with affected users, Air Nelson proposed a redesign of the Timaru RNAV (GNSS) RWY 20 approach which would result in a shortened 8 NM final approach path. This change would enable the previously proposed northern boundary of the MBZ to be moved 2 NM southwards. Additionally, the current missed approach hold at UNTAT, where the outbound leg passes over Rangitata Island aerodrome at 2000 ft, would be moved seaward of the coast.</p> <p>The approach redesign meant that the northern boundary of the Timaru MBZ would be in the vicinity of the existing MBZ boundary, and clear of operations at Rangitata Island aerodrome.</p> <p>The north-western boundary was also realigned to be south of Geraldine township.</p>

Timaru MBZ changes								
Feedback	<p>There were three submissions received. Two submitters suggested a minor change to move the proposed north-western boundary of the amended Timaru MBZ further south to allow more room for pilots to track around Geraldine township.</p> <p>It was also requested that the north-eastern corner of the amended Timaru MBZ be a geographical point on the coast.</p> <p><b>CAA comment:</b> <i>The north-western boundary has been aligned to track from Pleasant Point township to the intersection of Tiplady, McKenzie, Coach and Winchester Roads across to Orari Racecourse, which is 1 NM from the southernmost boundary of Geraldine township.</i></p> <p><i>While ideally the Orari River mouth would have made a suitable geographical point for the north-eastern corner boundary, this would have compromised the airspace around the new initial track for the RWY 20 RNAV approach. The next prominent feature on the coastline would have been the Rangitata River, but this was considered too far north and would have placed the northern boundary of the MBZ too close to Rangitata Island aerodrome.</i></p> <p><i>Refer to the diagram in Appendix A showing the northern boundary of the Timaru MBZ as a blue line.</i></p>							
	Result	<p>The Timaru MBZ is amended as detailed in the proposed final changes document, with the small adjustment to the north-west corner as advised above, new alphanumeric code NZB971. The maximum reporting interval will remain at 5 minutes.</p> <p>Three new MBZs are designated as follows –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NZB972 Timaru North, 4500 ft – 9500 ft, transponder mandatory; and</li> <li>• NZB 973 Timaru East, 2500 ft – 9500 ft, transponder mandatory; and</li> <li>• NZB974 Timaru South, 4500 ft – 9500 ft, transponder mandatory.</li> </ul> <p>The maximum interval between reports within NZB972, NZB973 and NZB974 is 10 minutes.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Proposal effect from current</th> </tr> <tr> <th>IFR</th> <th>VFR</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Minor +</td> <td>Minor +</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Proposal effect from current		IFR	VFR	Minor +
Proposal effect from current								
IFR	VFR							
Minor +	Minor +							

<b>Timaru MBZ changes</b>	
<b>2. South Canterbury common frequency zone</b>	
<b>Proposal</b>	<p>In conjunction with the proposed MBZ redesign, airspace users requested the disestablishment of the Rangitata CFZ to be replaced by a larger CFZ, South Canterbury.</p> <p>South Canterbury CFZ would surround the Timaru MBZ, encompassing the area east of a line from Mt Studholme – Mt Nessing – Arundel Bridge, follow the Hinds-Arundel Road to Hinds, then underneath the Timaru North, Timaru East and Timaru South MBZs.</p> <p>The CFZ would extend from the surface to the lower level of the MBZ above it, or to a maximum height of 5500 ft.</p> <p>The frequency will remain the same as the Timaru MBZ, 119.5 MHz 'South Canterbury traffic'.</p>
<b>Feedback</b>	<p>There were no further submissions received in regard to the final proposed CFZ boundaries.</p> <p>When finalising the airspace changes, CAA considered the length of the intended radio identifier of 'South Canterbury traffic'. Accepted practice is to abbreviate long identifiers where possible to less than four syllables. An example is Southern Alps MBZ which is abbreviated to 'Alps traffic', or Marlborough Sounds CFZ to 'Sounds traffic'.</p> <p>Via email consultation, CAA suggested a shorter alternative identifier – 'South Canty traffic' – to reduce radio clutter.</p> <p>There were five responses received – three supporting the proposed change, with two preferring to keep the longer identifier.</p> <p>Additional comment from one submitter who is concerned about further frequency clutter caused by pilots repeating the name of the area or aerodrome at the end of the transmission as well as at the start.</p> <p><b>CAA comment:</b> <i>With regard to the repetition of the aerodrome/area identifier at the end of reports – details of the official standard radiotelephony phraseology for use by pilots are contained within Advisory Circular 91-9 'Radiotelephony manual', Chapter 9 Mandatory broadcast zones, Chapter 10 Common frequency zones, and Chapter 11 Unattended aerodromes</i></p>

Timaru MBZ changes			
	<i>provide specific examples of the phraseologies and do not include repetition of the aerodrome/area identifier at the end of transmissions.</i>		
<b>Result</b>	Rangitata CFZ is disestablished with effect from 8 November 2018.	<b>Proposal effect from current</b>	
	New CFZ, South Canterbury, is established as described in the proposed final changes document.	<b>IFR</b>	<b>VFR</b>
	To align with accepted practice, the shorter radio identifier of 'South Canty traffic' is assigned to the new South Canterbury CFZ.	Nil	Minor +
<b>3. New visual reporting point</b>			
<b>Proposal</b>	A new VRP was requested over the Rangitata South irrigation scheme ponds near Arundel. Local airspace users were asked to suggest an appropriate name for this location.		
<b>Feedback</b>	Of the three submissions received, two suggested 'Arundel Ponds' as the designator of the new VRP. The third submission did not refer to the VRP.		
<b>Result</b>	New VRP 'Arundel Ponds' is designated.	<b>Proposal effect from current</b>	
		<b>IFR</b>	<b>VFR</b>
		Nil	Minor +



## Other airspace changes

For earlier consultation, development and details of the final changes, refer to the documents published on the CAA website – 2016 Other Airspace Consultation page – <http://www.caa.govt.nz/airspace/airspace-review/>.

This section summarises the submissions received in relation to the user consultation documents:

2018 Other proposed changes	Consultation closed
1. <i>Proposed restricted area – Mahia Peninsula</i>	12 April 2018
2. <i>Proposed change of NZD929 Burnham Camp to MOA</i>	12 April 2018
3. <i>Proposed change of NZD329 Linton Camp to MOA</i>	12 April 2018
4. <i>Proposed new West Coast danger area</i>	12 April 2018
5. <i>Proposed Ardmore CFZ extension and establishment of new Mercer CFZ</i>	17 April 2018
6. <i>Proposed restricted area – Hokianga Harbour</i>	27 April 2018
7. <i>Proposed danger area – Papawai aerodrome</i>	19 April 2018
8. <i>Update to NZ Army danger areas to include RPAS operations</i>	01 June 2018

2018 – Other proposed changes	
1. <b>Proposed restricted area – Mahia Peninsula</b>	
<b>Proposal</b>	Aerospace manufacturer Rocket Lab applied for a permanently designated restricted area, activated by NOTAM, in the

2018 – Other proposed changes			
	interests of aviation safety during regular rocket launch activity.		
<b>Feedback</b>	<p>There were five submissions received from airspace users, with no submissions opposing the requested restricted area.</p> <p>Airways confirmed that only one IFR route would be affected, but there are other alternatives available which may be used for air traffic management if the proposed restricted area is active.</p> <p>One of the Hawkes Bay/East Coast providers of emergency services, including search and rescue operations within the proposed restricted area, sought assurance that flight operations in the interests of a person's health and safety take priority over launch activity. Rocket Lab and the operator have been liaising to develop procedures.</p> <p>Confirmation was sought from another submitter that the contact telephone number of the administering authority was a direct line to a person who has authority to make restricted airspace decisions and '<i>not just a general restricted business number</i>'.</p> <p><b>CAA comment:</b> <i>In March this year, CAA and Rocket Lab discussed the limitations with telephone/cell phone coverage at the launch site. Rocket Lab has worked on an IT solution to ensure that the contact telephone number provided will be monitored and answered by an appropriate person.</i></p>		
<b>Result</b>	New restricted area NZR401, Mahia, became effective from 19 July 2018.		<b>Proposal effect from current</b>
	NZR401 is activate by NOTAM, from surface to 13,500 ft, and is Class G airspace when active.		<b>IFR</b>
			<b>VFR</b>
	Minor -		Minor -
2. Proposed change of NZD929 Burnham Camp to MOA			
<b>Proposal</b>	Changes to the structure of the NZ Army has expanded the military activities undertaken at Burnham Camp to include helicopter and remotely piloted aircraft system (RPAS) operations.		

2018 – Other proposed changes			
	The NZ Army requested NZD929 be re-designated as a permanently active MOA, with the same lateral and vertical boundaries.		
<b>Feedback</b>	There were three submissions received, none of which opposed the change of designation.		
<b>Result</b>	NZD929 is disestablished and NZM901, Burnham Camp, is designated with effect from 8 November 2018.	<b>Proposal effect from current</b>	
		<b>IFR</b>	<b>VFR</b>
		Nil	Nil
<b>3. Proposed change of NZD329 Linton Camp to MOA</b>			
<b>Proposal</b>	<p>Changes to the structure of the NZ Army has resulted in an expansion of the facilities at Linton Camp, Manawatu, and subsequent increase in military training activities within the danger area, including live arms firing and helicopter operations.</p> <p>Following a review of operations within the existing airspace, the NZ Army requested NZD329 be redesignated as a permanently active MOA, with a small extension to the lateral boundaries to contain firing activities. The vertical boundaries, surface to 1200 ft AMSL, would remain the same.</p>		
<b>Feedback</b>	There were no submissions received.		
<b>Result</b>	<p>NZD329 Linton Camp is disestablished and new MOA, NZM310 Linton Camp is designated as requested.</p> <p>NZM310 will be permanently active with effect from 8 November 2018.</p>	<b>Proposal effect from current</b>	
		<b>IFR</b>	<b>VFR</b>
		Nil	Minor -

<b>2018 – Other proposed changes</b>	
<b>4. Proposed new West Coast danger area</b>	
<b>Proposal</b>	To warn pilots of the potential hazard from live firing exercises, including the use of high explosives and RPAS operations, the NZ Army requested a danger area in the West Coast area approximately 7 NM east of Aharua township.
<b>Feedback</b>	<p>Of the two submissions received, one expressed concerns about the danger area.</p> <p>The primary issue was the presence of five other special use airspaces (four danger areas – one permanently active by day, one restricted area – active between February and December) within the vicinity of the proposed danger area which would have the following effects:</p> <p><i>‘Concerns around further limiting the free flying of the West Coast’s natural resources demands careful consideration as flying in mountainous ranges and navigating around multiple danger areas is problematic as leeward winds are an inherent danger.’</i></p> <p>It was requested that conditions be placed on activating the danger area as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <i>‘Not be active at the same time as Ahaura river and Totara Flat; and</i></li> <li>· <i>Activation per year be limited to 40 days maximum’</i></li> </ul> <p><b>CAA comment:</b></p> <p><i>The availability of suitable properties to carry out military exercises is limited. The NZ Army has correctly advised CAA of a potential hazard to aircraft operating in the vicinity of the exercise area.</i></p> <p><i>It is not CAA’s function to determine location of defence activity but it is required to inform pilots of the potential hazard. The designation of a danger area activated by NOTAM is the appropriate means to do so.</i></p> <p><i>The army has advised that the danger areas would not be activated simultaneously.</i></p>

2018 – Other proposed changes			
<b>Result</b>	New permanent danger area NZD711, Wai-iti Creek, activated by NOTAM from surface to 3000 ft AMSL, is designated as requested with effect from 8 November 2018.  The designated danger area is as small as practicable to ensure that no hazard exists at the boundaries.	<b>Proposal effect from current</b>	
		<b>IFR</b>	<b>VFR</b>
		Nil	Minor -
<b>5. Proposed Ardmore CFZ extension and establishment of new Mercer CFZ</b>			
<b>Proposal</b>	To standardise frequency use south of Ardmore MBZ, the Ardmore Flight Operations Group applied to extend the boundaries of the Ardmore CFZ and to establish a new CFZ around the Mercer MBZ.		
<b>Feedback</b>	<p>There were 14 submissions received from organisations and users.</p> <p>While all but two of the submissions supported the proposal of an extended CFZ and new CFZ, there was considerable disagreement as to the location of the boundaries. The primary issue was the western coastline and whether it should be part of an expanded Ardmore CFZ, new CFZ around Mercer or an extension of Blacksands CFZ. Submissions included several alternative proposed airspace designs.</p> <p>It was also proposed that the western coastline CFZ extend up to the Whenuapai CTR boundary.</p> <p>One submission suggested simplifying the uncontrolled airspace by disestablishing the existing Ardmore CFZ, and reducing the Ardmore and Mercer MBZs to encompass the vicinity of the respective aerodrome. A new CFZ, combining all of the proposed Ardmore and Mercer CFZs, could be established on a separate frequency to the Ardmore and Mercer aerodrome frequencies.</p> <p>Another area highlighted as a potential issue was the boundary between three CFZs at Huntly. This area has significant VFR traffic and it was suggested that the boundaries be relocated to eliminate an area where frequency confusion could occur.</p>		

<b>2018 – Other proposed changes</b>	
	Another issue raised was the winching operations at Drury aerodrome which take place on an unpublished frequency. Several submissions advocated that operations should continue on the discrete frequency as is done in the Matamata MBZ, which is a different frequency to the Morrinsville CFZ. Generally, within uncontrolled airspace except for MBZs, gliders operate on a chat frequency.
<b>Result</b>	<p>Due to VNC cut-off deadline at the end of April, further consultation would not be completed in time by the Director to appropriately consider and resolve issues which had arisen.</p> <p>The proposed changes to extend the Ardmore CFZ and establishment of a new CFZ have been deferred while revised boundaries are designed.</p> <p>CAA will continue to work with the Ardmore Flight Operations Group to develop a revised design which will then be disseminated for further consultation with users.</p>
<b>6. Proposed restricted area – Hokianga Harbour</b>	
<b>Proposal</b>	Incredible Skies Ltd applied for the designation of a restricted area, activated by NOTAM, to segregate manned aircraft from remotely piloted aircraft systems (RPAS) flight testing of beyond visual line of sight (BVLOS) technologies.
<b>Feedback</b>	<p>There were 26 submissions received, which ranged from support of the proposed airspace through to completely opposing the use of the airspace.</p> <p>In summary, there were four main areas of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• frequency of activation;</li> <li>• effect of the restricted area on coastal routing;</li> <li>• scenic flights within Hokianga Harbour;</li> </ul>

<b>2018 – Other proposed changes</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>size of the restricted area.</li> </ul>
<b>Result</b>	<p>Due to VNC cut-off deadline at the end of April, further consultation would not be completed in time by the Director to appropriately consider and resolve issues which have arisen.</p> <p>CAA will continue to work with users and Incredible Skies Ltd, and additional consultation with users will take place shortly.</p>
<b>7. Proposed danger area – Papawai aerodrome</b>	
<b>Proposal</b>	To warn pilots of the potential hazard from glider winch operations at Papawai, the Greytown Soaring Centre submitted an application for the establishment of a danger area, 1.5 NM radius, around the aerodrome to encompass winch operations. The danger area would be activated by NOTAM, during daylight hours only when weather conditions permit VFR operations in Class G airspace.
<b>Feedback</b>	<p>There were five submissions received. There were no objections to the danger area.</p> <p>The assessment of the effect, however, on the instrument procedures to and from Masterton aerodrome indicated that some of the procedures would not be clear of the proposed danger area. A redesign of the RWY 06 RNAV approach would be necessary to allow IFR aircraft to remain clear of the danger area, which would impose a significant cost.</p>
<b>Result</b>	CAA is continuing to discuss options with the Greytown Soaring Centre to resolve the issues.
<b>8. Update to the NZ Army danger areas to include RPAS operations</b>	
<b>Proposal</b>	<p>During military exercises within designated danger areas, there may be several types of activity taking place which could be a potential danger to aircraft. This may include a combination of live firing, use of high explosives, as well as support operations involving remotely piloted aerial systems (RPAS).</p> <p>Accordingly, to warn pilots of the potential hazard from all types of military activity during exercises, the NZ Army has</p>

<b>2018 – Other proposed changes</b>	
	requested that the danger areas listed in the consultation document are updated to amend the current activity to 'Military activity including RPAS'.
<b>Feedback</b>	<p>There were four submissions from airspace users, none of which opposed the change of designation.</p> <p>One submission requested that the activity be amended to 'military activity and RPAS activity' to allow for civilian use of the danger areas with consent of the Army.</p> <p><b>CAA comment:</b> <i>Rule 71.161(c) requires the using agency of a danger area to be 'a person or organisation that is responsible for the activity that necessitated the danger area being so designated'. As such, non-military activity would require another using agency to manage the airspace.</i></p> <p>Clarification was sought from a national organisation about the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>'Operational Days - RPAS is an additional activity that may trigger an increase in NOTAM's [sic] and the restrictive use of that airspace.'</i></li> <li>• <i>Operating procedures - Line of Site or Beyond Visual Line of Sight operations (BVLOS).</i></li> <li>• <i>Consultation - wider community i.e. landowners permission for RPAS activity as per 101.207(a)(ii).'</i></li> </ul> <p><b>CAA comment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The additional activity takes place during army exercises. It is not intended that there will be an increase in usage of the danger areas.</i></li> <li>• <i>The army follows the provisions of Part 101 for RPAS operations. The addition of RPAS activity to a danger area does not enable BVLOS operations, which are undertaken only in MOAs.</i></li> <li>• <i>The requirements of 101.207(a)(ii) do not apply within danger areas. As most activity is land-based however, the army already has consent from landowners to carry out exercises on privately owned land, including agreed health</i></li> </ul>



2018 – Other proposed changes		
	<p><i>and safety responsibilities.</i></p> <p>Another organisation suggested that the VNC symbol associated with model aircraft/RPAS activity be included with the danger area information boxes.</p> <p><b>CAA comment:</b> <i>The additional warning of RPAS activity within the danger areas will include the symbol alongside the other live firing and high explosives activity symbols.</i></p>	
<b>Result</b>	The danger areas listed in the consultation document will be updated as requested, to warn pilots of the hazards within active danger areas.	<b>Proposal effect from current</b>
		<b>IFR</b>
		<b>VFR</b>
		Nil
		Nil

For further information contact:

Paula Moore

Aeronautical Services Officer – Air Traffic Services (Airspace)

Civil Aviation Authority of New Zealand

P O Box 3555

Wellington 6140

Phone: (DDI) 04 560 9525

Email: [paula.moore@caa.govt.nz](mailto:paula.moore@caa.govt.nz)

### Appendix A – Timaru MBZ northern boundary

