ORDINARY MEETING

of

Council

AGENDA

Time: 9:30 am

Date: Wednesday, 11 June 2025

Venue: Waiata House, 27 Lincoln Road, Masterton

MEMBERSHIP

Mayor Gary Caffell (Chairperson)

Councillor Bex Johnson
Councillor Craig Bowyer
Councillor Brent Goodwin
Councillor David Holmes
Councillor Tom Hullena
Councillor Stella Lennox
Councillor Tim Nelson
Councillor Marama Tuuta

RECOMMENDATIONS IN REPORTS ARE NOT TO BE CONSTRUED AS COUNCIL POLICY UNTIL ADOPTED

Values

1. **Public interest:** members will serve the best interests of the people within the Masterton district and discharge their duties conscientiously, to the best of their ability.
2. **Public trust:** members, in order to foster community confidence and trust in their Council, will work together constructively and uphold the values of honesty, integrity, accountability and transparency.
3. **Ethical behaviour**: members will not place themselves in situations where their honesty and integrity may be questioned, will not behave improperly and will avoid the appearance of any such behaviour.
4. **Objectivity:** members will make decisions on merit; including appointments, awarding contracts, and recommending individuals for rewards or benefits.
5. **Respect for others:** will treat people, including other members, with respect and courtesy, regardless of their ethnicity, age, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or disability. Members will respect the impartiality and integrity of Council staff.
6. **Duty to uphold the law:** members will comply with all legislative requirements applying to their role, abide by this Code, and act in accordance with the trust placed in them by the public.
7. **Equitable contribution:** members will take all reasonable steps to ensure they fulfil the duties and responsibilities of office, including attending meetings and workshops, preparing for meetings, attending civic events, and participating in relevant training seminars.
8. **Leadership:** members will actively promote and support these principles and ensure they are reflected in the way in which MDC operates, including a regular review and assessment of MDC's collective performance.

These values complement, and work in conjunction with, the principles of section 14 of the LGA 2002; the governance principles of section 39 of the LGA 2002; and our MDC governance principles:

Whakamana Tangata	Respecting the mandate of each member, and ensuring the integrity of the committee as a whole by acknowledging the principle of collective responsibility and decision-making.
Manaakitanga	Recognising and embracing the mana of others.
Rangatiratanga	Demonstrating effective leadership with integrity, humility, honesty and transparency.
Whanaungatanga	Building and sustaining effective and efficient relationships.
Kotahitanga	Working collectively.

Order Of Business

1 Conflicts of Interest 5
2 Apologies 5
3 Public Forum 5
4 Items not on the Agenda 5
5 Confirmation of Council Minutes 6
5.1 Minutes of Council HEARING held on 28 May 2025 6
6 Committee Reports 15
Nil
7 Reports for Decision 16
7.1 Hood Aerodrome Aeronautical Charges Review Deliberations 16
8 Reports for Information 40
Nil
9 Public Excluded 41
9.1 Request for Funding 41
9.2 Contract Award 41
9.3 Contract Extension 41

The Chairperson will open the meeting with the karakia

Karakia timatanga

Kia tau ngā manaakitanga a te mea ngaro	Let the strength and life force of our ancestors
ki runga ki tēnā, ki tēnā o tātou	Be with each and everyone of us
Kia mahea te hua mākihikihi	Freeing our path from obstruction
kia toi te kupu, toi te mana, toi te aroha, toi te Reo Māori	So that our words spiritual, power, love and language are upheld
kia tūturu, ka whakamaua kia tīna! Tīna!	Permanently fixed established and understood
Hui e, Tāiki e!	Forward together

At the appropriate time, the following karakia will be read to close the meeting

Karakia whakamutunga

Kua mutu ā mātou mahi	Our work has finished
Mō tēnei wā	For the time being
Manaakitia mai mātou katoa	Protect us all
Ō mātou hoa	Our friends
Ō mātou whānau	Our family
Āio ki te Aorangi	Peace to the universe

1 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

2 APOLOGIES

The Chair invites notice from members of:

- leave of absence for future meetings of Masterton District Council
- apologies, including apologies for lateness and early departure from the meeting where leave of absence has not previously been granted.

3 PUBLIC FORUM

4 ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

The Chairperson will give notice of items not on the agenda as follows:

Matters requiring urgent attention as determined by resolution of the Council

- The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
- The reason why discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

Minor matters relating to the general business of Council

No resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of the item except to refer it to a subsequent meeting of Masterton District Council for further discussion.

5 CONFIRMATION OF COUNCIL MINUTES

5.1 MINUTES OF COUNCIL HEARING HELD ON 28 MAY 2025

File Number:

Author: **Harriet Kennedy, Governance Team Leader**

Authoriser: **Kym Fell, Chief Executive**

RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 28 May 2025 to hear submitters on the Hood Aeronautical Charges Review be received and confirmed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Minutes of Council Hearing held on 28 May 2025

MASTERTON
WHAKAORIORI
DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES

Council Hearing of Submitters

Hood Aerodrome Aeronautical Charges Review

Wednesday, 28 May 2025

Order Of Business

1 Conflicts of Interest 3
2 Apologies 3
3 Public Forum 3
4 Items not on the Agenda 3
5 Confirmation of Council Minutes 3
Nil
6 Committee Reports 3
Nil
7 Reports for Decision 3
7.1 Hood Aerodrome Aeronatical Charges Review: Hearings Report 3
8 Reports for Information 9
Nil
9 Public Excluded 9
Nil

MINUTES OF MASTERTON DISTRICT COUNCIL
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
HELD AT WAIATA HOUSE, 27 LINCOLN ROAD, MASTERTON
ON WEDNESDAY, 28 MAY 2025 AT 1:00 PM

PRESENT: Mayor G Caffell (Chair), Councillors B Johnson, C Bowyer, B Goodwin, D Holmes, T Hullena, S Lennox, T Nelson (in person then on Teams from 2.45) and M Tuuta

IN ATTENDANCE: Iwi representative Jo Hayes, iwi representative Robin Potangaroa (on Teams), General Manager Finance, General Manager Assets and Infrastructure, General Manager Strategy and Development, Chief Advisor, General Manager Community, Facilities and Open Spaces Manager, and Governance Team Leader

1 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bowyer declared a conflict of interest and left the table.

2 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

3 PUBLIC FORUM

There was no public forum as the meeting was to hear from submitters.

4 ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no late items

5 CONFIRMATION OF COUNCIL MINUTES

There were no minutes for confirmation

6 COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no committee reports for confirmation

7 REPORTS FOR DECISION

7.1 HOOD AERODROME AERONATICAL CHARGES REVIEW: HEARINGS REPORT

This report providing Council with the submissions received on the Hood Aerodrome Aeronautical Charges Review, the schedule of those submitters who wish to be heard by Council and information relating to the Hearing Procedure was presented by the General Manager Infrastructure and Assets.

Council heard from the following submitters:

Sub #	Name
7	Bill Dittmer The submitter spoke to his submission.

	Questions In response to questions the submitter advised that he thought that the Hood Users Group wasn't working, that Council should stop spending money and decide whether to form an advisory group
23	Greg Tetzlaff The submitter spoke to his submission. Questions In response to questions the submitter advised that for a recreational user an annual fee is best, transient users who come and go would be happy to pay a per landing basis. Those who fly out of Masterton need some stability and the increase in his fees would discourage him from building, staying here and flying out of here. The submitter advised that doubling the fee would work, or basing the fee on previous usage, not a one size fits all. It was something that needed to be worked out by talking to the people who fly at Hood. In relation to a question about the connection between the current cheap landing fees and the low utilisation the submitter advised that up until recently Hood was a place no one knew about, you couldn't get a hangar site, there was no interest in the aerodrome, the fee thing is from going under the radar, and now being looked at with the value of land and not getting a return from the asset. Those roadblocks were going now there is more interest in encouraging investment, those sites are being developed and there is interest, but need to be careful not to discourage that. Council could look at an overnight parking fee, having hangar homes available where people can live at the aerodrome, utilising the land better. There was a balance which could be found in discussion with the Hood User Group, which was representative of the community and functional. In relation to the impact of the removal of the annual fee for Vintage Aviator and the Aero Club, the increase in their fees would not encourage investment in further hangars and more planes. [The Vintage Aviator collection] would be the biggest and most unique collection in the world and should be promoted as something worthy of encouraging them to stay.
10	Hood Safey Advisory Group (Greg Tetzlaff) The presenter spoke to the submission. Questions In relation to the AIMM system and whether the submitter knew of any alternatives, the submitter said he didn't know but noted that the annual fee removes the necessity for it. The avoidance of the AIMM system was from the people who reside at the aerodrome. There wasn't a perfect system. It was about the culture of safety too and there was work to do to reduce the risk to other pilots, educating people to see the value in doing the right thing and encouraging people to make radio calls and fly with good airmanship.

	In response to a question about how the AIMM system worked the submitter advised that it picks up radio calls and lodges it against the plane registration and produces information about landings and takeoffs.
13	Legend Aviation (Bevan Dewes) The presenter spoke to the submission. Questions In response to a question about what the submitter saw as the unique aspects of Hood and the potential for bringing in extra income he advised that for the last ten years there hadn't been much investment, there was now the opportunity for more lease sites, and the part of the project that had been shelved due to lack of money would have been the sites that would have attracted more interest, with access to grass runway, and the lease sites would bring in more revenue. He also noted that the AIMM system reduced income by 50%, and that doubling the base fee would bring in more. In relation to a question about future growth for the aerodrome the submitter responded that it was an uncontrolled airspace close to Wellington, the closest regional aerodrome to Wellington with a big catchment and it was not uncommon for people to come over the hill. It was the only place to go for a fly in two Tiger Moths side by side, and was bringing people from all over the world to fly who brought money into the community.
27	Wairarapa AeroClub (Richard Handley and Keith McClure) The presenters spoke to the submission. Questions In response to questions the presenters advised that when people were training they would do a number of touch and goes because that was a critical safety aspect. The presenters did not comment on whether the proposed fees were unfair as they penalised people who were training but noted the impact on safety raised by previous submitters. They would like to take the data they have and sit down with Council and arrive at a fair fee.
11	Hood Users Group (John McMullan) The presenter spoke to the submission. There were no questions
24	Hood Hangar Company (Jacinda Johnston) The presenter spoke to the submission. Questions The submitter was asked whether all planes should be carrying a radio. She responded that it depended on the category of airspace it was not required by

	law at Hood but would encourage people to fit them.
17	Peter Rix The submitter spoke to his submission. There were no questions.
26	Viella Ltd (Michelle Beale) The submitter spoke to her submission. There were no questions.
The meeting adjourned from 2.33pm to 2.39pm All members were present when the meeting reconvened with the exception of Councillor Nelson who joined iwi representative Robin Potangaroa on Teams at 2.45pm	
28	Wairarapa Flying Tigers & Wairarapa Helicopters (Tom Williams) The presenter spoke to the submission. Questions In response to a question about whether microlights and helicopters should be charged differently as one was recreational and the other was commercial, the submitter responded that if damage to the aerodrome was a consideration then there was an issue he would disagree with but noted that helicopters were part of the region as they did search and rescue and firefighting. He wouldn't draw a distinction between commercial and recreational. The submitter was asked whether he thought the Hood User Group was working well and replied that it was and it was well chaired. He suggested a smaller group of users be formed to communicate between the User Group and Council. In response to a further question, the submitter advised that most of the Hood users resided in the Wairarapa.
2	Lapo Ancillotti The submitter spoke to his submission. Questions The submitter was asked if he would move the process to Hood and responded that the prototype had been developed in Auckland and the composite was made there but the assembly and test flights could happen in Masterton.
25	The Vintage Aviator Ltd (David Cretchley) The presented spoke to the submission.

	Questions In response to questions, the submitter advised that The Vintage Aviator Ltd had about 35 planes that they regularly fly, that they had a new hangar which meant that more planes could come, and that on a good flying weekend they would do 60-70 flights with half that number on a bad weekend.
31	Mark Wilson The submitter spoke to his submission. There were no questions.
14	Nicola Little The submitter spoke to her submission. There were no questions.
3	Murray Callister The submitter spoke to his submission. Questions In response to a question the submitter responded that the annual fees mentioned for different airports were per plane and included GST.
21	Skydive Wellington (Martin Lloyd) The presenter spoke to the submission. Questions The submitter was asked whether he thought a commercial business should be paying more and responded that they should pay more than a private owner but that they should also be paying a standard fee.
22	Super Air Ltd (Kent Weir on Teams) The presenter spoke to the submission. Questions The submitter was asked what he would recommend for their aircraft and responded that their planes were classed one or two classes above the weight category they operate from so would recommend their being lowered by one weight class. They currently paid a flat fee for the aircraft based at Hood and an additional fee for any additional aircraft. In response to a question about whether they were looking at development at Hood the submitter responded that they were looking to re-commence work on building a hangar at the airfield. In relation to a question about how the Hood charges compared to other

	airfields they operated from the submitter advised that the historical charging was in line with smaller uncontrolled aerodromes whereas the proposed fees fell in line with controlled aerodromes. They had been paying $1500 per annum for the two local aircraft then per landing for any additional aircraft.

RESOLUTION 2025/40

Moved by Councillor D Holmes
Seconded by Councillor B Johnson

That Council:

1. **receives** the full set of submissions received as part of the targeted consultation on the Hood Aeronautical Charges Review (Attachment 2):
2. **notes** that 31 submissions were received on the Hood Aeronautical Charges Review
3. **notes** that 17 submitters are confirmed to be heard at the hearing on 28 May 2025
4. **notes** that deliberations will take place on 4 June 2025.

CARRIED

[Note to Minutes: the Deliberations meeting was deferred to 11 June 2025]

8 REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

There were no reports for information

9 PUBLIC EXCLUDED

No matters were considered with the public excluded.

The Meeting closed at 3.51pm.

The minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the Council Meeting held on 11 June 2025.

.....

CHAIRPERSON

6 COMMITTEE REPORTS

Nil

7 REPORTS FOR DECISION

7.1 HOOD AERODROME AERONAUTICAL CHARGES REVIEW DELIBERATIONS

File Number:

Author: **Maseina Koneferenisi, General Manager Infrastructure and Assets**
David Paris, General Manager Finance

Authoriser: **Kym Fell, Chief Executive**

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to summarise the issues, concerns and suggestions made in respect to the proposal to restructure and review the aeronautical charges at Hood Aerodrome, and to provide the Council with options for the future charging regime, based on the principles that were set out in the review.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That Council:

1. **Receives** the Hood Aerodrome Aeronautical Charges Review Deliberations Report
2. **Adopts** the Aeronautical Charges model, general charges, discounts and general conditions as specified in Attachment 1, noting this includes:
    (i) User pays per landing, scaled by aircraft weight
    (ii) Discounts for bulk purchase of landing fees for individual aircraft
    (iii) Fixed charges for some specific users
    (iv) Concessions for aircraft domiciled at Hood Aerodrome;
3. **Notes** the additional revenue will move the Council closer to alignment with the Revenue & Financing Policy of achieving 60% user charges, but will not achieve it without more aeronautical activity
4. **Implements** the revised Hood Aerodrome Aeronautical Charges including new rates, payment options, and discount regimes from 1 July 2025.
5. **Completes** a further review of the Hood Aerodrome Aeronautical Charges within three years

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Submissions acknowledged the need for the review and many also acknowledged the need for an increase in the current landing fees.

Submitters generally expected fee increases, expressing most concern regarding the quantum of that increase and the removal of the option to pay a fixed annual fee.

Potential safety risks were raised as a concern by some, in particular that some pilots would fly less often reducing ‘pilot currency’, they would do less practice landings (touch and go’s) and that some may omit the use of their radios, all to avoid charges.

Submitters delivered reasoned arguments, and one had extensive research and analysis of other airports. There were constructive ideas as to how the fees could be structured.

There was a very strong focus on the value of the aviation community at Hood and the desirability of that aspect to be better considered in the final charging regime. Coupled with this was a view from some that the review should have considered the operation of the aerodrome excluding the pending application to become a Part 139 aerodrome i.e. they see Hood as a small, low use, low yield community airfield.

Changes to the fee proposal are recommended in response to the submissions, as outlined in Attachment 1. The recommended fee schedule has been reduced by 20% from the proposal document, touch and go's and missed approaches will not be charged for locally domiciled aircraft, a 15% discount is applied to prepaid 'landing packs' of 25 landings, and TVAL planes will be covered by a fixed annual charge.

CONTEXT

The Masterton District Council (MDC) operates the Hood Aerodrome as a key community asset and does so as a key activity of the Council. As such, Council is required to manage and operate the asset in accordance with MDC policies and plans, and related Government legislation, namely the Civil Aviation Act 2023 (CA Act 23).

The current aeronautical charges applying for the use of Hood Aerodrome were last reviewed in 2010, over 14 years ago. That review resulted in a fee structure that set fees with a range of options including direct charges for landings and fixed fees for local operators. The fixed fees have meant there are inequities, large discounts for high volume users. It also set charges for such things as aircraft parking and terminal use.

The need for a review is overdue. A direction was set by Council through the review of the 2024 Revenue and Finance Policy to increase revenue from airport users to achieve 60% user pays.

Landing fee revenue in 2023/24 totalled $28,808. Of that figure, $8,800 was paid in fixed annual charges by locally domiciled aircraft owners.

Review Process:

The review process was as follows:

A review was commenced in June 2024 with a report (AM 240704 Hood Aerodrome Review of Landing Charges FINAL) being provided to Council staff for consideration in July 2024. Work on a proposed charging structure commenced in February 2025 based on the June 2024 report.

A number of modifications were made to the original proposal in the June 2024 report resulting in some model options (AM 250411 - MDC Aeronautical Charges Review 2024 V1 and PowerPoint Hood Aerodrome - Aeronautical Charges Review Model Ver 5) which were presented to Council staff for consideration in April 2025. . These proposals included various alternatives in respect to discounts and treatment of touch and go landings. A key aspect of the model presented included:

(a) Four weight categories where charges were fixed within the categories

    i. 0-600kg, 601-1500kg, 1501-2900kg and 2901-5700kg.

(b) Three weight Categories where charges were based on a per kg charge within the three groups:

ii. 5701-10,000kg ($0.01628/kg), 10,001-15,000kg ($0.01776/kg) and 15,001 kg and above ($0.01924/kg).

Bulk payment/annual fee options were recommended to be discontinued and a range of options in respect to discounts for prepayments and direct payments were proposed.

On 16 April 2025 elected members provided direction to staff to proceed to consultation with affected users on a proposal that was based on the following:

- An uplift of the originally proposed fees by 20%.
- Cessation of annual flat fee payments.
- Acceptance of the general principles and conditions:
    - No differentiation between grass or sealed runway use.
- Market driven fees.
    - Endeavour to meet MDC private good criteria (60% of costs).
    - MCTOW as the basis of charges.
    - MCTOW weights to be grouped.
    - Heavier aircraft pay more per kg.
- Flat rates for groups below 6,500kg MCTOW (generally GA aircraft).
    - Charges above 6,500kg charge calculated individually based on MCTOW Helicopters treated as Fixed Wing
- Charge adjusted for Touch & Go: charged as applicable, every five T & G charged as one landing.
- Group bulk payments discontinued.
- Discounts for Prepay and Online payments.
- Future charging to be in line with the approved schedule.
- No radio aircraft (NORDO) will be required to provide records.
- Consideration on invoicing frequency (potentially quarterly).
- Application of an administration charge of $10 for invoices below $20.
- Conduct a review (or develop new) Aeronautical Conditions of Use to reflect model decisions.
- AIMM System continues to record movements and be the basis for charging (unless an appropriate more cost effective solution is determined)

Changes were made to the model to be consulted on in order to accommodate the Council's direction, resulting in the following categories and charges:

(a) Five weight categories where charges were fixed within the categories:

i. 0-600kg, 601-2100kg, 2101–3600kg, 3601–5100kg, 5101–6500kg.

(b) Four weight categories where charges were based on a per kg charge within the four groups.

ii. 6,501–9,500kg ($0.01575/kg), 9501–12,500kg ($0.01663/kg), 12,501 kg–15,500kg ($0.01838/kg) and 15,501 and above ($0.02013/kg).

ANALYSIS AND ADVICE

Consultation Process

Consultation on the Hood Aeronautical Charges Review began on Thursday 24 April 2025 and closed at 4pm on Thursday 22 May 2025.

The operation of the aerodrome is governed by the Civil Aviation Act 2023.

Consultation requirements are set out in Clause 230 (2) which requires an airport operator to consult with substantial customers *'before fixing or altering the amount of the charge; and within 5 years after fixing or altering the amount of the charge'*.

Section 219 defines the meaning of substantial customer as 'a person is a **substantial customer** of an airport operator if subsection (2) or (3) applies (or they both apply).

(2) This subsection applies if the person paid, or was liable to pay, the airport operator an amount—

(a) relating to identified aerodrome activities undertaken during the airport operator's last accounting period; and

(b) exceeding 5% of the total revenue paid or payable to the airport operator in relation to identified aerodrome activities undertaken during that period.

Despite the above, which required Council to consult with only three customers, Council undertook targeted consultation with all users that landed at Hood in the previous twelve months. An email was sent to 76 users containing a link to the consultation document, a link to the online survey, and other information on how to submit if the submitter did not want to complete the online form. The consultation document was posted to the remaining users where an email address was not held on file; 64 were posted in total.

Two information sessions were held at the Hood Aerodrome Terminal, the first on Wednesday 7 May at 6.30pm which was attended by around 25 people and the second on Saturday 10 May at 10.00am which was attended by three people. The two targeted information and consultation meetings were held to explain the proposal and answer questions. In both cases, the discussions presented a range of ideas which were also reflected in many of the submissions received.

Through the consultation period a number of information requests were received. These were treated under Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (LGOIMA). Detailed responses were provided promptly, and well before the close of the consultation period.

Consultation Document

The consultation document (see Attachment 2) provided information on the aim of the review, the principles that informed the review, the proposed charging model, and the model result which set out the proposed fees.

Submissions

A total of 31 submissions were received. These are available on the Council website as Attachment 2 to Report 7.1 on the 28 May 2025 Hearing Agenda.

17 submitters spoke in support of their submission at the Hearing held on 28 May 2025.

Analysis of Submissions

The majority of the 31 submitters (around two thirds) accepted the need to review and increase fees, however approximately half believed the proposed increases were too high,

The majority of submitters also advocated retention of the annual charge (60%), and some for a discount regime for locals. Some suggested what they felt would be an appropriate increase to the annual charge, ranging from 50% to 300% for local users, with double the current fee being most common.

There were a number of submissions that advocated for a broader approach to setting fees, for example to also take into account factors such as ground lease payments.

Submitters also raised concerns about the potential impact of the proposed fee increases on Hood and its users. Key concerns related to potential:

- Impact on safety at the airport (approximately 35% of submitters raised concerns that related to safety). Key concerns were that pilots may reduce their flying hours and therefore 'currency' and reduce the number of practice landings (Touch n Go's), noting these aspects are important to support safe flying. The potential for reduced radio usage to avoid fees was also raised, which could increase safety risks.
- Impact on utilisation (approximately 40% of submitters) e.g. declining use from local users and/or fewer itinerant aircraft stopping at Hood to break their journey. A small number (approximately 10% of all submitters) noted that this could have flow on effects such a risk the fuel provider withdrawing services. It was also noted that reduced utilisation could impact on Hood revenue and also aviation events.

The most common themes raised in submissions are summarised below:

Theme	**Analysis** (all percentages are approximate)[1]
Acknowledgement of need to review/increase fees	65% indicated that they accepted the need to review and/or anticipated an increase
Advocacy to retain annual charge option	60% of submitters requested
Acceptable range for an annual charge increase – suggestions varied from 50% to 300%	30% of submitters proposed
Potential impact on utilisation of Hood	40% of submitters expressed concern
Potential increase in safety risk – e.g. relating to pilot currency (flying less often); non-use of radios (to save cost)	35% of submitters expressed concern
Comparison table in the proposal	25% did not support Councils analysis and comparators

Further analysis of submissions is included in Attachment 3.

[1] There is always an element of interpretation when analysing qualitative feedback. Given that, trends rather than raw numbers/percentages should be emphasised.

Response to Key Submission Points

Annual Charges

Council's proposed move away from annual charges better supports Council's user pays policy position. It also addresses equity issues between aircraft operators.

An annual charge does not align with Council's user pays policy approach as it enables some users to benefit more than others – essentially, high users ultimately pay less per landing than others.

The Revenue and Finance Policy, revised as part of the development of the 2024-34 Long Term Plan, sets an external revenue contribution of 60% for Hood Aerodrome. The proposed increases will go some way to achieve that target.

Modelling of Proposed Fees

The proposed fee structure was completed using the Dual Till model meaning only aeronautical activities and the costs and revenue associated with those activities were considered. This meant that any impacts on revenue from other commercial activities such as ground leases, were not factored into the calculations.

As noted, a number of submitters strongly suggested that these factors should have been considered in the proposal, particularly in relation to Councils attempt to work towards the policy position of 60% user funded and 40% community (rates) funded. The decision to use a dual till model as opposed to a single till model, where airport operation is considered as a whole, was made based on the intention to complete a separate review of ground leases. This review is already in progress.

In settling on a final model, consideration has been given to the extent charges need to be raised and if payment incentives, preferential charges and/or bulk discounts should be factored in whilst considering the principles of user pays, equity and transparency.

The current aeronautical revenue falls well short of the 60% to cover the costs of operating the Hood Aerodrome aeronautical activities. It is acknowledged that achieving this private good proportion in the near term is not realistic given the relatively low activity, therefore an appropriate level of charges needs to be settled on or worked towards.

The current private good proportion (landing fees and income derived from baleage taken from the operational area) currently equates to only 8% of the cost of aeronautical operations. Across the whole Airport activity that figure increases to 36%.

One of the key considerations relates to how the impact of the removal of fixed annual charges can be moderated across the domiciled aerodrome users, particularly for those high users. The revised proposal put forward in this report provides for a 15% discount to users pre-purchasing 25 landings. It also does not charge locally domiciled aircraft for touch and go's or missed approaches. These two concessions will reduce the cost increase to the majority of local users to only moderate increases. Some low use aircraft owners will pay less. Some high frequency users will have to pay more for their greater use of the airport than others. See further analysis below in 'Recommended Option: Financial Analysis'

Safety Considerations

A key concern raised by submitters was the potential for pilots to reduce or stop radio use. It is noted that there are safety obligations for all pilots to use radio calls and that as part of the Airport Managers role, these would continue to be monitored.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

The existing charging structure was not considered as a viable option as it does not meet the aims of the review.

A good deal of submissions were received with strong feelings being voiced that the proposed fee increases were too large, did not align with the market information and, with the loss of the Annual Charge option, would adversely impact on airport usage and locally based operators.

This general view is supported given that the original proposal was developed with the market as a focus. The move to increase by 20% above the market has not been well received. The proposal to remove the bulk payments would, without a change in usage patterns, significantly increase the user charges income, however there is little doubt the increase would have a detrimental on usage/activity, at least in the short term. Comments relating to the threat of the loss of the refuelling facility are relevant here.

Revert to original proposal (as presented to Council).

The major focus of submissions focused on Hood as a community with the point being highlighted that the removal of Annual Charges would have an adverse effect on that local aviation community.

Overall, there was strong support for the review with the key concern being the 100% removal of the Annual Charge option.

Original proposal fees, with modified prepayment and discounts options

Given that the original Fee Schedule was aligned with the market sampled average, it is recommended that this be adopted. The advantage is that there is an immediate lift in revenue from non-local users and market aligned charges for light aircraft and commercial passenger aircraft alike. Not charging local users for touch and go's would help mitigate perceived risks associated with fee increases, such as reducing pilot currency and/or reduced utilisation of Hood. This also maintains the user pays approach that is a principled policy approach in line with other Council policies. Submissions did not dissuade from continuing with Council's user pays policy.

The calls for retention of the Annual Charges are partly addressed by three changes:

1. Remove the charging of locally domiciled aircraft doing touch and go's and missed approaches.
2. Introduce a 'Landing Pack' pre-purchase option of 25 landings per annum at a 15% discount, and
3. Offer fixed charge options to two special interest groups – TVAL and the Wairarapa Model Aircraft Club. TVAL on the basis that their vintage collection of aircraft have limited flying opportunities, and are a valued drawcard for visitors to Hood. The Model Aircraft Club do not have plane registrations so landings cannot be tracked and they cause minimal wear and tear on the runways.

These three aspects will reduce the costs significantly for most operators from the original proposal.

A summary of the options considered is included in the table below.

Option		Advantages	Disadvantages
1	Maintain the Status Quo	• None	• Does not address the aims of the review • Does not align with Council's Revenue and Finance Policy
2	Proceed as per proposal consulted on	• Has been consulted on • Results in increased income	• Increases are above the market, noting the numbers presented in the workshop were market comparatives • Strong opposition by submitters in relation to removal of annual charge • Strong opposition on level of increases for high users • Creates a dissensitive for some users
3	Modified proposal, remove 20% loading	• Aligns with the market • Still provides increases for Commercial passenger aircraft	• Strong opposition from the local market regarding removal of annual charges • Strong opposition on level of increases for high users • Creates a dissensitive for some users • Less revenue than proposed option
4	Modified proposal with bulk purchase of 25 landings at a 15% discount, no charges for TnGs or missed approaches for locally domiciled aircraft, fixed fee for specific users	• Meets the aims of the review. • Takes account of the weight and thrust of submissions • Aligns with the market • Provides increases for Commercial passenger aircraft. • Presents the opportunity to reassess the situation within three years. • Maintains fixed charges for TVAL collection	• Fixed annual charges not being restored may continue to generate ill feeling • Potential increase in income is not realised.

RECOMMENDED OPTION

Option 4 is recommended.

This fee structure (listed below) is designed to achieve increased revenue for the Airport and provide flexible options for aircraft owners, enabling occasional users to pay minimal costs and frequent users to purchase a bulk landings 'pack' of 25 landings at a 15% discount.

Not charging locally domiciled aircraft for touch and go's and missed approaches will address the submitters' calls for a fee regime that does not discourage landing practice and does not produce perverse incentives to not use radio calls.

This option will ensure Council achieves an uplift in aeronautical charges income, the concerns raised by submitters relating to the impact of the proposed higher fee model (as consulted on) are addressed in part, safety concerns re radio use are addressed and there is the opportunity to trial the model and review in partnership with users within the next three years. It also follows the policy principle of user pays.

Option 4 - Financial Impacts

Analysis of 12 months of aircraft movements shows Wairarapa Aeroclub being the highest user with 4 aircraft and some 450 landings. By excluding them, it is possible to average all other locally based aircraft and note that the average number of landings is 24.8 over 12 months. On that basis a bulk purchase option of 25 landings is proposed.

The range of use is from 2 landings to 66 per annum for the individually-owned aircraft. Under a regime where 'packs' of 25 landings can be pre-purchased at a 15% discount, the operator doing 66 and was paying $80 +GST, would pay $351. An operator with a larger GA aircraft doing 66 landings was paying $160+GST and under the proposed regime will pay $819. The operator who did 2 landings over 12 months and paid $160 +GST, would pay $28 +GST.

Across 50 aircraft currently paying Annual Charges, it is estimated that 14 will pay less.

Based on no change to the number of landings over the last 12 months, it is predicted that the new regime will generate 54% more revenue. That will see landing charges revenue raise from approximately $28,000 to $43,000, with locally domiciled aircraft contributing approximately double the current amount.

The Aeroclub's 4 planes landing fees will go from $480pa to $3,150pa. It should be noted that the Aeroclub is not a leaseholder at the aerodrome and does not pay aircraft access charges or aircraft parking fees.

With this structure, higher frequency users pay more, low frequency users pay less, charges are scaled to aircraft weights, visiting aircraft using the aerodrome for practice will be charged for Touch and Go's and missed approaches. There will be a greater degree of administration for the Council to ensure correct charging, but revenue will increase.

TVAL currently pay $960 annual charge across all their vintage planes. It is proposed that a new annual charge of $1,920 be set.

The Wairarapa Model Aircraft Club currently pay $320. It is proposed to increase that to $350.

Massey University and NZ Defence Force are currently paying access charges to do practice flights and landings over Hood. They currently pay $1,600 and $1,200 respectively. It is proposed that a 50% increase in their 'access fee' be actioned.

Proposed new fees vs Current fees

MCTOW Group	Aircraft/Glider Class	Proposed Fee per Landing (Excl GST)	Current fees (Excl GST)
0-600 kg	Microlights and Helicopters under 5,700 kg	**$6.00**	$5.00
601 - 1500	Small General Aviation (GA) and Gliders	**$14.00**	$10.00
1501 - 2900	Medium GA, Gliders, light twin	**$22.00**	$15.00
2901 - 5700	Large GA, Medium Twins	**$32.00**	$20/$25
MCTOW Range	**Aircraft Class including Helicopters over 5,700kg**	**Fee – MCTOW x Per KG Rate (Excluding GST)**	
5701-10,000	Large Twins	**$0.01628**	**$116.40**
10,000-15,000	Commercial Airline - Medium	**$0.01776**	**$225.00**
15,001 UP	Commercial Airline - Large	**$0.01924**	**$423.00**
MCTOW Group	**Aircraft/Glider Class**	**Discounted Fee for 25 Landings (Excl GST)**	**Annual Fixed Charge (excl GST)**
0-600 kg	Microlights and Helicopters under 5,700 kg	**130.00 (for 25)**	$80 (unlimited)
601 - 1500	Small General Aviation (GA) and Gliders	**300.00 (for 25)**	$160 (unlimited)
1501 - 2900	Medium GA, Gliders, light twin	**468.00 (for 25)**	$160 (unlimited)
2901 - 5700	Large GA, Medium Twins	**$680.00 (for 25)**	$480 (unlimited)

SUMMARY OF CONSIDERATIONS

Strategic, Policy and Legislative Implications

This decision does not have wider implications for Council strategies. It assists Council with progressing towards its policy position of 'user pays' as outlined in the Revenue and Financing Policy.

The need to increase aviation activity regulation is impacting the costs of small regional airports and there is a good deal of policy activity in this area, with the NZ Airports Association being heavily involved (Hood is a member).

MDC will make every effort through their representative to connect with the various initiatives the NZ Airports Association is engaged in with respect to assist regional airports with their funding issues.

The activity areas include:

- Government funding to promote Regional Connectivity.
- Government capital funding support.
- Government operational cost support.

Significance, Engagement and Consultation

The operation of the aerodrome is governed by the Civil Aviation Act 2023. Clause 230 (2) requires an airport operator to consult with substantial customers '*before fixing or altering the amount of the charge; and within 5 years after fixing or altering the amount of the charge'*.

Section 219 defines the meaning of substantial customer as 'a person is a **substantial customer** of an airport operator if subsection (2) or (3) applies (or they both apply).

(2) This subsection applies if the person paid, or was liable to pay, the airport operator an amount:

a) relating to identified aerodrome activities undertaken during the airport operator's last accounting period; and
b) exceeding 5% of the total revenue paid or payable to the airport operator in relation to identified aerodrome activities undertaken during that period.

Despite the above, Council sought broader feedback The proposal to review landing fees was consulted on with airport users.

Consultation ran from 24 April to 22 May 2025 with 31 submissions received.

Financial Considerations

The Masterton Airport is owned and operated by Masterton District Council. The facility has relatively low usage, so user charge revenue does not generate sufficient income to cover the costs operation. Ratepayers currently pick up 64% of the operating costs. The review of aeronautical charges is designed to move that dial more towards user pays.

The recommended option is estimated to generate approximately $15,000 more revenue. There is an intention that there be regular reviews of these charges to ensure, as costs increase, the users carry a share of those costs.

Implications for Māori

There are no implications for Māori identified with the decision or proposed approach.

Communications/Engagement Plan

As noted in the body of this report, the aerodrome users (i.e. those charged landing charges over the last 12 months) were provided with the consultation proposal. Two information sessions were held where the proposal was presented to attendees by Council staff.

A total of 31 submissions were received and 17 submitters spoke in support of their submissions at the hearing held on 28 May 2025.

Environmental/Climate Change Impact and Considerations

In respect to this decision there are no known impacts for the environment.

NEXT STEPS

Subject to adoption by Council, the Aeronautical landing fee charges listed in Attachment 1 will come into effect 1 July 2025.

ATTACHMENTS

1. **Recommended Aeronautical Charges Model ⇩**
2. **Consultation Document ⇩**
3. **Submission Analysis ⇩**

ATTACHMENT 1: RECOMMENDED AERONAUTICAL CHARGES MODEL

AERONAUTICAL CHARGES

MCTOW Group	**Aircraft/Glider Class**	**Fee per Landing (Excluding GST)**
0-600 kg	Microlights and Helicopters under 5,700 kg	**$6.00**
601 - 1500	Small General Aviation (GA) and Gliders	**$14.00**
1501 - 2900	Medium GA, Gliders, light twin	**$22.00**
2901 - 5700	Large GA, Medium Twins	**$32.00**
MCTOW Range	**Aircraft Class including Helicopters over 5,700kg**	**Fee – MCTOW x Per KG Rate (Excluding GST)**
5701-10,000	Large Twins	**$0.01628**
10,000-15,000	Commercial Airline - Medium	**$0.01776**
15,001 UP	Commercial Airline - Large	**$0.01924**
MCTOW Group	**Aircraft/Glider Class**	**Discounted Fee for 25 Landings (Excl GST)**
0-600 kg	Microlights and Helicopters under 5,700 kg	**$130.00**
601 - 1500	Small General Aviation (GA) and Gliders	**$300.00**
1501 - 2900	Medium GA, Gliders, light twin	**$468.00**
2901 - 5700	Large GA, Medium Twins	**$680.00**

Further Detail:

1. **BULK PURCHASE FIXED CHARGE** for up to 25 full-stop Landings per annum
    - Voluntarily taken up, paid in advance on invoice, per aircraft, by weight category, non-transferable
    - Beyond the 25 landings, another 'landing pack' of 25 can be purchased, or charged per landing
2. **TOUCH AND GO (T & G) CHARGES**
    - One Landing Fee applies for every series of 5 successive T & G's, or part thereof.
    - T & G count starts again on a declared full stop landing, or on vacating and rejoining the circuit.
    - Not applicable to Hood domiciled aircraft (as registered with Council)
3. **MISSED APPROACH CHARGE**
    - Aircraft executing missed approaches are liable for a charge of $5.00 for any sequence of 1-5 missed approaches.

- Not applicable to Hood domiciled aircraft (as registered with Council)

4. TERMINAL

- All aircraft over 5,700 kg MCTOW are considered to be Terminal Users.
- The use of the terminal facility is by prior arrangement with Airport Management, fee included in landing charge.

5. DISCOUNTS, PREPAYMENT & GROUP RATES

- As per (1) above, a 'Landings Pack' of up to 25 landings is inclusive of a 15% discount.
- Landing fees paid online before the end of the calendar month of the landing – a 15% discount can be applied at time of payment.
- NODOR Aircraft landing records are to be provided to MDC Quarterly – 15% discount on landings, unless covered by the TVAL fixed charge.
- Group Rates will apply for The Vintage Aviator Ltd (TVAL) collection and the Wairarapa Model Aircraft Club.
- Flight training providers not based at Hood (NZ Defence Force and Massey University School of Aviation) to be charged fixed fees for use of airspace. Landing charges to apply if stop landing.
- A $10.00 administration fee applies to all accounts totalling less than $20.00.

6. CONDITIONS OF USE

- All users are required to comply with the HOOD Aerodrome Conditions of Use.

Te Arotake Utunga Mahi Wakarererangi

Hood Aerodrome Aeronautical Charges Review

CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

Introduction

Masterton District Council is the operator of Hood Aerodrome and has undertaken a review of our aeronautical charges.

This review is overdue, with the last change being some 14 years ago. We are seeking users feedback on our proposed fees and charges for Hood Aerodrome.

Fees and charges for aeronautical activities are the only fees currently being reviewed. Property, buildings, and commercial activity are not included as part of this review.

The aim of this review

By undertaking this review, we hope to address the following issues:

- **Align with our Revenue and Financing Policy** – the Revenue and Financing policy guides Council's strategy of 'user pays' – requiring individuals who receive a service to pay directly for all or some portion of the service. The policy in relation to Hood Aerodrome states an allocation of 40% community funding (rates) and 60% from users. The current revenue from sources other than rates is well short of the 60% target. This review moves us closer to the policy target.
- **Outdated aeronautical charges** – our current model is dated, does not align with our principles, and is not commercially focused. The last change to charges was 14 years ago.
- **The current model is unclear** – there is an inconsistent approach to the application of charges, with numerous variables.
- **Understanding where the lack of equity is** – annual fixed charges result in some users paying as little as $0.33c and others up to $10.00 per landing for aircraft in the same weight group
- **Recovery of charges requires admin** – we need to ensure user pays revenue covers more than just the admin cost of recovering the charges
- **Understanding the commercial reality** - with an average of only 14 landings per day it is impossible to raise the landing charges enough to meet the policy. Doing that would require charges of more than four times the proposed new fees, which is considered unaffordable for users.
- **Low utilisation** – Hood Aerodrome averages 14 landings per day, with 83 per cent of aircraft weighing less than 1,500 kg

In future, the Council intends to review these charges annually.

Principles

Throughout this review, we considered the following principles:

- **Equity** – The service used is the same for everyone, therefore no one user should have an advantage over another.
- **User pays** – Those who use the service should bear the costs associated with is usage, rather than the public funding the majority (in line with Councils Revenue & Financing Policy).
- **Heavier aircraft create more wear and tear** – The cost structure should reflect this fact.
- **The fenced grassed areas are safety areas** – Cost of maintenance is included in operational costs.
- **Airport management & compliance activities benefit all** – All users share this cost.
- **Fee collection should be administratively simple** – It should be easy to recover charges.
- **Terminal users pay for terminal use** – Passenger capable commercial aircraft pay for the use of the terminal (aircraft over 6,500 kg).

Our proposed charging model

The proposed rates have been modelled to:

- levy all landings on an aircraft weight basis - Maximum Certified Take-off Weight (MCTOW)
- provide a differential within the charging model to recognising the higher impacts of heavier aircraft on the airport
- group aircraft into appropriate subgroups to apply fees and charges
- apply a flat rate for groups below the 6,500kg MCTOW
- calculate individual charges for aircraft at or above the 6,501kg MCTOW
- not differentiate between grass or sealed runway use
- reflects general aviation market charges
- endeavour to move towards Masterton District Council's Revenue and Financing Policy of user pays (60% user and 40% community).
- provide adjusted charges for aircraft conducting 'touch and goes' (non-full stop landings)
- includes the terminal charge in the fee charged for all aircraft over the 6,500kg MCTOW
- remove provision of an annual (discounted) charge
- provide a discount for users who prepay
- count five 'touch and go' landings as one full stop landing
- charge every 'missed approach' landing at a flat fee
- treat helicopters as fixed wing aircraft, with per applicable weight category
- apply an administrative charge to accounts that total less than $20.

Consultation

Under the Civil Aviation Act 2023 only substantial customers (those who pay more than five per cent of the total charges recovered) are required to be consulted, however the Council is asking all Hood Aerodrome users to have their say.

Key dates and activities

- **Thursday 24 April 2025** Consultation opens
- **Information sessions** Wednesday 7 May 2025, Hood Terminal 6.30pm – 7.30 pm
  Saturday 10 May 2025, Hood Terminal 10am – 11am
- **Thursday 22 May 2025** Consultation closes at 4pm
- **Wednesday 28 May 2025** Submission hearing
- **4 June 2025** Council decision
- **1 July 2025** New fees and charges take effect

Te āhua o tō tuku kōrero

How to have your say

We welcome your feedback on the Hood Aerodrome Aeronautical Charges Review.

Submissions close at **4pm on Thursday 22 May 2025**.

You can make a submission in several ways:

Complete the online submission form.

Complete the attached fillable submission form and email it to: **submissions@mstn.govt.nz**

Phone **06 370 6300** between 9am and 4pm Monday to Friday (excluding public holidays) and tell us what you think

Post the attached fillable submission to Masterton District Council, PO Box 444, Masterton 5840, or drop it off to our Customer Service Centre

Hearing

For those wanting to present their views to the Council, a hearing will be held on Wednesday 28 May 2025. You will need to indicate on your submission form that you would like to attend the hearing.

Model result

	Fixed				
Group	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Weight range (kg)	0	601	2101	3601	5101
	600	2100	3600	5100	6500
Mid-point		1351	2851	4351	5851
Class	Microlights	Small GA	Medium GA	Large GA	Medium Twins
	Bantam	C 172	Cresco, Harvard	Beech C90	Kingair 200
Group MCTOW	600	1,351	2,851	4,351	5,851
% of per kg rate	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%
per kg rate $0.01750	0.01225	0.01225	0.01225	0.01225	0.01225
Per kg rate x MCTOW	$7.35	$16.55	$34.92	$53.30	$71.67
NZ average	$5.35	$15.63	$21.33	$33.14	$56.61
Recommendation	**$7.50**	**$16.50**	**$34.00**	**$50.00**	**$70.00**
Inclusive of GST	**$8.63**	**$18.98**	**$39.10**	**$57.50**	**$80.50**

	Per KG Charge			
Group	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
Weight range (kg)	6501	9501	12501	15001
	9500	12500	15500	up
Class	BAE Jetstream	Lear Jet 75	SAAB 340	ATR 500
Sample Aircraft				
MCTOW	7,058	9,752	12,700	22,000
% of per kg rate	90%	95%	105%	115%
Graded (greater weight, higher cost)	0.01575	0.01663	0.01838	0.02013
Small Airport average	$115.91	$213.45	$258.59	$443.18
Recommendation	**$111.16**	**$162.13**	**$233.36**	**$442.75**
Inclusive of GST	**$127.83**	**$178.34**	**$268.36**	**$509.16**

ATTACHMENT 3: Hood Aerodrome Landing Fee Review – Submission Analysis

1. Overview

A total of over 60 themed concerns and suggestions were identified through the 31 submissions made in response to the Hood Aerodrome Landing Fee Review. These have been grouped according to the percentage of respondents who raised them[1], with accompanying insights and recommended actions.

2. Key Themes and Recommendations by Percentage Category

A. Strong Support or Concern (>60%)

Theme	%	Summary	Recommended Action
Acknowledgment of fee review necessity	>65%	General consensus that a fee review was overdue.	Noted – new fee schedule proposed, based on market survey.
Concern over loss of Annual Bulk Charge	>60%	Seen as a major disincentive; strong desire to retain it.	Introduce a pre-paid 'landing pack ' of 25 landings at a 15% discount.
Support for discount regime/bulk charge for locals	>60%	Preference for predictability and fairness.	Introduce a pre-paid 'landing pack ' of 25 landings at a 15% discount.

B. Moderate Support/Concern (35–60%)

Theme	%	Summary	Recommended Action
Support for alternative fee differentiation models	<55%	Desire for user-type-based charges.	Revised model reflects differentiated pricing for aircraft weights, but not recreational vs commercial use.
Perceived impact on usage and income	<40%	Fees may reduce airport usage and training.	Adjusted fee structure is designed to minimise any deterrent to usage.
Perceived underuse due to increased fees	<35%	Users may fly less or go elsewhere.	Revised fees model with discounted, prepaid 'landing packs' and no charges for Touch-and-Gos and missed approaches for local domiciled aircraft, address this concern.

C. Some Support/Concern (15–30%)

Theme	%	Summary	Recommended Action
Calls for local-user discounts	<30%	Seen as equitable.	As per above.

[1] There is always an element of interpretation when analysing qualitative feedback. Given that, trends rather than raw numbers/percentages should be emphasised.

Theme	%	Summary	Recommended Action
Opposition to fees for training landings	<30%	Safety and cost concerns.	Removed charges for Touch-and-Go and missed approaches for local users.
Hood's community role emphasised	<15%	Reference to similar airports.	Consider community airport elements in future modelling.
Management cost criticisms	<15%	Concern at rising OPEX and CAPEX.	Note part of fees review. Refer to Airport management for review and communication.

D. Low Support/Concern (<15%)

Theme	%	Summary	Recommended Action
Disagreement with fee comparisons (Part 139, ATC)	<10–15%	Believed comparisons were not valid.	Comparisons are a reference point. Recommended fee increases are close to the market comparisons.
Disagreement with charging methods (e.g. MCTOW)	<10%	Seen as inequitable in some cases.	Retain MCTOW model; allow per-landing bulk charge variation.
Safety concerns (radio usage, flight hours)	<10–20%	Risk of unsafe practices.	No limit on Touch-and-Gos and missed approaches. Monitor compliance, maintain safety group engagement.
Administrative improvements (online payment, AIMMS concerns)	<5–10%	Operational feedback.	Implement online payment options; review use of AIMMS for recording usage.
Helicopter and glider charging specifics	<10%	Need for tailored approaches.	Helicopters treated as under 600kg landings. Gliders added to fees schedule.
Training organisations, special interest groups (e.g. TVAL/Aeroclub)	<10%	Concerns around cost sustainability.	Reset TVAL & Model Aircraft Club fixed annual fees. Aeroclub (with 4 aircraft) to be treated as any other user, able to pre-purchase discounted 'landing packs'
Resident/operator differentiation	<10–15%	Equity arguments made.	Apply fee schedule to all users as equitably a bulk charges to Hood-based aircraft, not by residence.
Support for airport marketing and growth strategy	<20%	Encourage broader vision for Hood.	Refer to Airport Management for inclusion in strategic plan.

8 REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

Nil

9 PUBLIC EXCLUDED

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject matter of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48 for the passing of this resolution
9.1 - Request for Funding	s7(2)(a) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons s7(2)(b)(ii) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information s7(2)(i) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	s48(1)(a)(i) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7
9.2 - Contract Award	s7(2)(i) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	s48(1)(a)(i) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7
9.3 - Contract Extension	s7(2)(i) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	s48(1)(a)(i) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7