

# Minutes

**Subject:** Meeting of the Aircraft Noise Community Consultative Group

**Location:** Meeting held in Person and via Microsoft Teams

**Date:** 08 September 2025

**Member  
Attendance**

**In Person:**

**Via "Teams":**

Rachel Devine, Independent Chair  
 Marc Armitage, Auckland Airport  
 Grace Doughty, Auckland Airport  
 Councillor Alf Filipaina, Auckland Council  
 David Wong, Auckland Council  
 Heather Haylock, Community Representative  
 Helen Futter, Community Representative  
 Mark Easson, Community Representative  
 Jack Tan, Albert-Eden Local Board  
 Malcom Bell, Franklin Local Board  
 Bruce Kendall, Howick Local Board  
 Joe Glassie-Rasmussen, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu  
 Local Board  
 Troy Churton, Ōrākei Local Board  
 Mark Allen, Waitākere Ranges Local Board  
 Cath O'Brien, BARNZ

**Other  
Attendance**

**In Person:**

**Via "Teams":**

Caitlin Goodman, Auckland Airport  
 Mark Laurenson, Auckland Airport  
 Jaynie Yang, Auckland Airport  
 Steve Hardwick, Auckland Airport  
 Steve Peakall, Marshall Day Acoustics  
 Stephanie King, Marshall Day Acoustics  
 Kathleen Delaney, CASPER  
 Chris Middleton, CASPER

Karl Taylor, Airways Corporation  
 Geoff Hounsell, Airways Corporation (until  
 2.51pm)  
 Laura Batchelor, Auckland Airport (until  
 2.02pm)

**Members of  
the Public**

Nil

**Apologies**

Connie Rowe, Auckland Airport  
 Maria Meredith, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board  
 Fiona Lai, Puketāpapa Local Board

**1. Opening Karakia**

**2. Meeting Quorum & Apologies**

The Independent Chair, once quorum was confirmed, declared the meeting opened at 1:04pm.  
Apologies; as listed on cover page 1 of these Minutes.

**3. Public Forum**

The Chair noted that no requests were received from the public to speak at or to observe the meeting.

**4. Minutes of Meeting Held on 09 June 2025**

Cath O'Brien noted one heading was illegible.

**Action:** Auckland Airport to correct the heading and publish amended confirmed Minutes.

**5. Identification of Conflicts of Interest for this Meeting**

The Chair spoke to the reason for this agenda item. None of the attendees identified any conflict with items on the agenda.

**6. Matters Arising from the Previous Minutes**

Jaynie Yang spoke to items 2 and 3 circulated as part of the Meeting Pack (outstanding member signatures); both on hold pending imminent membership changes.

Jaynie Yang spoke to items 6 (temporary monitor correlation percentages), 8 (glossary of terms), 9 (community representative appointment) and 10 (noise monitor data outage in December 2024) in the Matters Arising paper. The Chair sought feedback on each but there were no questions or comments other than item 10. Geoff Hounsell provided updated information. He advised that there was no way of knowing the data was not being received. The proposed solutions involve duplicating the actual data "feed" so that there will not be a single point of failure for that aspect, and a new alert to allow more prompt rectification of such a situation in future.

**Action 1:** Auckland Airport to note Airway's solutions and comment if any further matters need consideration.

**Post meeting note** - The existing system for monitoring data feed output and error reporting identified the issue related to the data outage mentioned above. The outage was caused by a hardware failure, and the delayed resolution was due to the international shipping of replacement components. The missing data has since been recovered and was used to generate the Annual Noise Report. To enhance visibility and response, error alert notifications will now be sent to Airways alongside Casper. Airways will also be included in the daily *Casper/Noise AKL* status report to enhance monitoring.

The Chair asked if the revised Terms of Reference are available in the Unitary Plan on the Council website [*Mark Laurensen confirmed this was the case during the final "Other Business" agenda item*].

There were no further questions or comments.

**7. Noise Monitors Certification and Calibration**

Caitlin Goodman summarised the process to perform the 2-yearly certification and calibration of noise monitors, with the least downtime of the monitors.

There were no questions.

**8. Noise Reports**

*Quarterly Report*

Steve Peakall spoke to the Quarterly “main” Report (and reminded the group of the Supplementary Report containing further detail). Bruce Kendall asked how he was to respond to persons outside the contours particularly affected by aircraft noise, recognising that mitigation is not required and some people may be hyper sensitive. The Group gave the following responses:

- The Designation, informed by expert acoustic input, does not require noise reduction packages outside the MANA. While AIAL is sympathetic to parties that are more sensitive to aircraft noise, it is not in a position to offer packages beyond the MANA and doing so would set a precedent. (Mark Laurenson).
- It is known there are a range of sensitivities to noise. There is no known “test” to determine an individual person’s noise sensitivity beyond their own healthcare; the focus is generally at a population level (Steve Peakall).
- Products like “Magnetite” can be installed to existing glazing to reduce noise. Based on personal experience, installation cost \$10K and reduced noise by approximately 7dBA. It is an option for those hypersensitive to noise. (Helen Futter)
- Is a separate Council forum required to consider instances that are beyond AIAL’s obligations (Mark Allen) - This “wider” issue of considering all noise issues is likely within the scope of the updated Terms of Reference (the Chair).
- There is already a Council process to look at this type of complaint, but the process may need to be further discussed within Council (David Wong).
- Some NZ airports, like Christchurch Airport, have controls on activities sensitive to aircraft noise in the aircraft noise notification area (50-55db Ldn contour). This is not the case in the Auckland Unitary Plan, which sought to strike a balance between managing aircraft noise and constraining development. Review of the Unitary Plan will be the opportunity to review the controls on aircraft noise (Mark Laurenson).
- Research suggests that over the past several years “annoyance levels” in the general populace has increased (Steve Peakall).

#### *Annual Report*

Steve Peakall then turned to the Annual Report and explained that:

- the number of movements and aircraft noise was similar to FY24.
- compliance was achieved with the designation requirements.

the modelling software used to generate the contours has been updated to the latest version available by the provider.

#### *Monitor correlation*

Helen Futter questioned the low monitor correlation levels for Mt Eden and Wiri (Table 1, “Noise Monitor Correlations”), whether the results provided value, and whether there were alternative monitors that might provide better correlation.

Steve Peakall explained that there is a “low signal to noise ratio” due to a low general noise level (Mt Eden) and high background noise (Wiri), making it harder to differentiate surrounding noise from aircraft-specific noise. The locations were originally chosen due to high complaints and a historical SMART Flight Path trial (Mt Eden) and a specific flight track (Wiri). The results do call into question whether the monitoring locations are required or could be retired or relocated.

Kathleen Delaney and Chris Middleton explained that the monitors are performing appropriately but correlation is difficult in both quiet and noisy areas. Adjustments for background noise through changing parameters can result in false positives, as was shown when attempting to do so for the Velodrome monitor.

Mark Allen asked if there is an opportunity to obtain better data to inform the Unitary Plan review.

A discussion followed around an action for Auckland Airport to report on whether the existing monitors and parameters are appropriate.

- An action is needed; if there is not “good correlation” in some areas then that undermines the value of monitoring results (Helen Futter).
- Noise monitoring has limitations. The use of monitors to determine noise levels does not necessarily correspond to the way in which aircraft noise is disturbing people (citing LOSGA near Mt Eden with several flights overhead late at night, and the heights of flights over the Waitakeres) (Mark Easson). Geoff Hounsell responded that all flights over the Waitakeres should be at over 10,000 feet, and that recent flight path alterations mean that there should be no such flights over Mt Eden as the member cites.

**Action 2** Auckland Airport to prepare a report on the value of the temporary monitors having regard to the locations and parameters.

The Chair gave thanks for the contributions.

*[At this point of the meeting, in relation to the subheading “Future initiatives” at the end of para 6 on page 6 of the Marshall Day Annual Report, Geoff Hounsell spoke to an Airways presentation, as follows:]*

*Airways’ Future Initiative*

Airways is seeking removal of the current cap on the numbers of flights permitted to use the Required Navigation Performance (RNP) X and U approach paths. Airways is not aware of the rationale for the current cap and understands administration associated with documentation of flights is a key deterrent for the use of these approaches. There are potential fuel and CO<sub>2</sub> savings (estimated 6kg per flight using the approaches) and noise is expected to remain within requirements. Airways requests an indication of whether the Group is comfortable to support the proposal.

The Group discussion included:

- If the limit is in fact arbitrary, where did it arise from and is it a Civil Aviation rule or just a procedure (Cath O’Brien)? It was agreed with AIAL at the time as a procedure and is not a Civil Aviation rule (Geoff Hounsell).
- The limits reflect what was trialled (Karl Taylor).
- Mark Eason noted that the limit was a response to feedback during trials and asked if it was only being used 2 or 3 times per day currently, why change it. Geoff Hounsell noted the existence of the cap together with the inherent obstacles to its use in practice (eg, it needs to be pre-programmed in the aircraft, aircraft need certification, pilots need training and recurrent testing, crew must participate in regular flights on such paths) make it easier to “say no” to its use.
- Do the hours of availability depend on other external factors eg, Ohakea hours of operation (Cath O’Brien)? No (Geoff Hounsell).
- Is there an intention that there be public consultation (Cath O’Brien)? No, the procedure exists and Airways is requesting the removal of the arbitrary cap on a trial basis (Geoff Hounsell).
- There was discussion about whether the volume of flights (and related reduction in fuel/CO<sub>2</sub>) that could take advantage of the unconstrained RNP procedure would be as small as it seemed. What would the noise impacts be if the proposal went ahead (Heather Haylock)? Are the planes quieter when flying these routes (Malcolm Bell)? The noise is more consistent due to the way aircraft must operate when using the path (Geoff Hounsell). They are lower over built up areas (Mark Easson).

The Chair was concerned that the Group would need more time to think about its response to the proposal, so suggested the preference is for Airways to formulate and present at the next meeting some specific questions for the Group to discuss (with Mark Allen adding that it would be useful to understand what volume of flights would be involved and what the potential noise-level impact would be).

**Action 3:** Airways to present a report at the next meeting, which would include specific questions for the Group to discuss or consider.

**Post meeting note** - AIAL understands that this Airways proposal relates to the daily limits of the Smart Approach “Blue, Green and Yellow tracks”. AIAL will discuss this proposal directly with Airways ahead of the next ANCCG meeting. As part of this process AIAL will review previous Smart Approach reports, community feedback, and the current operational state to inform next steps. Initial investigation post the ANCCG meeting suggests that while the changes are not anticipated to affect compliance with the contours the change may be noticeable to the community beneath the tracks. Preliminary views are that consultation will be needed ahead of any trial to remove the cap.

## 9. Annual Noise Reduction Programme Report

Mark Laurenson spoke to the Report, including the following key points:

- There is an estimated 4,800 potentially eligible dwellings in the HANA and MANA for both runways;
- Approximately 2,000 potentially eligible dwellings in the current HANA and MANA.
- 733 packages have been installed to date (approximately 37% of currently eligible dwellings).
- Auckland Airport will again offer the full extent of the HANA for the existing runway and the FY20 MANA, which is larger than the anticipated noise for FY26 and FY27. This means no new properties will receive offers.

Questions and answers were as follows:

- The Chair - please elaborate on the difference between the 4,800 potentially eligible dwellings and the 2,000 currently eligible. Response: The 4,800 number is the estimate of potentially eligible residential dwellings in the future HANA and the MANA as modelled to 2044. The 2,000 number is a subset, being those within the extent of the current HANA and MANA and who will receive an offer for a noise reduction package.
- Helen Futter - it is not listed in the Report, but there is still an opportunity to task a senior tertiary student(s) with a study of barriers stopping potential package applicants from applying. Response: Correct, this item is part of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.
- The Chair - how does the modelling of forecast passenger numbers in the draft Master Plan relate to the modelling of 4,800 to 2044? Response: As addressed by AIAL at the last ANCCG, AIAL anticipates accommodating forecast passengers within the future noise contours as mapped under the Unitary Plan based on our current understanding and available modelling at this time.

There being no further questions, the Chair thanked Mark Laurenson for the presentation.

## 10. Any Other Business

Jaynie Yang advised:

- The minutes for the 15 December 2025 meeting would likely not be available until early 2026 due to the AIAL shut-down period (non-operational) after 19 December 2025 to 4 January 2026.
- A “Induction Session” is proposed to take place on the morning of 15 December 2025 (just prior to the next ANCCG meeting), with more details to come.

The Chair recommended as many members as possible attend the Induction Session as a learning opportunity.

The Chair referred to the end-of-tenure “Community Representative Reflections” provided to the Group and thanked all departing members for their highly-valued contributions, and requested any further final reflections from any of the local board or Council members or community representatives at this point. Alf Filipaina thanked and acknowledged all participants and supporting staff for their contributions to this Group. Heather Haylock thanked the Group for its work and added that she had learnt a lot and enjoyed her tenure.

The Chair requested a list of updated member details when available.

The Chair referred to Mark Allen's "future-focussed" statements at this meeting as being a great challenge for the Group to take up - to think strategically about aircraft noise in the future, which includes changes to the regulatory environment and the airport.

Troy Churton suggested that creation of a "one-pager" summarising the noise-related regulatory environment (including Council powers and Civil Aviation Rules, and which take precedence) would be useful to help set priorities for consumer rights. Cath O'Brien supported a summary, adding that it would be a good Induction Session topic.

**Action 4:** AIAL to coordinate circulation of an updated list of member details post elections and community representative appointments.

**Action 5:** AIAL to consider the feasibility and merits of a summary document to be included in the induction process, outlining the regulatory framework for aircraft noise.

There being no other business, the meeting was closed with a Karakia.

**Closing Karakia**

**Meeting closed:** 2.53pm

**Next meeting:** 15 December 2025