

From: [Benoit Pette](#)
To: [Macky Rogers](#)
Subject: Benoit PETTE Airport expansion oral submission
Date: Thursday, 20 May 2021 12:33:28 pm
Attachments: [2021-05-17.pdf](#)

Kia ora

Benoit Pette

Live in Miramar

I've got two boys, one 9yo, and 3yo named Cosmo. Cosmo goes to kindy in Kiilbirnie, about 400 meters away from the runway.

1. Some mornings, we can **smell kerosene burn**, and this fills me with **guilt**, something I am sure you can all relate to.
2. Some mornings, **we can't talk** because a plane takes off.

That's with my two boys in mind that I am doing this submission.
I oppose the expansion on three main grounds.

Climate Change

1. **Aviation is far from being in a position to reduce its emissions.** Commercial planes running on battery or hydrogen will start to be seen, as prototypes, by 2035, and operating commercially many years (decades?) later. To date, nobody can predict when flying sustainably will be possible, except for smaller aircraft which seem to offer some near term perspective.
2. Even "**fuel-efficient**" **planes are not the solution:** by being cheaper to run, they reduce the cost of flying, opening flying as a transport option to more people. The net effect is increased emissions! In a study released on the 19th of Sept 2019, the International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT) found that *"Airlines increased their fuel efficiency by 3 percent on average last year. But overall, the gains were not enough to offset rising greenhouse gas emissions from aviation industry, which released 7 percent more carbon dioxide into the atmosphere than last year."*
3. While the **expert evidence on climate change provided by WIAL** lists out all the good intentions from the sector to reduce emissions, it is hard to not read a list of wishful thinking, mostly out of the hands of the airport, which fails to convince emissions will be kept under control. In fact, it explains how the technology is not ready (points 42 and 46 of the written submission), and we know that for the fuel efficiency we're getting out of the existing technology, the net impact is increased emissions.
4. So an **expansion, with a greater number of flights will inevitably lead to greater air and land emissions**, over many years, even if planes are more fuel-efficient.
5. The possibility of increased emissions happens at an interesting time, different from where the country and the city were only a few years ago. Now, there is a **wide consensus that we are in a climate emergency** and that reducing emissions must be the top priority.
6. Here in Wellington, residents are demanding action on climate change by a wide majority, as captured in **Te Atakura** Implementation plan.
7. In it, a survey to which +1,200 residents responded shows that **92% of Wellingtonians** demand action against CC no matter what. This clearly gives a social license to wial and everyone living in this city to **RECUCE** emissions and not let them grow.

8. This implementation plan sets a **43% city-wide emissions reduction by 2030** (with full carbon neutrality by 2050).
9. It lists 28 actions and reaches a mere **14% emissions reduction by 2030**.
10. The **airport is excluded** from these 28 actions, as outlined on page 12: "Aviation and marine account for almost 20% of this sector, but have limited immediately available solutions".
11. So not only Te Atakura can't demonstrate a viable plan to sufficiently reduce emissions, it is doing so with an airport excluded from the actions, with a constant emission level. Allowing these emissions to rise by allowing the **expansion would further reduce Te Atakura's ability** to reach its already failing target of 14%!!!
12. In short, **the expansion will lead to greater emissions, which goes against what Wellingtonians want** and make it harder for the city to reach already challenging targets.

Impact on residents

1. Wellington is special in that its airport, unlike any other city in NZ or abroad, is located right in its heart. It begs the question: how far, how wide is our city prepared to sacrifice its amenities, its wellbeing, for the airport expansion?
2. Again, more planes, operating closer to homes, will directly, unequivocally, create a level of nuisance hardly bearable for local residents.
 1. No amount of expert evidence can deny that bringing planes closer to residents, from 250 meters away to under their windows, will create a **significant noise increase**, bringing havoc in their lives, a life they haven't chosen. Even the district plan recognizes the golf course was always meant to be used as a buffer from noise operation.
 2. No amount of expert evidence can deny **looking at a tarmac is more stressful** than the rolling hills of the current golf course.
 3. No amount of expert evidence can deny that **blowing kerosene burn** closer to these homes increase the risk of health-related incidents for these people.
3. Airport's proposal to mitigate these additional adverse effects by putting residents behind closed, double-glazed windows can not be remotely be seen as a viable solution.

Moreover, the airport's commitment to equipping the surrounding houses with double glazing has delivered on its promise for 135 houses, over 650 houses eligible for it, in 20 years! How long will it take to equip all the new houses that fall within the new noise boundary?
4. Same level of amenities, people never choose to live and work near an airport. Bringing the airport closer means people's lives will be worse.
5. The issue will be exacerbated with **Wellington's population** expected to grow.
6. This expansion is the **guarantee the nearby suburb will lock people in their own homes, or force them to move away**. It will deteriorate the Strathmore suburb.

Economy

1. Even from an economic standpoint, we can see the airport is becoming more a **drag** than an income generation. **Emissions are and will be more and more, costed in the economy**.
2. For example, all government agencies now have to become **carbon neutral as early as 2025!** The additional costs to flying this will generate will be passed to ratepayers, or avoided altogether.
3. Now, we have a climate emergency, carbon credits will be introduced, the law will enforce carbon neutrality, flight shaming, change in NZ desired tourism profile and COVID (with WFH). What is the impact on demand?

4. **LGWM and its \$6.5B** cost to ratepayers, is solely due to the fact the airport is located where it is. If the airport wasn't growing, then there would be a \$6.5B surplus on the government balance sheet.
5. This makes the **business case for the expansion quite uncertain**, if not dubious. In this context, it is urgent to wait.

Conclusion

1. In conclusion, this expansion will create social tension, between those who live near the airport and the airport, between those who act on climate change and those who still place their own interests ahead of it.
2. For the community, for Wellingtonians, for New Zealanders, we are begging for this expansion not to happen.