

LTCCP 2006-16 Submission - Received by Email

Name: Ken Livingston [mailto:klivingston@enabling.co.nz]

CC: lake.isaac@yahoo.co.nz; Info

Sent: Tuesday, 2 May 2006 11:33 am

Your Submission: IW Lake Isaac submission

Here's a copy of Sue Stubenvoll's observations of the whole issue, which I think gives a refreshing perspective:

A thought on how to move forwards:

Lake Isaac is being stopped by the Airport Company because of fear of bird strike. There has been an average of just under one damaging bird strike a year over 15 years and that seems too high, not just for the Airport Company but for all of us. Also, the most recent bird strike on the Pacific Blue plane was from a spur winged plover and the worst bird strike was from a flight of starlings – both non water-birds which thrive in open spaces (and tree roosts for the starlings).

The airport is rightly concerned that it has no influence on bird control measures outside its land and would like better control over an 18 km radius from the airport. This seems sensible and in everyone's interests. But it also raises an interesting view: Christchurch is the 'Garden City' and we can't reduce existing water features and open spaces and trees within the 18 km radius, nor would anyone want to.

So we have a dichotomy. The ordinary person wants safe air travel and a beautiful city with many natural and water features. So being 'against Lake Isaac' is actually only a symptom of a larger and important balance that needs to be addressed. Our 'Garden City' attracts birds – and the ordinary person doesn't want to stop that either.

A suggested approach:

1. We can show that the total surface area of Lake Isaac is small compared with the total surface water area within 18 km, including the full Waimak in flood, all of which, according to the airport, can attract birds into the flight path of aircraft.
2. We can show that the total green space of the Lake Isaac complex is small compared with the total green space area within 18km, all of which can attract birds into the flight path (especially tree roosts for starlings and open spaces for plovers, starlings and other potential hazards).
3. We can show that the demand for water features and trees will increase with better wasteland management and the spread of the city into areas closer to the airport, and should. These must be at least earmarked in the Long Term Plan.
4. The logical conclusion therefore is that the City Council should continue to encourage development of open spaces and recreational facilities for its growing population but also convene a work party of interested parties to suggest how to control birds within flight paths to/from the airport. The group should include the airport, pest control, recreational users of space, housing estate developers and conservationists – like they did in Fiordland.

**Your Submission
(Cont'd):**

5. The benefits are that all interested parties would stop spending thousands of dollars in time and money in fruitless disputes, the airport company, and therefore the people of New Zealand, would have a safer airport AND we would share a city that is as beautiful and exciting as it can be.

Cheers, Ken.

Ken Livingston

enabling technologies ltd

e: klivingston@enabling.co.nz

m: (025) 240 1225

p: +64 3 363 5809

f: +64 3 363 5801

50-56 Kilmore Street

Christchurch

New Zealand

Also at Auckland, Wellington, Dunedin & Invercargill

www.enabling.co.nz