

**Summary of submissions received by Greater Wellington Regional Council and Wellington City Council  
for WGN160137 & SR357837**

<b>General Position of Submission</b>	<b>Total</b>
Oppose	527
Support	227
Conditional	4
Submissions that are Neutral	18
<b>Total Submissions received</b>	<b>776</b>

Sub ID	Name of submitter / Organisation	Support / Neutral / Oppose application	Wish To Be Heard?	Summary of submission
1	Thompson, Joshua	Support	No	Believes runway extension may be necessary to maintain existing levels of service if aviation requirements become more stringent. Believes there are sufficient travellers to make the project viable. Supports the runway extension because it would have economic benefits such as more international students, more diplomatic visits, more film work, and more IT jobs.
2	Kleist, David	Oppose	Not Specified	Opposes the extension due to the economic cost as WCC ratepayers may have to fund \$250m of the project compared to Infratil's \$50m. Notes that no airlines have so far stated an interest in long haul flights to Wellington. Also concerned that the design of the extension will pose a danger to Cobham Drive traffic and damage electricity and gas utilities in the event of a plane crash.
3	Roberts, Dennis	Support	Yes	Supports the extension because of the economic benefits. Sees an opportunity for produce exports to Asia with the future four lane motorway connecting the Horowhenua with Wellington.
4	Urquhart-Hay, Simon James	Support	No	Supports the extension as believes it will be economically beneficial to the Wellington region.
5	Campion, Roy	Support	No	Supports the extension as believes Wellington needs to swiftly install necessary infrastructure to progress economically and socially. Concerned about progressive ideas being stymied by ill-informed special interest groups.
6	Campion, Laurie	Support	No	Supports the extension but believes if it goes ahead all the roads leading to the airport need to be upgraded for increased traffic.
7	Sandford, Matthew	Support	No	Supports the extension and believes consent should be granted with the long-term good of NZ in mind. Expresses concern over anti-establishment groups who readily oppose such projects.
8	Aldridge, Philip	Support	No	Supports the extension and highlights economic benefits including time-savings for long distant flights, making it easier for organisations to do business, more employment in Wellington during and post the construction process, and improved Wellington GDP.
9	Green, Ralph Julian	Support	No	Supports the extension and sees only economic and multigenerational benefits. Works as an internationally focussed luxury lodge tourism operator, and thinks the extension will make a huge difference to Wellington's appeal to overseas guests. Believes more businesses would locate to Wellington if it had better air transport connections.
10	Kent, Mary Elizabeth	Support	No	Supports the extension as a regular international traveller and believes it would offer shorter travel times to long-haul destinations and more competitive fares.
11	Steel, Stephen John	Support	No	Supports the extension and believes it would provide economic benefits such as increased tourism numbers and business visitors. It complements Transmission Gully and shared ownership of a big Wellington project would divert attention away from Auckland and Christchurch.
12	Wellington Regional Stadium Trust	Support	No	Supports the extension as the Stadium will benefit economically through increased visits for major events. The longer runway will remove one of the impediments for major artists visiting Wellington, as staging and equipment has often had to be transported via road from Auckland.
13	Rydges Wellington	Support	No	Supports the extension because it will encourage economic growth in Wellington. Rydges Wellington is a member of the hotel community and places considerable weight on having an international airport in close proximity to the CBD.
14	Ruscoe, Elizabeth Ann	Support	No	Supports the extension as believes the long haul flights into Wellington will have economic benefits, increasing trade and tourism and possibly making flights cheaper.
15	Mallard, Andy	Support	No	Supports the extension because it will provide much needed infrastructure to attract more direct visitors.
16	Dinsdale, Andrew John	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because there is no economic justification for it; it is not supported by any major airlines; it does not stand up to environmental scrutiny; we should not be extending into Cook Strait; Infratil is not paying its fair share of the costs; and it will be a huge drain on ratepayers both local and regional.
17	Novak, Simon Kenning	Support	No	Supports the extension as believes it is an essential piece of infrastructure for Wellington's economic growth.
18	Talbot, Sally Elizabeth	Support	No	Supports the extension as believes it will benefit Wellington, the NZ economy, the roading system, travellers, and Parliament.
19	Morgan, Patrick	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the applications. Believes economic business case is weak and demand forecasts lack rigour. Concerned about opportunity cost to WCC and unknown cost to ratepayers; negative traffic impacts especially construction traffic; and lack of support from airlines. Believes pilots' concerns about runway safety have not been satisfied. Believes alternative sites have not been adequately investigated nor have climate-change impacts.
20	Harkness, John Renwick	Support	No	Supports the extension based on the economic benefits for increased tourism and more direct trade and business links. Believes any adverse effect on the marine environment can be managed.
21	Caffardo, Nicolas (Willis Wellington Hotel)	Support	No	Supports the extension as believes it is crucial for Wellington economic growth and to remain competitive with other areas of NZ and Asia Pacific.
22	Greig, Simon	Support	No	Supports the extension to help secure Wellington's future.
23	Gilligan, Patrick	Support	No	Supports the extension as believes it will promote economic growth through increased tourism, job opportunities, and enabling more companies to base themselves in Wellington.
24	Howarth, John Lindsay	Support	No	Supports extension and believes it is the single most important infrastructure project necessary to support Wellington's future connectivity and economic growth. Is a frequent trans-tasman traveller and is often inconvenienced by having to fly via Auckland due to capacity constraints.
25	Russell, Frances Helen	Support	No	Supports the extension and believes that the reclamation will create new 'real estate' for sea life as has happened after disturbances to Lyall Bay in prior years.
26	Scots College	Support	No	Supports the extension because it is necessary for Wellington to reach its economic potential. Believes the extension could increase international student numbers as international families often do not wish their children to have to take connecting flights.
27	Jumpjet Airlines Limited	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. The extension is not required for Jumpjet's passenger services. Concerned construction will disrupt Jumpjet's operations because of traffic delays and airport services being unavailable. Concerned about cost of the project to ratepayers since costs may blow-out to double original estimates, particularly the cost of earthquake proofing. Believes public benefit to the NZ economy from the project would be negligible and includes economic impact figures for foreign carriers in its submission. Concerned that an increase in foreign airlines will increase the number of over stayers. Concerned about conflict of interest with WCC owning a share in the company applying for resource consent.
28	Maranui Surf Life Saving Club Inc	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because of the unknown surf impacts on Lyall Bay including on the beach, possible safety implications of new rips forming, and unknown threat to the clubhouse of Maranui Surf Life Saving Club on the foreshore.
29	Roxy Cinema	Support	Yes	Supports the extension to enable long haul flights, which will encourage economic development in Wellington. Considers it likely to benefit the tourism sector and Wellington's education sector through increased overseas student numbers.

30	Aldridge, Phillipa	Support	Not Specified	Supports the extension as believes it will provide business opportunities and increase tourism.
31	Longstaff, Owen	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Lives close to the proposed construction site and is very concerned about noise impacts. Wants to see some sort of sound-proofing system to address this. Also concerned about negative impacts on the surf beach.
32	Spotswood, Dorothy Myrtle	Support	No	Supports the extension as Wellington requires an airport that can land planes from long-haul flights. Believes this is vital for tourism and will result in increased overseas companies coming to Wellington.
33	Dunajtshik, Mark	Support	Yes	Supports the extension and believes it will benefit the Wellington region. Believes that if it is built then people will use it.
34	Burns, Dennis	Support	Yes	Supports the application and believes the long-term benefits will be immense. Travels a lot and does not like having to hub through Auckland, Christchurch or Sydney.
35	McCallum, Annabel	Support	No	Supports the extension and believes it is crucial to Wellington's economic prosperity. Believes those opposed have other agendas.
36	Macdonald, Peter J	Support	No	Supports the application and believes it is critical to Wellington's development. Believes criticism of the application is for selfish or business reasons and it is inappropriate to consider it.
37	ANDIS, STANLEY	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned about construction noise impacts on residents, lack of consultation, and non-compliance with WCC District Plan noise standards and precedents set by past large projects in the area. Believes that key noise impacts have not been considered or satisfactory mitigation measure proposed, particularly noise from water-based transport, amphitheatre effects, effects on Kekerenga Street residents, and night-time noise impacts. Strongly objects to applicant's proposal to undertake work at night. Recommends changes to the proposed Construction Community Liaison Group. Also concerned that the extension has not been fully costed.
38	Cycling Action Network	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because of traffic effects from construction causing congestion, pollution, noise, amenity loss and road safety issues and post-construction effects on local roads from additional passengers and freight. Believes project costs will be passed on to airport customers and increase travel costs. Wishes to know how carbon pricing resulting from climate-change agreements will affect demand for long-haul flights.
39	Ibis Wellington	Support	No	Supports the extension as a hotel operator in Wellington CBD. Believes it will increase tourism and business travellers and will complement the proposed conference facility.
40	Mountier, Frances	Oppose	Yes	Oppose the application primarily for climate-change reasons but also because of economic costs, construction noise and congestion effects, and damage to the Lyall Bay surf break and impacts on the nearby marine reserve. Believes we should be decreasing reliance on air travel and that sea level rise and storm surges will threaten the extension.
41	Destination Wairarapa	Support	Yes	Supports the extension as it will help grow tourism numbers to both Wellington and the Wairarapa, which will positively influence tourism investment. Tourism NZ is particularly encouraging Chinese visitors to visit this region and this project will support that.
42	Varga, Gloria Lauraine	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Does not think flying to Wellington via another airport is an issue for tourists. Concerned about congestion on already overloaded traffic routes during construction. Believes there is no certainty new airlines would use the extended runway. Does not think the people of Wellington share WCC's objective to turn Wellington into a new Sydney or Copenhagen.
43	Heffernan, Marie Helen	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of adverse effects on noise, traffic, surf, and carbon emissions. Notes damage to the environment, specifically effects of contaminated infill on marine life and recreational activities. Believes climate-change impacts such as sea level rise and storm surges have not been properly considered. Considers the applicant's Cost Benefit Analysis unsound and questions economic viability of the project. Concerned that a longer runway end safety area is required.
44	Moore, Stephen	Support	No	Supports the extension as it will improve safety. Concerned that public opposition by airlines is motivated by an anti-competitive strategy. Not concerned about environmental impacts on the coast because it has already been subject to a lot of change. Wants the fill to be barged to the site rather than delivered by road. Will be potentially impacted by road noise on Ruahine St.
45	Shand, Adam	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Concerned about costs, environmental effects, recreational effects on Lyall Bay, and effect that landing larger planes will have on the residents of the eastern suburbs. Concerned that airline representatives are not in favour and that pilots are challenging the extension. Would rather see the money spent on alternative projects such as public transport.
46	Young, Elliott	Oppose	No	Opposes the application primarily because of concerns about the impact of reclamation on marine ecology and concerns about climate-change implications. Earthworks during construction will release large amounts of CO2 as will increasing aircraft miles. Concerned about impact of sea level rise on the extension. Secondarily concerned about economics. Objects to rates being used for this venture and believes the cost benefit analysis does not stack up.
47	McConnell, Kylie	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as does not want to encourage more migrants and tourists and exacerbate existing housing shortages and heavy traffic issues. Concerned about impact on surf beach. Does not wish to encourage more use of fossil fuels. Concerned about the cost to ratepayers.
48	Lefale, Penehuro	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Unhappy with consultation to date and previous interactions with the airport regarding residents' noise concerns and the closed access through the airport road adversely affecting Bridge Street.  [Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
49	Cresswell, Kyla	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of costs and adverse effects on marine ecology, surf effects, and traffic and noise impacts. Does not trust the airport to carry out proposal as stated. Believes increased visitors will make existing Cobham drive and Mt Victoria tunnel traffic worse. Concerned about effects on Taputeranga Marine Reserve and little blue penguin and reef heron habitat, particularly from contaminated fill from CentrePort dredging. Believes applicant has not taken into account climate-change effects of sea level rise. Concerned about the length of the runway end safety area and is not convinced of the project's economic viability.
50	Apperley, Ian	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. [Guardians of the Bays text]. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology; and lack of consideration of climate-change impacts including sea level rise and storm surge. Considers alternative sites have not been adequately investigated.
51	Slater, George Brent	Support	Yes	Supports the extension as someone with a long history of working with commercial property and considers it crucial for Wellington's future prosperity together with a second tunnel through Mt Victoria and improved road links.
52	Slater Ryan, Shirley Anne	Support	No	Supports the extension as it is a positive step towards making Wellington more than a little town outside of Auckland.
53	Maloney, Andrew	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to adverse effects on the surf break, effects on marine ecology from sediment, and greenhouse gas emissions contributing to climate-change. Does not believe the economic cost/benefit ratio adds up and is concerned the cost will be passed on to ratepayers.
54	Enright, Patricia	Support	No	Supports the extension as it will be a major improvement to our airport. Inconvenience during construction happens with all projects and is not a reason not to proceed.

55	Seager, Tony	Support	No	Supports the extension as it is part of developing Wellington. NZ needs to expand infrastructure and diversify its population beyond Auckland, and the extension will help show incoming travellers that NZ consists of more than one main city.
56	Finny, Charles	Support	Yes	Supports the extension as longer haul flights will have economic benefits for Wellington such as more tourism and increased numbers of international students. Believes that flying passengers direct to Asia or the US will be more carbon efficient than via a hub. Lives in Seatoun and sees no adverse environmental impacts from this project even during construction.
57	Browne, Richard	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because we should not be encouraging fossil fuel usage, which is contributing to climate-change. Believes we should be finding other, sustainable transport solutions for Wellington.
58	Bryne, Jane	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because it is an ill-conceived plan.
59	Dey, Christopher	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of economic costs. Believes it will increase rates and wants to know why WCC is fully funding a project despite only being a one-third owner in the airport. Believes WCC funds could be better spent elsewhere such as on homeless people.
60	Dunlop, Dido	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because of concerns that more flights will increase carbon emissions and contribute to climate-change.
61	Audebert, Vincent	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of effects on surfing and recreation. Concerned it will increase pollution run-off into the sea, particularly during storm surge and the construction phase. Worried it will restrict more airspace and prevent use of a paraglider around Wellington. Concerned about the possibility of more noise and air pollution from bigger planes. Believes a longer runway would mean more people and would lessen the naturalness of the city. Believes tourists come here for the naturalness of NZ and that it should not be ruined by building more artificial structures and polluting the environment.
62	Rose, Nathan	Support	No	Supports the extension as the lower North Island desperately needs this infrastructure.
63	Young, Jennifer	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of the economic costs to ratepayers and the encroachment into the marine area. Does not believe NZ needs another international airport. Concerned about effects on plant and sea ecology, surf, and traffic. Believes climate-change and sea level rise need serious consideration as storm surge already causes problems close to the existing south tunnel.
64	Tully, Jack	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Believes extra international travel is not needed for Wellington to prosper and that it makes sense for Auckland to be the entry point into NZ as tourists can then complete a figure 8 tour of the country. Concerned that increasing tourist numbers direct to Wellington will detract from our natural environment, increase traffic congestion, and put pressure on real estate. Believes there are better ways to spend rate payers' money. Concerned about effects on surfing and the surf culture of Lyall Bay. Concerned that investors will push people out of their homes in the Eastern suburbs. Concerned about ecological effects, particularly on the habitat of blue penguin.
65	Downes, Rebecca	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
66	Stuart, Jeanne	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of costs concerns. Believes costs of travel will increase for all passengers as a result of the extension.
67	Pomare, Ema	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because the economic costs outweigh the benefits to Wellington taxpayers. Believes there is insufficient demand and that putting a roof on the stadium would get more people coming to Wellington than the runway extension.
68	Cami, Charlotte	Oppose	Not Specified	Opposes because Lyall Bay has a unique surf culture.
69	Pelabon, Florian-Emmanuel	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of effects on surf at Lyall Bay. Believes if the proposal goes ahead they will need to create an artificial reef to compensate for the loss of the current beach environment.
70	Te Whaaro, Jenny	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
71	Gibson, Lucy	Oppose	No	Opposes the application and doesn't think Wellington will benefit much from an extended runway. Concerned about increased traffic congestion both during and post construction. Concerned about effect on surfing and recreation in Lyall Bay. Believes the money could be better spent elsewhere.
72	Pierini, Rocco	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application and believes the economic cost should not fall on taxpayers. Concerned about negative impacts of increased tourism and that the tag "coolest little capital" would quickly be forgotten. Believes the money should be put towards an alternative airport site out of town if a bigger airport is needed. Concerned about noise during construction and from more planes landing making nearby suburbs unliveable.
73	Brown, Steven	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because of concerns about economic cost and viability. Recently Council built a 100m sea wall near their house that required only small scale works but cost \$750,000, and so they do not believe \$350 million will fully cover the cost of the extension. Concerned the cost will mean less money for councils to invest in local projects. Also has doubts about environmental impacts, economic benefits, and traffic disruption during construction.
74	Johnson, Keith	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application on economic, financial, equity and environmental grounds. Has a background in economics and planning and has published a number of articles on the runway extension and would like these to be considered as part of their submission. Critical of economic business case and concerned that detailed costings have not been prepared. Concerned about project viability, particularly the runway end safety area. Considers it unacceptable for WCC to contribute \$90 million to the project and wants a full assessment of the equity impacts of the project.  Concerned about construction effects, particularly traffic and noise. Believes that the recreational report lacks robust assessment as only 13% of participants were residents of Lyall Bay or nearby suburbs. Concerned about use of contaminated fill. Considers WIAL have failed to consider climate-change impacts of sea level rise and storm surge. Also notes effects on regionally significant surf break and impacts of contaminated infill on marine ecology.  Considers a comprehensive, integrated multi-criteria assessment is required.
75	Wilkinson, Richard Charles	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because of costs to ratepayers, increased noise, ecological effects, and because the deal does not make commercial sense long term.
76	Barber, James	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because it does not stack up economically, socially or environmentally. Has doubts that council will listen genuinely to opposing submissions. Wellington airport already increases traffic congestion around the Miramar Peninsula. Does not want rates to increase or for the runway extension to come at the cost of maintaining important infrastructure or improving services such as public transport, parks, and recreational facilities. Concerned about traffic and noise effects during construction, disruption to surfing and associated effect on local beachfront businesses, and ecological effects on reef heron at Moa Point. Considers it wrong that climate-change is not considered under the RMA.
77	Hobbs, Kelly	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of adverse effects on surfing in Lyall Bay, traffic congestion caused by construction and increased airport usage, and lack of need for a longer runway. Lives close to

				airport and the noise of larger planes landing and taking off would impact their quality of life.
78	Winder, Blake	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because it will cause long-term stress to the local area without any real benefits.
79	Snelling, Geo	Oppose	No	Opposes because of increased noise from larger planes and cost to ratepayers. Believes the money is badly needed elsewhere in our communities.
80	Barraud, Ned	Oppose	No	[No submission details]
81	Thompson, Melanie	Oppose	No	[No submission details]
82	Bolger, Chris	Oppose	No	[No submission details]
83	O'Connor, Teresa	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
84	Meyer, Philip	Oppose	No	Opposes because they are concerned the extension will increase traffic congestion and rates and that larger planes will increase levels of noise pollution.
85	Reid, Ezmae	Oppose	No	Opposes as does not believe the extension will benefit the area and thinks the costs outweighs the need for it. Also worried about increased pollution.
86	Berson, Alex	Oppose	Yes	[No submission details]
87	Vanoost, William	Oppose	No	Opposes as a resident of Miramar Peninsula and someone who frequently uses Wellington airport. Will be affected by construction traffic, noise and pollution. Concerned the runway and its corresponding traffic will have adverse visual effects on the residents living on the hills around the site that will decrease property values. Doubts the extension will increase tourism and revenue as Air NZ claims it will not land larger jets here. Does not think Wellington has the capacity to handle a new surge of tourists.
88	Nowotny, Alexander	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Fears costs will lead to increased rates and travel costs. Concerned about ecological and surf impacts on Lyall Bay. Thinks it is ridiculous to invest more money in an airport that sits in a potential earthquake and tsunami zone. Concerned that no airlines have confirmed they will actually offer long haul flights. Does not believe it will make Wellington more attractive to overseas students.
89	Wigmore, Timothy	Oppose	No	Opposes because of concerns about how it will affect the 'corner' surf break. Wants more information on proposed 'wave focuser' and assurances that the surf break will not be adversely affected.
90	Bailey, Emily	Oppose	Yes	Opposes on grounds that it will adversely affect the natural environment, wildlife, recreational users and nearby residents. Believes it is irresponsible to increase air traffic because of climate-change effects.
91	Thapa, Jo	Oppose	No	Opposes as a larger runway won't benefit Wellington as a whole. Believes the location is too small and that Paraparaumu would be a better site for an international airport with a fast train.
92	Smith, Chris	Oppose	No	Opposes because of concerns about traffic increases, particularly as there is already a major bottleneck at the basin reserve, and objects to ratepayers sponsoring a commercial entity.
93	Thomas, Murray	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. [Same text as submission #50 regarding economic cost to ratepayers and length of the runway end safety area].
94	Garside, Alexander	Oppose	No	Opposes since it does not seem a wise investment in an age of dwindling fossil fuel resources and ambitions to lower emissions. Believes it makes more financial and environmental sense to use Auckland as a hub.
95	Newson, John Harvey	Oppose	No	Opposes because construction noise 24 hours a day for 3-4 years will have a totally unacceptable effect on residents. Feels nothing has been done to alleviate this noise and that the airport has not consulted with the public on the issue.
96	O'Shaughnessy, Bernard	Conditional	Yes	Supports the notion to extend the airport but believes the present business case is lacking hard evidence. Wants more consultation and thinks the Government, private enterprise, Air NZ and other transport companies should fund the proposal rather than ratepayers. Concerned that the effects of climate-change are not addressed and that the pilots association are not in support of the proposal.
97	Williams, Alicia	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned that increased congestion will make the city unpleasant and decrease safety. Believes it is unsound to build an airport extension on reclaimed land, especially considering climate change effects. Does not think there is adequate roading infrastructure to support the traffic. Believes travel costs will increase and domestic flights will become less frequent.  Works as a relocation manager and assists hundreds of families to settle in Wellington each year. Does not think larger flights are needed as travellers to NZ are not bothered by an extra domestic flight.
98	Torres, Jesus Ruiz	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Concerned about effects on recreational diving and fishing activities at Moa Point and on marine ecology. Concerned that airline pilots have publically stated safety concerns about landing larger planes. Concerned that the cost is just under \$1 million for every metre of extension.
99	Deshprabhu, Rahul	Oppose	No	Opposes because Wellington as a city is not ready for the airport.
100	Walbran, Neil David	Oppose	No	Opposes as believes economic benefits have been overstated. Critiques Section 2.3 the technical report for relying on high levels of growth in air travel that appear inconsistent with other independent reports on expected jet fuel usage growth in NZ. Refers to figure from Business NZ's NZ Energy Scenarios that suggests a growth rate of only 1% p.a. compared to the airport's estimate of 7% p.a.
101	Young, Eve	Oppose	No	Opposes as believes it will have a negative impact on Wellington socially, economically and environmentally. Does not think it is a good use of council money. Believes tourists will visit Wellington because they want to visit not because they can fly direct.  [Same text as submission #50]. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology; and lack of consideration of climate change impacts including sea level rise and storm surge. Considers alternative sites have not been adequately investigated.
102	Ashe, Robert	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension because it puts Wellington's most important surf break at risk; the economics don't stack up and they do not support taking large financial risks with public money; and there is no quality public transport infrastructure to support the expansion.
103	Oliver, George	Oppose	No	Opposes because they do not want ratepayers to have to foot the bill. Concerned the extension will mean less money for councils to re-invest in local projects. Believes costs of travel will increase for all passengers as a result of the extension.
104	Darling, Byron	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because of potential impacts on surf. Has surfed their whole life at Lyall Bay and greatly values this activity. Does not think the infrastructure and roads could cope with the years of disruption during construction. Concerned about overloading roads from Eastern suburbs if supplies need to be brought in after an earthquake. Considers that airport could be wiped out in a big enough earthquake/tsunami. Believes the extension should not be funded by local taxpayers as they

				will be disrupted by the work and noise of larger jets. Also wants pilots' safety concerns to be heard.
105	Hoare, Maree Joy	Oppose	No	<p>Opposes the application and is appalled that council would consider a project that would cause long-term and in some cases permanent disadvantage to so many residents.</p> <p>[Same text as submission #50]. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology; and lack of consideration of climate change impacts including sea level rise and storm surge. Considers alternative sites have not been adequately investigated.</p>
106	van Daatselaar, Susan	Oppose	Yes	<p>Opposes the application. Concerned there is insufficient evidence the proposal will lead to the promised economic growth and that WCC has not undertaken an independent business case, given the potential cost to ratepayers. Not confident that costs will be \$350 million as stated and considers it likely that airport users will be charged additional fees. Concerned also that international airlines do not support the runway extension and that they have raised safety concerns.</p> <p>Refers to the Ernst and Young report that notes the value to business customers is the productivity savings from reduced travel times, but considers this a weak argument given it is only an hour flight from Auckland and Christchurch to Wellington and given that airfreight will not increase. Believes alternatives to this proposal should be considered as the best option for supporting business growth and notes the airport's investigation of alternative sites is from 1992, before many roading developments.</p> <p>Opposes because of potential impacts on marine ecology from fill, particularly the nearby Taputeranga marine reserve.</p> <p>Considers the social impacts significant, particularly effects on the Lyall Bay surf break, increased noise pollution for residents and recreation users, and negative visual impact.</p>
107	Gannaway, Noeline	Oppose	Yes	Opposes because it is not favoured by Air NZ; it will increase air traffic and greenhouse gas emissions, promoting climate-change; and road congestion is likely during its 4 years of construction.
108	Mallon, John	Support	No	Supports the extension because it is vital to Wellington's future economic growth and tourism, will provide a direct gateway to the rapidly developing Asian markets, and will benefit all New Zealanders.
109	Norris, Greg	Support	No	Supports the extension in the interests of economic development opportunities.
110	Darlow, Richard	Oppose	No	<p>Opposes the extension because it will not be used by sufficient extra traffic to make it economically viable. Refers to 1970s Central Laboratories tests that showed no sustainable engineering works would stand up to sea action in this area. Notes this model correctly predicted failure of the current ackmon armouring. Concerned climate-change impacts of sea level rise will compound the difficulties.</p> <p>Believes cost estimates are inadequate and project costs will blow out.</p>
111	Mills, Jessica	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Concerned the extension will endanger recreation and amenity values of the Wellington coastline that bring people to the area. Does not think international airlines will restructure their routes to use Wellington and thinks the extension will be under-utilised, especially as it will still be deemed too short and dangerous for larger international planes. Concerned ratepayers will pay the economic costs and would rather have pristine marine ecosystems, surf spots, and beaches.
112	Wartenberg, Bastian	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because it will affect Wellington more negatively than positively. Concerned about increased environmental and noise pollution, the traffic situation, and effects on Lyall Bay's unique charm. Does not see why the extension is necessary.
113	Hawcroft, Francis	Oppose	No	<p>Opposes the application because the extension will be vulnerable to the effects of climate-change, its construction is contrary to the goal of reducing New Zealand's emissions, and it is not part of a proper integrated transport development plan for Wellington.</p> <p>Questions whether the effects of different sea level rise projections and increased extreme weather events have been properly factored in to the cost/benefit analysis.</p> <p>Thinks this project sends a message to the world that NZ is not serious about climate-change or trying to build a greener economy and wants to see investment instead in e.g. teleconferencing facilities, faster international internet connections, and research into low-emission forms of transport.</p> <p>Believes there are much higher priority transport problems facing Wellington and that council investment in these other areas would provide a far better return.</p>
114	Bowler, William James	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because the economic cost should not be paid by ratepayers since the airport is majority owned by Infratil and because the proposal is financially flawed. Thinks infrastructure to and around the airport is inadequate for current numbers and would be a disaster for assumed increased numbers of passengers and traffic in and out of Wellington.
115	Holben, Victoria	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because of concerns about the environmental impact on Wellington's water quality and local wildlife. Also concerned about the potential for erosion and the dangerous weather conditions for landing planes.
116	King, James	Oppose	Yes	<p>Opposes the extension because the economic business case requires ratepayers to take much of the initial risk of funding. Believes business case should be opened up to independent scrutiny that satisfies the Treasury Better Business Case criteria.</p> <p>Concerned that 'The Corner' surf break will be lost and that the DHI report does not take into account the significant loss of amenity value.</p> <p>Concerned that the negative response from air safety experts to the runway extension indicates a fundamental design flaw.</p>
117	Chamberman, Mark	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because does not believe there is enough demand for long haul flights from Wellington. Flies regularly to Europe and has no issue flying via Australia or Auckland. Lives under flight path and does not want noise levels to increase. Does not want to pay for the extension and thinks the airport should pay the entire cost themselves.
118	Brook, Marianna	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension. Concerned that airlines and pilots organisations do not see benefits from it but the costs are many. Concerned about cost to Wellington citizens, impact on wildlife and coast, and disruption caused by construction.
119	Moffat, Winifred Annette	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Believes the extension will damage our image as the 'coolest little capital' as where else can you see surfers close up as you take off and land? Concerned about marine ecology impacts on penguins. Thinks council should be putting money elsewhere such as housing. Thinks airline pilot's safety concerns are being treated lightly by extension proponents.

120	Peterson, Stephen	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension because of the economic impact on Wellington. Concerned about (1) BARNZ's submission asserts that the traffic forecasts are overstated by a factor of 5; (2) traffic projections don't take into account risks associated with uncertain fuel and carbon prices over the next 20 to 50 years; (3) WIAL does not bear the risk of project failure; (4) minimal business benefit. Wife frequently travels and would not use a direct flight out of Wellington if it was more expensive than one via Auckland; (5) adverse recreation impact on swimming, surf, and ability to safely cycle around the bays over the next 10 years.
121	Redican, Paul	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as does not believe ratepayers should be funding Infratil's extension. Believes the airport has wildly overstated the economic costs/benefits. Concerned about environmental impact and sustained noise and traffic issues during construction. Thinks WCC signing a memorandum of understanding with a Chinese construction company prior to any public consultation on this project is arrogant, anti-democratic and a waste of ratepayer's money.
122	Swann, Pauline & Athol	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application until a valid business case with detail proving economic justification is provided. Wants assurance Wellington ratepayers' rate bills will not rise to pay for any shortfall, a firm commitment from airlines that they will fly a regular long-haul route to the city before the extension is built, and for WIAL to provide the 240m runway end safety area.  Concerned about duration of noise from construction, particularly the night haulage times.  Concerned the extension will adversely affect surf at Lyall Bay and marine ecology at Taputeranga Marine Reserve and Moa Point.
123	Airways Corporation of NZ Ltd	Neutral	No	Neutral towards the application and submits to ensure issues relevant to Airways operations are acknowledged. Extension will impact on the design of the future Instrument Landing System (ILS) localiser array and the southern ILS array will need to be moved. Identifies the potential impacts on functionality of the array: if it is moved closer to the water, it will require higher maintenance costs; if it is moved further back, it may require a wider array to lessen effects on the signal; and current distance between localiser antenna array and jet blast deflectors needs to be maintained and re-evaluated with larger jets.
124	Young, Vanessa	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application on the following grounds: (1) Has lived in Breaker Bay for 36 years and cares deeply about the area; (2) Disruption to marine and land ecology through fill and damage to the seafloor from such a large reclamation. Particularly concerned about little blue penguins nesting on Moa Point and on Taputeranga Marine reserve; (3) Lives at the south end of Breaker Bay and construction traffic is likely to severely disrupt their bike to school journey. Bikes down the Leonie Gill cycleway, crossing Onepu Rd, which trucks are proposed to be crossing at a rate of up to 30 an hour, and is very concerned about the impact of trucks on children biking on this cycleway ;(4) Concerned that climate-change effects and sea level rise have not been taken into account; (5) Understands barges and other sea-based equipment will have to be moved into Wellington harbour every time there is a southerly gale and is concerned that the applicant has not taken into account the number of southerlies and the effect of this on the construction phase; (6) Concerned that the construction phase will take longer than the four years scheduled; (7) Uses Lyall Bay for recreation such as boogie boarding and swimming and is concerned about potential adverse effects if surf waves become larger; (8) Does not accept airlines will send sufficient numbers of larger aircraft to justify the disruption, damage, and costs; (9) Does not want WCC to spend ratepayer money on the extension and believes there are better alternatives to spend money on.
125	Mathews, Glen	Support	No	Supports the application because Wellington needs to pump money into the economy to boost its trade and developments.
126	Smith, Scott	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as a surfer who grew up surfing at The Corner in Lyall Bay. Believes the extension must enhance The Corner for the hundreds of surfers who use it, not diminish it.
127	Day, Stephen	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because NZ does not need more long-haul international airports. Doubts it will result in extra flights coming to NZ and thinks it may only shift some flights from Christchurch or Auckland, of no net economic benefit to NZ. Does not want rates spent as a corporate subsidy.  Concerned about environmental impacts on the south coast. Thinks that with the growing reality of climate-change and peak oil, Wellington should be trying to adapt to a carbon neutral future rather than investing in a very expensive long-haul runway when NZ already has some.
128	Adamek, Sonja	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension as Wellington does not have the infrastructure or accommodation for more people arriving.
129	Kotsapas, Mario	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension because there is no need for another full international airport. Larger countries than NZ only have one major airport and most people in Auckland take longer to travel to the airport than a Wellingtonian needs to go to Auckland for a connection flight.
130	Marshall, Robert David	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Objects to ratepayers paying 80%, or any cost at all. Experiences regular traffic congestion getting on and off the peninsular already and believes the roads need to be upgraded as soon as possible.  Concerned about marine ecological damage and particularly implications for fishing recreation. Refers to previous reclamation of Cobham Drive and notes this used to be a breeding ground for cockles, flounders and fish including snapper. Notes that although the airport promised to return the area as much as possible to its original state, today the seaside area of Cobham Drive is a rat-infested scrapyard of old bricks and concrete rubble with few snapper. Concerned that the reclamation will bury a large area of paua and crayfish breeding grounds on the south coast. Has been free diving in the area for 60 years.
131	McCormick, Richard	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Thinks rates and taxes should not pay the principal part of the costs and that if Infratil is confident in the economic business case, Infratil should pay for it. Considers the case for the extension is founded on questionable assumptions such as that tourists will not prefer to simply arrive at one end of the country and travel to the other before leaving. Concerned that the extension is not viable.
132	Skeet, Neil	Support	No	Supports the extension because as the capital city, Wellington should have a connection to the world. Wonders how many tourist dollars are being injected into other region's economies that should be rightfully coming to Wellington and how many tourists wish to visit Wellington but cannot get a direct flight and the transfer costs are too high?
133	Hutt, Judy	Support	No	Supports the extension and believes it is essential for Wellington's economic future as overseas tourists would be encouraged to stay in Wellington and spend money here rather than in Auckland or Christchurch.
134	Victor Anderlini	Support	No	Supports the application. Has often wanted to fly directly to San Francisco to visit family and friends and believes the extension would provide both a valuable personal benefit and a boost to Wellington's economic future. Thinks it would allow more tourists to come to Wellington and stay longer.  As a marine scientist, has read NIWA's technical reports 18 and 20 and believes the studies were conducted in a robust, impartial and professional manner. Would like to see a long-term environmental monitoring programme initiated prior to construction and included in the operational plans of the airport.
135	Pinson, Jim	Support	No	Supports the proposal as a businessman and as a surfer. Has witnessed a shift to Auckland by organisations and is convinced that the need to 'two hop' flights to Auckland and then beyond has

				<p>been detrimental to Wellington.</p> <p>Has surfed The Corner in Lyall Bay regularly since 1994. Considers it a very crowded surf wave and thinks this crowding needs a solution in the form of additional structures in the bay. Makes observations on the nature of the current surf conditions in Lyall Bay. Considers the airport's commitment to build and maintain a wave focussing structure extremely positive and hopes that it will help Lyall Bay become a much more varied beach break.</p>
136	Beconcini, Mereana	Oppose	No	<p>Opposes the application as it will ruin the best beach in the city and is an expensive and unnecessary use of local government money.</p> <p>[In addition, same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]</p>
137	Sacks, Bryan	Oppose	No	<p>Opposes the application. Concerned that WIAL has been told that the airlines will not fly here in larger planes if they build the extension; that RESA says the current design is unsafe; and that the International Airlines Association has already proclaimed the landing fees too high for the airport size.</p> <p>Concerned that Infratil owns 2/3 of WIAL but wants public money to pay for 80% of the cost and that WIAL will raise landing fees and flying costs for everyone to pay for it.</p> <p>Owns a home near the airport and is concerned about construction noise. Fears the surf break will be destroyed and the clean water of Lyall Bay will be ruined by dredging.</p>
138	Wellington Chamber of Commerce	Support	Yes	<p>Supports the application. An average of 77% of Chamber members surveyed have demonstrated strong support for this project over a two year period. Comments on the significant economic impacts for businesses include improved access to overseas markets, increased incoming tourism, reduced freight times, and overall economic growth.</p> <p>The Chamber comments on three key economic benefits of increased long-haul air connectivity: (1) increased freight capacity, where exporters can freight through Changi Airport. Wellington Airport's catchment stretches from Gisborne to New Plymouth and creates approximately 30% of NZ's GDP, but less than 1% of NZ's air freight imports or exports come through Wellington airport; (2) Increased tourism opportunities; (3) More attractive option for international students. Anecdotal feedback is that more than 2 flights is a barrier for families in school selection.</p> <p>Considers that any environmental concerns have been satisfactorily mitigated through WIAL's efforts. Surveys of the Chamber's members show they are overwhelmingly not concerned with any environmental impacts given WIAL's mitigation measures. An overview of these survey numbers is included.</p>
139	Hill, Steve	Oppose	No	<p>Opposes the application due to concerns around effects on surf at Lyall Bay. Has surfed for more than 40 years and considers that Lyall Bay provides a significant amount of Wellington's surfable days to both local residents and visitors. Does not believe there is sufficient analysis to fully appreciate the negative effects. Wants a credible study to explore if the extension can enhance the existing surf opportunities.</p>
140	Porirua City Council	Support	Yes	<p>Supports the application. PCC has looked at noise and traffic effects and neither will impact Porirua City in any substantial way. Recognises positive economic effects for the Wellington region but finds it unclear from the cost benefit analysis how many of these would pertain to Porirua or if these regional or national net positive effects may mask negative local economic effects on Porirua. Wants more detailed information about the economic costs and benefits of the project to be made available.</p>
141	Kapica, Ilka	Oppose	No	<p>[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]</p>
142	West Plaza Hotel	Support	No	<p>Supports the application particularly because of the economic benefits of increased tourism opportunities for Wellington. West Plaza Hotel directly benefits from increased tourism and sees the runway extension as significantly contributing to the local economy. Considers WIAL has been proactive and diligent in mitigating environmental impacts, particularly those on the Moa Point residents, the surfers at Lyall Bay, and the potential disturbance of sea life.</p>
143	Goodwin, Trevor	Support	No	<p>Supports the extension as would much prefer to depart from Wellington for international travel. Is not a resident of Wellington but thinks that the economic impact of more people from the Central Districts choosing to depart from Wellington International Airport should not be underestimated. Particularly supports how the extension will increase tourism opportunities and make Wellington a more attractive option for international students. Thinks WIAL has been very diligent in the assessment of the environmental impact.</p>
144	Intern NZ	Support	Yes	<p>Supports the application. Intern NZ brings approximately 100 students per year from around the world who wish to undertake an internship in NZ as part of their academic course requirements.</p> <p>Particularly supports how the extension would: (1) increase tourism opportunities; (2) make Wellington a more attractive option for international students. Wellington is significantly behind the national trend of retaining international students, holding a 6% share; (3) increase Wellington Airport's freight capacity, which will increase the ability to export to key markets and shorten the time to access these markets.</p> <p>Satisfied that WIAL has mitigated any environmental impact concerns, particularly those on the Moa Point residents, the surfing community, and the potential disturbance of sea life.</p>
145	Arona, Lynda	Oppose	Yes	<p>[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]</p>
146	Hunter, Michelle	Oppose	Yes	<p>[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]</p>
147	Griffin, Lorraine	Oppose	Yes	<p>[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]</p>
148	Dovey, Sue	Oppose	Yes	<p>[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]</p>
149	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Yes	<p>Supports the application, particularly the economic benefits. Fulton Hogan has previously undertaken work for WIAL and the construction would potentially benefit them as well as many other construction businesses within Wellington. Considers the extension will stimulate economic growth through improvements in international connectivity and will provide a number of permanent employment opportunities for Wellington locals. Agrees with WIAL's technical assessments.</p>
150	Solomon, Jason	Oppose	Yes	<p>[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]</p>

151	Spector, Daniel	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because it is bad economic sense. Thinks there isn't evidence that it will return its costs and that it won't significantly improve life for the majority of residents. Refers to Sir Paul Callaghan's argument that increasing tourism is a net negative to our economy.
152	Kearns, Caitlin Neuwelt	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because it will be devastating to the natural environment and will hugely disrupt the lives of Wellingtonians. Does not think more air traffic justifies disrupting some of the cleanest waters around. Concerned that climate-change impacts may make the current runway unviable. Worked at the surf club in Lyall Bay and saw so many people enjoying that beach on a daily basis; considers any development that threatens recreation there unacceptable. Might reconsider if there were strong commitment from airlines that they would fly regular routes to the city.
153	Bellingham, Maia	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because of environmental impacts and concerns from pilots. Considers the cost to ratepayers very high if airlines will not commit to flying to Wellington.
154	Brandreth-Wills, Graham	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because it is founded on a number of assumptions with a questionable basis, such as that international tourists will prefer arriving in Wellington rather than arriving at one end of the country and travelling to the other before leaving. Remains unconvinced that the extension is the silver bullet.
155	FitzJohn, Trevor	Support	No	Supports the extension because it is a no-brainer investment in infrastructure and will open many investment opportunities in the region.
156	Pearce, Andrew	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to concerns about the cost to ratepayers; project viability; economic growth; traffic effects during construction; health impacts from noise, dust, vibration, the sewerage pipe and marine pollution; safety; surfing effects; recreation; marine life; and climate-change.
157	Oliver, Mary	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because it makes no economic sense. Concerned that costs will be passed on to ratepayers and thinks Wellington should focus on improving existing infrastructure. Concerned about adverse effects on Lyall Bay including marine ecology and recreation and about traffic congestion during construction.
158	Coakley, Jonathan Davis	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Has lived in Melrose for 14 years and is accustomed to the nearby airport. Finds it easy to travel internationally to and from Wellington via connections to Auckland and Christchurch. Does not agree with most of the \$350 million cost being paid through public rates and thinks these funds could be used for purposes with more benefit to the Wellington community.  Concerned about effects on recreation and water quality. Dives and fishes in the area of the proposed extension and does not want it destroyed. As a surfer, is disappointed that the models show fewer surfable days in Lyall Bay.  Does not think the airport's contribution to greenhouse gases and climate-change can be ignored. Considers it unacceptable to subsidise a private company when much of the costs of climate-change will be borne by taxpayers and ratepayers.  Sees insufficient evidence to support the claim of economic benefits such as increased tourism. Believes increasing the airport size will reduce Wellington's natural character and culture, which are the qualities people visit and live in Wellington for.
159	Bailey, Jo	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because it is unnecessary and can only be a bad thing from a carbon emission, conservation and liveability perspective.
160	Olsen, Andrew	Support	No	Supports the application for economic reasons because (1) Wellington can leverage its reputation as the 'coolest little capital in the world'; (2) Acting now could avoid cost increases caused by delays, such as in construction of Transmission Gully; (3) There are more carriers coming to NZ and more aircraft suitable for the extended runway and long-haul routes; (4) Wellington survives on a few international events each year that put pressure on marquee attractions like Te Papa.
161	POWERCO LIMITED	Neutral	Yes	Powerco is neutral towards the application but seeks to ensure that it does not affect its gas utilities network. Powerco's pipe system traverses the airport in two locations but it is unclear to what extent construction works will affect the gas pipeline or whether there is a need to relocate/realign existing assets. Generally supports the intent of the airport's proposed conditions regarding management plans and network utilities but suggests amendments to Draft Conditions 17-20 and 50-52.
162	Kremer, Klaus	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application and thinks there needs to be more independent research conducted for (a) economic benefit and (b) ecological impact. Points out that Berlin has 5 million citizens and thrived for 50 years with an airport the same size as Wellington's. Believes taxpayer money could be better spent on creating jobs and affordable housing.
163	Creative Capital Arts Trust	Support	Yes	Supports the application. CCAT delivers arts events, and to date has delivered the annual NZ Fringe Festival and CubaDupa festival. CCAT's events involve international artists and CCAT sees the Wellington culture scene increasingly being a reason for people to visit. Believes the extension will extend Wellington's connectivity and growth in the art and cultural sectors. States that studies show travellers are highly sensitive to convenience and cost; CCAT has found this in conversations with international artists who performed in the 2016 Fringe Festival.
164	Iseke, Geer	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Surfs and considers Lyall Bay the only significant surf beach in Wellington. Considers that there are other options for the airport to create a longer runway that will not affect the open coast environment, swell corridor, and surf breaks.  [Part of the same text as submission #50 concerning: surfing, recreation, marine ecology, use of contaminated fill, and consideration of alternatives.]
165	Guttke, Egon	Support	No	Supports the extension as it will make Wellington a more attractive tourist destination, benefit travellers from the lower North Island, and benefit local businesses as a result of being better connected to the rest of the world.
166	McAlister, Vivienne	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Believes we have ample access to global destinations through Auckland and Christchurch and does not believe it will be viable for airlines to fly in and out of Wellington. Believes Wellington should be prioritising investment and this should start with infrastructure and in particular the road around the Basin Reserve. Concerned that if the extension goes ahead the increased traffic will make the commute from the airport to the city worse.
167	Tolich, Terry	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to concerns about effects on surf and recreation. Notes historic and cultural significance of Lyall Bay, such as the visit by Duke Kahanamoku from Hawaii in 1915. Considers the application has failed to consider policies 3, 4, 5, 10, 13, 14, 15, 18, 22, and 23 of the NZCPS. Does not think the statutory context report acknowledges surf break policy P51 in the GWRC PNRP.  Considers WIAL have provided little detail on proposed promenade construction and modified Moa Point Rd seawall. Does not consider adverse effects on surf can be mitigated by providing other amenity values as surfing is not interchangeable with cycling, walking, or visiting cafes. Believes effects on the surf break should be avoided or remedied, not mitigated. Notes that the peer review of the DHI Surf Break Assessment report highlights that the effects on surfing waves have not yet been investigated adequately.  Concerned that WIAL are not prepared to protect The Corner and are seeking its deletion from the schedule of regionally significant surf breaks in GWRC's PNRP. Considers WIAL's consultation process a failure and the revised draft Surf Adaptive Mitigation Management Plan unacceptable. Questions how WIAL can submit a Preliminary Shoreline Impact Assessment for the Submerged

				Wave Focusing Structure (SWFS) when they have not yet provided a final SWFS design concept. Considers WIAL has not adequately caucused with the surfers' independent peer reviewer.  Objects to the use of fill from CentrePort's proposed dredging as it will have disastrous consequences for surf breaks of Eastbourne and Wellington.
168	Middleton, Anna	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because: (1) There is no guarantee rates won't increase to cover the cost and WCC will have less money for other local projects; (2) Truck traffic effects, particularly noise and effects on residents and visitors; (3) The surf community will take a huge hit; (4) Adverse effects on marine ecology, particularly little blue penguins; (5) 20 airline representatives do not support it; and (6) the cost of maintenance in the face of storm surge will be crippling.
169	McCarthy, Tanya	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because it isn't in Wellington's best interest.
170	Brenton, Scott	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because it will destroy the surf waves at The Corner that they have been surfing for 30 years, and notes that the costs exceed the benefits.
171	Upton, Yachal	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Concerned about economic cost to ratepayers and that airline representatives do not support the extension as viable. Notes airline pilots' safety concerns. Considers Wellington should invest in existing infrastructure instead. Questions the applicant's assumptions about tourist behaviour. Also concerned about 10-year disruption from construction and use of potentially contaminated fill.
172	Moore, Ash	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension as it will reduce the number of days and size of waves they can surf. The submitter surfs every day at Lyall Bay and hopes to represent NZ at the Tokyo Olympics in surfing.
173	Betteridge, Stephen	Oppose	Yes	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
174	Turrell, Robbie	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension because it will destroy the recreational water sport and surf culture of Lyall Bay. Also concerned about effects on conservation. Considers the construction disruption will destroy the local economy and inconvenience residents with little long-term benefit outweighed by increased congestion, pollution and aircraft noise.
175	Schott, Roy	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of potential effects on surf. Submitter is a surfer and therefore highlights that a large number of people and businesses rely on the Lyall Bay surfing spot for recreation and for their livelihood. Considers that irreparable damage has already been caused by putting the airport in and that the extension would be the final nail in the coffin. Considers the extension would have cultural effects by defying the treaty and kaitiakitanga.
176	Samuel Marsden Collegiate School	Support	No	Support the application and commend WIAL and WCC for their community consultation. Particularly support that the extension will make Wellington a more attractive option for international students. Satisfied that WIAL has mitigated environmental impacts, particularly on Moa Point residents, Lyall Bay surfers, and potential disturbance of sea life.
177	Corleison, Grant	Support	No	Supports the extension because Wellington needs to build for the future now if it is to protect and grow its economy. Thinks "build it and they will come" is a truism.
178	Edwards, Elaine	Oppose	No	Opposes the application on the basis of noise, disruption, damage to the environment, and cost and does not agree there is sufficient demand for direct international flights from Wellington. Lives opposite the airport on View Road and currently planes taking off and landing cause significant sleep disruption that would be increased if the planes were larger. Additional construction noise would adversely impact submitter's ability to work from home and enjoy their garden, directly opposite the construction work. The extension would also have significant visual effects and detract from the value of their home. Argues that the value of the South Coast's nature is of more value to Wellington than direct international flights.
179	Beconcini, Stefan	Oppose	Not Specified	Opposes the application due to concerns about contamination of the marine environment. Submitter lives in Lyall Bay and thinks it will ruin the residential area and destroy one of the most amazing surf and recreational beaches in the Wellington area.  [In addition, same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
180	Munro, Miranda	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of the economic costs to ratepayers; construction effects on recreation in Lyall Bay; effects of potentially contaminated fill; and increased traffic congestion and pollution. Notes international airlines' lack of commitment to use the new runway and airline pilots' safety concerns. Doesn't think council should consider this proposal in a time where climate-change is already causing problems with Lyall Bay losing sand to sea level rise.
181	Thompson, Peter	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension on the basis of the NZIER analysis suggesting there were shortcomings to the impact analysis supporting the project. That analysis suggests economic benefits will not cover the cost of investment, leaving ratepayers liable for the shortfall.
182	Weight, Matt	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension. Concerned that fill around Moa Point may have a negative impact on little blue penguin and other marine ecology. Concerned about negative impact on Lyall Bay surf and the local economy. Considers the two artificial reefs tried before in NZ at Mount Maunganui and Opunake complete failures. Believes the economic business plan is flawed and questions why ratepayers should subsidise a private company. Concerned about effects on southern and eastern suburbs during construction and about increased noise and air pollution.
183	Fierlinger, Philip	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Considers the benefits overstated and the costs underestimated. Considers environmental impact significant, particularly on surf. Does not think Wellington needs more noise, people, traffic, and pollution from bigger jets and is concerned it will increase the odds of a devastating crash. Thinks having a stopover in Auckland is no big deal.
184	Barrett, Mark	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of adverse impacts to the south coast environment and Lyall Bay surf. Thinks there is no proven economic business case that supports the opportunity cost and opposes ratepayers' money contributing to the development.
185	Craft, Ellie	Oppose	Yes	[Part of the same text as submission #50 concerning economic cost-benefit analysis and climate-change impacts.]
186	Hughes, Trevor	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension because the economic case does not add up. Does not think it makes sense in terms of climate-change effects such as sea level rise and concerned it will be vulnerable to earthquakes. Concerned about impacts on marine life, recreational users, and disruption caused by construction traffic.
187	Duggan, John Hugh	Support	No	Supports the application. Has used this area as a surfer, diver and Lyall Bay resident since the 1950s and believes the proposed changes will not adversely affect the area and will enhance its usability and positive development.
188	Lowe, Michael	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because: (1) Business case is not independent and robust; (2) No strategy to address how increased airport activity, which will have induced demand strain on existing transport network, will be resolved in an environmentally sustainable way; (3) Recreation report lacks robust assessment; (4) Investigation into alternative sites is now 24 years old; and (5) Extension does not guarantee an equal or better surf outcome for Lyall Bay.
189	Wilkinson, Ralph	Support	No	Supports the application because it will increase international access and the submitter does not support Air NZ's case to maintain their duopoly at Wellington airport. Submits that effects on the surf

				break are not proven and are addressed by the applicant.
190	Watson, Russell	Support	No	Supports the application because they believe Wellington will economically benefit from greater access to cities and markets. Has travelled to Auckland and Christchurch for years to access business markets and finds the extra travel and cost completely unjustifiable. Believes the expenditure is more warranted than on the cycleway project.
191	Guthrie, Robert	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. As a resident with views over the airport, the increase in noise and other aspects of the development will impact on their standard of living.
192	Mormede, Sophie	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension. Concerned about under-stated environmental costs versus overstated economic benefits and particularly costs to Moa Point and lack of mitigation measures proposed. Recommends the airport buy all the Moa Point houses and transforms them into Airport precinct. Considers applicant's reports biased and incomplete. Does not think climate-change impacts or resilience of the city and infrastructure has been taken into account. Concerned that no mitigation plan is available in the event of damage to the wastewater outflow utilities structure.  Submitter lists flaws in the ecological models used to consider impacts on the Moa Point cove and thinks effects are understated. Also considers economic report flawed and that project will probably be well over budget. Considers build effects understated with biased noise calculations. Concerned about safety of the runway length and that extension is at the lowest standards and costs.
193	Boyle, James	Support	No	Supports the application. Considers that wider community benefits should outweigh negative impacts on a small group of surfers or residents at Moa Point who purchased land there in full knowledge that there have been plans to extend the runway. Considers there are benefits to the university and business community including opening up the city to more students from Asian cities. Thinks Air NZ's stance against the proposal is self-interested to protect their domestic business transporting people to Auckland to fly internationally and that once it is built they will change their tune quickly.
194	Cleghorn, Sarah	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Lives in Lyall Bay and uses the beach for recreational purposes such as swimming, boogie boarding, and walking. Concerned about that effects on the beach are uncertain, the wave focussing device is untested and fill will affect water quality. The noise will affect the submitter badly and they fear if construction takes place at night the airport will take this as an indicator that planes can also. Traffic during construction will affect submitter's access to Lyall Bay. Concerned also that vibration will be substantial and light pollution around the South Coast will increase. Does not think the extension will be much use in the event of a tidal wave or severe earthquake and is concerned about the cost to ratepayers.
195	Wavish, Paul	Support	No	Supports the application because they believe it is important not only for Wellington but for NZ. Thinks that the government should encourage population growth to spread to parts of the country other than Auckland and that the airport extension is vital to encouraging growth in the lower part of the North Island.
196	Wilson, John	Support	Yes	Supports the application as the Wellington Region will benefit from direct international flights. Has worked in the container shipping industry and made similar decisions about 'ports of call'. Considers Air NZ and other airline's opposition to the proposal anti-competitive and that they should be excluded from the process on that basis. Believes big infrastructure decisions are sometimes about vision and leadership rather than economic business cases alone.
197	Richardson, Paul Keith	Support	Yes	Supports the application as it will be of huge benefit to Wellington and will have no detrimental effect on the environment. Considers that the lack of direct flights is the main reason stopping international students from choosing Wellington schools.
198	Smiler, Jane	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension because it will ruin the visual look of Lyall Bay and the surf; will disrupt residents during construction and afterwards with noise and traffic; and it is unnecessary given the fact that no airlines have shown support.
199	Ryan, Dennis	Support	Not Specified	Supports the extension because it is very necessary.
200	Ryan, Teresita	Support	Not Specified	Supports the application.
201	Plimmer, William Neil	Neutral	Not Specified	[Incomplete submission]
202	Barton, Sarah	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Lives in Lyall Bay in a house overlooking the beach and enjoys recreation in the area including surfing, kite-surfing, walking, and snorkelling. Concerned about pollution, increased sediment affecting marine ecology, traffic effects on air quality, and destruction of the surf break. Believes destructive effects on recreation will have a knock-on effect of making Wellington a less desirable as a place to live and will negatively impact economic growth. Worried about the potential costs and the personal financial impact of increased rates. Biggest concern is the opportunity cost and would prefer WCC to invest in improving public transport and other local infrastructure. Notes international airlines' lack of commitment to use the new runway and airline pilots' safety concerns. Concerned about truck noise and sleep disturbance. Considers sleep critical to their ability to not make mistakes in their role as a doctor. Daytime traffic will reduce recreation enjoyment and increase congestion.
203	Brown, Andrew	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because they do not support ratepayers funding the project; as a homeowner in Lyall Bay it will adversely affect their quality of life by reducing the number of surfable days; WIAL's submission opposing protection of The Corner in the proposed Natural Resources Plan shows they won't commit to the minimum of maintaining current surf conditions; and because commercial airlines don't support for the project.
204	Griffin, Victoria	Oppose	No	Opposes the application and believes the impacts from disruption during construction and long-term on recreation and marine ecology far outweigh the benefits of increased flights. Opposed to dumping of rubble into the marine environment and thinks there are more beneficial projects WCC could spend the money on.
205	Jamieson, Peter	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as it will not bring any more visitors to Wellington, will damage the local surf culture and beach, will be a disruption while being built, and will increase rates.
206	Pender, Bryce	Support	No	Supports the application as a longer runway allows a greater margin of error, will add Wellington as an emergency alternate airport for larger planes, and in an emergency should see a usable length remain available for short take-off and landing aircraft meaning quicker response. Considers it will add competition for airlines, improve freight capacity, and offers potential growth for the region.
207	Donaldson, David	Oppose	No	Opposes the application for economic reasons, particularly cost to rate payers and airport users, and environmental reasons, particularly surf impacts and lack of forward thinking regarding climate-change and sea level rise. As a surfer, considers The Corner has already suffered from work done on the carpark. Notes ongoing erosion problems at the carpark at The Corner.
208	Abbott, Caroline	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension. Already woken each morning by plane noise and is concerned increasing the number and size of planes will worsen the issue. Wants council to pay for double glazing on all houses within e.g. a 10km radius if it goes ahead. Enjoys Lyall Bay and is concerned about effects on the beach and marine ecology. Believes the extension is a waste of taxpayers' money and suggests it should be built on the outskirts of Wellington if more planes are needed.

209	Eaton, Lindsay	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Lives in Lyall Bay and is concerned about visual impact on views. Also raises concerns about the impact on marine ecology such as little blue penguins and reef heron; flawed recreation assessment including a survey they were unaware of; surf break effects highlighted by the Surfbreak Protection Society; construction effects including traffic and noise; climate-change impacts; economic viability; and costs.
210	Brickhill, Zandra	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Lives locally and enjoys watching surfers and taking beach walks. Concerned about negative environmental impacts and considers the money could be used for other projects that would benefit the city more. Believes an alternative site for a new airport would be more beneficial.  [In addition, same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
211	Shanks, Mark	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because of effects on the natural character of Lyall Bay, particularly adverse surf effects, and because there are better ways to grow Wellington's economy.
212	Williscroft, Hemi Webster	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Thinks the natural beauty of Moa Point and the south coast should be protected and is concerned about the impact on marine ecology such as blue penguins and reef heron. Considers it does not provide for future generations both because of its effects on recreation and because of the economic costs that will affect WCC's ability to undertake other projects in Wellington.
213	Hunt, Marie	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because of concerns about traffic, noise, effects on the marine environment, cost to Wellington ratepayers, and concerns about project viability.
214	Mormede, Rosemary	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application on the grounds of additional and unaccounted for costs for repairing road damage done by heavy truck use for a minimum of 3 to 4 years, prolonged disruption to ecology of South Coast, maintenance concerns about Moa Point wastewater pipeline utilities, and proximity of stockpile areas to Moa Point residents.
215	Moorsom, Richard	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Doesn't think the economic rationale stacks up or that WCC should subsidise it and considers it will cripple WCC's ability to promote local economic and environmental objectives for decades to come.
216	Nahkies, Anne Natasha	Oppose	No	Opposes the application primarily because of concerns around traffic flows as already the timing of trips to and from the airport are unpredictable. Unconvinced the economic benefits will balance the costs and thinks international passengers are well-used to hubbing.
217	Albert, Frederic	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Unconvinced by economic business case and concerned about disruption and noise during construction. Lives on the flight path and does not welcome more planes.
218	Gentejohann, Robert	Support	No	Supports the extension as travels overseas frequently and it would considerably reduce travel times to international destinations in Asia or Western Australia by 2-3 hours. Considers a longer runway will also provide an extra safety margin for local flights. Surfs in Lyall Bay and does not think the extension will have an impact.
219	Nicolson, Andrew	Support	Yes	Supports the application. Comments on economic business case and considers there is sufficient demand for international services from Wellington. Calculates potential fuel consumption / carbon emission reductions from direct flights. Notes that noise levels are predicted to comply with the Air Noise Boundary. Considers recreation effects minor or less and that the loss of surf amenity will affect only a very small group of expert surfers and highlights that WIAL has committed to mitigating surf impacts. Comments on marine ecology, traffic effects and economic benefits.
220	Rovers, Antonius Bernard	Neutral	Yes	Neutral towards the application. Lives on Ahuriri Street and is concerned about increased noise, particularly at night. Critical of noise report including background noise monitoring and receiver and measurement locations. Wants to see expected noise contours for different construction phases for residential areas near the airport and more information as to mitigation proposed at residences further from the construction site. Has found operational airport noise for the last 10 years OK mainly due to the night curfew, with some negative noise disturbance due to early 6am flights. Concerned about substantial noise increases during the curfew period. Requests conditions relating to noise if consent is granted.
221	Vollweiler, Shirley Flora	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Concerned about the rationale in the economic cost/benefit analysis and believes the benefits are over-optimistic, particularly because of the per hour values used and the assumption that 80% of international air travel passengers would fly direct from Wellington. Thinks NZ does not need another international hub and is concerned that the suggestion that ratepayers fund it means it's really a dubious investment.
222	Sidwell, Kenny-Jean	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension due to concerns about costs and project viability, traffic, and environmental damage. Does not trust WCC or Infratil and considers WIAL has never shown they are willing to be 'good neighbours'.
223	Buchanan, Lynette	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to concerns about the costs and economic benefits; environmental damage to Moa Point due to fill and negative impact to Lyall Bay surf; disruption from truck traffic during construction; and lack of support from airlines and pilots' safety concerns.
224	Winqvist, Erik	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. The extension will have a visual impact on the submitter's view from their house across Lyall Bay. Concerned about: economic business case; airline pilots' statements that the length is insufficient to land safely; construction effects including traffic and noise; and effects on surf, kaimoana and recreation.
225	Guo, Xiaolin	Support	Yes	Supports the application. Believes it will bring benefits to Wellington, more business opportunities, and more job positions.
226	Napier City Council	Support	No	Supports the application for the flow-on economic benefits that will come to the regions. Particularly supports how the extension would: (1) increase tourism opportunities; (2) increase Wellington Airport's freight capacity, which will increase the ability to export to key markets and shorten the time to access these markets. Satisfied that WIAL has mitigated any environmental impact concerns, particularly those on the Moa Point residents, the surfing community, and the potential disturbance of sea life.
227	Milkop, Andre Heldur	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Concerned about the economic business case and that Infratil are prepared to fund only about 10% of the cost. Would support if the extension was needed for safety reasons for shorter-haul international services. Thinks that the traffic situation at the Basin Reserve should be fixed first.
228	Bruggemans, Valerie Joan	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Lives at Moa Point close to the airport and is concerned about impact on their house value and on rates. Concerned about: noise and dust during construction; effect on marine life; enjoyment of recreation; and safety concerns for large planes landing in unpredictable weather.
229	Thomson, Donald Graham	Support	No	Supports the application. Thinks Wellington as the capital should have easy access to international air hubs and that the extension will increase safety for existing links. Welcomes the proposal as a frequent flyer.
230	Frank & Julia Quirke	Neutral	No	Considers that the extension should not proceed unless Infratil pay 67% of the estimated construction costs. Concerned that the level of sand on the beach will be subject to erosion as previous airport work has left large tracts of gravel and wants assurance that if this happens, sand will be brought in to repair the damage.

231	Douglas, William John	Support	No	Supports the extension and feels Wellington needs every commercial advantage it can get. Owns beachfront property in Lyall Bay. Thinks the airport surf reef will protect the beach dunes by defusing larger waves before they hit the shore. Thinks direct Asian flights may increase foreign student numbers. Considers that another 350 metres of airport will not change the look and feel of the place.
232	Bateson, Jennifer	Support	Yes	Supports the extension. Owns properties in Lyall Bay and believes the extension will increase property values through economic prosperity. Would personally value direct flights to long haul destinations. Positive about improved surf waves and visual effects from coastline landscaping.
233	Shelton, Martin	Support	Not Specified	Supports the extension as believes investment in the runway is important to the continued sustained development of Wellington and NZ.
234	Carr-Gomm, Matthew Philip	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned about the economic business case, particularly: (1) no agreements in place by any airline to fly additional routes; (2) air traffic movements have been steadily declining at Wellington airport since 1997; (3) the investment in the Rock terminal in 2010 did not increase daily international flights; (4) even with the extension, Wellington can't compete with Auckland and Christchurch airports. Concerned about environmental effects including: increased noise pollution; removal of the no-fly night curfew; safety concerns due to frequent high wind conditions; poor roading infrastructure and traffic congestion; and damage to marine ecology.
235	Smith, Amy	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension. Concerned it does not have financial backing from airlines and will cost ratepayers significantly. Considers Wellington's traffic infrastructure insufficient to support an increase in passengers arriving and the environmental/societal impact on local residents significant and unfair.
236	Hawke's Bay Tourism	Support	No	Supports the application. Thinks Wellington is a logical international gateway for the region and it would be a huge advantage for inbound visitors to come to Hawke's Bay via Wellington. Worked jointly with Air NZ in 2012/13 on a campaign using Wellington as a gateway for inbound Australian flights, which sold over 260 flights SYD/WLG/HB.
237	Layburn, Thomas Wilfrid	Support	No	Supports the extension as it is long overdue and the benefits outweigh the disadvantages.
238	Connor, Katherine	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Doubts the desired outcomes presented in the economic business case. Finds it damning evidence that Infratil is not prepared to invest significantly and considers it a case of corporate welfare at the expense of ratepayers. Believes WCC should step up to the role of guardianship for the marine reserve.
239	Child, Michelle	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to the effects on recreation and diving opportunities, as well as local marine ecology such as the little blue penguins and reef heron at Moa Point.
240	Wellington Phoenix FC	Support	Yes	Supports the application. The Wellington Phoenix is an international business with half of all games played in Australia and a strategic focus on developing international connections, including international students in the Wellington Phoenix Football Academy. Greater choice in connections will have economic benefits for them. The Phoenix is expanding its links into Asia and improved international links between Wellington and international cities will help them remain competitive.
241	Ellis, Jenny	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because the costs do not warrant it for such a small city. Concerned the Mt Vic Tunnel is inadequate for truck traffic without severe congestion, noise, and safety issues.
242	Currie, Kushla	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension as the cost seems too risky and the impact on the marine area is unacceptable.
243	Tuohy, Sabine	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension. Owns Pilates Synergy on Lyall Bay Parade 68-74 Kingsford Smith St and is concerned about traffic congestion and noise impacts on their business. Concerned also about night haulage noise impacts on residents. Considers the millions of dollars could be spent in better ways.  [In addition, part of the same text as submission #50 concerning: economic cost-benefit analysis; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
244	Bond, Jason	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to the environmental impact as well as traffic congestion and overall noise and disruption in the area.
245	Marlborough Chamber of Commerce	Support	No	Supports the application because of economic benefits to the region including areas serviced by short haul regional flights from Wellington airport such as Marlborough. Recent removal of Air NZ's direct flight links from Christchurch to Marlborough leaves only Auckland and Wellington airports as international feeders for tourism to Marlborough.
246	Meulendijks, Helga	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Lives in Miramar and frequently visits the south coast for recreation and is concerned about potential adverse effects on it. Notes international airlines' lack of commitment to use the new runway and questions economic business case.
247	Angell, Malcolm	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension as there is no viable economic business case and the construction will be massively disruptive and destroy local surf breaks.
248	Jarratt, Mason	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because it requires a massive economic public subsidy that will not be reflected in a commensurate ownership interest in the airport.
249	Millar, Stephanie	Oppose	No	Opposes to the extension due to concerns about: increased rates, more expensive flights, increased traffic, changes to Lyall Bay and its surf, toxic sediment fill, and noise and disruption on the peninsula.
250	Catley, Edward	Oppose	No	Opposes to the extension due to concerns about: increased rates, more expensive flights, increased traffic, changes to Lyall Bay and its surf, toxic sediment fill, and noise and disruption on the peninsula.
251	Morolli, Dora	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension due to concerns it will ruin the coastline, increase house prices, and cause disruption for at least 10 years. Lives near to the airport and is concerned about more air, noise and light pollution.
252	Leng Goh, Mui	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
253	Niklaus, Lukas	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as it does not make economic or ecological sense.  [Part of the same text as submission #50 concerning: economic cost-benefit analysis; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
254	Urbanova, Michaela	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned about environmental effects and disruption and does not consider the project beneficial.  [Part of the same text as submission #50 concerning: economic cost-benefit analysis; environmental effects including surfing, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
255	Mansueto, Jade	Support	No	Supports the application and thinks it's a good idea to plan for the future. Flies internationally each year and would appreciate a runway that can handle bigger jets.
256	De Roose, Frank	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned about economic cost to ratepayers and airport passengers; truck noise and the hazard they will pose when crossing local roads to get beach access or walk their dog; traffic congestion during construction and afterwards with increased air traffic.
257	Mackenzie, Tiana	Oppose	No	Opposes to the extension due to concerns about: increased rates, more expensive flights, increased traffic, changes to Lyall Bay and its surf, toxic sediment fill, and noise and disruption on the peninsula.

258	Douglas, Erica	Oppose	No	Opposes to the extension due to concerns about: increased rates, more expensive flights, increased traffic, changes to Lyall Bay and its surf, toxic sediment fill, and noise and disruption on the peninsula. Notes international airlines' lack of commitment to use the new runway.
259	Parsonage, Dianne	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned about ratepayers funding the project and ongoing costs, international airlines' lack of commitment to use the new runway and airline pilots' safety concerns. Considers the project a bad economic investment.  Dismayed at 10 year construction period and associated effects on local community, public safety and road infrastructure from traffic. Walks dog daily to Lyall Bay beach and considers the project construction will diminish their enjoyment and other recreation users'. Concerned that effects of climate-change have not been fully considered and does not want to take chances with the marine ecology of Lyall Bay. Concerned about the visual impact of the extension on views from their house.
260	Das, Barin	Support	No	Supports the application because it will: (1) increase tourism opportunities; (2) make Wellington a more attractive option for international students; (3) increase Wellington Airport's freight capacity. Satisfied that WIAL has mitigated any environmental impact concerns, particularly those on the Moa Point residents, the surfing community, and the potential disturbance of sea life.
261	Eilers, Denise	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to concerns about costs, pollution and noise and health and safety risks to the local community. Believes the region can be promoted more creatively via smaller link planes, boats and rail.
262	Julien, Kimberly	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Lives on the peninsula and is concerned about noise and toxic sediment in the water they swim and surf in. Think WCC needs to solve existing traffic congestion issues before expanding the airport.
263	Holmes, Mark	Oppose	No	[Part of same text as submission #50 concerning: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; and environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill.] Considers there has to be a better more appropriate site.
264	Antipas, Michael	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Lives in Strathmore, runs a business in Lyall Bay and fishes and dives on the south coast. Concerned about effect on marine ecology from contaminated fill; insufficient planning for increased traffic volumes; and cost to ratepayers.
265	Mikkelsen, Elisabeth	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Concerned about climate-change impacts and thinks WCC should discourage flying. Does not want continual noise from planes taking off and trucks during construction when visiting Lyall Bay.
266	Dawe, Claire	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned about: (1) overstated economic cost-benefit predictions; (2) noise and traffic congestion from trucks transporting fill; (3) project viability and lack of commitment from international airlines; and (4) economics of airlines having several bases in NZ.
267	Molloy, Harvey	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned about: (1) climate-change and greenhouse gas emissions; (2) proximity to the Taputeranga Marine Reserve and effects on marine ecology and recreation; (3) surf impacts; (4) overstated economic benefits; (5) alternative projects WCC money could be spent on.
268	Terry, Jon	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application due to concerns regarding: (1) traffic noise and congestion; (2) cost to ratepayers; (3) lack of support from airlines; (4) length of the runway safety area; (5) effects on marine life; (6) projected future fuel costs; (7) personally has no problem flying via other airports; (8) potential sea level rise.
269	Stevenson, Veronica	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension. Notes international airlines' lack of commitment to use the new runway and airline pilots' safety concerns. Believes 10 years of construction traffic using already congested roading infrastructure would damage Wellington's liveability.
270	Barrett, Bill	Support	No	Supports the application. Considers the economic benefits obvious and that there is a negative vocal minority.
271	Matthews, Sarah	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension due to concerns about it being funded by increased rates; traffic disruption; noise of night haulage; and risks to the surf break. Requests that more information of the details of proposed construction be provided to local suburbs in a mail drop and that the economic return be carefully considered in light of cost to residents and the environment.
272	Harford, Greg	Support	No	Supports the application and considers environmental impacts will be appropriately mitigated. Believes there are strong economic reasons to extend the runway.
273	McKirdy, Daniel	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension due to concerns about the economic viability and effects on marine ecology and recreation. Does not think alternative sites have been considered.
274	Wellington Underwater Club	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Primary concern is impacts on the diving recreation community and that the underwater environment is not damaged and remains safe for diving. General observation is that the economic business case is overly optimistic. Lists a number of concerns with environmental impacts and impact on recreation use including questioning what the effect of the final wastewater utilities outflow will be and what plans are in place to mitigate increased wave action adding to beach erosion. Concerned the Moa Point cove models need refinement and that it may become a dead space with stormwater flows going in. Concerned that there is a lack of information on the ecological impacts of temporary structures.
275	Simpson, Claudia	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Concerned about the visual, noise and recreation impacts on their grandparents' house on Moa Point, especially night noise. Works as a lifeguard on Lyall Beach and considers it would be detrimental to the squad's training. Thinks the extension does not comply with section 12 of the RMA.
276	Maxwell, Alexander	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Travels regularly and would personally benefit from easier long-distance flights but is unpersuaded by the economic business model. Considers it should be funded by private investors not WCC.
277	Boyes, Jonathan	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as a step too far. Considers the financial, social and ecological costs unjustifiable, particularly impacts on Lyall Bay users, increased traffic congestion and increased fossil fuels contributing to climate-change.
278	Leighton, Marion	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Raises concerns with economic business case, increased cost to ratepayers and airport passengers, and extension not being long enough to land larger planes safely, disruption during construction, and effects on the south coast. Also concerned that we have a responsibility to aim for zero emissions to address climate-change and that a new runway is far from doing our best.
279	Barber, Paul	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as the costs are too high, airline pilots have challenge the extension's safety, Wellington should be reducing climate-change emissions, and rising sea levels don't appear to be adequately taken into account.
280	Logan, Kathleen	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as the economic case does not stack up. Thinks investment should be in more lucrative city infrastructure.
281	Wellington Boardriders Club	Conditional	Yes	WBC's position is that if the extension is to proceed, any adverse effects on surf must be ameliorated. Includes background information on the significance of Lyall Bay to the surf community. Has worked with WIAL on proposed mitigation measures including the submerged wave focussing structure (SWFS). Considers the SWFS, if a success, would be a real asset to surfing in Lyall Bay but is concerned due to its experimental nature. Includes revised consent conditions and SMAMP agreed with WIAL and requests these amendments are adopted. If sufficient certainty is not provided that mitigation measures will be effective and enduring, then WBC would oppose the proposal.

282	Gibson, Liz	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension.[Part of the same text as submission #50 concerning environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]  In addition: concerned about the carbon footprint of the airport and would prefer to see ratepayers' funds spent on more sustainable community ventures.
283	Fraser, James	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Believes it was a mistake to locate the airport in Lyall Bay in the first place. Concerned about effects on surf, recreation, marine ecology, and traffic congestion. Thinks the economic case is unproven. Feels the region should look for alternative sites to build a new airport if there is a long-term case to be made for a longer runway.
284	Tweedie, Richard	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because (1) unsatisfactory economic case; (2) Wellington doesn't need an international airport; (3) construction impact with traffic and noise; (4) negative impact on marine life; (5) recreational activities jeopardised; (6) climate-change impacts not adequately taken into account; (7) funding by ratepayers is disproportionate considering Infratil own 66% of the airport.
285	Hewitt, Justin	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Lives near the airport. Opposed because of 1. Cost; 2. Public subsidy via rates; 3. Airline usage; 4. Construction effects, particularly traffic; 5. Alternative options - wants to see research done into alternative airport locations.
286	Nelson, Antony John	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension due to concerns about flawed economic business case. Comments on other NZ runway extensions and considers only Queenstown's has been successful, where it was completed at the request of airline operations to service the tourism industry. Notes that operational safety requirements imposed for the Qantas B747SP operations in the eighties will still apply, with consequent delays.
287	Fletcher Building Limited	Support	Yes	Supports the application. Fletcher Building employees use Wellington airport regularly for business purposes and it supports the extension to enable long haul flights, which will sustain and encourage economic development. Submits that economic development is linked with infrastructure investment and that improved connectivity is likely to raise productivity and/or demand in other sectors.
288	Moir, Patricia Mary	Support	No	Supports the extension as believes it will increase visitor numbers and have economic tourism benefits. Would personally love to leave from Wellington airport to overseas long haul destinations.
289	Densem, Paul	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of concerns about effects on Lyall Bay.
290	Keller, Richard	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Believes there needs to be less tourism in a carbon-constrained world and that air travel is a symbol of the desperation our culture experiences approaching the nature and extent of required fundamental change. Concerned the airport's analysis is shabby and should be examined in terms of the economic business case, traffic effects, health and safety, surfing, recreation, marine life, and climate-change.
291	McMillan, Amanda	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because we do not need it.
292	Day, Sarah	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application primarily because of effects on the marine environment, the recreation value of the bay and the quality of living for residents. Regularly surfs and cycles.  [Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
293	Holborow, Don	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Thinks night haulage noise from truck movements will render houses on Ellice Street uninhabitable. Basin Reserve has an amphitheatre effect, which was particularly apparent during the Mount Victoria Tunnel upgrade, where they had many nights of disturbed sleep. Concerned about day-time traffic noise and dust effects on Wellington College and Wellington East Girls College, especially if there is a roading project ongoing at the Basin at the same time and wants alternative transport methods such as barging should be looked at. Also considers there is scant economic justification for the project.
294	Dodge, Nadine	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension and thinks if there were a sound business case for it, it wouldn't need such a large amount of WCC funding. Considers that the availability of long haul flights disproportionately benefits the wealthy and creates equity issues since the population as a whole is expected to support something that the majority do not benefit from. Flies overseas multiple times a year and is happy with the status quo.
295	Johnston, George	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as the money could be put to better use addressing climate-change issues.
296	Duncan, Alyx	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension and believes it is not viable. Concerned about economic costs; visual impacts; effects of marine ecology and recreation at Moa Point; lack of support from airlines; and questionable assumptions about tourist behaviour.
297	Short, Evan	Support	No	Supports the application direct access to more countries will have economic benefits and add to local culture. Sympathise with those concerned about extra noise and traffic but believes we need to be realistic about the need for smart growth.
298	Poley, Gareth	Support	No	Supports the application because progress is good for NZ.
299	Rowlands, David	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Opposed to a private company receiving public funding; concerned about noise impacts from larger planes, effects on the Lyall Bay surf break, the visual impact, and pollution from fill. Notes that modelling date suggests oil costs will increase. Considers long-term economic viability dubious.
300	Cook, Vernessa	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned about: the impact of fill and toxic chemicals from machinery; visual impact; the impact of trucks on traffic congestion, road condition and noise; cost to ratepayers; upkeep costs from storm damage; lack of airline support; and pilots expressing concerns over the safety implications.
301	Wyeth, Fraser	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as does not believe the benefits will outweigh the economic and environmental costs.
302	Hexagon Safety & Infrastructure Limited	Support	Not Specified	Supports the application and will benefit from more competitive airfare pricing and less time consuming international travel. Particularly supports how the extension would: (1) increase tourism opportunities; (2) make Wellington a more attractive option for international students; (3) increase Wellington Airport's freight capacity. Satisfied that WIAL has mitigated any environmental impact concerns.
303	Laurenson, Richard and Susan	Oppose	Yes	Oppose the application. Submit that it does not meet the purpose of the RMA. Own property at 49 Moa Point Rd and will be directly affected by construction and use of the extension. Consider no conditions of consent will adequately avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on their property and neighbourhood. Consider economic grounds flawed.
304	Bonjers, Luke	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because in their view the drawbacks far exceed the future benefits.
305	MacKay, Donald James	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because of concerns about: (1) economic justification is flawed and public material issued by the airport is misleading at best; (2) significant disruptions to both nearby residents and throughout Wellington; (3) adverse effects on local ecology; (4) effects on recreation activities; (5) use of potentially contaminated fill; (6) sea level rise and surge impacts have not been properly taken into account; and (7) the applicant has not properly considered other alternatives.

306	O'Connell, Paul	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Considers the economic case spurious and a reckless use of ratepayer money given the uncertain benefits and high costs.
307	Rose, Nathan	Support	No	Supports the application because it is a vital improvement and the NIMBYs of the bay must not be allowed to stop progress.
308	Momentum Consulting Group	Support	Not Specified	Supports the application because of economic benefits and increased business connectivity. Considers greater international connectivity will allow business to enjoy better access to customers, suppliers, face to face meetings, international labour markets and foreign investors. Believes it will also benefit the tourism and education sectors.
309	Aubry, Matthieu	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Concerned about costs; that traffic is already terrible; and that noise and dust pollution for residents of Maupuia and Miramar will increase greatly.
310	Falkner, Uli	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
311	Stone, Prudence	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned about the economic business case and short-term gains in tourism growth that could be detrimental long-term to the environment and the city's capacity to handle growing demand. Wants to see robust due diligence from WCC before it invests and considers council should prioritise other expenditure. Notes international airlines' lack of commitment to use the new runway and airline pilots' safety concerns.
312	Basher, Michael and Eileen	Support	No	Supports the application because of economic benefits including: access to global markets; increased tourism; and more competitive airfares. Considers a viable case exists and believes the extension will attract new international airlines and open new routes. Values having an international airport in close proximity to the CBD.
313	Choveaux, Georgia	Oppose	Yes	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
314	Dixon, Stefanie	Neutral	No	Wants consent to be declined. Considers the increase in noise and traffic would make homes close to the airport unliveable. Opposed to effects on surf. Does not consider there is a need for it.
315	Young, Vanessa	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application and is concerned that although the decibel level of noise will not increase, the number and size of planes increasing will increase the proportion of the time that planes are heard. Wants to know if there will be a change in runway configuration and an increase in loudness from individual aircraft events.
316	Scott, Geraint	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Considers economic benefits are massively overstated. Does not think offsetting measures for impacts on the south coast cut it. Thinks that given climate-change, the proposal is a double whammy of stupidity, increasing emissions and giving the runway itself less chance of survival with sea level rise. Believes the hub system for airports is more efficient and Wellington airport should be kept at its current size.
317	McLaren, Rachel	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Thinks the applicant has failed to properly consider climate-change impacts of sea level rise and storm surges on the extension and the effect of the extension on the possible extent of sea level rise.
318	Bay Plaza Hotel	Support	No	Supports the application on economic grounds and as a business would benefit directly from increased tourism. Satisfied that WIAL has mitigated any environmental impact concerns.
319	Bonjers, Samantha	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Would rather the runway be built properly taking into account pilots' safety concerns. Thinks routes planned for construction traffic are inappropriate.
320	MACALISTER, JOHN	Support	No	Supports the application for economic reasons. Disinclined to travel overseas via Auckland or Christchurch. Thinks Wellington not being an international gateway is a disincentive for international students.
321	Gale, Josephine	Support	No	Supports the application as Wellington needs to cater for international flights and the upheavals experienced during construction will soon be forgotten when we start to reap the benefits of increased access to the rest of the world.
322	Kaos, Sylvie	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to concerns with the economic business case and environmental impacts. Concerned the real cost could be up to \$500 million and that ratepayers will pay most of this, leaving WCC less money to reinvest in other projects and services. Concerned there is no evidence that the surf mitigation artificial reef will work and that the 300m exclusion zone around the construction site will impact on recreation access.
323	Gale, Sadie	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension. Concerned about: (1) traffic; (2) economic cost and risk to ratepayers; (3) safety of bigger international flights in Wellington conditions; (4) reduction in number of surf days; (5) effects on marine ecology at Taputeranga Marine Reserve; and (6) increased boulders and damage to roads from larger storms with the effects of climate-change.
324	Nahm, Holger	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to a lack of comprehensive economic business case and danger to native bird ecology, particularly reef herons and little penguins at Moa Point. Notes that these bird populations are vulnerable to even benign, controlled human disturbance.
325	Woodford, Ronald Bruce	Support	No	Supports the extension and thinks it will be an asset to Wellington.
326	Bongers, Herwin	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application for reasons including traffic effects, cost to ratepayers, and minimal safety standards applied to the runway design.
327	Lipski, Karla	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Considers WCC should not be a consenting authority for the application as an economic shareholder in WIAL and because they have a responsibility to keep rates to a minimum. Does not think WIAL has learnt from the experiences of Rotorua and Invercargill airports. Considers that the expected rise in long-haul passengers could be catered for by fast rail between the main centres.  Concerned about effect on marine ecology and habitat loss and is unclear on what the blue/green shaded area in the Site A plan represents.  Concerned about the extended hours for construction activities, particularly the constant movement and idling of heavy vehicles. Considers that WCC need to place sensitive noise and ground vibration receivers on the Houghton Bay ridge, as this has an amphitheatre effect. Suggests noise mitigation measures: no heavy vehicle operations between midnight and 6am, double-glazing of residents' windows, and alternative transport methods. Notes that the Evans Bay fault line is considered to cause subsidence if it moves.
328	Underwood, Rachel	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Concerned about the economic business case and does not think ratepayers should bear a major part of the costs when there are other more pressing needs in the city. Notes international airlines' lack of commitment to use the new runway and airline pilots' safety concerns. Concerned about long-term effects from climate-change and rising sea levels. Other environmental concerns include effects on marine ecology, use of potentially contaminated fill, and construction traffic presenting a danger.
329	Driver, Barry and Mata	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Critical of economic case, particularly that Air NZ and Qantas Airlines do not support the proposal, that the demography of Wellington does not provide a sufficiently large population to assure success, that the current noise curfew regime may make it uneconomic, and that the region has insufficient commercial and industrial activity to generate the necessary support.

				Considers the extension not in the interests of nearby residents or the proposed residential area at Stanley Bay. Supports airline pilots' safety objections.
330	Graham, Peter John	Support	No	Supports the application as it will help Wellington to continue to develop.
331	Ryder, Brinsley Donald	Support	No	Supports the extension because they believe it will contribute to economic progress and enhance business and tourism opportunities.
332	Mila, Karlo	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because it is ugly, awful, damaging and intrusive to the environment.
333	May, Lloyd	Support	Not Specified	Supports the extension.
334	Searle, Brenton	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Enjoys water sports and is concerned the extension will damage the surf conditions and the marine reserve as well as increase noise. Believes we should stop reclaiming land as sea levels are also increasing.
335	Prockter, Vanessa	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
336	Black, Aaron	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
337	Webb-Pullman, Julie	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
338	Grocott, Robert Gerald	Oppose	No	Opposed to any public funding for the extension.
339	Harrison, Piers	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because of negative impacts on surf and recreation and noise from construction and bigger planes. Does not think the economic benefits outweigh the costs.
340	Miramar Business Improvement District	Support	No	Supports the application. Miramar Business Improvement District (The Bid) members are local businesses within Miramar. Survey of members shows clear support for the extension because of economic benefits including quicker transport options, reduced travel times for overseas labour, positive impact on local service businesses near the airport, increased foreign student numbers, and increased tourism.
341	Shock Limited	Support	No	Supports the application. Provides premises for leasing in the Miramar area close to the airport. Believes the extension will have economic benefits including cheaper and more convenient links to Asia and North America, increasing tourism, more international students, and more job opportunities.
342	James, Emma	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because there will be too much environmental impact.
343	Howard, Christina	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Concerned about the economic cost benefit analysis, lack of airline support, pilots' safety concerns, and the environmental impact.
344	Morrison, Matthew	Support	No	Supports the application.
345	Rusden, Damon	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #322 with concerns regarding economic business case and surf and recreation effects.]
346	Friends of Taputeranga Marine Reserve Trust Charitable Trust	Oppose	No	<p>Opposes the application. FoTMR highlights technical uncertainties around the project including lack of comprehensive surveys; unknown fill method and composition of sediment and site protection before the concrete accropodes are installed; surf effects and impact of the proposed Surf Wave Focussing Structure; and specific differences within and between technical reports, particularly in turbidity predictions.</p> <p>Considers the impact analysis superficial and biased in favour of the extension and has concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- construction effects on marine habitat and ecology, especially benthic sessile species</li> <li>- turbidity plumes and potential dispersal of suspended sediments beyond the reclamation construction zone</li> <li>- re-suspension of potentially toxic sediments during construction</li> <li>- effects of fine-sediment blankets and effect on re-colonisation of the Lyall Bay shoreline</li> <li>- underwater noise</li> <li>- increased spread of exotics</li> <li>- potential effects of sedimentation on kaimoana</li> <li>- source of cleanfill that avoids any contamination</li> </ul> <p>Considers that a comprehensive monitoring and adaptive management programme must be developed before approval of any construction. Support the proposal to design and construct the rockwall to enhance biodiversity. Would like to see more cultural involvement of tangata whenua.</p>
347	Wharakura, Daniel	Neutral	Not Specified	Blank pdf submitted
348	Ebanks, Lester Melvin	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of concerns about: cost to ratepayers; viability; economic growth; construction traffic; health impacts from dust and marine pollution; safety of the 90m RESA; surf effects; recreation; marine ecology; and lack of consideration of climate-change impacts.
349	Ebanks, Leonora Mary	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Lives in Lyall Bay with views of the airport. Concerned about short-term effects: noise, dust and vibration from truck traffic and restrictions on recreation areas on Lyall Bay Beach. Also concerned about long-term effects on the surf break and ecological damage.
350	Steel, Jared	Oppose	No	Opposes the application and thinks the economic benefits have not been adequately demonstrated. Has not seen an assessment accounting for how aircraft and landing technology changes may render the extension work redundant in the medium or long term. Concerned about costs to ratepayers and airport users. Considers the project will undermine the recreation and surf lifestyle Lyall Bay offers to residents and visitors.
351	Randerson, Richard	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension because of (1) damage to marine ecology; (2) impact on surf, social and recreation; (3) lack of economic business case; (4) impact of construction; (5) lack of support from airlines; and (6) opportunity cost of spending public money.
352	McGuinness, Mark	Support	Not Specified	Supports the application. Believes improving long-haul connections is crucial to attract and retain the talented people and smart companies necessary for Wellington's economic growth. Thinks the extension will decrease airfares through increased competition and other benefits include: regional economic growth through increased freight capacity, promoting Wellington as a tourist destination, and attracting more international students.
353	Ernst & Young Limited	Support	Yes	Supports the application for its economic benefits. Ease of mobility for staff members is important for Ernst & Young Limited and they consider a greater number of direct flights will drive productivity gains for them. [Includes part of the same text as submission #308 concerning potential economic benefits].
354	Adams, Sarah	Oppose	No	Opposes the application and considers it a waste of money that would be better spent preparing ourselves for the impact of climate-change rather than building a runway into the sea.

355	Bevan McCabe	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as it risks being a white elephant and major airlines have said they cannot justify long-haul trips to Wellington. Considers more flights contrary to Wellington's goal of reducing carbon emissions.
356	McVeagh, Joanna	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because it conflicts with WCC policy to reduce climate-change emissions; does not trust economic business case; the fact that the area is part of a site of significance for indigenous bird ecology has not been adequately recognised; and an extension will interfere with birds' flight paths and put air travellers at greater risk due to bird strike.
357	McLean, Madeleine	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because of the visual impact on the beautiful scenery and disturbance of delicate ecology such as little blue penguins. Believes the extension is unnecessary and the money could be spent on more worthwhile things. Also concerned about the safety of the 90m RESA. Considers four years construction disruption excessive and concerned that noise pollution will increase once it is completed.
358	McGlynn, Mike	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Particularly concerned about effects on the Lyall Bay surf conditions and considers The Corner warrants the utmost protection for future generations, as there is nowhere else for Wellington's surf community to go.
359	Norton, Patricia	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application for reasons: (1) if it is as economically viable as claimed, then the applicant should pay the full cost; (2) lack of support from airlines; (3) construction traffic effects; (4) noise, dust, and vibration effects on traffic routes; (5) effects on sewage utilities and implications on adjacent marine reserve are unclear; (6) unknown ecological effects on marine and shore life; (7) pilots' safety concerns; (8) increase in carbon emissions; and (9) the impact of climate-change factors does not seem to have been properly considered.
360	Wellington Water Limited	Neutral	Yes	Neutral towards the application but seeks protection of its utilities infrastructure. Submits on two specific parts of the application: (1) reclamation within the CMA where it encroaches on the Moa Point Wastewater Treatment Plan outfall pipeline and (2) construction activities that could affect the sludge pipeline along Moa Point Road and wastewater interceptor under the southern end of the existing runway. Considers the application lacks detail, including the significant consequences of damage to the Moa Point outfall pipeline and how it will be protected. Unconvinced that 'burying' the pipeline under the runway reclamation is acceptable, given the potential impacts if the pipeline is damaged and cannot be acceptably repaired or maintained. Notes there is no reference in the AEE to the inceptor main and sludge pipeline and the potential risks to these from construction. Seeks a more detailed and clearly laid-out methodology be described in the conditions for the NUMP.
361	North, Kym	Support	No	Supports the application and believes it will be a very positive outcome for the Wellington Region.
362	Gill, Swarna	Support	No	Supports the application and believes it will be a very positive outcome for the Wellington Region.
363	Gill, Rasbeer Singh	Support	No	Supports the application and believes it will be a very positive outcome for the Wellington Region.
364	Shergill Trust	Support	No	Supports the application and believes it will be a very positive outcome for the Wellington Region.
365	McGuinness, David	Support	No	Supports the application because of economic benefits, particularly increased business and tourism opportunities. Believes the airport is a key infrastructure asset for the entire region.
366	Davies, Nick	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as it detrimentally impacts on coastal habitat and Moa Point marine ecology. Thinks this habitat also has important heritage value for the Wellington community.
367	HAMPTON, SHIRLEY	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension. Walks around Lyall Bay frequently and is concerned it will disrupt surf and recreation; that the fill will adversely affect marine ecology such as little blue penguins. Considers the south coast a fragile area. Does not want their rates to go towards it and not convinced that there is adequate economic research showing demand for direct long haul flights. Also concerned about the safety of long-haul flights landing in Wellington weather conditions.
368	McIntosh, Ian	Support	No	Supports the application. Involved in the Lyall Bay Surf Life Saving Club and other recreation such as dog walking on the beach and believes the beach environment and community has always changed and will continue to change with or without the extension. Considers WIAL plays a critical part in the local and regional economy and the extension will increase their economic contribution. Believes direct flights will bring further diversity and opportunity for Wellington.
369	Nelson, Russell	Support	Yes	Supports the extension because achieving better international links will have flow-on economic benefits. Travels regularly and twice had to stay overnight in a hotel in Auckland to catch an early morning flight. Have had flights from Wellington>Auckland delayed, resulting in missing international connections with costs including: missed an important meeting and cost the company a significant commission, and another time had to completely rebook flights. Also thinks the extension would improve safety for planes.
370	Smith, Mandy	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
371	Gill, John	Oppose	No	Opposes the application and does not want WCC to pay for it. Concerned that (1) the airport turned down the business opportunity as not economic but said they would do it if it's free money; (2) that there may be a safety issue for bigger aircraft taking off into a prevailing northerly wind; (3) noise will be an issue; (4) the extension will be exposed to erosion and crosswind; and (5) traffic during construction. Notes lack of support from Air NZ and Qantas.
372	Privett, Stephen	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the proposal. Concerned with economic cost of the project; marine pollution due to runway fill; and the construction exclusion zone affecting the submitters ability to do recreation diving.
373	Brown, Robyn	Oppose	No	Opposes the runway extension due to the economic cost of the project and lack of valid business case. Concerned about the viability of the structure long-term due to climate-change and sea level rise. Concerned with ecology and recreation impacts to Lyall Bay.
374	Marra, Paddy	Support	No	Supports the proposal due to the economic benefits, saving the public and businesses in the region time and money. Submitter proposes that fill from the second Mt Vic tunnel should be used for runway extension fill, or harbour dredging fill, to save money on the project. Traffic congestion on SH1/airport corridor needs to be alleviated.
375	Zwaan, Rick	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension. Economic costs are uncertain and will be a huge waste of ratepayers money, meaning council services will be reduced in other areas. The proposal has large potential to do irreversible damage to the environment including ecology effects on marine life and recreation effects to divers, surfers, beach goers and fishing.
376	Bailey, Gillian	Oppose	No	Opposes the proposal as it is an unnecessary and expensive economic cost.
377	Protin, Arthur	Oppose	No	Opposes the proposal as it is not based on a sound economic analysis. Disputes the economic benefits put forward by the applicant.
378	Griffiths, Gore	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension. Adverse effects from fill on the ecology of the marine environment. Adverse effects on Lyall Bay beach and recreation users - surfers will be affected and the artificial reef may cause unknown effects that may endanger water users. Concerned with increased operational airport noise on local residents. Concerned with increased congestion and construction traffic, may cause significant disruption to evacuation of southern suburbs during a natural disaster. WCC cannot act independently on this proposal as a shareholder.

379	Philipsen, Rob	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the runway extension, as rate payers should not pay for an asset in private ownership. The submitter states that there are no independent studies that prove any significant economic benefits. Traffic congestion in the airport corridor is already severe and needs to be addressed before thinking about increasing airport passenger numbers. There is a need to fully assess the impact on the local community, particularly impacts to recreation and ecology. Concerned about dust, noise impacts and traffic impacts on local residents during construction.
380	Howe, Barbara	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension as the projected economic benefits seem wildly overstated, and do not want their taxes wasted on the project. Traffic impacts - congestion and local infrastructure cannot cope with the increase in passengers. Climate-change and rising sea levels place a lot of risk in project viability. Visual impacts will be significant on Evans and Lyall bays. Noise effects of construction and construction traffic will have negative impacts on local residents.
381	Stantiall, Ben	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension. Economic costs are uncertain and will be a huge waste of ratepayers money, meaning council services will be reduced in other areas. The proposal has large potential to do irreversible damage to the environment including ecology effects on marine life and recreation effects to divers, surfers, beach goers and fishing.
382	Foon, Laurie	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the runway extension as the public is yet to see an independent, rigorous and robust business case to assess the economic benefits. Opposes ratepayers carrying the burden of cost for the proposal, and the reduction of council services that will occur. Ecology impacts - Moa Point has giant kelp forests, little blue penguins and nationally endangered reef heron, as well as other important marine life. Recreation, surfing and diving activities will be impacted. Concerned effects of climate-change and sea level rise have not been taken into account. Very concerned about the increase in heavy traffic through Wellington suburbs.
383	Stephen-Smith, Naomi	Oppose	No	Opposes the runway extension. Believes that traffic effects from transport to and from the airport are not addressed in the application, and further congestion of the SH1 corridor will result. The submitter also states that Wellington International Airport does not support residential traffic using Stewart Duff Drive, so should consider some traffic mitigation strategies as part of the proposal. The submitter states there does not appear to be a cost benefit analysis of the proposal, and the economic benefits are not clear.
384	Fleming, John	Oppose	No	Strongly opposes the runway extension. The southern coastline is the jewel in the Wellington environmental crown and an integral part of what makes Wellington what it is, with Lyall Bay in the centre of this area. Recreation will be impacted by the extension by affecting surf and the beach. Visual effects will be significant in breaking the natural coastline, dominating coastal views and changing the feel of the area. Submitter states that an independent process is needed to assess the environmental impact. Submitter believes that the proposal should not go ahead without a sound business case, and the economic cost-benefit does not stack up.
385	Annesley, Barbara	Neutral	No	Opposes the extension as it does not make economic sense and does not appear to be financially viable. The submitter opposes the proposal on recreation and ecology grounds - detrimentally affecting surfing, diving and fishing on the south coast, as well as marine life, kelp forests and little blue penguins. The submitter believes further investigation and analysis is needed to establish a compelling case for the runway extension.
386	Leloir, Philippe	Support	No	Support the extension as it will enhance the Wellington regional economy, increase employment opportunities, future proof the airport, and enhance tourism, particularly in the Wairarapa. The submitter supports the stated benefits and environmental effects in the application.
387	Wellington Recreational Marine Fishers Association	Oppose	Yes	Oppose the extension. Wellington Recreational Marine Fishers Association (WRMFA) view it as unacceptable that they were not consulted regarding denying access for recreation for fishers and divers to a very large marine area due to the runway extension. These areas were set aside by the government as an offset to the previous establishment of marine reserves. They believe the closed area around the construction site is far too big, and closing the entire area for at least four years is illogical and confrontational. The submitter disputes the findings of the TRC Tourism Technical Report 6 - Assessment of Effects on Recreation, as no recreational fishers were interviewed between 13 March and 1 April, when they believe there would have been hundreds fishing and collecting seafood etc. The submitter presents the WRMFA survey from 1998 as evidence of how important the south coast of Wellington is as a regional asset for recreational fishing and marine activities. The submitter states that there is an unacceptable double standard between the health and safety provisions of very large marine exclusion area for construction, and the actions of WCC in other areas. They cite several grievances with WCC actions and management relating to recreational fishing assets and access. Ecology - the submitter believes the NIWA report on marine life is seriously flawed and shows a lack of understanding on the local marine environment and recreational fish species. The submitter states that the loss of bladder kelp forests will have a massive impact on marine species in Lyall Bay. The fill for the extension will see sediment smothering marine life, and the Sediment Management Plan is not fit for purpose and will not adequately manage sediment. The submitter states that the runway breakwater will fail due to the severity of Cook Strait swells not being taken into account. They believe that the current knowledge held by govt agencies and NIWA is completely inadequate and will cause the project to fail. Climate-change is increasing the speed of currents and severity of swells in storms, which was cause greater gravel deposition and cause the biggest threat to the runway extension structure. The submitter believes that the need for the wave structure is unproven, and is likely to cause erosion on Lyall Bay and cause impacts such as wiping out support structures for the surf lifesaving club. Utilities - the submitter states that the runway extension will cause the collapse of the wastewater pipe.
388	Ong, Sing Gay	Support	No	Supports the application and thinks the economic gain could be huge.
389	Newton-Howes, Marcus	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application for reasons: (1) NZ has a duty to take steps to curb climate-change and making air travel easier is contrary to this goal. (2) Economic costs are too great and the \$300-\$350 million of public money should be spent on more important projects. (3) Traffic will add to congestion and the noise will disrupt people who live on the route's sleep. (4) NZ does not need another international airport. (5) It will not be long enough for safety concerns. (6) It will negatively impact surf. (7) It will impact marine ecology. (8) The economic benefits are uncertain.
390	Wellington Trails Trust	Support	Yes	Supports the application. Wellington Trails Trust (WTT)'s 10-year vision is for Wellington to be recognised as the world's best mountain bike city and achieving this vision requires better links between Wellington and the rest of the world. Believe the economic benefits of the extension will include: more visitors and making it easier for the entrepreneurs and business people they want to attract to connect with the rest of the world.
391	Helfen Limited	Support	No	Supports the proposal as it will bring direct and indirect economic benefits to the region. Direct links to Asia will reduce business costs for his company. Tourism growth and growth in international students in Wellington due to direct long haul flights.
392	Oil Free Wellington	Oppose	Yes	Oppose the proposal. Believe that the airport already possesses unfair and undue control over the Miramar peninsula. The runway extension will further increase airport noise and disrupt local residents. Extending the runway will further increase traffic and congestion in the area. Construction traffic of 5-30 trucks per night time hour will create a large disruption for residents. They are concerned that the project will cause significant cultural impacts on whenua and the takutai moana, and doubt local iwi will be able to exercise their rights in the decision process. Impacts to ecology - particularly the critically endangered reef heron at Moa Point. Any impact on protected species should be enough reason to prevent the project going ahead. Climate-change effects - at a time of climate crisis, expanding an airport and growing air travel is the opposite of what should be done.

393	Watson, Owen	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension, as the public economic benefits are very overstated, and may even be negative if we go into a recession.
394	Elzenaar, Alexander	Support	No	Supports the extension. No submission text to support their position.
395	Caldwell, Elizabeth	Support	No	Supports the extension to encourage greater ease of international travel. Particularly interested in supporting the ability to land wide-bodied cargo planes, to facilitate the delivery of artworks from overseas. Landing wide-bodied planes at Wellington will reduce transit costs for exhibitions at the gallery, and increase the number of exhibits that can be shown in Wellington.
396	Jawing, Felix	Support	No	Supports the extension as it would be great to have more direct international flights in Wellington.
397	Sherman, Mitchell	Support	No	Supports the extension because it will happen one day, so should be done as soon as possible. The runway extension will be great for Wellington in many ways.
398	Weir, Alex	Support	No	Supports the extension as it will facilitate economic growth and development in the region for 20+ years. Direct flights to the United States and Asia will provide a huge boost for tourism, and help to capitalise on Wellington's international reputation as the "Coolest Little Capital". The extension will also be positive for surf and ecology, allowing for the creation of new habitats on artificial reefs. The extension will be great for recreation in that it will make the Lyall Bay Surf Club more popular and offer a better training environment for surf lifesavers. Wellington needs more economic development and to not stay stagnant.
399	Wong, Aaron	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension as the estimate of economic benefits outweigh the environmental compromises. Particularly concerned about the effects on marine life ecology, and loss of recreation amenity at Lyall Bay. The proposal fails to properly consider the effects of climate change and the effects this will have during construction (in case of extreme weather event) or in operation.
400	Puddick, Vernon	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension. Concerned that traffic routes are already congested, and the increase in passengers will exacerbate congestion. Believes that there is existing capacity for international passengers within current services to Wellington and Auckland that will allow for significant growth without the need for the runway extension. Due to the economic impacts of climate-change on Wellington in the next 100 years, and the increased burning of fossil fuels from increasing flights, the predicted increase in revenue from the extension will not offset the cost due to sea level rise.
401	Henderson, Kevin	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension due to operational safety issues and life-threatening hazards that are not addressed in the runway design; the economic cost-benefit analysis does not support the proposal as the benefits are overstated.
402	Murray, Robert	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application, as the proposal: has no economic viability and therefore no justification for the removal of the proposed marine area from the public domain; construction will be too disruptive to the City and the submitter personally; and safety is insufficiently addressed.
403	Petherick, Laurence	Support	No	Supports the application. Submitter does not believe the proposed extension will have any marked effect on current recreation surf conditions around Lyall Bay Beach. Concerned that an artificial reef may adversely affect "the corner" surf break and the remainder of the beach, and believes it necessary to put in place a rigorous monitoring scheme to determine if the artificial reef is working.
404	Upper Hutt City Council	Support	No	Strongly supports the proposal due to the economic benefits that can be gained, particularly from direct flights from Asia. Runway extension is one aspect of a broader regional growth package that will increase visitor numbers and boost the economy and have a positive impact for the community.
405	Carnegie, Kieran	Support	No	Supports the application to facilitate economic growth in Wellington
406	Watt, Diana	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned with: effects on marine life ecology and ecosystem; loss of personal recreation opportunities; sediment from fill affecting the kelp forest; impacts to reef herons and blue penguins; effects of climate-change, sea level rise and storm surges; overstated economic cost-benefit predictions; increased costs to airline passengers and ratepayers; traffic and noise effects from construction. Alternate site should be investigated.
407	Schneider, Renate	Oppose	No	Opposes the proposal as the environmental impacts are too great and economic costs are too high. Concerned over impacts to residents due to construction noise and traffic. Roads around the airport do not have enough capacity to support the development proposed.
408	Marlborough Tour Company	Support	Yes	Supports the proposal wholeheartedly as it will drive economic benefits for Wellington and the top of the South Island. The submitter will benefit greatly in their business - Marlborough Tour Company - from increased tourist numbers to the region, particularly in Asian market. Believes economic benefits will be gained for the whole of New Zealand by increasing direct long-haul capacity. Submitter identifies a near-monopoly on international flights into Auckland, and believes greater competition is needed.
409	Barnes, Richard	Support	No	Supports the proposal in full. Submitter sees no issues with environmental impacts: additional construction traffic will not add to noise or congestion on the busy highway corridors. The submitter believes that the application mitigates the effects on recreation surfing at Lyall Bay. Would like to see funding split between the interested parties based on increase in income for the airport.
410	Chen, Even	Oppose	No	Opposes because the benefits do not greatly outweigh the cost.
411	Chen, Etan	Oppose	No	Opposes because there are more high priority problems in New Zealand than the runway.
412	Whittington, Lydia	Support	No	Supports the application due to the economic benefits that will be gained in the Wellington region. Resiliency - Wellington Airport can provide another place for long-haul aircraft to land if Auckland and Christchurch airports are closed.
413	Wylie, Carolyn	Support	No	Supports the proposal for the growth and economic benefits that will be gained for the Wellington region. Submitter considers that the economic benefits far outweigh the environmental effects. Submitter requests that consent is granted with the 15 year lapse period requested.
414	Whittington, Stephen	Support	No	Supports the proposal as an important piece of regional infrastructure and for the economic benefits that will be gained by improving international air links.
415	Stephens, Katherine	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerns regarding the economic viability/justification for the proposal; lack of a traffic plan from airport to city to cover the huge increase in passengers; seeks independent consultants to address recreation impacts to Lyall Bay beach, noise impacts to local residents and local traffic impacts.
416	Marshall, David	Support	No	Supports the proposal due to the economic benefits that will be gained. Submitter is willing to pay modest increase in rates to pay for the extension; believes a vocal minority should not be able to stifle progress in the region, as has happened with other transport initiatives in Wellington.
417	Gard, Samantha	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
418	DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION - HAMILTON	Neutral	Yes	Submitter is neutral towards granting of the resource consents. Submission is in regards: sediment discharge from fill; ecology of rare red algae and loss of reef habitat and displacement of macro fauna. Submitter seeks amendment to the wording of proposed condition 64(a), and proposes 3 new conditions regarding sediment discharge from fill. The submitter supports the retaining and wording of the conditions relating to mitigation addressing the loss of reef habitat and relocation of mobile reef macro fauna.

419	James, Charlie	Oppose	Not Specified	Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts
420	Earl, Christina	Oppose	No	Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts
421	McGovern, DR Bronwyn	Oppose	Yes	Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts. Strongly oppose the proposal as the environment should be left for future generations to enjoy and appreciate. Proposal will cause adverse effects to the visual beauty and landscape of Lyall Bay and Moa Point.
422	Pemerika, Gafua	Oppose	Yes	Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts
423	Slade, Jennifer	Oppose	No	Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts
424	Hawkes, Joanne	Oppose	No	Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts
425	Whakamoe, Kezia	Oppose	Yes	Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts
426	Coronno, Mark	Oppose	Yes	Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts
427	Pitcher, Nick	Oppose	No	Opposes runway extension. Recreation - proposal will negatively affect Wellington's prized surf break, and concerned artificial reef will not mitigate this effect.
428	Dear, Pauline	Oppose	Yes	Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts. Council should look after basic infrastructure before extending the airport. Ratepayers should not have to pay for a private asset.
429	Coronno, Rachel	Oppose	Yes	Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts
430	Reed, Richard	Oppose	Yes	Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts
431	Cotidis, Tania	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Enjoys the beach and wants it to remain the same. [In addition, same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts]
432	Kershaw, Tessa	Oppose	Not Specified	[Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts]
433	Roland, Timothy	Oppose	No	[Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts]
434	Ishaan Kochhar	Support	No	Supports the application as an international student. Considers it will have economic benefits for Wellington and the university.
435	Gallagher, Kathleen	Support	No	Supports as it would create growth for the Wellington region.
436	Munro, Robert	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension as there is no persuasive economic business case.
437	John Cordner	Support	No	Supports the application. Thinks it represents an overall economic benefit to Wellington. Considers the environmental effects such as traffic and noise are outweighed by significant benefits and supports the wave focussing structure proposed to address surf effects.
438	Munro, Alison	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Has seen no buy-in from key airlines and wants to know who will cover the cost of increased border security/customs. Doesn't think increased pollution and environmental damage is acceptable. Concerned about surf effects. Thinks the visual landscaping improvements should occur without building the runway. Thinks the damage done by construction traffic, as well as noise, is underplayed. Does not think the economic benefits will eventuate.
439	Mitchell, Gary	Support	No	Supports as it is a great opportunity for the Wellington region.
440	Munro, Mary	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Concerned that it is not supported by a strong economic business case and that airlines do not back it. Considers that traffic congestion to the airport is already bad enough. Thinks ideally the airport should be located elsewhere to the north, not extended to create more congestion and noise pollution. Wants to know where the fill will come from. Also concerned with environmental impact on the south coast.
441	Brown, Brian	Oppose	Yes	Opposes WCC being involved in granting resource consent for the extension when they have also indicated their intention to provide funding for it. Opposed to the granting of a ten year consent for construction. Considers the council is in breach of principles in the LGA clauses 14(a),(i) and (f). Considers it involves unacceptably high degree of commercial risk and uncertain economic viability and that costs are likely to overrun. Considers Council is failing to meet transparency principles in clause 14(i) and that a 10-year consent for construction indicates clear uncertainty as a properly thought-out commercial project could be expected to be completed in 3-5 years.
442	Day, Greg	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Critical of economic cost-benefit analysis, particularly that there are no clear costings, only indirect benefits are included, external costs are not costed, and the hub-and-spoke model is the most utilised model in world aviation. Considers the business case laughable and questions what it will cost, what will the benefits be, what percentage of Wellington's population will indirectly and directly benefit, what percentage of the population will be negatively impacted, and if the costs of using the airport will increase.
443	Nimmo, Richard	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned about the economic cost to ratepayers and who shares in profits/over budget costs. Wants to know about compensation to the council for road damage due to heavy trucks and to residents for night time noise. Wants to know if an independent feasibility report has been completed and if alternative areas for the airport have been considered. Thinks locating a longer runway on existing land outside of town would cost less and address traffic congestion problems.
444	Findlay, Rachael	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as ratepayer money should not be wasted on corporate hand-outs. Asks why if it's such a great economic proposal, the owners of the airport don't invest their own money.

445	Blaylock, Roger (Corporate Consumables Limited)	Support	No	Supports the application and has been managing director of a company located in Rongotai for more than 20 years. Particularly supports economic benefits, including how the extension would: (1) mean freight could be flown directly into Wellington, making a more efficient supply chain; (2) increase tourism opportunities; (3) make Wellington a more attractive option for international students; (4) increase Wellington Airport's freight capacity. Satisfied that WIAL has mitigated any environmental impact concerns.
446	Quirk, Carol	Oppose	Yes	<p>Opposes the application. Has used Lyall Bay for recreation for about 50 years. Submits that several technical reports have insufficient data on which to base their conclusions. Critical of the following parts of the AEE reports:</p> <p>(a) Cultural - Technical report 5 doesn't recognise the heritage significance of Lyall Bay as one the places Duke Kahanamoku introduced surfing and where the first surf lifesaving patrol in NZ was undertaken in 1910.</p> <p>(b) Recreation - Critical of online survey, that personal observations were done only on 16 days in late autumn in unknown conditions, that Figure 1 understates areas used by recreational users, that Maranui does not patrol Lyall Bay, and the report doesn't identify potential effects of the Moa Point Rd mitigation on The Corner surf break or of the Mount reef.</p> <p>(c) Safety - notes difficulties with maintaining navigational buoys on the Mount Reef, potential for rip creation, distance from shore of the artificial reef that may result in people being swept out to sea.</p> <p>(d) Coastal process and surf quality, erosion - critical of length of time/extent of data samples and that effects of climate-change and sea level rise are not addressed. Notes that the Pickrill reports are nearly 40 years old and there have been changes in the beach profile since.</p> <p>(e) Ecology;</p> <p>(f) Considers economic benefits exaggerated.</p> <p>(g) Could not find assessment on effects of construction noise and traffic on property values.</p> <p>(h) Concerned at length of the construction time period and exclusion zones of 300m, meaning massive restrictions on recreation. and</p> <p>(i) Noise</p> <p>Finds it worrying that the effects on surfing are proposed to be mitigated by an untried and experimental artificial surf reef, which has not yet been designed and the effects of which will create significant problems. Notes peer review by ECoast has said the DHI technical report is fundamentally flawed and the model inappropriate. Examines results of other artificial reefs, which have not been successful. Concerned that artificial reef may pose a safety risk to swimmers and that rock reef material will end up on the beach.</p> <p>Considers the application falls short of fulfilling statutory requirements. Does not think the SMAMP in the proposed consent conditions will ensure the desired outcomes and thinks it is essential that a removal condition for the rock reef is included if significant adverse effects occur. Does not think alternatives were adequately considered.</p>
447	GIBSON, MICHAEL	Oppose	Not Specified	<p>Opposes the extension. Doesn't think the application takes into account that future aircraft may require shorter runways or the need for better road access.</p> <p>[In addition, part of the same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]</p>
448	C Watson Consultancy Limited	Oppose	Yes	<p>Opposes the application. Concerned about the economic costs and environmental effects including those on marine ecology, traffic and associated noise, dust and air pollution. Considers the proposed council payment breaches the fundamental tenet of "user pays" economics and thus cannot be justified in terms of the NZ Treasury Better Business Case. Considers tourism a false friend as it increases the proportion of low-wage jobs.</p> <p>Particularly concerned about climate-change considerations and that the need to reduce carbon emissions requires less air travel. Thinks increasingly people will choose not to fly for this reason. Suggests the internet provides the means to remain connected internationally without flying.</p>
449	Edwards, Mark	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Critical of the economic business case, particularly that the benefits are likely to be national rather than regional so it doesn't make sense for the city residents to pay for it and states there is no evidence of need for it. Considers Lyall Bay will be subject to increasing erosion issues with sea-level rise, which will be magnified by the extension. Concerned about noise from night work and thinks residents will need double glazing.
450	Destination Great Lake Taupo	Support	No	Supports the application and highlights potential economic benefits, particularly to tourism. Destination Great Lake Taupo places considerable weight on having multiple international airports within easy driving distance of the Taupo region and considers that it will help with tourism flows and attract new international airlines, investors, and open up new tourism markets.
451	Tozer, Greg	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application due to effects on water quality and marine ecology at Taputeranga Marine Reserve and Moa Point. Concerned that marine-derived fill from CentrePort may be contaminated.
452	CENTREPORT LIMITED	Support	Yes	Supports the application because of economic benefits and opportunities for synergy with other major infrastructure projects. The proposal provides an opportunity for dredge material from CentrePort Limited's proposed channel deepening project to be used as reclamation fill, promoting efficiencies and reductions in environmental effects for each respective project.
453	Bryn Whyman	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of damage to marine ecology and fish populations with construction so close to popular areas for recreation fishing and diving and the Taputeranga Marine Reserve.
454	Underwood, Catharine	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application on environmental grounds. Thinks there has been no consultation with residents in the wider Wellington area about increased plane noise and flying over new suburbs and that this will make Wellington a less pleasant place to live and visit. Concerned about impact on marine life, recreation, and surf at Lyall Bay and whether the fill used will be clean. Objects on economic grounds because there is no robust business case and it will mean council can't fund other projects with greater benefits. Objects to increased truck traffic and associated noise, dust, and safety concerns.
455	Johnson, Jamison	Support	No	Supports the application as it is needed to future proof the airport and ensure it does not become a bottleneck to future regional economic growth. Notes trend in commercial aviation is towards mid-sized passenger aircraft capable of travelling greater distances.
456	Nelson Airport Limited	Support	No	Supports the application as it will greatly improve economic prosperity of the Nelson/Tasman region. Wellington is a 25-minute flight from Nelson/Tasman rather than the 1hr 20min flight to Auckland, currently the main port of entry for tourists. One of Tourism NZ's stated objectives is to enable better disbursement of visitors into the regions and another long haul entry point will support this. Thinks the extension will also improve connection times for business interests in Nelson/Tasman, which will encourage people to choose to live in regional NZ.
457	Early Childhood Council	Support	No	Supports the application, particularly economic benefits. Keen to bring its annual conference back to Wellington after being forced away following the earthquake two years ago. Considers the extension would increase tourism opportunities and make Wellington a more attractive option for their annual conference, enabling them to further market for delegates from overseas constituencies. Satisfied that WIAL has mitigated any environmental impact concerns.
458	Dougherty, David	Support	No	Supports the application. Frequently travels internationally. Thinks infrastructure is never built for today but for tomorrow and for future generation's needs and that as stewards of our city we need to

				build the infrastructure appropriate to support those needs. Would personally use Wellington as a port of departure to Asia and Europe. Considers Air NZ's opposition is due to their economic business model and not about passenger needs. Submits that freight/cargo is a significant airline revenue stream and that direct flights to Asia are attractive to the needs of flower, produce, fine food and wine industries. Considers we need to build resilience into NZ's export abilities. Personally finds flying through Auckland inconvenient and costly.
459	Johnson, Michael	Support	No	Supports the application for the long-term economic growth and health of Wellington. Works for a global organisation where connectivity is greatly important to ensure they can keep senior positions based in Wellington rather than moving them to a more accessible city like Auckland. Does not think vocal minorities should stop progress.
460	Abraham, Quentin	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of our climate-change commitments, the economic cost/benefit analysis, and passenger safety.
461	Kearns, Nowell & Velda	Support	Not Specified	Supports the proposed runway extension
462	Newtown Residents' Association Inc.	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application based on the following concerns: the economic business case is weak and the demand forecasts are unconvincing; there are unknown economic risks to ratepayers and opportunity cost is not taken into account; significant negative effects of construction traffic through the city causing noise, congestion, pollution (dust), and added congestion; safety concerns raised by pilots; effects of rising sea levels have not been adequately investigated (climate-change); roading and traffic effects due to increased airport demand for passengers and freight; New Zealand's commitment to climate-change mitigation and the potential effects for long-haul flight costs and demand. The submitter questions whether delaying the applications by 15 years would allow for a better assessment of the costs and benefits.
463	Morris, Jonathan	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application due to the following reasons: economic risk to Wellington ratepayers; traffic impacts; construction and operational noise impacts and disturbance; and visual landscape effects, permanently degrading their enjoyment of life.
464	Klaphake, John	Support	No	Supports the application as it will do a lot for the growth and viability of the Wellington region.
465	Cave, Michelle	Support	No	Supports the application due to the economic benefits of Wellington being better connected internationally. The construction work associated with the project will provide immediate economic benefits through local employment.
466	Wellington Institute of Technology & Whitireia Community Polytechnic	Support	Yes	Supports the application as it is likely to provide very significant economic benefits to the region. These benefits are through attracting international students, particularly as a result of direct flights to Asia, not only for WelTec and Whitireia, but also other tertiary education providers in the region.
467	Stace, Julia	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as it is a waste of ratepayers' money (economic). The proposal will damage the marine environment from extraction fill from the inner harbour and dumping it in Lyall Bay. Climate-change and sea level rise will cause the structure to fail.
468	Blakiston, Charles	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as they question the economic validity and justification of the proposal. Concerned about negative impacts to recreation, particularly surfing at "the corner", degradation of marine ecology, and reduced quality of life. Concerned about increased noise and traffic from construction impacts to residents.
469	Vanisselroy, Cameron	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as the economic benefits do not outweigh the costs, and there is no economic justification for the proposal.
470	Studd, Zoe	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Greatly concerned about effects to recreation and ecology, particularly gathering kaimoana, protecting the marine reserve, protecting species such as the little blue penguin, and impacts to the Lyall Bay surf break. The submitter is concerned about changes in hydrology of both the bays, and the impact of sedimentation and contamination from fill. The submitter is dismayed that the proposal is considered in light of climate-change and associated sea level rise and increase in storm surges.
471	Sanson, Niroo	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Resident of Moa Point for 20 years. Concerned about: construction impacts on ecology marine life and birds; erosion impacts on the bay and their home; round the clock construction effects on their health and wellbeing; and the runway extension will be a visual eyesore.
472	David Fowler	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as there is no proven economic need for the extension, they question the funding basis for the proposal, and construction traffic will seriously affect residents and the transport system in general.
473	Patterson, Gemma	Support	No	Supports as the tourism will economically help New Zealand.
474	Buchanan, Andrew	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as they do not believe the extension is justified and therefore there will be no return on investment for the project.
475	Faherty, Michael	Support	No	Supports the application as they believe it will have a positive social and economic impact on Wellington. The submitter believes that the requirements of the notified resource consent process are sufficient to ensure developers will need to ensure that any adverse effects are mitigated and/or outweighed by positive effects.
476	Chameleon Events	Support	Yes	Supports the extension due to the local and wider economic benefits that will be gained, and the increase in market competition between airports and airlines. The runway extension will decrease business costs for the submitter's business - Chameleon Events - and encourage further growth in the Wellington creative sector.
477	Gray, Elizabeth	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Concerned about: construction noise, traffic and dust, especially during the night will be detrimental to the health and wellbeing of local residents; questions the demand for the runway extension and the economic justification for the project; risks to the ecology of marine life; damage to recreation water sports and surf at Lyall Bay; lack of investigation into alternate airport sites outside of the city.
478	Weber, Karl	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Resident of Moa Point. Concerns are: Economic justification - reports produced have been widely discredited upon peer review; the environmental risks are borne by ratepayers, Wellington and south coast residents, while the benefits are almost entirely Infratil's; noise, traffic impacts and disruption to local residents during construction; reports commissioned suffer from incomplete data collection and flawed assumptions, thus are biased in favour of the extension; recreation - lack of access and use of Moa Point by all users, destruction of the surf break; Ecology - impacts to marine life, sediment and turbidity from fill construction activities, destruction of natural reef and giant kelp forest, impacts to rock lobsters and paua, impacts to little blue penguins, reef heron and other marine life; climate-change - no regard has been given to future access of the airport, increased extreme weather events and storm surges will impact construction and operation; no analysis of alternate sites; noise impacts to Moa Point residents, and past failures to implement noise mitigation for Moa Point residents.
479	Chitty, Christopher	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Has owned a house in Moa Point for nearly 20 years. Concerns over: the lack of project economic viability; major disruption to traffic and noise and dust effects from construction; and underestimation of the severity of risk from waves and storm surges on the proposed extension.
480	Sharpe, Matt	Oppose	No	[Same part text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; and climate-change impacts.]

481	Carver, Bryan	Oppose	No	Opposes the proposal as the economic cost of the extension should be entirely financed by the airport company. If it is not financially viable then the development should not go ahead.
482	Barber, Peter	Oppose	Not Specified	[Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts]
483	Kane, Mary	Oppose	No	[Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts]. With climate-change, Wellington Airport will be unuseable within 50 to 100 years.
484	Ennor, Mareke	Oppose	Yes	[Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts]
485	Wilson, Susan	Oppose	Yes	[Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts]
486	Bisley, Catherine	Oppose	Yes	[Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts]
487	Sargent, M F & G I	Support	No	Supports the proposal due to the economic benefits and growth that will result - stimulate the economy, increase market competition and boost tourism.
488	Kelly, Colin	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as: effects on the environment are more than minor; the economic business model is weak and unjustified; impacts to marine ecology and recreation (surfing); disturbance to the community; more regional traffic through Wellington increasing congestion.
489	Bisley, Charles	Oppose	Not Specified	[Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts]. Submitter is particularly concerned by the dubious economic benefits and the environmental impact - all users and life associated with the ecosystem need to be considered.
490	Bisley, Jacqueline	Oppose	Yes	[Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts]
491	McDonald, Robert	Oppose	No	[Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts]
492	Martin, David	Oppose	No	[Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts]
493	Hill, Elizabeth	Oppose	No	[Same text as #419. Concerns about: economic cost; construction traffic; health impacts from noise, dust, and sewerage utilities pipe; safety of the RESA; effects on surf, recreation, and marine ecology; and climate-change impacts]
494	David Mitchell	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to concerns with: negative impact on marine environment ecology; sediment from fill; visual impacts of the ugly protrusion into the bay; impacts to recreation surf break; impact to submitter's property due to erosion and damage to their seawall; noise pollution from increased flights; unjustified economic business case for the proposal.
495	Maich, Judith	Oppose	No	Opposes the proposal as they are unconvinced by the economic business case and justification for the project. Concerned about: huge increase in traffic through Lyall Bay due to construction, causing noise and dust air quality impacts; recreation - impacts on the surf break at Lyall Bay; Visual impacts on the whole landscape of Moa Point; water quality issues from sediment and fill; safety concerns raised by pilots.
496	Peach, Eric	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application due to the uncertain and conflicting economic cost-benefit analyses, and the environmental consequences which are not fully explored or understood. Concerned about significant traffic disruption during construction activities.
497	Holmes, Melody	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned about: severe impacts on the environment, particularly marine ecology, kelp forests, little blue penguins and reef heron; impacts to recreation surfing diving and fishing; increased economic cost to ratepayers and airline passengers; lack of economic viability; climate-change - sea level rise and storm surges; safety of planes using the runway as identified by pilots; construction noise, traffic congestion and disruption; cultural values of the sacred south coast waters and kaitiaki/guardianship of the environment.
498	Nowotny, Sabine	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as the economic cost to ratepayers is too high, with no government funding support
499	Campbell, Robin	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as the economic benefits do not stack up, and therefore will not outweigh the significant environmental effects. Concerned with: construction traffic effects and disruption to local residents; recreation impacts to the surf break at Lyall Bay; visual impacts to Lyall Bay and Moa Point; impact on the marine environment ecology; contaminated dredge fill; climate-change and sea level rise effects.
500	Lineham, Oliver	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Climate-change effects: proposal will increase greenhouse gas emissions which will have catastrophic effects; proposal is not in line with WCC Low Carbon Capital plan or GWRC Climate Change Strategy; bringing in larger aircraft will not reduce carbon emissions. Ecology effects: proposal will adversely affect little blue penguins and nationally endangered reef heron; construction will adversely affect marine life in Lyall Bay and the marine reserve; fill taken from the inner harbour is likely to be contaminated. Economic effects: economic benefits are vastly overstated; funding regime for the project is fundamentally unjust between ratepayers and private shareholder.
501	Tait, Janette	Oppose	No	Opposes the application and whole-heartedly supports the Guardians of the Bay's reasons not to proceed.  [Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
502	Anstey, Clive	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application and considers potential environmental effects are grossly understated and uncertain. Submits that: Economic cost-benefit analysis is uncertain, with no serious analysis of the benefits for ratepayers and those who currently live in and visit the affected environment. Costs and benefits are clearly framed within the corporate interests of WIAL. Natural character - south coast has high natural character. Assessment fails to acknowledge the significance of the changes and the visual intrusiveness of such a large structure in a largely undeveloped context. Amenity - report understates visual effects by having a predominance of viewpoints in urban settings and virtually ignoring the effects on visitors. Urban-design - proposed 'mitigation' would further urbanise the character of the proposed extension. If there is a need for additional facilities such as seats and car parks, these could be provided without an airport extension.

				Recreation - only 112 online survey respondents were from Lyall Bay and nearby suburbs. Moa Point is assuming increasing importance for diving and fishing and therefore the effects of the 300m exclusion zone and water turbidity during construction on recreational visitors is not addressed. Basis of conclusion that effects on recreation users would be acceptable is obscure. No attempt made to clearly differentiate construction effects from post-construction effects.
503	Save the Basin Campaign Inc	Oppose	Yes	<p>Opposes the application. Comments particularly on construction and operational traffic impacts on the Basin Reserve area. Comments that the prospect of supply more marine-sourced fill appears to depend on dredging projects not under control of the applicant and barbing material would create another set of environmental issues in an already busy and sensitive marine environment. Submits that construction traffic should be assessed on the basis of the worst-case scenario in Technical Report 9, which is up to 1 truck movement per minute with hours 9.30am-2.30pm and 10pm-6am. Concerned about the length of the construction period and significant adverse effects on: public health, including road safety, dust, emissions, and sleep disturbance; economic productivity due to delays; and loss of amenity values through the centre of Wellington. Submits that applicant has not adequately considered alternative routes or methods.</p> <p>Post-construction traffic: considers applicant has failed to have regard to WCC's sustainable transport hierarchy and has considered only motor vehicle trips, to the Low Carbon Capital Plan as it will increase car use, and has failed to consider effects of increased vehicle journeys exacerbating existing parking and congestion and the effects of particulate emissions from the additional private motor vehicle use envisaged.</p> <p>Other issues - submits applicant has not considered climate-change, adequately demonstrated economic benefits, adequately acknowledged environmental effects including those on marine ecology, visual and landscape, amenity, and heritage. Does not consider the opportunity cost has been assessed or alternative locations or methods investigated.</p>
504	Little, Jane	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because (1) the applicant has no plan to reduce climate-change emissions; (2) economic case not proven viable; (3) requested proportion of public funding much higher than annual dividends; (4) no commitment from airlines; (5) no satisfactory mitigation and monitoring plan for marine ecology impacts; (6) no evidence that the Surf Protection Society's conditions will be met; (7) traffic impacts; and (8) safety concerns.
505	Hamilton, Geoff	Support	Yes	Supports the application. Works as a surf lifeguard and lives in Lyall Bay. Concerned with public safety at Lyall Bay beach and endorses work done by applicant to mitigate adverse effects. Considers it unlikely that the submerged wave focussing structure (SWFS) will be successful and permanent and encourages WIAL to consider an adaptive approach including consideration of when the SWFS should be modified, rebuilt or removed if necessary. Wants likely build-up of shingle on Lyall Bay beach to be mitigated through regular mechanised beach cleaning.
506	Shea, Richard	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because of: (1) airlines' lack of commitment, (2) WCC economic funding will detract from funding of other projects with benefits to a wider range of people, (3) project will likely go over budget, and (4) pilots' safety concerns.
507	Sebastian Schmidt	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as the economic benefits do not outweigh the cost. Regularly travel to Europe and reducing travel time by 1-2 hours does not make that much difference when travelling 27 hours or more. Lives close to the airport and are affected by noise currently. Expect noise levels will increase massively and already find it hard to have a conversation outside when planes are taking off. Also concerned about impact on surf in Lyall Bay.
508	Randerson, Rebecca	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because seeking any increase in fossil-fuel powered transportation, which contributes to climate-change, is foolish; because of negative consequences for marine ecology; and because they object to ratepayers contributing to the economic cost and think the city should invest the money elsewhere. Also does not trust the projected costs or accept the stated benefits as they and many people of Wellington will not reap any benefit.
509	Ducat, Michelle	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application primarily because it will increase greenhouse gas emissions and contribute to climate-change. Climate-change will also affect the economic viability of the runway through sea level rise, storm surge, reduced travel demand, and NZ becoming an unethical tourist destination because of the carbon footprint of long-haul flights.
510	Neilson, Michael	Support	No	Supports the extension because of the economic benefits of more travellers coming directly to Wellington. Owns a quick service food restaurant and can only see value of increased arrival numbers coming into Wellington airport.
511	Jones, Jennifer Kay	Oppose	Yes	<p>Opposes the application. Concerned about the long construction period, the economic uncertainty, and the impact of the additional flights for those in the vicinity of and beneath the flight path. Wants to know what other infrastructure would be needed to make a success of a larger airport. Construction-related concerns include: traffic congestion; health impacts of noise, vibrations, dust and other particulates; recreation impacts on the wellbeing and availability of the marine environment; mixed economic consequences with construction making the area less attractive; and adverse heritage effects on original Moa Point cottages.</p> <p>Post-completion concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of recreation fishing opportunities</li> <li>- Negative economic aspects of taking a large proportion of WCC infrastructure budget and restricting other investments. Psychological and actual financial consequences if the planned-for passengers fail to arrive in sufficient numbers to justify the costs. Little indication that Wellington infrastructure will be able to cope with vastly increased tourist numbers. Ernst &amp; Young study does not include an assessment of the economic impacts of the construction itself.</li> <li>- Ability of the extension to withstand sea level rise and storm surge due to climate-change.</li> <li>- Health impacts such as noise for those in the airplane flight path.</li> </ul>
512	Hill, Harold & Pat	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Does not think an economic business case has been made if major airlines indicate they do not support it. Objects to rates being used to subsidise a company that does not have sufficient confidence in its proposal to invest heavily itself.
513	MacLennan, DR Anne	Oppose	Yes	<p>Opposes the application because it does not take into account predictable social, atmospheric, economic and political future changes so the benefits are overstated and the harms are understated: Adverse health effects - construction will increase air pollution (dust) and potential for traffic accidents. Air travel is a source of air pollution e.g. soot and sulphates. Climate-change and increased air temperatures will increase air pollution from diesel exhaust and allergens.</p> <p>Economic futility - assuming increasing volumes of air traffic is naive as future flying behaviour will be very different from the present. Cost-benefit analysis doesn't factor in costs to local community related to noise, disruption, and pollution.</p> <p>Climate-change - Aviation will be increasingly impacted by extreme weather events and increased CO2 levels are predicted to cause increased clear air turbulence in the jet stream, making long-haul flights longer, consume more fuel, and more hazardous. NZ has committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and air travel is a significant source of these.</p>
514	Exley, Jonathon	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because of: traffic congestion; construction noise and vibration; WCC funds could be used more productively elsewhere; economic funding of a commercial company should not be by ratepayers; major airlines have not committed; existing traffic infrastructure could not cope with increased visitors; and increased air traffic noise will adversely affect local residents and businesses.

515	Poultney, Bronwyn	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of: traffic congestion; construction noise and vibration; WCC funds could be used more productively elsewhere; economic funding of a commercial company should not be by ratepayers; major airlines have not committed; existing traffic infrastructure could not cope with increased visitors; and increased air traffic noise will adversely affect local residents and businesses. Alternative locations should be considered.
516	Fox, Christopher	Support	No	Supports the extension because of economic benefits of travel opportunities, tourism, visitors and international students arriving straight to the capital. Considers it will save time and money and larger planes will not only allow more passengers but benefit exporters sending precious cargoes such as fruit and flowers.
517	Cootes, Andrea	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Lives on Moa Point and swims there frequently. Greatly values the marine ecology and recreation of the area and does not want this natural situation to be lost. Objects to ratepayer funds being used for the economic cost. Construction will negatively affect their health and well-being: noise, dust inhalation, vibration, sewage and marine pollution. Suffers from back injury and considers lack of sleep from construction activities will exacerbate this. Concerned that airport security will forbid swimming and walking access.
518	Sanders, Aidy	Oppose	Yes	<p>Opposes the application. Lyall Bay is treasured by thousands of people year-round for the marine ecology and recreation activities such as surf lifesaving, swimming, walking, surfing, diving, and kayaking. Critical of AEE recreation report, particularly the short timescale and 4 observation points. Concerned about risks to use of the bay from traffic and construction noise, large marine exclusion zones, night work disturbing residents and wildlife, use of dredged sand for fill, and changes to water quality.</p> <p>Also concerned that predicted effects on surf underestimate the reduction in surfable waves. Review of the DHI study by eCoast questioned the modelling methodologies used including: no modelling of nearshore currents or small sediment movement around the bay; no allowance for wind effects on currents, longshore bars or detailed study of the surf-zone bathymetry; and wave buoy data used was collected at Baring head and not Moa point. Does not have faith in the proposed submerged wave focussing structure (SWFS) as there are many failed examples and thinks the cost could be closer to \$50 million than the proposed \$3 million. Thinks WIAL is a bad neighbour and sees little prospect of this changing. Notes that airport's marker buoy weighing over 1T was torn off its mooring in a 2015 storm and thinks the SWFS may meet the same fate.</p> <p>Thinks there's no economic rationale for the proposal and notes Air NZ's lack of support and pilots' association's safety concerns. Fears ratepayers will end up subsidising it and thinks the money should be spent elsewhere. Also can't see how the extension will help meet the IATA commitment to reduce climate-change emissions by 50% by 2050. Could only find one reference to climate-change in the WIAL report. Does not consider it is a good economic investment if it contributes to destroying the planet and considers it incompatible with a number of GWRC's Climate Strategy objectives. Believes if the airport needs to grow it should investigate moving to alternative sites.</p>
519	Ayrosa, Sergio	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension as the costs, risks and environmental impact do not justify it. Thinks it's short-sighted to expand an international airport in the middle of an established, densely populated residential area. Can hear noise from 6am to 1am from airplanes crossing the harbour and is concerned bigger planes and more air traffic will make this worse. Can hear plane engines echoing around the harbour on from Roseneath and Hataitai to Shelly Bay. Witnessed an urban airplane crash in Sao Paolo that killed people in a residential area. Thinks the Lyall Bay airport should be downsized and a bigger international airport built on the outskirts where it has space to grow rather than next to the natural barrier of the ocean. Questions if we really want to destroy the pristine surf beach. Concerned about the economic costs and use of taxpayers' money.
520	Jones, Timothy	Oppose	Yes	<p>Opposes the application.</p> <p>Climate-change: applicant has failed to have regard to the effects of sea level rise, storm surges, extreme wind speeds, and the economic impact on the project of likely measures taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from air travel during the project's lifetime. Does not think the precautionary approach in the NZCPS has been adopted. MfE's climate change projections predict extreme wind speeds are expected to increase by up to 10% in parts of the country by the end of the century and the applicant has not considered this. NZ has committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and the applicant has not assessed the impact of this on its economic viability.</p> <p>Traffic - Submits that construction traffic should be assessed on the basis of the worst-case scenario in Technical Report 9 since there is no evidence this will not eventuate. Concerned about adverse effects including on amenity, road safety, dust, emissions, noise and sleep disturbance for all those living, working and travelling alongside and near the proposed route, including the submitter's family. Especially concerned about health and safety implications for children attending the primary and secondary schools beside or near the route in Mt Victoria, Mt Cook and Te Aro.</p> <p>Post-construction traffic: considers applicant has failed to have regard to WCC's sustainable transport hierarchy and has considered only motor vehicle trips, to the Low Carbon Capital Plan as it will increase car use, and has failed to consider effects of increased vehicle journeys exacerbating existing parking and congestion and the effects of particulate emissions from the additional private motor vehicle use envisaged.</p> <p>Other issues - submits applicant has not adequately demonstrated economic benefits, adequately acknowledged environmental effects including those on marine ecology, visual and landscape, amenity, and heritage values. Does not consider the opportunity cost has been assessed or alternative locations or methods investigated.</p>
521	Barraud, Josh	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to concerns about the impact on the Wellington coast and recreation activities such as surfing and diving. Sceptical of economic benefits and concerned about cost to ratepayers and the safety of the runway.
522	Sajdl, Iva	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as a resident who lives near the airport. Concerns include: damage to south coast; increased noise pollution; increased risk of air traffic accidents; overly high economic costs; use of ratepayers' money; lack of viability; overestimated economic benefits; huge negative impact during construction on traffic, local residents, and surfers.
523	Business and Economic Research Limited	Support	Yes	<p>Supports the application. Believe the VISTAS feasibility study of passenger demand and flows is accurate or conservative. BERL completed work in 2008 and 2012 with less comprehensive data concluded an initial service would be viable with flights four to five times weekly, increasing to a daily service within two years. Finds credible the Sapere Research Group cost-benefit analysis on the economic benefits. Completed work in 2008 and 2012 found similar significant direct benefits in terms of reduced travel times, new visitor expenditure, and lower fares. Assert that the SRG analysis could have been extended to measure some benefits they considered 'not able to be quantified', including: migrants, business growth-related opportunities, international student growth, urban density, property values, and local government rates revenue. BERL believes these benefits are measurable based on other work they have done.</p> <p>Also believe that the personal and social benefits include better service to current and future residents and businesses. Note that the extension will not necessarily benefit Air NZ as it will reduce domestic travel through Auckland and are not surprised by Air NZ's resistance to the initiative.</p>
524	Burke, Judith	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Noise from take-offs and landings make the window glass sing, rattles blinds, drowns out radio/TV. Prevailing northerly wind means most flights leave and arrive from the south. The bay acts like an amphitheatre. The 6-hour window for sleep frequently isn't if the midnight

				flight is late. When the Moa Point tunnel was installed, that precious sleep time was interrupted and submitter was unable to open windows for 2 years due to the dust. Mentions other cities where affected residents were assured of double and triple glazing for noise mitigation.
525	Tregonning, Russell	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because: (1) climate-change effects on the project will likely be considerable; (2) Unrestrained economic growth is the philosophy of the cancer cell and we need development to a low-carbon economy; (3) The business case doesn't stack up. Air NZ opposes it and pilots are concerned about safety. Tourism will probably decrease with time because of the need to change to a low-carbon economy worldwide; (4) Marine ecology will be threatened, particularly if Centreport dredging fill is used; (5) Disruption of city street traffic and noise, dust, emissions, and safety impacts; and (6) Recreation disturbance.
526	Ryan, Anne Paisley	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Questions the economic viability of the project and high cost to ratepayers. Concerned with construction noise and traffic impacts to residents of the surrounding suburbs, particularly the 24/7 nature of construction. Believes that construction impacts to airport users have not been considered. Duration of the construction works is unacceptable. Believes the proposal will cause destruction to the coast in terms of ecology and visual impacts. Wave action will be destroyed so impact on surfing and recreation. Climate-change - long haul flights are likely to be restricted or banned, making the large and destructive project obsolete.
527	Leverton, Pauline	Support	No	Supports the runway extension as it will provide economic benefits to Wellington, and take the hassle out of overseas travel.
528	Ursin, Nicholas	Support	Yes	Supports the application due to the economic benefits as a result of job creation, tourist numbers, freight cost reductions and availability. They believe the short term effects of construction are outweighed by the long term benefits.
529	Howells, Martyn	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as they believe that the proposal fundamentally does not meet several parts of sections 5, 6 and 7 of the RMA, and constitutes an act of environmental vandalism. The submitter lives on Moa Point Road and the prolonged period of construction, particularly at night as proposed, will place a great strain on the submitter and local residents due to noise. They consider themselves to be directly affected by all facets of the construction and use of the proposal, and consider that no conditions of consent will adequately avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects on the residential and coastal environment.
530	Turley, Graham	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as they believe there is no economic justification for the proposal and therefore the economic risk to ratepayers is too high. They state that public transport to the airport needs to be improved, rather than a runway extension.
531	McGaveston, Philip	Support	No	[No submission text]
532	McGaveston, Jennifer	Support	No	[No submission text]
533	Tony Law	Support	No	Supports the runway extension as it will enhance economic development of world trade and tourism. They believe the long-term benefits must take precedence over any short term negative impacts that may affect some local individuals.
534	Bronwyn Kelly	Support	No	Supports the extension of the Wellington Airport as believes it will increase tourism which will have a positive economic impact on local businesses.
535	Mills, John Francis	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as they question the economic viability of the proposal and believe the demand forecast is overstated. The submitter states that runway safety concerns should be addressed, including building a bridge at the northern end of the runway over SH1.
536	Vivienne Mulholland	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as the proposal is too costly and has unacceptable economic risk. Increased airport noise is of major concern for residents of the eastern suburbs.
537	William Thomas & Pauline Pringle-Thomas	Oppose	No	Opposes the application on the grounds that the effects of climate-change have not been assessed or taken into account in the application, and that the extension is not viable in an economic sense when there are other projects to fund with more tangible benefits.
538	Feast, Deborah	Support	No	Supports the runway extension as it is vital for economic growth and development in Wellington
539	John Feast	Support	No	Supports the application as it is essential for the economic and commercial growth of the Wellington region. They state that additional costs are incurred for goods and services, and business opportunities are lost due to the lack of direct long haul connection to Wellington. The runway extension may also significantly decrease the cost of constructing a second Mt Vic tunnel.
540	Levestam, John	Support	No	Supports the runway extension as they believe it is essential for the economic development of Wellington. They state that there are currently unnecessary additional costs and time involved with exporting goods and services due to the limited air facilities.
541	Kiwibank Limited	Support	No	Supports the proposal as direct long haul flights will provide significant economic benefits to the city, region and nation. They state that the runway extension is consistent with a number of economic development and strategic plans, and long term aspirations of local authorities and the business sector.
542	Cor, Antoinette	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. They have serious concerns regarding the significant impacts to recreation in Lyall Bay. The submitter believes that experts who have looked into this proposal assess that there would be much more detrimental impacts to the bay than stated in the application. Increasing size and number of aircraft would increase pollution (dust) and noise impacts on the area. Construction noise, particularly from construction traffic will have serious impacts on local residents. Increasing airport capacity will add to the serious traffic issues currently experienced in Wellington.
543	Johan Brounts	Support	No	Supports the application in order to stimulate economic activity, employment and tourism. The submitter requests that the design include public access to the seafront for recreation activities such as walking, running and fishing.
544	Thompson, Jon	Oppose	No	Opposes the application on the grounds of the long-term disruption to the ecology of a sensitive marine environment. There is not sufficient economic benefit to mitigate the local environmental destruction.
545	Bacon, Joshua (BACON Architect Studio Limited)	Support	No	Supports the application as it will promote a strong economic environment in Wellington.
546	Barwick, Jessie	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. They strongly believe that the runway extension will damage local ecology and recreation opportunities at Lyall Bay. The marine area affected by the proposal will cause damage to marine life and therefore affect recreation fishers and divers. Impacts to reef heron and little blue penguin. Their understanding is that the surf break at Lyall Bay will be irrevocably damaged. They believe the economic benefits of the proposal are overstated. Traffic impacts and congestion will cause significant impacts during construction and operation of the runway extension.
547	Corlett, Antony	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the runway extension as it has no sound economic basis and poses a large financial risk to ratepayers.
548	Te Papa Tongarewa	Support	Yes	Strongly endorses and supports the proposal. They consider that the significant long-term economic development and growth has been balanced with minimal environmental impacts as assessed by NIWA in the area of affected Wellington coastline.
549	Webber, David	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as it is not in the interests of the economic, social and environmental development of Wellington City or the region. The submitter is critical of the economic justification for the proposed development and believes the benefits are overstated. They believe that the extension

				must not be granted without a substantial investigation of the social, environmental and economic implications of the proposal.
550	Ian Cassels for The Wellington Company Group	Support	Yes	Supports the application as it will be provide economic benefits to Wellington and New Zealand.
551	Trotter, Douglas	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application due to concerns and the lack of a compelling business case for the proposal. Believes that demand forecasts are based on inadequate data, and that a thorough economic cost-benefit analysis is not available. Questions whether geological risks have been adequately addressed. Concerned regarding: potential impacts of climate-change to the proposal; the impacts of construction traffic and noise; and the loss of surf recreation and viability of artificial surf structure.
552	Milligan, Willow	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns included: environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
553	Boone, David	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Submitter sits on the Committee for the Surfbreak Protection Society, and has been consistent contact with WIAL regarding recreation surfing and environmental impacts from the extension. Submits that WIAL has been in conflict with their commitment to preserving Lyall Bay's surf amenities since a meeting in December 2015. Believes that versions of the Surf Mitigation Adaptive Management Plan have been reversed by WIAL on what was previously agreed upon with the submitter. Believes that WIAL cannot be trusted to carry out a project of this magnitude successfully.
554	O'Rourke, Stephen	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Believes there is no evidence of demand or economic viability. Submits that the local environment and community will be negatively affected during construction by truck traffic. Believes that the extension will negatively affect the beach and surf at Lyall Bay (recreation and erosion). Submits that the negative environmental impacts are significant and mitigation is not satisfactory.
555	Spargo, Graham	Support	Yes	Supports the application as significant economic benefits will accrue and help to strengthen the Wellington and lower North Island economies. Believes there is significant demand for long haul flights to Wellington. Resident of Lyall Bay beach and will overlook construction - satisfied that relevant environmental and construction effects have been addressed.
556	Strong, Callum	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Submitter is a spear fisherman and is concerned about impacts to marine ecology and recreation. Concerned about use of dredge fill from harbour entrance.
557	Hartshorn, Guy	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
558	Smith, William	Support	No	Supports the application as it will contribute economic benefit, whereas it will not have much effect on the environment.
559	Baird, Susan	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Believes that the demand or need for the extension does not exist, and the economic benefits are overstated. Concerned regarding not meeting international standards for runway run-off area. Concerned about large impact caused by construction traffic and noise. Critical of the assessment of impacts to the environment and believe that the scale of proposed mitigation measures against the significant impacts of the extension is laughable. Concerned about utilities and resilience, particularly the wastewater outfall and stormwater systems. Believes there is a lack of contingency and recognition of climate-change effects - particularly increase in frequency and severity of storm surges.
560	Sarah Free	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as it will have significant adverse environmental and social impacts. Construction impacts: severe effects on residents from 24/7 noise and vibration from haul trucks; dust; local traffic effects and safety risks to residents; restriction zones over 4 years will be very limiting for recreation users. Long-term impacts: uncertainty regarding the stability of the runway extension due to climate-change; effects to the surf break; uncertainty of maintenance of the sewer outfall and stormwater utilities; impacts to ecology; increased traffic congestion; and increased greenhouse gas emissions.
561	Tagliavini, Giuseppe	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as it will dramatically change the visual character of Lyall Bay and Moa Point, cause traffic impacts, and will not deliver economic benefits.
562	Smith, Ian	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Believes that the demand does not exist for long haul services out of Wellington, and that the economic benefits to the city are overstated. Concerned about the safety of the runway in not meeting the international standards. Construction would totally disrupt transport and daily life - causing significant noise and traffic impacts.
563	Collor, Bianca	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Critical of the lack of critical information and detail in many areas of the application, and a proper assessment of the benefits and costs cannot be made. Believes there is no need for the runway extension and the proposal is not viable. Submits that infrastructure in the City and airport corridor must be improved to alleviate current traffic congestion, and to allow for increased passenger numbers if the extension goes ahead.
564	Helen Salisbury	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Submitter believes that air quality (dust) emissions due to airport operation must be addressed during the consent process. Presents that currently they experience black residue on their property due to aircraft emissions, and that air quality concerns are not adequately addressed in the application. Concerned on the operational noise impacts on local residents from the increasing number and size of planes. Believes the curfew should be strengthened, with no increase in the number of night flights, and no Code E aircraft should be prohibited from arriving during the curfew and night time shoulder. Any impact on the recreation surfing should be investigated and appropriately mitigated. Concerned about noise, vibration and traffic congestion from haul trucks. Submits that WIAL should be required to use sea-based haulage, and land based haulage through airport land instead of residential areas.
565	Ludermir, Pablo	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns included: economic cost-benefit analysis; and environmental effects including surfing, recreation, and marine ecology.]
566	Reid, Alan	Oppose	No	Opposes the application for the following reasons: the case for the benefits from the extension carries too much uncertainty; the effects on the natural environment and communities outweigh any economic benefit; biosecurity risks and costs associated with greater international flights; and that public funding would have greater benefit to the Wellington community if it was invested in other infrastructure, particularly to alleviate traffic congestion.
567	Davidson, Ben	Oppose	No	Opposes as it will ruin the only good safe surf spot on the south coast most accessible to all Wellingtonians.
568	Machado, Flavia	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns included: economic cost-benefit analysis; and environmental effects including surfing, recreation, and marine ecology.]
569	Sajdl, Zlata	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application for the following reasons: priority for ratepayer's money should be used to strengthen existing infrastructure to reduce the risk of earthquake damage; there will be huge and permanent damage to the south coast; huge ongoing noise pollution; economic benefits are overstated and the proposal is not viable; significant traffic impacts and disruption to local residents; traffic congestion on Wellington roads that cannot cope with the increase in passengers.
570	Curry, Peter	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns included: economic cost-benefit analysis; and environmental effects including surfing, recreation, and marine ecology.] Believes the proposal is not worth the economic risk and increased debt to WCC.
571	Holden, Ashley	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to the high economic cost and no guarantee of return on investment

572	Ann Cunninghame	Support	No	Supports this application as believes it will have minimal environmental impact and significant strategic and economic benefits for the region.
573	Weta Workshop	Support	No	Supports the application due to the potential for economic benefit for the submitter (Weta) and for the region in terms of facilitating increased tourist numbers - particularly the Asian market through direct long haul connectivity.
574	Erwin, Mark	Support	Not Specified	Supports the application for the greater economic good of the Wellington region, progress and greater industry
575	Erwin, Anne	Support	Not Specified	Supports the application for the economic development of Wellington regarding tourism and industry
576	Victoria University of Wellington	Support	Yes	Supports the application due to the economic benefits that will be gained. Specific economic gains will be due to international recruitment, retention and investment; increasing international students; and international connectivity. Submitter presents that the proposal will play a major role in improving the City's environmental sustainability - direct flights from Singapore to Wellington would save around 3% and 9% of current CO2 emissions compared with flying via Sydney or Auckland, respectively.
577	Esson, Rachel	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Believe that the proposal is not viable, and the damage to the environment will not be outweighed by the economic benefits. Concerned with safety and length of the RESA - note pilots association concerns. Proposal will have a huge negative benefit to the environment, coastal ecology and visual character of the coast. Increased number and size of planes will increase noise and air pollution (dust).
578	Baier, Joerg	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to the high economic cost with no proven benefits, and the massive damage to the environment the proposal would cause.
579	Pollock, Fingal	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to concerns regarding noise and climate-change. Believes that hearing loss is occurring in the suburbs surrounding the airport, particularly in children, due to current airport operations - these impacts will increase with larger aircraft. Questions how much carbon will be released due to construction and operation of the proposal, and whether climate-change agreements can be met if this proposal goes ahead.
580	MacFarlane, Graeme (Metrolink Trading Limited)	Support	No	Supports the application, particularly how the extension would: (1) increase tourism opportunities; (2) make Wellington a more attractive option for international students; (3) increase Wellington Airport's freight capacity. Satisfied that WIAL has mitigated any environmental impact concerns.
581	Burton, Tara	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns included by submitter: economic cost-benefit analysis; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, and marine ecology.]
582	Esson, Victoria	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the runway extension due to concerns over the safety of the runway operation - noting the pilots association advice. They believe Wellington is already well connected by the current airport.
583	Air New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Reasons given are: it does not achieve the purpose and principles of the RMA; the extension is not necessary, the purported economic and operational benefits will not be realised; the consideration of alternatives has been inadequate; it is contrary to the NZ Coastal Policy Statement 2010; it is contrary or inconsistent with relevant regional and district policy statements and plans; and it does not give effect to, nor is it consistent with, Tourism 2025, or other tourism strategic documents or plans. The submitter is critical of the market demand analysis and forecasting for long haul flights to Wellington, and believes that the proposal is not commercially viable. The submitter is concerned that the applicant has not adequately engaged with them as the largest airline user of the airport, and therefore believes the economic analysis of the project results in much higher forecast benefits than is likely. They believe the application over-estimates the benefits to Wellington airline passengers, and the wider economic benefits to the region. The submitter presents that funding has yet to be obtained for the proposal, so the economic costs of the project cannot be fully assessed. They contend that the proposal will not achieve sufficient return on investment to justify the development, and the costs will be borne by public funding and airline passengers. They present that the proposal fails to meet the threshold test under Policy 10 of the NZCPS - that land reclamation should be avoided unless it will provides significant regional or national benefit, or that particular regard should be provided for "efficient operation" of infrastructure. The submitter is concerned that the proposal will cause unnecessary adverse effects to the environment that will not be avoided, remedied or mitigated, or without any offsetting positive effects or other effects. These include adverse effects to visual landscape and natural character, coastal processes, hydrodynamics and sediment processes, marine ecology and water quality, and recreation including surfing and fishing.
584	Hutt Valley Chamber of Commerce & Industry	Support	Yes	Supports the application as the every effort has been made to mitigate environmental and community impacts, and therefore the benefits of extending the runway exceed the costs. Believe there will be significant economic benefits due to increased tourism, increased international students and increased freight capacity and lower costs for regional exporters. The submitter believes that the 3 areas most affected by the proposal - Moa Point residents, surfing recreation at Lyall Bay, and potential disturbance of sea life ecology - have been mitigated in the application due to the diligence and concerted effort by the applicant in the AEE and community consultation.
585	Wilkinson, Fraser	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Questions the need for the extension - the airport functions perfectly as it is. Believes ugly extension would could significant visual impacts and spoil the south coast. Recreation impacts - the submitter frequently uses Moa Point for eating lunch, and this would be spoiled. Significant construction impacts - extra truck traffic, noise, road damage and dust impacts, which will affect a far greater area than just the eastern suburbs. Operational noise impacts - they can tolerate the current noise levels, but believe that large long-haul aircraft to Wellington is another matter entirely in terms of noise impacts.
586	Vandeleur, Kara	Oppose	Not Specified	Opposes the application. Submitter works from home with a clear view of the airport. Believes economic investment in the runway extension should not take place until sufficient feasibility studies have been conducted, and a written commitment is made from definitive airlines that they have strong interests in scheduling large flights to Wellington. Believes that current infrastructure, particularly traffic, cannot handle the increase in passengers that will come from large planes, and significant investment in Wellington City infrastructure would be necessary.
587	Murphy, Tim	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension as it puts the economic benefits of the airport above the negative impacts on the marine environment and wider community. Lives in Lyall Bay and will be impacted by noise and increased traffic on Onepu Road and by effects on Lyall Bay water quality where they recreationally swim and surf. Roading networks are already struggling and a larger airport will put an increased load on this.
588	Hyam, Peter Nelson	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as it will prove to be a significant economic and environmental loss and cost. Particularly comments on: (1) Marine ecology in the fill area - will affect legally protected species such as Spiny Red Crayfish, paua and kina and there is no information on how the project will uphold the existing legal protection. (2) Traffic congestion - does not accept existing infrastructure will easily absorb the proposal traffic. Notes current congestion issues on Lyall Bay foreshore, along Cobham Drive and Ruahine Street 9-11am Saturday and Sunday, weekend traffic in Ruahine Street, traffic going to the Kilbirnie Indoor Sports stadium. Thinks the project heavy traffic will add significant: congestion, hazards, infrastructure wear and tear, and increased private property maintenance. (3) Marine ecology in the remaining bay - extension will shield the bay to some degree and may be sedimentation and partial stagnation impacts from changes to surf waves. (4) Concerned about impact on recreation in Moa Point Bay (5) Dust contamination - mitigation strategies are only within 50m of its source but submitter believes the dust will travel further than this and is concerned there is no monitoring, mitigation or remedial

				plan to keep dust and grit from affecting e.g. appliances and roof gutters.
589	Guan, Bo	Support	Not Specified	Supports the application as it is good to get economic growth, more tourists, direct flights, and boost employment.
590	Baker, Peter	Neutral	Not Specified	Wants to improve or maintain the recreational surf park at Lyall Bay. Wishes the beach and the contribution to its surfing from the extension to be a positive growth aspect and enable many more visitors and locals to enjoy it.
591	Tourism Industry Aotearoa	Support	Yes	Supports the application. MBIE's NZ Tourism Forecasts 2016-2022 expected to grow by an annual 5.4% and international spend by an annual 7.5% to 2022 and TIA recognises significant infrastructure is required to cater for strong tourism growth. Improved regional dispersal is a key goal. Thinks it would be useful to understand more about the pull factors of direct services from Asia/US to Wellington and needs more itinerary building/ future visitor flows modelling to understand regional dispersal benefits from the extension. Considers the proposal potentially has significant air connectivity economic benefits but is concerned over the reliance on local and central government funding.
592	Gill, Jagmohan	Support	No	Supports as it will economically benefit every Wellington resident directly or indirectly and NZ as a whole.
593	Winifred Ryan & Anne McKinnon	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension. Concerned about traffic, dust, and noise disruption during construction and that economic benefit will be to only a few - the rich. Concerned about damage to Wellington's reputation as the 'coolest little Capital' and its natural capital. Considers the extension will be a visual eyesore and that the solution for surf effects is not guaranteed. Thinks the intimate nature of Wellington would be lost by changes necessary to host many more tourists and house more citizens and opposes the cost to ratepayers. Notes lack of airline commitment.
594	Andersen, Svend	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Lives near the airport and will be personally affected by traffic noise during construction. Considers that the airport should be paying Wellington for the disruption and environmental damage, not asking to be subsidised. Thinks that if there is a demonstrable economic benefit, the airport should only be rewarded afterwards and that if they are not confident enough in their success to raise the money themselves, why should Wellington be shouldering the bill of their gamble? Also considers that there must be more suitable alternative sites.
595	Goodwill, James	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension but supports economic development for Wellington. Believes we should look at more viable sites around the region as insisting on an expensive and potentially unsustainable extension on reclaimed land, and adversely impacting marine life, is a futile exercise.
596	Howard, Mark	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension and is concerned about degradation of surf in Lyall Bay. Wants to see ideas in place to reduce the impact including: removal of the breakwater, a solid side to the new runway rather than boulders that absorb the wave energy, and installation of lights along the corner surf break to increase surfable hours. Concerned that the wave focussing device is unproven and other attempts at artificial reefs have failed.
597	Massey University	Support	Yes	Supports the application on the grounds of economic benefits. Leaves potential negative environmental consequences for others to investigate and report on. Increasing international student numbers studying on the Wellington campus is critical to achieving Massey University's growth agenda. Significant economic and logistical advantages for Massey staff, students and their families entering/departing through a gateway airport closer to campuses in Wellington and Palmerston North. Not having direct flights into the capital from major international cities can negatively influence prospective students' choice of study destination. Considers direct flights could provide an incentive for greater numbers of students' families to accompany them on their return to NZ to graduate.
598	Wollerman, Philip	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Thinks the extension will make only a minor difference to current surf at The Corner. Opposes the untried wave focussing structure and thinks the money would be better used on improving the existing wave. Suggests this could be done by extending into the area of the Corner and lining the wall with sheer concrete. The quality of The Corner wave noticeably deteriorated after the original steel wall lining was replaced with rip-rap, which diffused the swell and available energy. Wants this opportunity to be examined.
599	Connor, Corrina	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because of effects on marine ecology; lack of provision made for climate-change impacts such as sea level rise; effects on surf and recreation on the south coast including from sediment and heavy traffic; and economic implications for ratepayers.
600	Pike, Errol	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application, particularly because of damage to infrastructure, disruption to traffic and inconvenience to residence by construction and in particular by transporting fill. Construction period of up to ten years will have considerable and lengthy disruption to traffic in the eastern suburbs. Considers WIAL has ignored eastern suburbs residents in the past when it seriously inconvenienced access to the western side of the airport by installing ticket barriers. Notes existing traffic issues around the Basin Reserve and considers it irresponsible to add to this congestion. Suggests all fill is brought by water barges instead. Also opposes the runway extension for reasons covered by other submissions. Feels WIAL public consultations were little more than PR spin and has little confidence that WIAL will change their approach to the local community.
601	Robinson, Michael	Oppose	No	Opposes as it has environmental impacts that outweigh the questionable economic returns
602	Hunt, Dennis	Support	Yes	Supports the application due to the economic benefits for Wellington.
603	Hughes, Amy	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension. Lives on Queen's Drive parallel to the proposed extension and will be directly affected by noise and light and doesn't want to live next to a construction site for 10 years. Does not think there is economic demand for a long-haul runway or that it is necessary for Wellington. Also concerned about impacts on marine ecology and wants to know if climate-change impacts have been taken into account.
604	Lyall Bay Surf Life Saving Club	Conditional	Yes	Conditionally supports on the basis that appended conditions form part of the consented activities. Has agreed these changes with the applicant. Submits in relation to effects on surf, recreation, the beach, and club buildings. Changes in beach level will restrict timely deployment of rescue equipment and use of facilities. Concerned that the effects of the extension and proposed submerged wave focussing structure are understood and do not cause adverse erosion, accretion, or safety impacts. Proposes conditions to mitigate potential adverse effects on these.
605	Mead, Tania	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Thinks it is a white elephant project and is concerned about the economic cost to ratepayers and that there will be less money for WCC to spend on other projects. Also concerned about environmental costs including on surf with no evidence the artificial reef will work and on recreation with the 300m exclusion zone.
606	Woolhouse, Anna	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because of effects on recreation and marine ecology; doubts about long-term safety with climate-change sea level rise and storm surges; traffic disruption; economic costs to WCC; acceptability of the extension to pilots in terms of safety; costs to airport users; concern about whether Wellington's infrastructure is up to the task of accommodating more tourists; and the need for WCC to spend funds on more pressing needs.
607	Kidman, Fiona	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application and agrees with the Guardians of the Bay points. Lives overlooking the airport and agrees with Pilots Association about safety concerns with hazardous cross winds. Concerned that Miramar Peninsula is frequently difficult to access because of traffic congestion and the extension will increase this. Disagrees that more international students will come because of direct flights.

608	Peter Marshall	Support	No	Supports the application as it is essential Wellington has an airport that permits long-haul aircraft. Considers it will have economic benefits such as making Wellington more attractive to multinational conglomerates and points to how Luton Airport in the UK revitalised a large town.
609	Lutzebaeck, Beate	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because of environmental impacts on marine habitat. Thinks the economic benefits are uncertain and tourists will not be attracted by destroyed natural habitats.
610	McDonald, Insook	Oppose	Yes	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
611	New Zealand Festival	Support	No	Supports initiatives that will increase the potential for increased visitation to the region and improve international connections
612	Gunson, Michael	Oppose	Yes	Opposes as believes it would impact negatively on Lyall Bay's surf breaks, and on Wellington's community and culture as a whole. Endorses submissions by Surfbreak Protection Society and Guardians of the Bays.
613	Miramar Maupuia Progressive Association	Conditional	No	Supports the application in principles but questions the length of time. Stresses the need for establishment of a liaison group prior to work starting.
614	Hunt, Leigh	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Lives and operates a small business at Moa Point and will be directly affected. Considers the application contrary to the RMA, the Regional Coastal Plan, proposed Natural Resources Plan and the NZCPS; is not economic; and fails to assess alternatives. Concerned about effects on health and recreation from loss of marine ecology. Snorkels, runs, and mountain bikes in the area. Does not think it is economic because airlines don't support it and Auckland and Christchurch airports extend their runways without ratepayer funding.
615	McMullan, John	Oppose	No	Opposes because of destruction of marine habitat and surf break. Thinks WIAL has removed any attempt to beautify the area with urban-design and is interested only in carparks. Does not think there will be an economic benefit.
616	Gardner, Robyn	Support	No	Supports the application for economic benefits. Will most likely shift to Auckland if the extension does not go ahead as they intend to travel a lot more in the future. Particularly supports how the extension would: (1) increase tourism opportunities; (2) make Wellington a more attractive option for international students; (3) increase Wellington Airport's freight capacity. Satisfied that WIAL has mitigated any environmental impact concerns.
617	Gardner, Susan	Support	No	Supports the application for economic benefits. Will most likely shift to Auckland if the extension does not go ahead as they intend to travel a lot more in the future. [In addition, same text as submission #616]
618	Hamish Tweedie, Angerlia Oliver, Hazel Tweedie, Alana Cooper	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Live in Lyall Bay. Reasons for opposition: Traffic infrastructure - inadequate to current needs, especially around the Basin Reserve, and no point increasing airport demand without feed-in infrastructure. Noise - increased noise from flight traffic especially at the edges of the curfew period; construction noise during the night curfew and during calm weather conditions when noise will travel further. Concerned WCC has a conflict of interest and does not adequately investigate noise complaints regarding the airport. Recreation and visual amenity impacts on Lyall Bay. Alternative sites - only study is from 1992. Property rights in Lyall Bay - have been expropriated over time without recompense by increasing airport development. Expropriation of public space for private purposes. Dubious economic benefits.
619	McKay, Andrew	Oppose	Not Specified	Opposes the extension. Regularly uses Lyall Bay area for recreation and is a marine ecologist. Reasons for opposition: concerns about economic benefits, noting BARNZ criticisms; pilots' safety concerns with length of the RESA; climate-change impacts such as sea level rise; Wellington Boardriders Club's criticism of baseline monitoring data; and ecology impacts on the south coast.
620	Sunita Singh & Gavin Dench	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension. Lives in Melrose with a view including the airport. Concerned about effects of traffic congestion; marine ecology and birdlife; airport safety; that the extension will bring airport activity closer to other coastal areas, e.g. Te Raekaihau Point and Hue te Taka; recreation and tourist experiences; visual intrusive nature of the extension; and effect of increased numbers of visitors on Wellington, especially on traffic infrastructure.
621	Tervoort, Rod	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application, particularly because of effects on surf. Has surfed the break for the last 28 years and considers the carpark construction and revetment wall have had a negative impact on the wave. Concerned that the modelling suggests the impacts will be greatest during long period swell events, which are the events that produce the best quality waves. Has limited faith in the proposed wave focussing structure and wants to know if it has worked anywhere else.
622	HAWKINS CONSTRUCTION LIMITED	Support	Yes	Supports the extension. [Includes part of the same text as submission #308 concerning potential economic benefits]
623	350 Aotearoa - Wellington Branch	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application primarily because it will increase aviation emissions at a time when humanity needs to drastically reduce CO2 emissions in the very near term to address climate-change. Concerned that there is no assessment of climate-change impacts in the AEE.
624	Hawes, Freijah	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension because it cannot be undone and it will ruin Lyall Bay, a prized area for many people in the Wellington area.
625	Greenwood, Christine	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Reasons: economic business case, cost to ratepayers, and likely increased fares; noise and disruption from construction; unsuccessful runway extensions within NZ in Hamilton and Rotorua; lack of commitment from airlines; pilots' safety concerns; climate-change considerations; recreation impacts; marine ecology impacts; and use of potentially DDT-contaminated fill.
626	Flynn, Tony	Support	No	Supports the application because of the economic benefits for Wellington and the lower North Island's future.
627	Puddick, Kirsten	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Lives in Lyall Bay and concerned about increased traffic on Onepu Road and Lyall Bay Parade. Values recreation and amenity of Lyall Bay beach and thinks increased traffic will negatively affect local businesses like surf shops and cafes. Would like to see investigation into other locations that don't require reclamation as well as more evidence that a larger airport is required. Concerned about economic viability; cost to ratepayers and increased travel costs; pilots' safety concerns; effects on surf waves; and marine ecology.
628	Hardstaff, Peter	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because the economic case is spurious at best and the environmental case against it is robust. Thinks the fact that the airport won't bankroll the whole thing shows they are not confident it is economically viable.
629	Sajdl, Dennis	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Reasons: use of ratepayers' funds; economic viability including unlikely benefits and lack of airline support; safety concerns with this geographic location; dust and noise impacts; traffic congestion; and ensuring Wellington has regular and timely connections to key Australian hubs will deliver better choices and lower cost for air travellers in and out of Wellington.
630	Parbhu, Jeetan (Jeff Gray BMW & Mini)	Support	No	[No submission details]
631	Kilford, Brent	Oppose	No	Opposes as it will ruin any surf at Lyall Bay

632	Pierson, Marilyn	Support	Not Specified	Supports the application. Travels internationally frequently and believes it would bring economic benefits. Also thinks there need to be significant traffic improvements to ease congestion and allow for an increase in traffic.
633	Hogan, Brendan	Support	No	Supports the application. Reasons: economic benefits; appropriate conditions can address environmental effects; no weight should be given to veiled trade competitor effects from competing airports or airlines; as the capital, Wellington should not have airport infrastructural constraints; and it is in the nation's interest because it will spread operational resilience in the event of natural hazards so that resources can be quickly transported to affected parts of the country.
634	Clark, Sandra	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension. Unconvinced demand exists for it and thinks the need for a passenger tax to partially fund it will discourage airport users. Concerned about environmental impact on sensitive ecosystems. Has noticed increased erosion at the eastern end of the beach and thinks the extension may have a detrimental effect on the beach. Also concerned about traffic, especially during construction.
635	Gorbey, Ken	Support	No	Supports the extension as a ratepayer and as a constant user of the airport.
636	Williams, Christian	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension because of the poor economic business case; negative environmental effects including on marine ecology, surf, noise, and increased climate-change emissions; and because it is inconsistent with WCC's Low Carbon Capital plan.
637	Teichert, Charles	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Lives locally and concerned about cumulative impact of the extension alongside intensification of residential and retail/commercial developments such as the new indoor ASB stadium which are increasing traffic movements. Concerned the proposal will add to traffic congestion, noise and reduced amenity.  [In addition, same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
638	Lindsay Park	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Concerned about economic business case and thinks it should not be funded by ratepayers. Traffic queues already exist near the wharves when luxury cruise boats arrive. Concerned about environmental effects: surf; noise and pollution; loss of natural environmental; and rising wind levels.
639	Skibin, Evan	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as it will be detrimental to Wellington's beauty and the money is better spent on other improvements.
640	Course, Addison	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of adverse effects on the Lyall Bay surf break.
641	Parkin, Tim	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of adverse effects on the Lyall Bay surf break.
642	Nikolai Artemiev	Support	Yes	Supports as believes it will provide many economic benefits to the Wellington region.
643	Purohit, Harish (Delaware North)	Support	No	Supports the application because of economic benefits such as lower fares, reduced travel times, increased tourism, more job opportunities, direct revenue impact, and local business growth due to increased visitor numbers.
644	Nelson Regional Development Agency	Support	No	Supports the application. NRDA works with Nelson Airport, Wellington Airport and Positively Wellington Tourism promoting visitors to/from Nelson. Considers the extension will have economic benefits for the Nelson Tasman region such as increased tourism and business travel.
645	Dean, Frederik	Oppose	Yes	Opposes because of safety concerns, traffic congestion, noise, impact on the south coast, increased housing costs and unproven economic benefits.
646	Parker, Lawrence	Oppose	Yes	Opposes because of (1) Economic viability; (2) misaligned incentives with councillors seeking to gain commercial credibility and non-council owner stakeholders not properly exposed to commercial risks; (3) ratepayer subsidies; (4) unsustainable investment; (5) public policy failure as a whole of NZ approach to the need for international airport facilities would show the proposal cannot be justified; (6) disruption during construction; (7) impact on the south coast and on water recreation; and (8) personally has travelled internationally and the brief inconvenience of the Auckland/Wellington leg is irrelevant. Thinks the convenience of the airport to Wellington city mitigates any inconvenience from lack of direct flights.
647	Murphy, Rita	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Lives in Lyall Bay and will be affected by the construction. Concerned about noise on Onepu Road from trucks and larger airplanes throughout the night; dust pollution and effect on their children; traffic, especially safety impact on children crossing Onepu road on bikes; sea pollution in Lyall Bay and effects on recreation. Also concerned about the economic viability and lack of consideration of alternative sites.
648	Property Council New Zealand	Support	Yes	Supports the application because the economic benefits will outweigh adverse effects. Submits that it will provide for the broad economic well-being of Wellington and individuals. References 2007 International Air Transport Association (IATA) report on economic impacts of improved links to the global air transport network, Wellington's current connectivity, and potential increases in connectivity with the extension. Considers some of the benefits include increasing Wellington's market exposure and increased tourism. Submits that the project is viable and there is sufficient demand, using the recent Singapore Airline flights as an example. Comments on runway capacity and which routes the extension could support.
649	Cotter, Maria	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Economic business case concerns: cost to ratepayers; lack of support from airlines; potential for WCC to cut funding to other projects to pay for budget over-runs; and no guarantee of greater economic growth. Environmental concerns: traffic effects including noise, carbon emissions, dust, safety, congestion and damage to road infrastructure; and effects on Lyall Bay and Moa Point beach areas, including to recreation and ecology.
650	Philpott, Emma	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #605. Concerns regarding: economic business case; effects on surf and recreation.]
651	Cunningham, Carolynne	Oppose	No	Opposes the application and is concerned about the economic costs, project funding, and need for the extension; traffic and noise impacts; and effects on marine reserve and on Lyall Bay beach. Considers that if Wellington must have a larger airport it should be build outside the city, which would also keep the potential for an air disaster away from populated areas.
652	SURFBREAK PROTECTION SOCIETY INC	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Submits primarily regarding effects on surf. Gives background information on SPS and notes increasing number of people who surf has increased and expected to increase. Considers section 6 and section 7 matters relevant to surfing and economic value of surf breaks. Opposes WIAL's proposal because it is inconsistent with NZCPS policies.  Notes heritage significant of Lyall Bay in terms of Duke Kahanamoku's visit in 1915. Includes criticisms of WIAL's technical reports, particularly that the submerged wave focussing structure is unproven [Appends peer review by eCoast as commissioned by the Wellington Boardriders Club, which details concerns with the applicant's technical reports]. Opposes placing rock material into the predominantly sandy beach and is concerned it will be subject to future erosion. Also concerned that the public exclusion zone may obstruct access to the centre of Lyall Bay and also questions how WIAL intend to police these zones.  Appendix 1 - SPS's submission to WIAL including historic photos

				<p>Appendix 2 - eCoast technical review of the DHI surfing impact study</p> <p>Concerned that the urban-design promenade extension would be subject to large swell events and may require an extension of the current Moa Point sea wall, with associated impacts on Lyall Bay. WIAL's maintenance of the sea wall has interfered with the swell corridor for The Corner surf break. Submits that the promenade is unacceptable.</p> <p>Critical of the AEE on recreation, particularly that surfing offers sightseeing opportunities for local cafes and encourages economic activity in the area. Objects to the applicant's assertions about the value of the Lyall Bay surf break.</p>
653	Nicolson, Heather	Support	No	Supports the application due to the economic benefits that will be generated by increased business, cheaper exporting of goods, and tourism.
654	Morgan, Benjamin	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application for the following reasons: the economic case was based on flawed assumptions and biased data - the economic benefits are overstated and the extension is not viable; traffic impacts during construction, noise and nuisance to residents (dust); effects to the surf break (recreation); and effects to sea life ecology, which could be devastating.
655	Rongotai Green Party Branch	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application for the following reasons: it will not promote the management of sustainable resources and will not achieve the purpose of the RMA; is contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA, and other relevant planning and non-statutory documents including the RCP, PNRP and NZCPS; the applicant has no plans to reduce GHG emissions and failed to analyse the impact of climate-change; the economic capital expense has not been proven viable by an independent application to Treasury's Better Business Case Framework; WIAL/WCC reports have not been peer reviewed and are clearly biased in favour of the applicant; no clear and satisfactory mitigation and monitoring plan for all expected impacts on south coast marine ecology, including the habitat loss of threatened species; the assessment of marine life has been sub-standard; the limited data collection provides an incomplete picture of fill sedimentation effects and risks to natural hazards; no evidence that the fill material is not contaminated; the proposal contains no evidence that the Surfbreak Protection Society's conditions will be met, and WIAL has actively tried to get Lyall Bay surf removed as an area of national significance in the Draft Regional Plan (recreation); significant noise, dust, vibration and traffic impacts during construction, with no compensation proposed; proposal does not contain evidence that Pilots Association concerns were taken into account.
656	Bennion, Tom (Bennion Law)	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application due to the application not considering the full effects of climate-change, which significantly undermines the economic case for the extension. Submits that air travel demand within the next 2 to 3 decades will reduce due to voluntary and compulsory GHG reduction measures, changes in passenger views regarding GHG emissions, and changes in the international and domestic economy due to climate-change effects. Direct ecological effects of the extension include loss of intertidal and subtidal habitat.
657	Shearer, Ian	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application for the following reasons: climate-change - significant addition to climate change impacts from construction and operation, measures addressing sea level rise in the application are very limited; traffic effects during construction are unacceptable; a robust business case has not been presented so economic investment is not justified; concerned with impacts to marine ecology, and giant kelp forests and little blue penguins; recreation fishing and diving activities will be affected. Submits the following conditions if consent is granted: (1) That at least 90% of fill material is pumped from barges; (2) WIAL become major partners in the development of a light rail system to connect to Wellington railway station.
658	Kennett, Paul	Oppose	No	Opposes as it will lead to increased climate-change emissions.
659	Bollinger, Timothy	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as it will destroy the environment for the economic gain of WIAL. Believes that the runway extension is not necessary or justified. Submits that the visual impact of the extension is totally out of scale and character to the existing coastline, and will adversely impact on local residents.
660	Taylor, Erin	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application for the following reasons: climate-change is a planetary emergency that must be tackled at all levels, and this proposal is irresponsible from a climate-change perspective; concerned about coastal erosion, which is accelerating due to climate-change; the extension will destroy the Lyall Bay surf beach for recreation; qualities of the marine environment ecology will be threatened.
661	Mt Victoria Residents Association	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application for the following reasons: it will not achieve the purpose of the RMA; there has not been sufficient assessment of alternatives; the cost-benefit analysis exaggerates the economic benefits and the demand forecasts are overstated; the effects on marine ecology are not adequately mitigated; climate change impacts from increase in frequency and size of planes; increased operational noise impacts; noise, traffic and dust emission impacts from construction haul trucks.
662	Feith, Renee	Oppose	Yes	Opposes due to noise pollution and massive environmental impact on the marine environment and recreational use of the bay.
663	Hovey, Richard	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application on the basis of climate-change effects, which are not considered in the application or the economic analysis.
664	Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira Inc	Neutral	Yes	Neutral to the application. Submitter acknowledges the effort that WIAL have taken to mitigate any potential adverse cultural effects. To allow the submitter to practice kaitiakitanga, they recommend an MOU is developed and added as a condition to consent. The MOU should include WIAL to engage and collaborate on the development of an Environmental Management Plan, engaging on: monitoring programme with cultural health indicators to monitor effectiveness of artificial reef system; research on impact of fill sediment on larval stages of taonga species and modelling of the sediment plume; survey of surrounding areas for taonga species; impacts of wave focussing structure on ecology. Submitter recommends that an iwi monitor is resourced and present during works, and is supportive of the accidental discovery protocol.
665	Cranston, Tony	Neutral	Not Specified	[Incomplete submission]
666	The Hurricanes	Support	Yes	Supports the application due to economic benefits and opportunities for Wellington, and ease of travel.
667	Gibson, Megan	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as the proposal does not demonstrate economic viability, and the economic benefits are grossly overstated. Concerned about significant traffic impacts that are unfair and unreasonable to the eastern suburbs residents. Mitigation of the environmental and social impacts put forward in the application is limited.
668	Tourism Industry Aotearoa Hotel Sector	Support	Not Specified	Supports the application as economic growth and tourism growth requires significant investment such as the runway extension, which will complement investment from the tourism and accommodation sectors.
669	FOREST AND BIRD, WELLINGTON BRANCH	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application for the following reasons: is contrary to the purpose and principles in Part 2 of the RMA; the environmental assessments are inadequate and superficial; there is insufficient detail on the nature of the proposed fill and potential contamination; the effects on ecology, particularly threatened or at risk species have not been investigated; issues of stormwater runoff have not been adequately addressed; climate-change effects of sea level rise and storm surges have not been adequately considered; and the environment could be irreparably damaged in the implementation of an unsustainable project that lacks a credible economic business case.

670	O'Byrne, Con	Support	Not Specified	Supports the runway extension as it will deliver great economic benefit, with minimal effects on the surrounding environment.
671	NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY	Neutral	Yes	Areas of interest are: construction traffic and related effects on the wider transport network (SH1 and SH2); and traffic generation from passengers and freight going to and from the Airport in its new operating capacity, and what effects there will be on the transport networks in the Wellington region. Submitter seeks: conditions of consent that will avoid, remedy, mitigate and manage the adverse effects on the transport network of truck hauling and construction materials; clarification of the modelling used to determine what operating effects are likely to occur on the transport network during construction and once at full capacity; conditions of consent to avoid, remedy, mitigate or manage any adverse effects that the operating effects of the airport substantiate a material impact contributing to the need for transport network upgrades; and any alternative relief that would address the concerns of the submitter. The submitter anticipates the above matters can be resolved prior to the hearing via further discussion and working with the applicant to agree to conditions.
672	WEEBER, YVONNE	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as it is: inconsistent with Part 2 of the RMA; inconsistent with, and contrary to, the policies of the NZCPS; and inconsistent with, and contrary to, the objectives and policies of the Regional Policy Statement, Regional Coastal Plan and the District Plan. Submission is a detailed assessment of the application, focussing on urban-design and landscape architecture matters. Submits that the application is contrary to s5, and many subsections of s6 and s7 of the RMA. Likely to have impacts to water quality and marine ecology. Application is contrary to NZCPS: Objectives 2 & 4 and associated policies, Policies 11, 14, 15 and 16 - protecting visual landscapes and coastal environment; Objective 4 and Policies 18, 19 and 25; Objective 5 and Policy 3 - climate-change. Proposal is inconsistent with WRPS Objectives and Policies addressing water quality, and protection of natural character of the coastal environment. Proposal is inconsistent with WRPS urban-design principles. Land reclamation is not fully justified and all available alternatives have not been considered. Proposal is contrary to the Proposed Natural Resources Plan, particularly Objectives 54, 55, 56 & 58. Proposal will impact on marine ecology through turbidity and sediment from fill. Development is contrary to the District Plan Open Space B zone Objectives and Policies. Effects to visual landscape and natural character are irreversible, and more than minor. Construction of the extension will have more than minor effects on the recreation pursuits of people in Lyall Bay and Moa Point. Submits that Technical report 6 is not thorough enough in data or analysis for recreational activities. Concerned about residents living on truck haulage routes being subject to traffic, noise, dust and visual effects during construction. Submits that the AEE and technical reports do not provide a true picture of the effects of the proposal, and that the cumulative effects of another reclamation are not analysed by the applicant in a comprehensive way. Submits that Technical Report 25 down-plays the significance of adverse effects to marine ecology and environmental quality as temporary in nature. Believes the reclamation will put another headland - that is engineered with no natural character - into the southern coastline. Submits that the significance of visual effects would range from high to extreme, and are understated in the Boffa Miskell assessment. Disagrees with the urban-design assessment of the extension in Technical Report 23 p9, and believes that the urban design effects will range from extreme to very high-high for Moa Point and Lyall Bay residents respectively. Concerned that a precedent will be set by this reclamation that further reclamation will be easier in future. Submits that the urban-design assessment under the Urban Design Protocol focuses on context and connectivity, rather than the more fundamental custodianship guidance which should have been applied to the southern coastline. Considers that the application creates substantial custodianship effects and does not support an enjoyable, safe public space and quality environment.
673	Harrison, Ian	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as the economic benefit numbers have been grossly exaggerated. The submitter presents their review paper of the cost-benefit analysis (Tailrisk Economics - December 2015, 11 pages) as detailed support of their submission - that the cost-benefit is based on flawed assumptions, incorrect or incomplete data, and favourable estimates. Submit in the review paper that the effects of climate-change have not been taken into account in the cost-benefit analysis.
674	Weale, Denita	Oppose	Yes	Opposes due to the impact on the environment and animals.
675	Smith, Alex	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns included: environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.] Submits that we are currently facing runaway climate change, and we should not be encouraging the most carbon intensive form of transport.
676	Turner, Ellery	Oppose	Yes	Opposes due to the impact on the environment and animals.
677	Barry Wilson for Wellington Loyal & Progressive Group	Support	Yes	Supports the application for reasons (1) necessary to future proof the city and regions; (2) in-bound tourism economic benefits; (3) Believes we should be developing return flights from China and Air NZ lobbying against the extension is monopolistic, nationally disloyal, and boorish; (4) is over the time wasted in Auckland waiting; (5) to grow tourism in NZ's shopping, fashion, cultural and food capital; (6) Wellington is the gateway to the Wairarapa and Marlborough.
678	Sangster, Oliver	Neutral	No	Regularly surfs at Lyall Bay and endorses the submission of Wellington Boardriders Club [#281]. Supportive of consent being granted based on the conditions for surfing impact mitigation being imposed as suggested by Wellington Boardriders.
679	TE NGARU ROA A MAUI	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Te Ngaru Roa a Maui (TNRM) is a surf organisation based on cultural tangata whenua values. Surf impacts: critical of evidence for DHI claim that the Corner will be impacted upon by only 4-8%. Concerned there could be adverse effects from substantial urban-design works to Moa Point Promenade extension. Notes DHI report replies on NIWA Sediment Transport Modelling that only covered a small window of 8 weeks with minimal simulation of strong southerly winds that can cause significant sediment transport into Lyall Bay. Concerned that the SWFS will be constructed by an excavator that may only operate in fair weather conditions, resulting in long delays or potential damage to the structure while left uncompleted. Considers that most of the provisions in the Draft Surf Mitigation and Adaptive Management Plan should have been undertaken previously. Concerned that SWFS success is uncertain with high risk of shoreline erosion or that the SWFS will be damaged in storm events - no information provided on how this will be removed if so.  Concerned about traffic impacts such as noise, travel times, health and safety, and vibration, especially on directly affected Moa Point road residents; impact on marine ecology from habitat destruction, constant compacting and machinery noise over 4-5 years and use of Centreport fill that may contain toxins and DDT; effects on recreation users of toxic DDT laden water. Concerned the economic cost benefit analysis is flawed and asks why if it is such a good investment, WIAL is not paying for the extension out of its own reserves; concerned that the effects of the exclusion zone on recreation have been downplayed. Submits that the proposal does not meet statutory requirements.
680	Lamb, Pete	Oppose	No	Opposes due to effects on recreation, specifically fishing
681	Heuston, Sean	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Lives in Lyall Bay and believes the extension will negatively change the look and feel of the area. Also concerned about: questionable economic viability of the project, costs, traffic, construction impacts on noise, air pollution and road safety, surf effects, safety of big planes landing and departing, marine ecology effects and climate-change effects on people.

682	Heuston, Veronika	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Lives in Lyall Bay and believes the extension will negatively change the look and feel of the area. Also concerned about: questionable economic viability of the project, costs, traffic, construction impacts on noise, air pollution and road safety, surf effects, safety of big planes landing and departing, marine ecology effects and climate-change effects on people.
683	McGivney, Gary	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Opposes taxpayer funds being spent on this project and destruction of the bay for the alleged economic gains of a runway that no airline has said they will use.
684	Bisley, William	Oppose	Yes	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
685	Wellington Culinary Events Trust Inc	Support	No	Supports the application. WECT's core activities are to deliver Visa Wellington on a Plate and Beervana and long-term aim is to grow activities with a view to attracting an international audience. Success in gaining an international attendance will increase with direct access to Wellington from long-haul destinations. Airport provides access to national and global market for the WCET and is a catalyst in maintaining and encouraging economic growth and tourism. Direct entry point into central NZ will provide more choice for tourists.
686	SHADBOLT, MARY	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension. Lives in Maupuia close to the airport. Reasons for opposing: lack of proper economic business case including that WIAL appear not to want to take the risk of major investment, lack of airline support, and questionable assumptions about tourist behaviour; traffic effects during construction, especially night haulage noise, congestion, and road safety effects.
687	Zwartz, David	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Reasons: (1) Concerned at lack of independent economic business case and thinks other infrastructure improvements would show better return than this one and that if the runway extension case is financially sound, WIAL is capable of financing it by conventional means; (2) Lack of airline support and pilots' safety concerns; (3) construction effects. Strongly opposes increase in truck traffic using the Basin Reserve Area and Mt Victoria tunnel; (4) environmental effects on marine ecology of Lyall Bay, Moa Point, Taputeranga Marine Reserve; (5) climate-change effects such as sea level rise and storm surge throw doubt on future safety of the extension; and (6) alternative airport sites. Current site is vulnerable to earthquake damage and sea level rise and with northward population growth, calls for reconsideration of siting of the airport further north.
688	Board of Airline Representatives New Zealand Inc	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because it fails to meet the tests set out in Part 2 of the RMA. Other reasons: InterVISTAS Reports BARNZ commissioned Ailevon Pacific Aviation Consulting to review the InterVISTAS Reports [attached as appendix to submission] and considers they provide an overly optimistic view of Wellington Airport's non-stop long-haul service potential: (a) Wellington travel market is small and slow-growing; (a) extent of Wellington's catchment is smaller than identified; (c) INTERVISTAS overestimates existing and potential long-haul demand; (d) INTERVISTAS incorrectly assumes Wellington's location is advantageous for connections compared to Auckland and Christchurch; (e) projections ignore the role that Auckland and Sydney play in catering to non-stop long haul demand. Provides reasons why the potential routes to Singapore, Los Angeles, Dubai via Melbourne, Hong Kong, and other Asia are unlikely to eventuate.  Economic analysis CBA misleading because (a) Although InterVISTAS says the forecasts by route are mutually exclusive, they are all included in the projections of benefits; (b) benefit of additional visitors' spending is significantly overstated because it does not take proper account of labour costs and fixed capital costs of meeting the demands of these passengers; (c) benefits associated with savings in travel time are overstated because they use values based on estimates made overseas in higher income countries than NZ; (d) The spreadsheets suggest that for the early years the CBA uses higher numbers of passengers than those implied by InterVISTAS demand forecasts; (e) Omissions of substantial costs such as the costs of environmental damage and mitigation. When corrected for errors, the CBA benefit cost ratio is less than 1.0. BARNZ considers it likely that if the projected non-stop long haul flights do not eventuate, WIAL would increase charges for all other services to collect the additional approximately \$47m per annum required, which would increase airfare costs.  Other effects Adverse environmental effects on (a) the Lyall Bay surf break; (b) many years of traffic effects during construction; (c) amenity impacts from the visual effect of the extension; (d) effects on marine life and recreation.  Includes appendices with further details: Appendix 1 - background to BARNZ Appendix 2 - Ailevon Pacific Aviation Consulting Report review of the WIAL passenger forecast reports Appendix 3 - Spreadsheets in support of Sapere CBA Appendix 4 - Issues with the spreadsheets underlying the Sapere CBA
689	Barrowman, Andrew	Support	No	Supports the application.
690	Barbara Mitcalfe & Chris Horne	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Economic concerns: funding of the proposal, reduced council funds for other essential projects, and potentially exaggerated benefit/cost ratio. Climate-change concerns: appears to ignore NZ's commitment to slash greenhouse gases and effects of increased storm surges and sea level rise. Marine ecology concerns: sediment plumes blanketing benthic communities. Construction impacts concerns: traffic, noise, and vibration effects on roads and residents. Concerned it may increase landing fees if the project proceeds and that no airline has committed to flying unsubsidised long haul flights. Questions Infratil's record on airport management. Believes Dominion Post advertisements are misleading in terms of how many international links the extension would bring and wants to know who paid for them.
691	Paua Industry Council Limited & PauaMAC2	Support	No	Supports the application due to increased freight export opportunities, and the opportunity to enhance the marine habitat for paua in Lyall Bay. Recommends conditions to facilitate the recolonisation of affected marine species following construction.
692	Morris, Alice	Support	No	Supports the application because of economic benefits such as increased tourism, domestic and international trade and freight movement. Has friends in China who have sent their children to study in Melbourne rather than Wellington because of the difficulty in getting here.
693	Moreton, Shirley	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Lives in Moa Point and 4 years of construction noise, traffic, dust, and pollution will cause serious disruption to their life. Concerned about effects on marine ecology and the exclusion zones that won't allow use of Moa Point or Lyall Bay beaches for recreation for years. Notes damage from previous storms and asks whether the extension will work or will it be submerged sometimes? Doesn't believe the extension will bring more economic benefits and thinks if it is needed it should be located at the top of the south island. Thinks costs are likely to cost more than estimated.
694	Sustainability Trust	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension, with specific concerns relating to: (1) ongoing climate-change carbon emissions increases; (2) congestions and safety issues from increased truck traffic and wants to see detailed assessment of mitigation measures to improve low-carbon options during construction; (3) use of public funds for a purpose that will provide questionable economic benefit.
695	Nicolson, John (Irwell Rest Home)	Support	No	Supports the application. Considers there is demand for long-haul services and increasing the length of the runway has the potential to reduce fuel consumption and thus climate-change carbon

				emissions. Notes noise levels are not expected to be significantly louder or breach any of the long-term compliance regulations and WIAL has consulted with local residents about sound proofing buildings with double glazing. Considers recreation impacts minor and surf impacts mitigated by a wave focussing structure. Considers sediment will disperse quickly with no lasting effects on marine ecology. Thinks that if the extension occurs at the same time as the proposed harbour entrance dredging, the synergies could result in significantly lower traffic volumes. Highlights economic benefits including increased tourism, business productivity, increased student tourism, freight productivity, and an increase in aviation related expenditure.
696	Short, Katherine	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned the economic business case doesn't stack up and disagrees with subsidising SIA to fly into Wellington. Travels internationally regularly but would rather the south coast stays as it is and spend a few extra hours going through Auckland. Concerned about maintenance and safety challenges of the location and risk of cost overruns. Concerned about effects on marine ecology if kelp is smothered by sediment.
697	Roberts, Ben	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because of safety concerns; impact on the environment; noise as they live nearby; and because why should the local council and taxpayers fund this?
698	Thomson, Christine	Oppose	No	Opposes the application primarily because it runs counter to the need to reduce climate-change carbon emissions.
699	Campbell, David John	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as it exaggerates the economic benefits and minimises the environment effects. Considers WIAL should risk more than 10% of their own money. Concerned at traffic effects and finds it difficult to accept WIAL's assessment that the extra numbers of long-haul aircraft take-offs would be within the day/night average noise limits set for the airport.
700	Kleyn, Russell	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.] Supports GOTB summary of reasons.
701	St Patrick's College	Neutral	Yes	Neutral towards the extension but seriously concerned about the impact of heavy truck traffic movements during construction, especially the proposal to use a route that includes Evans Bay Parade. Particularly concerned about the impact of thirty 23m-long HPMV's trucks per hour travelling past St Patrick's College on health and safety of staff and students. Safety concerns: the College shares classes with St Catherine's College and students move between the schools during the day, many crossing Evans Bay Parade. Two driveways exit from the college onto Evans Bay Parade - concerned about safety of turning vehicles; many students also walk to College from Hataitai and there is no controlled pedestrian crossing apart from the lights at Cobham Drive; would also like to acknowledge and express concerns about the safety of disabled students attending Kimi Ora and crossing Evans Bay Parade. Health concerns: dust and debris from traffic as they move past the College; impact of increased traffic noise on classroom activities and on recreational time during planned breaks; and impact on the College's 3 tenanted flats located on Evans Bay Parade. Wants a route to be found that only uses State Highway 1.
702	Hicks, Matthew	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned about the cost to ratepayers; effect on marine environment; safety of pilots landing planes. Expresses a number of doubts about the economic business case, particularly Infratil's decision not to contribute significantly, expected economic benefits, cost of insurance, and declining international enrolments in WIAL's catchment region. Highlights issues with the location and considers a further north alternative site would be better and would avoid the traffic and disruption from construction.
703	Skrzynski, Peter	Oppose	Yes	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns about: economic cost-benefit analysis; construction effects including traffic; environmental effects including surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.]
704	WEBSTER, ELISE	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Lives at Moa Point and will be directly affected by construction and the extension itself. Concerns include: not being able to swim or collect kai moana, disrupted sleep from noise, dust, and exclusion zone preventing recreation. Visual impact concerns: vast concrete monstrosity festooned by rubbish and plastic bags caught in the barbed wire around the perimeter of the runway. Noise: concerned noise impact is underestimated and that all plans will take off immediately in front of their house. Cultural: of Ngati Toa descent and considers that Ngati Toa have not been made aware of the detailed information about impacts on mana whenua. Economic: considers WCC has failed to insist on a comprehensive business case using Treasury's Better Business Case model and concerned at lack of response to criticisms of the technical reports.
705	Warwick, James	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension. Has seen changes in surf, rips, sand levels and erosion over time and believes they have been exacerbated by the previous runway extension, maintenance on sea wall, and installation of storm water pipes on the seaward side of the road and concerned the extension will exponentially increase this negative impact. Concerned about traffic congestion and longer travel times; recreation and surf effects; safety of extension length. Unconvinced by proposed wave mitigation structure. Concerned that the applicant's reports downplay the environmental impact and has no confidence in the economic business case and thinks these need independent review. Considers extending north into Evans Bay would have less environmental impact.
706	Randerson, Jackie	Oppose	Yes	Opposes because of concerns about impacts on recreation and social life; economic costs and funding by public money; global advice is to build away from the coast to plan for climate-change; and increased air fare charges increasing inequality.
707	Knox, Johanna	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because it will subtract from Wellington's value, likely be a huge economic risk, be disruptive during construction, impact on Lyall Bay's recreation and surf community value, and destroy the coast's environmental values.
708	Rotmann, Sea	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Lives at Moa Point and will be directly affected. Has a PhD on the environmental impacts from sediment and turbidity stress on marine fauna and experience in a number of environmental roles. Considers the sampling methodology and data collection the technical reports are based on flawed and the description of Lyall Bay/Moa Point ecology and faunal and floral assemblage inaccurate and thus the assessment inadequate.  Social impact concerns Uses bay extensively for a range of recreation activities and concerned about the impact of the 300m exclusion zones. Considers recreation impact reports lack local experience. Concerned about: human health and safety during construction; traffic and noise impacts, especially increased traffic through main access roads to Moa Point and questions the airport's assertion that Moa Point Road won't be off-limits. Considers the applicant's suggestion that Moa Point residents can be accommodated in hotels during loud periods of construction unrealistic. Doesn't think the application has taken into account the considerable forces of Cook Strait. Considers the reports have visual landscape values to residents and visitors.  Economics Considers forecasting and cost-benefit analysis flawed and concerned about cost to ratepayers and increased airport charges, which will impact the submitter personally.  Alternative sites Does not consider the applicant has adequately assessed alternatives.
709	Qantas Airways Limited	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. On the basis of Qantas Group's existing operations and growth plans, does not believe a substantial investment in runway infrastructure is required at this time. Acknowledges possible economic benefits but considers over-investment in infrastructure is likely to result in higher

				ticket prices in the medium term which could reduce demand and have negative economic impacts.
710	Swartz, Jonathan	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Lives in the outer cone of the flight path and already finds large plane noise disruptive and the extension would increase this problem. Concerned at the length of the construction time, particularly the night haulage times; that the economic business case is costly and not viable; and concerned about effects on marine ecology and recreation including surf.
711	Stubbs, Samantha	Support	No	[Part of the same text as submission #695. Highlights economic benefits and comments on effects on noise, recreation, surf, and marine ecology]
712	Hue te Taka Incorporated	Oppose	Yes	<p>Opposes the application. HtT's objective is to protect the interests of Moa Point residents impacted by the proposal and it considers there are no conditions of consent that will adequately avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects on them. Submits that consultation with Moa Point residents has been inadequate and details process to date. Believe alternative locations have not been adequately considered.</p> <p>Environmental concerns HtT has members who whakapapa to local mana whenua and are concerned about impacts on cultural values including mauri and kaimoana. Value the environment for recreation, kai moana, views, marine ecology and concerned about impacts on these. Consider the technical reports are lacking sufficient and validated data.</p> <p>Social, health and safety and recreational impacts Consider their way of life will be destroyed. Critical of recreation reports, particularly limited knowledge of fisheries undertaken in the area. Concerned about impacts on surf, and impacts of noise, dust, traffic, vibration, and access to evacuation zones. Do not think the proposed mitigation options adequate.</p> <p>Economics Critical of economic viability, costings, and do not want their rates to support it.</p>
713	Wellington Regional Economic Development Agency	Support	Yes	Supports the application as WREDA is a strong advocate of improvements in Wellington's international connectivity. Highlights economic benefits including more tourists, increased convenience, more international students, reduced possibility of businesses relocating, making Wellington a more attractive destination, international business activity, raised profile of Wellington and broadening the appeal of NZ. Considers there is sufficient demand and growth to support the extension.
714	CHORUS NZ LTD	Support	No	Supports the extension on the basis of socio-economic benefits and improved business connectivity. No Chorus assets within the immediate vicinity of the proposal but they note any proposals to relocate or disturb infrastructure would be managed through the network utilities management plan as proposed by the applicant. Do not comment on environmental effects but anticipate these would be subject to appropriate conditions.
715	Todd, Geoff	Support	No	Supports the application as a truly international airport is a critical component for the region to thrive. Comments on economic benefits: reduced cost of doing international business, increased convenience of travel, and connectivity with the global economy.
716	Kettles, Helen	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Uses Lyall Bay beach for recreation and has an active interest in maintaining the health of the coastline. Reasons for opposition include: risky investment with no independent economic business case; wants rate money to be spent elsewhere; increased costs of regional flights; airline pilots' safety concerns; site may not be sustainable with climate-change and tsunami risk; noise, traffic, and dust impacts; concerned about public exclusion zones; impacts on marine ecology and use of contaminated fill. Also concerned about visual impact, reduction in natural character and surf effects.
717	Collins, Tim	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because of adverse effects on the high quality surf waves at The Corner.
718	Pilcher, Ricci	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension because the effects on marine ecology, the coastline, and surf cannot be undone.
719	Lambrechtsen, DR Nicolaas	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because does not want Wellington ratepayers to be levied for a project that should stand on its own economic merits and concerned that there is no mention in the reports of the technical problems with wave erosion when extending the runway southwards. Fearful that there will be cost over-runs due to rock placements being washed away in severe storms.
720	Gibson, Cliff	Oppose	Not Specified	Opposes because no ratepayer money should be invested as the economic business case is not believable and the major shareholder would be the major beneficiary.
721	Bowler, Patrick	Support	Yes	Supports the application as it balances the need for an airport capable of connecting Wellington by direct flights to a wider range of countries, with the need to minimise the impact on the environment.
722	Kominik, Anna	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerns about negative economic consequences including project viability and cost to ratepayers; pilots' safety concerns; and decreased attractiveness of Wellington resulting from the project. Concerns about environmental effects, particularly on surfing, recreation, marine ecology and use of contaminated fill; and climate-change impacts.
723	Strathmore Park Progressive & Beautifying Association Inc	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as it will adversely impact a proportion of Strathmore Park residents. Notes WIAL has not attempted to consult with those residents identified as receivers of construction noise. Wants noise mitigation measure named "runway 35" from Technical Report 8 to be considered. Encourages residents input into the Community Liaison Group but does not think such a group should be responsible for managing a consent allowing 24-hour construction with sound levels known to cause sleep disturbance. Considers proposed noise during the night curfew unacceptable. Acknowledges that while homes within the Air Noise Boundary have the opportunity to be insulated and ventilated, homes in their suburb are offered a subsidy of less than 100% cost. Want noise insulation work to proceed prior to start of construction and on a 100% subsidy basis. Opposes specific sections of the AEE noise reports.
724	Palmer, Karen	Support	Not Specified	Supports the application as the present arrangement through Auckland is slow and pedantic and the population base in Wellington would be appropriately served by the extension.
725	Yule, Mike	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application on the basis that the risks and benefits have not been sufficiently independently explored and that it is unfairly funded. Homeowner in Breaker Bay and uses this reef for diving and other recreation. Concerned about the WIAL advertisements being biased and that there is no independent assessment of the economic business case. Considers risks and costs entirely socialised and likely to result in economic disadvantage, particularly with potential for remedial investment to mitigate surf depletion, coastal erosion or contamination of the seabed. Sceptical of lack of consideration for the impact of climate-change.
726	Ryrie, David & Gillian	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Includes a number of questions about WIAL's demand forecasts, climate-change impacts, and noise impacts on Strathmore, Miramar, Kilbirnie and Hataitai. Also concerned about cost and economic funding by WCC and lack of consideration of alternatives.
727	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated Society	Oppose	Yes	<p>Opposes the application for reasons including: Marine environment - unclear extent of effects and inadequate information and data in reports. Lyall Bay/Moa Point environment inadequately described.</p> <p>Climate-change - failed to take a precautionary approach or give regard to possible effects of sea level rise and storm surge. Does not give effect to WCC's Low Carbon Capital Plan.</p>

				<p>Recreation, fishing, kaimoana - permanent loss of Airport Rights surf break, inadequate consideration of effects of 300m exclusion zone for up to 4 years on recreation activities, unproven submerged wave focussing structure.</p> <p>Urban-design, landscape, visual amenity - submits that effects on amenity values will be significant and adverse; disagrees with assessment that the extension would look sufficiently 'natural' to be acceptable or well-integrated into existing context. Submits that the assessment fails to acknowledge significance of changes.</p> <p>Passenger forecasts - based on flawed data with catchment over-exaggerated to include destinations as far south as Kaikoura. Concerned ticket prices will increase for passengers to cover costs.</p> <p>Economic analysis - Cost-benefit analysis flawed and compounded by overly optimistic passenger forecasts.</p> <p>Cultural values - GOTB represent some people who whakapapa to local mana whenua and are concerned about adverse effects on mauri, water quality, kaimoana, and local taonga.</p> <p>Construction impacts; noise; traffic; and health and safety</p>
728	Ramanathan, Bhageerathy	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because no reliable studies done on economic benefits and environmental cost to the south coast is too high.
729	Green Party Wellington Province	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application on social, environmental, and economic grounds. Economic concerns include: no plan to reduce greenhouse gas emission or analyse impact of climate-change on the airport's economic future; high proportion of public funding; lack of independent peer review of report. Environmental concerns include: no satisfactory mitigation plan for marine ecology impacts; sub-standard assessment of marine life; no proposal for long-term data collection on hydrodynamics, sediment movement especially geomorphological and seismic data of Lyall and Moa Point Bays; unknown fill composition; surf effects; no evidence residents will be compensated for noise, dust and vibration issues from traffic; no strategy to mitigate transport bottleneck implications of the proposed route; and no evidence that pilots' safety concerns with the length of the RESA have been taken into account.
730	Pemberton, Ruth	Oppose	Not Specified	Opposes the application because of effects on marine ecology, particularly from contaminated fill; effects on recreation and surf; traffic effects during construction, particularly the use of Evans Bay Parade and Onepu Rd as a route; overstated economic benefit/cost predictions; lack of support from airlines; and lack of consideration of climate-change impacts.
731	de Lisle, Jane	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to concerns about the economic business case; environmental impacts from traffic, noise, and effects on marine life and recreation as well as increasing climate-change contributions; and airline pilots' safety concerns for larger planes landing.
732	Hoy, Dolores	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application due to lack of convincing economic business case, high cost to ratepayers, and negative effects of increased traffic.
733	Brodie, Chanelle	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because there will be greater adverse effects compared to positive effects for Wellington. Reasons include: visual impact of eliminating existing natural environment and impact on marine ecology; social and recreation effects including on the surf break; and effects on the character of the coastal environment, particularly on the region's outstanding natural features and landscapes located within view of the airport extension site.
734	Woodward, Iona	Oppose	No	Opposes the extension as not enough evidence of the promised economic benefits and the extensive disruption and costs of construction have not been justified.
735	OraTaio: The NZ Climate and Health Council	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned about economic viability, particularly in the context of the new global zero net emissions direction; physical viability, particularly in the context of climate-change; and adverse health impacts from construction including dust, diesel truck pollution, increased truck volumes discouraging active transport growth, noise effecting sleep quality and quantity, and risks from contaminated fill from Centreport dredging.
736	Montgomerie, Christine	Neutral	Yes	Neutral towards the application. Concerned about overstated economic cost-benefit predictions, risk to ratepayers and unconvinced tourists will opt to do a figure-8 travel itinerary. Main concern is regarding traffic impacts during the construction and beyond. Wants a condition to ensure all fill is transported via barge and a more comprehensive transport plan developed to enable increased visitors to commute between the CBD and airport more easily.
737	Springford, Elizabeth	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application, mainly due to concerns about lack of climate-change considerations. Also concerned considerable money has been spent before any independent economic business analysis and that the airport has attempted to exclude surf interests from the process and has proposed a remedy that is relatively untested. Would like to see how much the airport is donating to mayoral and councillor candidates declared publicly.
738	The New Zealand Air Line Pilots Association	Oppose	Yes	Opposed to an extension of the Wellington Airport runway unless the extension includes an adequate Runway End Safety Area or it incorporates an Engineered Material Arresting System.
770	Webster-Adams, Lily	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as the runway will not only affect the direct area it is proposed to occupy, but neighbouring bays and communities, and the future for the wider city. Notes that Government and Airlines do not support it and believes that it will fall short economically of funding and support, leaving the potential of long life debt to be paid off as a city. Notes that people will visit Wellington for the culture and will not be enticed to visit by the runway. Shares concerns for international students as believes that Wellington is not adequately prepared to support the supposed influx of students who will come here if the runway is extended.
773	Flewelling, Sally	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns included: economic cost-benefit analysis; and environmental effects including surfing, recreation, and marine ecology.]
774	Graykowski, Judith	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application and notes that it has failed to conduct a Social Impact Assessment outlining the scale and impact of the project on the neighbourhoods and peoples/tangata whenua of the Bays: homes, community spaces, schools sporting precincts, and recreational leisure activities - walking, bicycling, running, swimming pursued in the outdoors around Evans Bay, Lyall Bay and nearby. Notes concerns about carbon emissions and contribution of the project to climate change. Concerned that the application will not promote the management of sustainable resources and will not achieve the purpose of the RMA; is contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA, and other relevant planning and non-statutory documents including the RCP, PNRP and NZCPS; will not meet foreseeable needs of future generations; will not enable social, economic and cultural wellbeing; does not avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on environment; and fails to adequately assess alternatives.
775	McKenzie, Alisdair	Support	No	Supports the application and notes the significant time and money savings as a frequent international business traveller. Also notes that the extension would generate additional services and passengers inbound and outbound and stimulate increased economic and tourist activity to benefit the city, region and country.
	<b>LATE SUBMISSIONS</b>			
739	Bent, John	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because of concerns about costs, lack of evidence, and adverse effects.

740	Cotter, Sophie	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because they do not believe a thorough environmental impact analysis has been conducted. Particularly concerned about noise pollution, traffic congestion, and pollution effects on recreation at Lyall Bay beach.
741	Schone, Janice & Fritz	Oppose	Yes	Opposes because they are not satisfied the project is feasible considering the weather and sea conditions, because they would prefer the airport for large aircraft relocated to Ohakea with a fast train service to Wellington, and because a proper economic business case has not been produced.
742	Kane, Patricia	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as no airlines are interested; truck traffic every 2 minutes; safety of the length of runway; and adverse effects on marine ecology in the reserve and little blue penguins nesting near Moa Point.
743	Appropriate Technology for Living Association	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the extension because (1) has not seen a good economic business plan; (2) network approach using Auckland will produce less greenhouse gas; (3) need to reduce climate-change emissions; (4) sea-level rise and storm surge make this an unwise location; (5) construction traffic; and (6) people are attracted to Wellington for reasons other than easy airline access.
744	Power Squadron Marine Management	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application because impacts on fishing are generally poorly considered; there will be a negative impact on commercial rock lobster fishing; and the intended vessel exclusion zone is too big and will exacerbate the negative impact on rock lobster fishing. Consider that there is potential for short to medium term habitat loss for paua and lobster to be offset by new created habitat. Outlines potential adverse effects of displacement of commercial rock lobster from the grounds inside the construction zone, including: competition for catch on adjacent grounds; decreased average rock lobster fishing incomes; increased gear and spatial conflicts between commercial and amateur fishermen; and increased risk of gear loss and accidents if fishermen feel they are forced to fish where/when they may not otherwise have attempted. Submits the applicant has not obtained sufficient information to understand these effects. Details the Quota Management System that applies to rock lobsters and that the proposed construction zone is sited within Statistical Area 915 of the rock lobster fishery. Details constraints on this fishery and impacts of displacement of fishermen from the construction exclusion zone. There are twenty or more commercial pots regularly set in the general area proposed to be closed to fishing during and after construction with an estimated daily value of \$2,600 and seasonal value of \$89,000/tonne. Applicant makes no provision to address the impact.
745	Housing New Zealand	Neutral	Yes	Neutral towards the application but would like to seek clarification on and suggests changes to the proposal to address potential impacts on HNZ properties just outside the airport noise boundary line and within the flight path.
746	Bagnall, David	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Critical of the economic assessment being based on the proportion of the population of the world who can fly directly to Wellington as does not consider this a key factor in tourists' decision making. Considers it will have a negative impact on tourism. Notes primary mitigation action proposed for loss of visual amenity is to purchase properties at Moa Point but this does not reduce the impact on visual amenity for other users of the area. Applicant does not assess liquefaction risk to the fill used to create the runway.
747	McCallum, Elizabeth	Support	No	Supports the application. Travels frequently internationally and direct flights to Asia would be of economic benefit to their business as they frequently visit their suppliers there. Considers it would be of significant advantage to have a streamlined transport system direct to the airport from the railway station.
748	Cawthorn, Isabella	Oppose	No	Opposes the application on the basis of poor process. Believes level of debate and information has not been sufficient for economic expenditure of this magnitude and is concerned about conflicts of interests.
749	World of WearableArt Limited	Support	No	Supports the application as it will sustain and encourage economic development within Wellington and the wider region. Currently 50% of WOW designers come from outside NZ and 3% of the audience and WOW has a focus on growing this. Extending the runway will help grow WOW's international audience, support their activity with design university engagement, and help ensure ease of involvement in the awards from leading creative directors and theatre specialists.
750	Grigg, Tim	Support	No	Supports the application.
751	Knox, Andrea	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as it should be privately funded and not subsidised by ratepayers, and also the climate-change impact of extra carbon emissions.
752	Jackson, Adele	Oppose	No	Opposes the application primarily because it is unnecessary and the costs will affect both ratepayers and passengers; and secondarily because it will adversely affect the environment, particularly marine ecology and traffic noise, disruption and safety impacts.
753	Wilkinson, Geoffrey	Support	No	Supports the application. Reasons include: increased safety; lower emissions; ability for larger aircraft utilisation, which will produce less emissions as their engines are more efficient; lower noise levels; better airport infrastructure to handle increased visitor numbers; economic benefits; build it and they will come; and more efficient connections to the rest of the world.
754	Horner, Maurice & Jenny	Support	Not Specified	Supports the application as believes it is essential for the economic development of middle New Zealand and will help pull development away from the Auckland agglomeration to the benefit of a more balanced New Zealand.
755	Fitzgerald, Matthew	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as it is not a viable economic option for Wellington and ratepayers should not be funding it.
756	McKay, Bernard	Oppose	No	Opposes the application because of effects on marine ecology at Moa Point as well as recreation and diving activities.
757	Walker, Christopher	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application as the money could be spent elsewhere and there is not enough evidence of economic benefits. Considers the risk of ruining the surf too high.
758	Wevers, Maarten	Oppose	No	Opposes the application on the grounds that a proper economic business case has not yet been made for the investment of ratepayer funds. Considers it would be difficult to promote Wellington as a separate destination, particularly in Asian markets, and notes the hub model is well established in aviation economics. Does not think there would be sufficient passenger demand for flights.
759	Dinamani, Giri	Support	Not Specified	Supports the application as Wellington needs the runway extension to fully leverage its reputation so tourists worldwide can directly access the coolest little capital in the world. Wellington is ideally suited to being a larger tourism hub but an airport that can serve many different countries is needed for that to happen.
760	Hargreaves, Bridget	Support	No	Supports the application as more flights in and out of Wellington will be good for the economy in terms of visitor numbers and jobs. Also likes the idea of having direct access to other destinations around the world.
761	Hartstonge, Peter	Support	No	Supports the application as it will enable flights to/from further afield overseas thereby greatly benefitting many travellers in time, money and convenience, while also growing the Wellington region. Notes personal benefit of being able to fly directly to Perth to visit family.
762	Hartstonge, Jill	Support	No	Supports the application as it will be good for Wellington to have larger aircraft landing here, bringing tourists directly and therefore more money into Wellington economy. Notes the convenience of not having to go to Auckland first in order to take a longer flight overseas.
763	Miller-Fergusson, Corrinne	Oppose	No	Opposes the application. Considers the cost does not make sense and is worried that airfares will increase. Concerned about disruption to residents from noise and traffic and effects on surf. Notes the wave focussing device is not guaranteed to work. Considers the marine ecology and recreation

				values around Moa Point may be compromised, particularly from contamination of marine-derived fill sediment.
764	BURRELL, BRIAN	Oppose	No	Opposes the application due to the effects and ecological damage caused during construction, and on-going effects if constructed.
765	Cotterall, Stephen	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Concerned at lack of evidence for economic benefits and that the extension is unnecessary. Concerned about effects on surf and marine ecology; noise; and possibility of increased costs, particularly because of the location extending into Cook Strait.
766	Weir, Janet	Support	Yes	Supports the extension because (1) they host international college students and a direct flight would encourage more international students; (2) direct flights would support their son's plan to import/export goods from Ho Chi Minn; (3) a \$100,000 grant a few years ago for surfers to build an artificial reef was not picked up and they query the enthusiasm of the current group of surfers professing concern about their hobby at Lyall Bay; (4) don't think the extension would affect marine life including penguins; and (5) it will improve the economic and international future for us all.
767	Bradbury, Noel	Support	No	Supports the application as it will enhance trading and notes that Wellington City will 'wither on the vine' if it can't handle modern aircraft. Comments on the associated need for roads to be upgraded.
768	Walsh, Stephen	Support	No	Supports the extension as it will meet development and safety requirements. Believes that making it easier for international visitors will enable more local investment in tourist attractions and infrastructure and has good potential to have compounding economic benefit. Notes that traffic alternatives need to be looked into, instead of heavy trucks lumbering through the central city. Also comments that a longer runway will provide a potential support option for Wellington in the event of a major disaster.
769	Bramley, Neil	Support	No	Supports the application as it will help promote tourism and make Wellington a better place to live. Submitter is in the lobster export business and notes the time saving for delivering live lobster in good quality, as well as making it easier to travel the globe and bring customers here to show what we have on offer in Wellington.
771	Leanne Bramley	Support	No	Supports the extension as no major city can really get its tourism and business centre running to full capacity without the ability to have direct international flights. Believes that it is great for exports of some of our main resources like seafood and other business interactions, and for tourists to be able to visit without being side-tracked to other destinations.
772	Jenkins, Pete	Oppose	No	Opposes the application as it will ultimately not result in any airline support and therefore not justify the significant economic cost to ratepayers. Believes that visitors travelling to Wellington on private or Government business are not time/cost sensitive and are used to having to transit through hub ports internationally to achieve this.
773	Flewelling, Sally	Oppose	No	[Same text as submission #50. Concerns included: economic cost-benefit analysis; and environmental effects including surfing, recreation, and marine ecology.]
774	Graykowski, Judith	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application and notes that it has failed to conduct a Social Impact Assessment outlining the scale and impact of the project on the neighbourhoods and peoples/tangata whenua of the Bays: homes, community spaces, schools sporting precincts, and recreational leisure activities - walking, bicycling, running, swimming pursued in the outdoors around Evans Bay, Lyall Bay and nearby. Notes concerns about carbon emissions and contribution of the project to climate change. Concerned that the application will not promote the management of sustainable resources and will not achieve the purpose of the RMA; is contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA, and other relevant planning and non-statutory documents including the RCP, PNRP and NZCPS; will not meet foreseeable needs of future generations; will not enable social, economic and cultural wellbeing; does not avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on environment; and fails to adequately assess alternatives.
775	McKenzie, Alisdair	Support	No	Supports the application and notes the significant time and money savings as a frequent international business traveller. Also notes that the extension would generate additional services and passengers inbound and outbound and stimulate increased economic and tourist activity to benefit the city, region and country.
776	Mulholland, Marlene Nora	Oppose	Yes	Opposes the application. Lives at Moa Point and is concerned about the impact of fill on marine ecology, particularly on nesting little blue penguins, recreation and the visual eyesore of an extension with barb or razorwire. Concerned about the economic business case and that Infratil are trying to buy up houses on Moa Point Rd to prevent noise, dust and other construction-related complaints. Believes the community's amenity values, health and safety and property values in the small heritage suburb should count for something too.