

justified, in view of the limitations imposed by hills which restrict the air approaches. This means that the classes of aircraft which will be able to operate at Rongotai with safety will be limited and operations in instrument flight conditions will be strictly limited.

285. We appreciate that there is no alternative site for the construction of an aerodrome in the vicinity of Wellington, and it is necessary that Wellington should have an aerodrome convenient of access from the city. It is only on this basis that the proposal to construct an aerodrome at Rongotai can be justified. We recognise that a great deal of thought and careful planning have been devoted to this project. Nevertheless, we feel bound to draw attention to certain unsatisfactory features of the scheme and to suggest certain minimum improvements :—

- (a) The satisfactory development of this aerodrome for safe operation of the internal air services and other air traffic will involve clearing the greater part of the isthmus of Rongotai of houses and other obstructions. While some of the clearing can be deferred, the ultimate effect of building an aerodrome on this site should be faced before the project is commenced.
- (b) The proposed north-south landing strip is sited in the best position now attainable, but is too far west, with consequent encroachment on the approaches at the north end by the slopes of Mount Victoria in the vicinity of the Patent Slip and at the south end by the hills projecting into Lyall Bay at Arthur's Nose. The best position for the runway would be on a parallel line further east, passing through the site of the Power-house. We appreciate that the Power-house cannot be demolished now, but it will be found necessary to do so later and to relocate the landing strip.
- (c) The proposal to build the landing strip initially 300 feet wide and to demolish houses only sufficient for this purpose is one with which we cannot agree. The minimum width recommended by I.C.A.O. for any landing strip at any aerodrome is 500 feet, and this is based on the supposition that the aerodrome will be built in open country and not surrounded by a crowded residential district. For an instrument runway on a Class E aerodrome, the width of strip recommended by I.C.A.O. is 1,000 feet. There is a danger not only to aircraft but to local residents in the present proposals. The minimum width of strip which we could recommend for initial construction is 500 feet. To give the I.C.A.O. side clearance of 1 in 7, houses 20 feet in height should be set back 150 feet, making a total clearance of 800 feet in width.