

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JON ROBERT STYLES ON BEHALF OF HAVELOCK VILLAGE LIMITED

NOISE AND VIBRATION

Council acoustic review (Malcolm Hunt)

1. The Council has engaged Mr Hunt to review the acoustic evidence provided by myself, Mr Ellerton and Mr Day. That review is not available at the time of preparing this statement. I can provide updated comments once the Council makes the review available.

Proposed industrial noise limits and zone interface provisions

2. As set out in paragraph 3.1 of my Primary evidence the Proposed District Plan (PDP) prescribes the following noise limits within the industrial zones and at the interface between industrial and other zones:
 - (i) 75 dB L_{Aeq} (at any time) for noise received within any other site in the Heavy Industrial Zone.
 - (ii) 75 dB L_{Aeq} (7am to 10pm) and 55 dB L_{Aeq} and 85 dB L_{AFmax} (10pm to 7am) for noise received in the Industrial Zone.
 - (iii) Noise measured within a site in any zone (other than the Heavy Industrial Zone) must meet the permitted noise levels for that zone.
3. The same type of interface controls apply in the Franklin section of the Operative District Plan (ODP) as set out at paragraph 3.3 of my Primary evidence. The PDP interface noise control P3 therefore proposes to maintain the interface control in the ODP.
4. To maintain the amenity and viability of noise sensitive zones which are adjacent to industrial zones, I consider it essential that the PDP maintains the interface noise limits.
5. Notwithstanding my support, I consider that the wording of P3 is not as clear as it could be, and I do not consider that the Heavy Industrial Zone requires any special treatment. P3 is currently worded:

Noise measured within any site in any zone, other than the Heavy Industrial Zone, must meet the permitted noise limits for that zone.

6. I consider that the application of P3 would be easier if it read:

Where noise generated by any activity on a site in one zone is received by any activity on a site in a different zone, the activity generating the noise must comply with the noise limits and standards of the zone at the receiving site.

7. This amended wording is consistent with the wording used in the Auckland Unitary Plan for the zone interface noise controls.

Noise limits within the industrial zone

8. On the basis that land zoned Industrial 2 under the ODP becomes Heavy Industrial under the PDP, and that land zoned Light Industry becomes Industrial in the PDP, then in summary the changes from the ODP to the PDP are:

- i. The noise limits in the PDP Heavy Industrial Zone are 5 dB higher than the noise limits in the ODP Industrial 2 Zone.

- ii. The day time noise limits in the PDP Industrial Zone are 10 dB higher than the noise limits in the ODP Light Industrial Zone.

9. At night, the PDP introduces lower night time noise limits for the Industrial Zone (55 dB L_{Aeq} and 85 dB L_{AFmax} from 10pm to 7am). This represents a 10 dB reduction from the ODP.

10. I consider a noise limit of 70 dB L_{Aeq} applying at any time is appropriate for the Heavy Industrial Zones to adequately provide for the range of noise generating activities which occupy the zone. I recommend the PDP noise limits are reduced by 5 dB to control noise effects to a reasonable level within the zone. In my experience as by way of example, it is uncommon for activities in the Heavy Industrial Zone in Auckland to have any issues complying with a noise limit of 70dB L_{Aeq} between sites in the same zone.

11. I also support lowering the noise limit for the Industrial Zone by 5dB, and consider the lower night time noise limits proposed within the Industrial Zone to be inappropriate. I am not aware of any night time activities permitted in the Industrial Zone that would require night time noise amenity (noting that the interface noise limits protect the night time noise amenity in any adjacent zones containing noise sensitive activities to ensure adequate protection from sleep disturbance effects). I consider that the 55dB L_{Aeq} night time noise limits between sites in the Industrial Zone will introduce additional

unnecessary compliance costs or resource consent requirements for no apparent good reason.

Sensitivity of receiving environments

12. Ms Williams (for Tuakau Proteins Ltd, submitter #402) considers that the interface rule should only apply between industrial and residential zoned land, and should not apply to rural land.
13. I disagree and consider the interface rule, as notified and supported in the section 42A report, should apply between industrial zones and all other zones where noise sensitive activities are permitted. Noise sensitive activities can occur in the rural zone, albeit at a lower intensity than the residential zone and those activities should be afforded adequate protection from noise effects.

“Date stamp” approach to creating buffer zones

14. Mr Day for Ports of Auckland Limited (POAL) and Mr Ellerton for Huntly Power Station (HPS) both support a ‘date stamp’ approach when applying noise limits to industrial activities. This approach essentially limits the compliance point for noise emissions to any house or noise sensitive activity existing at a specific date.
15. I do not have any specific involvement with either the HPS or the Horotiu Industrial Park (HIP) that Mr Ellerton’s and Mr Day’s evidence relates to, and I do not comment on the specifics of the date stamp approach in those cases. However, I provide comments on this approach in general terms in case it was seen to be a template or acceptable approach for a district-wide control.
16. I consider that fixing the date of the receiving environment is a poor substitute for establishing a noise control boundary and buffer zone using noise level predictions or existing information on the general nature of the noise from the industrial activities, where the effects on the intervening land are known and can be appropriately managed, and where there is good certainty for all stakeholders. If detailed noise level predictions are not possible, the location of the noise control boundary can be reliably estimated using the information typically available, including resource consent documentation for existing activities. Even if this approach is approximate, the noise control boundary approach is likely to be considerably more efficient and effective than the date stamp approach.

17. Noise control boundaries can be combined with or incorporated by setback rules or similar plan provisions to provide appropriate and adequate protection for both existing noise generators and future noise sensitive activities. I have been assisting Havelock Village Limited with the identification of noise contours on its site, for noise arising from the nearby industrial activities. I understand that Havelock Village is proposing setbacks and buffers for residential activities within the site in light of my objective assessment. In principle, I consider this to be an appropriate method to manage noise issues. I consider that it is not always necessary to use compatible zones to manage that issue.
18. Regardless of the way that a buffer zone is implemented (by date stamp, noise control boundary or other method) I consider it critical that the PDP makes it clear to any reader that there is a buffer zone in place, what the effects would be and what development controls apply in that buffer zone.
19. Whilst the date stamp approach may be reasonable for specific sites and situations where the fixed location is acceptable (e.g. for the HPS), I do not support the date stamp approach as a district-wide control.