

Dr Stephen Chiles for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 25 November 2016

Business Chapters - Hearing Stream 08

1. The Business zones contain both noise generating and noise sensitive activities, leading to inherent tensions or conflicts between those activities.

Queenstown and Wanaka Town Centres

2. With respect to the Queenstown and Wanaka town centres, in my opinion the Operative District Plan (**ODP**) does not effectively address tensions between entertainment and residential/visitor accommodation activities. Consequently, there have been numerous longstanding problems relating to noise.
3. Policies in the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) promote nightlife in the Queenstown and Wanaka town centres, and are explicit that residential amenity will be compromised to an extent. I am not aware of a technical solution that would avoid the need for a compromise such as this.
4. In my opinion the noise rules set out in the PDP for the Queenstown and Wanaka town centres are consistent with the relevant policies. The rules include requirements for sound insulation of new noise sensitive activities and the establishment of Entertainment Precincts to assist in the management of conflicts between activities.
5. Numerous submissions seek to make the Queenstown and Wanaka town centre noise rules either more stringent or more liberal. For the reasons set out in my evidence, I do not consider that any material changes to the noise rules are justified beyond those in the recommended version attached to the evidence of Ms Jones.

Local Shopping Centre Zone (LSCZ)

6. General sound insulation requirements for the LSCZ in Frankton are more stringent than acoustic treatment requirements for Queenstown Airport noise in other PDP zones. I consider that there is no justification for additional airport noise requirements in the Frankton LSCZ.

-
7. I have reviewed the evidence of Mr Christopher Day and Mr John Kyle relating to the Frankton LSCZ. In terms of sound insulation, I agree with the evidence of Mr Day and Mr Kyle,¹ who in turn expressed agreement with my evidence in chief. I also agree that it would be preferable for ventilation rules for the Frankton LSCZ to be consistent with the revised ventilation requirements in Chapter 36 for other scenarios. However, I do not consider this to be essential, as can be inferred from the evidence of Mr Kyle.²
8. Mr Kyle³ sets out tests for acoustic treatment and asserts that I have oversimplified those tests in my evidence. Mr Kyle is correct that compliance with the acoustic treatment rule can be demonstrated by using specified constructions or providing certification. The key point that I was highlighting in my evidence is that if the airport noise is less than 57 dB L_{dn}, then certification can be provided automatically without further assessment and without any treatment.

Airport Zone - Queenstown

9. Mr Day and Mr Malcolm Hunt have provided acoustics evidence relating to visitor accommodation and general noise limits for the Queenstown Airport Zone. With respect to that evidence:
- (a) I agree with Mr Day⁴ that short-stay visitor accommodation in the Queenstown Airport Zone can be appropriately designed to mitigate noise effects. However, in my opinion people sleeping in any visitor accommodation in the Queenstown Airport Zone should remain within the definition of an Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (**ASAN**). As for all other types of ASAN in zones outside the Queenstown Airport Zone, the fact that effects can be appropriately managed through sound insulation requirements in the rules does not mean activities should not be classified as ASAN.
- (b) I agree with the general intent of Mr Day's⁵ proposed controls to manage the nature of any visitor accommodation in the Queenstown Airport Zone. However, I do not consider that an explicit limitation on the maximum length of stay is necessary, so long as any visitor

¹ Mr Kyle's evidence at Part 8 and Mr Day's evidence at paragraphs 33-34.

² Mr Kyle's evidence at Part 8.

³ Mr Kyle's evidence at Part 8.

⁴ Mr Day's evidence at paragraphs 12-25.

⁵ Mr Day's evidence at paragraph 25.

accommodation in the Queenstown Airport Zone is not used for long-term residential type use.

- (c) I agree with Mr Hunt⁶ that the standard sound insulating constructions set out in Chapter 36 might not be sufficient for some locations in the Queenstown Airport Zone. I therefore recommend that any visitor accommodation in the Queenstown Airport Zone be required to have individual certification that the Indoor Design Sound Level will be achieved. This should address the key issues raised by Mr Hunt. However, I am not certain if there is scope within Remarkables Park Limited's submission to provide for this.
- (d) Mr Day⁷ and Mr Hunt⁸ both comment on the noise limits applying for sound from activities in the Queenstown Airport Zone received in neighbouring zones. I have addressed this issue previously in my evidence on Chapter 36 in Hearing Stream 05⁹. In summary, I agree with Mr Day that these noise limits should only be in Chapter 36 and not in Chapter 17. I agree with Mr Hunt (and disagree with Mr Day) that the differences from other zone noise limits are not justified (although I understand no scope has been identified to make a change). I disagree with paragraph 29 of Mr Day's evidence where he equates this situation to the Queenstown Town Centre Zone.

⁶ Mr Hunt's evidence at paragraph 11-21.

⁷ Mr Day's evidence at paragraphs 26-31.

⁸ Mr Hunt's evidence at paragraph 48.

⁹ Dr Chiles evidence Hearing Stream 05 dated 17 August 2016 at paragraph 8.3.