

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL HEARINGS PANEL

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991
IN THE MATTER of the review of parts of the Queenstown Lakes
District Council's District Plan under the First
Schedule of the Act
AND
IN THE MATTER of submissions and further submissions by
REMARKABLES PARK LIMITED

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF MALCOLM JAMES HUNT ON BEHALF OF REMARKABLES
PARK LIMITED**

NOISE

CHAPTER 17 – AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE

30 November 2016

**BROOKFIELDS
LAWYERS**

J D Young
Telephone No. 09 379 9350
Fax No. 09 379 3224
P O Box 240
DX CP24134
AUCKLAND

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My evidence focuses on the following:

- (a) Noise issues relevant to establishing Activities Sensitive To Aircraft Noise (**ASANs**) within the Airport Mixed Use Zone (**AMUZ**) in the vicinity of Queenstown Airport; and
- (b) The proposed extension of daytime hours set out within the noise rule applying to land-based activities in the AMUZ.

2. ACTIVITIES SENSITIVE TO AIRCRAFT NOISE

2.1 I address the noise issues relevant to Rule 17.5.8.1, which deals with establishing ASANs within the AMUZ. My evidence particularly supports the approach of NZ Standard NZS6805 *Aircraft Noise Management & Land Use Planning*, which recommends prohibiting activities such as visitor accommodation within areas exposed (or likely to be exposed) to aircraft noise at levels of Ldn 65 dBA or above.

2.2. I am concerned that the assessment of potential noise effects on visitors is too simply focussed on cumulative effects of repeated stays, which is the basis of mitigation proposed by QAC in the form of limits on the number of continuous nights accommodation provided for.

2.3. I also consider that the Report by Marshall Day Acoustics does not represent a viable assessment of the environmental effects and more specifically:

- (a) Fails to adequately consider indoor noise effects or the ability of the proposed acoustic insulation standard to address this effect; and
- (b) Fails to address the recommendations of of NZS 6805:1992 *Airport Noise Management & Land Use Planning*.

2.4. In addition, depending where within the Air Noise Boundary (**ANB**) the accommodation facility is developed, it appears the generic construction table in Appendix 13 would, based on the calculations provided, provide an inadequate level of acoustic insulation.

- 2.5. There is no objection to establishing such facilities within the lesser noise area located between the Ldn 65 and Ldn 55 dBA boundaries, provided they are acoustically insulated in accordance with Appendix 13 or similar.

3. AMUZ LAND BASED NOISE LIMITS

- 3.1. My evidence addresses the following two issues:

- (a) The proposal to extend the daytime period of Rule 17.5.6.1 by one hour in the morning and two hours in the evening is questioned based on there being no assessment of noise effects assessing the impact of such changes on nearby sensitive areas, including those with Remarkables Park; and
- (b) The proposal to increase the noise limits of Rule 17.5.6.1 by 5 dB when received at sites within the Rural General Zone.

- 3.2. Neither of these two proposals are supported. My evidence contends there has been a lack of assessment of effects within receiving environments for either of these two changes (coupled with a lack of demonstrable need for such changes). There is insufficient evidence to justify these two modifications to Rule 17.5.6.1.

4. CONCLUSION

- 4.1. I consider that the methods proposed by QAC to manage and/or mitigate the effects of noise within the AMUZ are inconsistent with the approach of NZ Standard 6805:1992 and the remainder of the Proposed Plan. I also do not consider that there is a need for the extension of the noisier daytime hours, which in my opinion is inconsistent with sustainable management of resources.