

Ruth Evans for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 9 September 2016

Chapter 36 Noise – Hearing Stream 5

1. The structure of the redrafted Noise Chapter remains largely the same as the notified version, other than some general non-substantive amendments for the purposes of clarity and efficiency, and some amendments made as a result of submissions.

2. Non-substantive changes include:
 - (a) amendment of column 2 of Table 2 to refer to the 'zone the sound is received in,' as opposed to the 'activity or sound source, consistent with notified clarification 36.3.2.7';
 - (b) consolidation of rules relating to noise from commercial motorised craft; and
 - (c) relocation of the rule relating to State Highway noise from near Jacks Point to the Jacks Point Zone in-line with other residential zones.

3. Changes based on submissions include:
 - (a) provision for sound for emergency and back-up generators as a permitted activity;
 - (b) addition of more lenient noise standards for parts of the Jacks Point Resort Zone and Walter Peak Rural Visitor Zone;
 - (c) removal of provisions for the industrial zones (intention is that these be re-notified in Stage 2);
 - (d) a reduced noise limit for frost fans that will more adequately control noise effects;
 - (e) provision for double glazing in relation to sound insulation;
 - (f) amendments to ventilation requirements within the Outer Control Boundary and Air Noise Boundary and town centre and business zones;
 - (g) removal of the testing requirements for motorised craft; and
 - (h) amendment to the definition of 'notional boundary'.

-
4. In relation to the evidence of Mr Sean Dent,¹ I do not consider an alternative noise limit for the recently consented helipad near the Skyline Gondola necessary. The helipad already has consent which includes the noise limit of 60dB Ldn. If the Panel were of a view to include this specific noise limit, I consider the rule should be amended to provide for a higher limit at the assessment location of 5 metres west of the Zip Trek platform, not throughout the entire reserve.
 5. I do not consider the changes sought by Ms Fiona Black² to the noise standards, in relation to vessels, to be appropriate. If the vessels are low noise emitters then they will comply with the noise limits, and if not, I consider it appropriate to assess the noise effects of the vessels through the resource consent process.
 6. I agree with Mr Chris Fergusson,³ that the EIC Activity Area in the Jacks Pont Zone be included in Rule 36.5.6 (redrafted 36.5.5). However, I do not agree that non-compliance with the limit should result in a restricted discretionary activity status, as this approach is inconsistent with the majority of the chapter. I consider non-compliance should require a robust assessment and application of the section 104D gateway test. A non-compliance with a 'minor' effect will pass both limbs of s104D with regard to noise. Therefore I do not consider the non-complying activity status to be too onerous.
 7. I agree that Mr Chris Day's⁴ suggested amendment to Clarification 36.3.2.5 improves clarity. I accept that 'sound from an activity' is not an 'activity.' However, an activity status has been provided in Table 1 on account of the way that the chapter has been structured and I consider that retaining the activity status provides certainty for PDP users.
 8. On the evidence of Mr Sheridan Roberts⁵ and the proposed ventilation rules:

¹ For Totally Tourism Limited (#571) and Skyline Enterprises Limited (#575)

² Tor Real Journeys Limited (# 621) and Te Anau Developments Limited (#607)

³ For Jacks Point Residential No.2 Limited, Jacks Point Village Holdings Limited, Jacks Point Developments Limited, Jacks Point Land Limited, Jacks Point Land No. 2 Limited, Jacks Point Management Limited, Henley Downs Land Holdings Limited, Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited, Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited, Willow Pond Farm Limited (#762 and #1275) Jacks Point Residents and Owners Association (#1277)

⁴ For Queenstown Airport Corporation (#433).

⁵ For Queenstown Airport Corporation (#443).

-
- (a) I agree that the Building Code needs to be complied with regardless of any provision in the PDP. I understand from Dr Chiles that 0.5 air changes per hour will achieve compliance with G4 and therefore (i) of Rule 36.6.3 could be amended accordingly;
- (b) I agree that reference to heating could be included as it was in the notified version. However, I do note that the purpose of these provisions is to mitigate noise effects and provide alternatives to opening windows, which you would not do if you were wanting to retain heat; and
- (c) I do not consider it necessary for a note to be included to specify that existing systems may meet the standards.
9. Regarding the evidence of Kirsty O'Sullivan,⁶ I agree that the Remarkables Park Zone should be added to the list of receiving zones in Rule 36.5.2. I also acknowledge the structure of the table with the column 2 amendment does not work properly for this rule as it refers to the sound generator (Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone) not the receiving zone. A solution may be to transfer this rule to Table 3. This will alleviate the structural issue within the table and ensure consistency with Clarification 36.3.2.7. I do not agree that there should be separate insulation rules for the town centres, as the requirements are generic, and not specific to airport noise.

⁶ For Queenstown Airport Corporation (#443).