

**PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 1 – THE HILLS RESORT ZONE – SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF CHRISTOPHER WILLIAM DAY ON BEHALF OF THE REQUESTOR**

1. My full name is Christopher William Day. I am a founding Partner of Marshall Day Acoustics and I have over 50 years of experience in acoustics.
2. I have been engaged by the requestor, The Hills Resort Limited (THRL), to provide advice and give evidence in relation to THRL's request to change the provisions of The Hills Resort Zone (HRZ) and the HRZ Structure Plan to facilitate the rerouting of the existing 18-hole golf course by amending the location and extent of existing Activity Areas, and to establish new Activity Areas and Homesites (the **Plan Change Request**).
3. I have prepared a statement of evidence dated 13 March 2026 on the potential noise effects arising from the SG Activity Area as part of the Plan Change request.
4. My colleague Rob Hay has made a measurement of the ambient noise level at Advance Terrace, and I have visited the site recently.
5. In this summary statement I will provide a summary of my 13 March 2026 evidence and address matters arising since I prepared that evidence, in particular, matters arising from submitter evidence.
6. I confirm that in preparing this summary evidence and my 13 March 2026 evidence I have complied with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witness contained in the Environment Court Practice Notice 2023.

**Summary of Evidence**

7. Contrary to Mr Graeme Todd's submission, the District Plan does provide noise limits that activities in the Sport Garden Activity Area (SG) would have to comply with. These noise limits are more conservative than most district plan noise limits. Ambient noise measurements and traffic noise calculations in Advance Terrace confirm that the District Plan noise limits are reasonable for this location.
8. I have calculated the level of noise received at the Brown's residence (Submitter #4, and the closest residential property) from the three main sources of noise in the SG Activity Area – music noise, court noise and people noise. The predicted noise level from all three activities complies with the District Plan noise limits by a considerable margin of 5 to 20 dB. The noise level at the Todd residence (Submitter #2) will be slightly less than at the Brown's.
9. My experience of residential tennis clubs and the SG type activity areas at Tara Iti and Te Arai Links suggest that the level of usage at The Hills SG Activity Area is likely to be significantly less than that used in the noise calculations above.
10. In my opinion the noise level from the SG Activity Area received at the residential interface would be reasonable.

11. Since I prepared my evidence, evidence on behalf of submitters has been lodged. I have reviewed the submitter where noise is discussed, in particular, the evidence of Graeme Todd and Shayne Galloway. I make the following comments in response.

#### **Submitter Evidence – Graeme Todd**

12. Mr Todd is concerned (in paragraph 20) that there are no specific limits on the number of persons and no restrictions on the type of music and the food truck activities. In my opinion the implementation of such overly prescriptive rules is not necessary as the important thing is, that the noise effects will be controlled by the District Plan noise limits. My calculations have shown that these noise limits can readily be complied with.
13. In paragraph 18 of his evidence, Mr Todd implies that they are affected by noise from the Monk property (the Merryfield Farm wedding venue). He goes on to express concern that *“certain activities allowed by the rules for the SGAA we will have a similar experience [to the wedding venue], especially on still, summer evenings when we choose to have our bedroom windows open at night”*.
14. The Merryfield Farm is a completely different type of venue to the SGAA in that it is a professional wedding venue. I understand it accommodates up to 150 guests with flexible indoor and outdoor spaces. The venue also includes two bars (upstairs and downstairs), and extensive grounds suitable for marquee setups and guests are welcome to stay up to midnight<sup>1</sup>. This is very different to the SGAA which is not set up to be a functions facility and retail activity, which I understand includes the sale of alcohol, is limited to only one non-permanent food truck (Rule 47.5.20) and there is to be no sale of food or alcohol after 8pm (Rule 47.5.20A).
15. In my opinion, the two facilities are of a completely different scale and intensity and the ‘retail aspect’ of the SGAA cannot take place at night. Therefore, cumulative noise effects from the Merryfield Farm venue and the SG Area are unlikely to arise.

#### **Submitter Evidence – Shayne Galloway**

16. Mr Galloway ‘accepts my evidence that the noise levels will comply with the District Plan noise limits’ but goes on to suggest that the character of the noise is such that the amenity in the residential area will be affected. I disagree with this suggestion as in my opinion the noise from court sports, people and low-level music is typical of what one can expect in a residential area.
17. Most tennis clubs are located in residential areas with common boundaries (no 400m buffer). These clubs exhibit similar noise characteristics but at a much higher level due to adjacency without significant conflict. I qualify this with the comment that there have been problems with noise from pickleball courts abutting residential properties but with the 400m buffer to the SG area the noise will be at a reasonable level as discussed in my evidence.

---

<sup>1</sup> Merryfield website <https://merryfield.nz/>

## **Conclusion**

- 18.** In summary, nothing in the submitter evidence or in the Council's rebuttal evidence causes me to reconsider the conclusions reached in my 13 March 2026 evidence. I maintain the view that the noise levels from the SG Activity Area received at the residential interface would be reasonable and of an appropriate character for a residential receiving environment.

**Christopher William Day**

**14 April 2026**

