## Before the Independent Hearings Panel For Wellington City Council

Under	the Resource Management Act 1991
In the matter	an application for resource consent for an extension to the existing car parking area of the Khandallah New World supermarket at 26 Ganges Road, 3 Dekka Street, 31-33 Nicholson Road, Khandallah

# Speaking notes summary of evidence of Michael Miklin Halstead on behalf of Foodstuffs North Island Limited – Noise

Date: 1 May 2024



Solicitor on the Record Contact solicitor

Level 4, 20 Customhouse Quay, Wellington 6011 PO Box 2791, Wellington 6140 Tel +64 4 472 6289

d Stephen Quinn stephen.quinn@dlapiper.com Mhairi Mackenzie Everitt mhairi.mackenzie@dlapiper.com +64 4 474 3217 +64 4 474 3207

78090895v1

### INTRODUCTION

- 1 My name is Michael Miklin Halstead. I am the Senior Associate at the Wellington office of Marshall Day Acoustics Ltd. I prepared a statement of evidence dated 15 April 2024 with respect to noise matters. The purpose of this document is to summarise that statement.
- 2 I outlined my qualifications, experience, and commitment to comply with the Environment Court Expert Witness Code of Conduct in my April statement of evidence.
- 3 The following are the key areas where I consider there is agreement between the applicant's experts and Council's experts:
  - 3.1 The noise effects from the application are related to customer and employee parking activities only, and do not involve deliveries.
  - 3.2 With the proposed mitigations (acoustic fences, control of out-of-hours use of the car park, and employee training) the noise limits in the District Plan would be met. In my statement of evidence, I have provided some clarification around the details of the calculation of attenuation from the boundary fence, as requested by the Council's noise expert.
  - 3.3 Vibration from operational activities will not cause effects to adjacent properties.
  - 3.4 Construction noise and vibration can be managed to reasonable levels, as normally anticipated by construction projects, through the adoption of a construction noise and vibration management plan.
- 4 I will focus on the matter that remain in contention between my evidence, the Council's reporting planner and opposing

submitters, which is whether residential amenity with respect to operational noise effects would be adversely affected by the unanticipated character of car park noise in the residential zone.

#### Amenity Effects of Car Park Activity

- 5 The Section 42A Report asserts that noise from the carpark would be inconsistent with what is anticipated in a residential zone, despite complying with the noise limits in the District Plan.
- 6 I disagree with this assertion, as the noise of people and cars are a common occurrence on the roads which serve the residential zone. These roads also carry bus traffic, and are used for parking by the public as of right. By contrast, I would consider that the types of noise which are not anticipated in the residential zone could include industrial machinery, manufacturing equipment such as saws or grinders, or generators.
- 7 I do however agree that the scale and intensity of people and vehicle noise is a factor in considering residential amenity. It is for this reason that noise limits are set in the residential zone which are consistent with residential amenity. My assessment, and the recommendations for mitigations, are based on achieving this level of amenity.
- 8 The approach in New Zealand of considering noise effects on amenity are described in New Zealand Standards NZS6802:2008. This standard states that audibility of a noise is not a measure of its acceptability; rather it is the level of noise and to a certain extent the freedom from special audible characteristics that is used to determine its acceptability. By achieving the noise limits applicable to the residential zone, the scale and intensity of the noise from people and vehicles should be considered consistent with the amenity values of the residential zone.
- In my opinion the design of the carpark including the noise barrier
  fence will control the scale and intensity of the car parking activity

such that it does not materially change the character, or run counter to the anticipated character, of a residential zone, particularly one which borders a commercial zone.

## CONCLUSIONS

- 10 On the basis of my assessment, I consider that the operation of the proposed carpark expansion will result in reasonable noise levels which will not have a significant noise impact on neighbours.
- 11 I consider the construction of the carpark will generally have reasonable noise effects if managed with good practice and particularly with good neighbourly communications and regard for specific times of noise sensitivity.

Date:

1 May 2024

M. Willind

Michael Miklin Halstead