

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: an application by Ryman Healthcare Limited for resource consent to construct, operate and maintain a comprehensive care retirement village at 26 Donald Street and 37 Campbell Street, Karori, Wellington

between: **Ryman Healthcare Limited**
Applicant

and: **Wellington City Council**
Consent Authority

Summary Statement of **Siiri Wilkening** on behalf of Ryman Healthcare Limited

Dated: 13 September 2022

Reference: Luke Hinchey (luke.hinchey@chapmantripp.com)
Nicola de Wit (nicola.dewit@chapmantripp.com)

chapmantripp.com
T +64 9 357 9000
F +64 9 357 9099

PO Box 2206
Auckland 1140
New Zealand

Auckland
Wellington
Christchurch



SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SIIRI WILKENING ON BEHALF OF RYMAN HEALTHCARE LIMITED

- 1 My full name is Siiri Wilkening. My qualifications and experience are set out in my statement of evidence dated 29 August 2022.
- 2 I, and my colleagues at Marshall Day Acoustics (*MDA*), have assessed the noise and vibration from the construction and operation of the Proposed Village at 26 Donald Street and 37 Campbell Street, Karori (*Site*).
- 3 Construction will occur for 36 to 40 months. However, works that cause high noise or vibration levels such as earthworks and piling are likely to occur mostly during the first 12 to 18 months. The Site is large, and construction activities and equipment will move around the Site. This means that individual neighbouring houses will only be affected for limited periods of a few days or weeks before high noise activities move on.
- 4 I predict that construction noise can generally comply with the noise criteria. Where exceedances are predicted, they are generally slight (2 to 3 dB only) and for a limited period when the equipment operates immediately adjacent to the boundary.
- 5 Construction vibration levels can generally comply with the relevant criterion. Any piling will be undertaken using a drill rig, which is a low vibration (and noise) form of piling. Where compaction with a vibratory roller is required, I have recommended that an alternative option is chosen within 8 metres of any dwelling, such as compaction without the vibratory function, or the use of smaller equipment such as plate compactors, to ensure that compliance with the vibration criterion is achieved.
- 6 I have recommended mitigation and management measures that should be implemented to reduce construction noise and vibration effects. These include a 2.4m high construction fence around the Site, use of temporary barriers on site where effective, mindful spacing and choice of equipment, considerate timing of high noise works to avoid sensitive times (e.g. for the neighbouring school) and the avoidance of unnecessary noise (e.g. from tonal reversing alarms). These measures will be included in the recommended Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (*CNVMP*).
- 7 Operational noise from the Site that is required to comply with relevant noise limits of the District Plan includes mechanical noise (e.g. from air conditioning and similar plant) and service vehicles on the Site. Noise from residents and visitors would be classed as residential noise, which does not need to comply with the District Plan noise limits. Noise from light vehicles on the Site would also be

classed as residential noise, but I have assessed this noise in response to submissions.

- 8 I have predicted compliance for all Site operations that are required to comply with District Plan noise limits. Light vehicles and the emergency generator on the Site are also predicted to comply with the District Plan noise limits, irrespective of not being required to.
- 9 I have reviewed and responded to submissions discussing noise or vibration issues. The submissions broadly discuss construction noise and vibration (e.g. duration, level, management and similar), and operational noise (e.g. air conditioning and carpark tyre squeal). I consider that with appropriate Site management and design as recommended in our assessment and my evidence, both construction noise and vibration, and operational noise, can be managed to be within reasonable levels. In relation to the late submission of Ms Lina and Mr Cheng Hao, I generally addressed the potential traffic noise effects from the Site on neighbouring properties, including this property, at paragraphs 103 to 108 of my statement of evidence. I have provided some further specific comments in the **Appendix**. I consider the traffic noise and vibration effects on this property to be negligible.
- 10 I have reviewed the Council Officer's Report and the acoustic assessment of Council's acoustics specialist and find that they agree with the MDA assessment.
- 11 I consider some amendments to the draft conditions in the Council Officer's Report are necessary to clarify the intention and outcomes of some conditions. In summary, those amendments are:
 - 11.1 Condition 34 (CNVMP): I consider a further bullet point should be added to this Condition requiring a mechanism of review and recertification in the event of a change to the construction methodology.
 - 11.2 Condition 36 (construction noise hours): I consider this Condition should identify that only noisy construction activities are to be limited. Safety and toolbox meetings, pack up and similar low noise activities should not be restricted.
 - 11.3 Conditions 37 and 38 (construction noise/vibration management): I agree with the intended methodology of providing additional information if activities cannot practicably comply with the relevant noise and/or vibration limits. However, I consider that a different mechanism is simpler to apply – the use of Schedules. A Schedule is a "mini" CNVMP for a specific activity that is predicted to exceed the noise limits and needs to be certified by Council.

- 11.4 Condition 41 (wheel squeal): I recommend a condition requiring this treatment be specified by an appropriate supplier, as this is an unusual requirement. In my statement of evidence at paragraph 145, I indicated that a noise monitoring report may be a way to address the wheel squeal effect. I am also comfortable with Ryman's proposed new condition requiring an appropriate treatment to reduce wheel squeal noise to be specified by the manufacturer during the design process as an alternative. This approach will ensure the appropriate surface is installed at the outset.
- 12 In my opinion, the amended conditions will ensure that any noise and vibration generation on the Site will be managed and mitigated to a point that residual effects are reasonable in the context of the Site and surrounding environment.

Siiri Wilkening
13 September 2022

Appendix - Submission by Ms Lina and Mr Cheng Hao (40 Campbell Street)

- 1 I have reviewed the amended submission by the residents of 40 Campbell Street as it relates to noise. The submitters are concerned about the potential for traffic noise received at the bedroom facing Campbell Street. The dwelling is partially shielded by the garage and set back approximately 10 metres from the road edge, and nearly 30 metres from the Site boundary.
- 2 While the District Plan does not require residential activities such as light vehicles on the Site to comply with the zone noise limits, I have predicted noise levels from traffic entering and exiting the Site (refer to paragraphs 103 to 108 of my statement of evidence).
- 3 I understand that service vehicles and rubbish trucks will enter the Site from the Donald Street only. The Campbell Street entrance is intended for light vehicles only and will be used by approximately 15% of the overall traffic generated by the Site (refer paragraph 106 of my statement of evidence).
- 4 Based on a similar distribution for the peak hour, some 11 vehicles would use the Campbell Street entrance. This amount of traffic would equate to a peak hour noise level of less than 30 dB $L_{Aeq(1h)}$, and the noise level would be significantly less during night-time when less vehicles move to or from the Site (refer paragraph 108 of my statement of evidence).
- 5 Inside the dwelling, even with windows open for ventilation, the noise from vehicles entering or leaving the Campbell Street entrance will be well below any noise level that would cause sleep disturbance. The noise will be similar in character to, and of a lower level than, traffic passing on Campbell Street.
- 6 I therefore do not consider that additional changes to the Campbell Street entrance are required on noise grounds.