

BEFORE THE Hearing Panel on the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

IN THE MATTER OF The Resource Management Act 1991

AND

**IN THE MATTER OF Of the hearing of submissions and further
submissions on the Proposed Waimakariri
District Plan – Stream 12F: Airfield**

STATEMENT OF SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF ROB LACHLAN HAY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 My full name is Rob Lachlan Hay.

1.2 My qualifications and experience are given in my Evidence-in-Chief.

1.3 Although this is not an Environment Court hearing, I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023 and have complied with this Code in preparing my rebuttal evidence.

2.0 SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

2.1 My evidence will specifically address:

- Matters relevant to noise in the s42A report prepared by Mr Powell (Consultant Planner); and
- Matters raised in the Evidence-in-Chief of Mr Lewthwaite (acoustic peer reviewer on behalf of Council).

3.0 THE EVIDENCE OF MR LEWTHWAITE

3.1 Consent of dwelling occupants

3.2 Mr Lewthwaite and I share common ground in considering it important that ownership or occupation of dwelling units are closely tied to an airfield activity for reasons we have both canvassed. I consider the mechanism by which this may be achieved to be contractual/legal/planning matters and so I do not propose to address them further, except to agree with Mr Lewthwaite that there must be some mechanism that ensures non-owner occupants of dwellings (for example rental or BnB) are aware of the nature of the environment and restrictions on complaints about lawful activities on the airfield.

3.3 I do not consider that these mechanisms must necessarily form part of a District Plan rule, however if they do not, Council should have some means of ensuring the efficacy of the mechanism.

3.4 At para 27 Mr Lewthwaite states that there is a risk that increased flight movements, longer runways, or changed flightpaths resulting in more overhead traffic may increase noise levels to the point that implied consent of owners/occupiers of on-airfield dwellings may be compromised.

3.5 Mr Lewthwaite was the Council's peer reviewer during the previous plan change and designation process. As such he is already aware that the modelled noise contours and associated rules already allow for realistic long-term growth; and the rule framework requires Council to monitor annual aircraft movements and review the suitability of the contours before that growth has been fully achieved.

3.6 The proposed increase in runway lengths is modest and in reality, allows for enhanced safety and ease of operation, rather than allowing operation of a new class of aircraft that the noise contours do not envision. Significantly larger aircraft that may create more noise would realistically require sealed runways, most probably also associated with the installation of runway lighting and navigation aids. This was explicitly rejected at the time the Designation was introduced and the noise contours established. I am not aware that this situation has changed.

3.7 Similarly, the noise contour already anticipates flight paths with a high degree of training, including standard overhead circuit joining procedures.

3.8 Given these facts and the high degree of control that Council exerts over the airfield as its owner and operator, I am not concerned that the kind of noise creep Mr Lewthwaite raises will occur.

3.9 Should the airfield activities expand or intensify beyond what the current noise contours anticipate, Council (or another party) would need to undertake processes consistent with whatever planning and regulatory framework exists at that time. Assuming those future processes are similar to the current framework, that would have to include a full assessment of effects and consultation with affected parties in addition to whatever hearings or regulatory process is required.

3.10 Sound insulation requirements for 'other habitable rooms'

3.11 Mr Lewthwaite proposes reducing the allowable internal noise level for 'other habitable rooms' in table-NOISE-1 by 10 decibels. This is a district wide matter affecting dwellings under the noise contour for Christchurch International Airport in addition to Rangiora Airfield.

3.12 I have not considered this matter in detail as this matter has implications beyond Rangiora Airfield as it applies to the noise contours for Christchurch International Airfield Limited (CIAL) as well. Unlike CIAL, Rangiora Airfield does not operate at night. I agree with Mr Powell that this should be properly addressed in the Stream 5 hearings.

3.13 I do agree with Mr Lewthwaite (para 34) that there are common construction systems that can achieve the noise level he proposes, albeit these may restrict the area of glazing and the type of doors or windows used.

3.14 Taxiing and engine testing

3.15 I have not assessed noise from taxiing aircraft to dwellings within the SPZ(RA). Noise from taxiing aircraft is both transitory and to be expected in live/fly arrangements. Tolerance of such noise is yet another reason why occupation of any dwelling should be tied to an aviation related activity, or the nature of the environment at least made plain to short term occupants.

3.16 Mr Lewthwaite notes that taxiing and engine testing may occur at night (outside of WDC-1). I do not foresee that engine testing would in fact occur at night, but I note that noise effects would be mitigated at RLZ dwellings by the requirement to comply with the RLZ night-time noise limits.

3.17 Similarly, existing aircraft movements rarely occur at civil dawn or dusk during the summer, which would be required in order for taxiing of aircraft to occur during District Plan night-time. Other than in rare instances I do not consider that an issue requiring additional controls actually exists. However, should the Panel consider additional controls are necessary a time restriction on taxiing outside of WDC-1 could be applied either through a rule applying within the SPZ(RA) zone, or by a legal contract applying to owner/occupiers of affected properties.

3.18 Engine testing may take a number of forms but is generally a relatively brief period of both low and high-power running following servicing or significant engine maintenance. I am not aware of the specific rules at Rangiora Airfield, but generally in my experience such testing is required to be undertaken and specified locations. Often this is at the end of a runway, or some other location well away from casual passersby. In the event that an engine reconditioner were to establish in Area A and require the ability to test engines out of an airframe, this would need to be done within an specifically designed test facility.

3.19 I note that activities such as engine testing and taxiing aircraft would fit within the intent of the proposed District Plan policy NOISE-P2 – Limited duration noise generating activities, given that these are required within the proposed zone and are consistent in both level and character with the amenity value of the receiving environment

3.20 Industrial activity noise within the SPZ(RA)

3.21 At paragraphs 43 and 44 of his evidence Mr Lewthwaite raises noise generated by industrial activities causing high levels of noise within Area A that may affect the amenity of residential and visitor accommodation activities within both Areas A and B.

3.22 This is a matter picked up by Mr Powell in the s42A report, so I will address this below.

4.0 THE S42A

4.1 A number of the matters raised in the s42A I have already addressed above. The key matter I have not yet addressed is the potential for noise effects arising from ground based industrial or other activities within Area A affecting residential activities in both Areas A and B. Mr Powell extends this point to include effects on adjacent land uses within the RLZ zone (paragraph 356c).

4.2 This latter point is the most readily addressed. As briefly described above, any ground-based activity within the SPZ(RA) zone would have to comply with the relevant receiving zone noise limits in table-NOISE-2. For the RLZ zone this would be 50 dB L_{Aeq} (daytime) and 40 dB L_{Aeq} / 65 dB L_{AFmax} (night-time) assessed at the dwelling notional boundary. In my view this will provide an appropriate level of amenity.

4.3 Noise arising from ground-based activities, especially of an industrial nature, do have the potential to create adverse effects on ASANs within Areas A and B. While this could be addressed through means other than the District Plan such as an airfield operations manual or contractual arrangement, I consider that it would be appropriate to have a noise limit apply to the zone, or at least those parts outside WDC-1.

4.4 There are a wide range of activities that could appropriately establish within Area A. Many of these, including aircraft maintenance workshops, make very little noise much of the time. However, I do not discount the possibility that noisy activities could arise at times. Any zone noise limit should reflect that Area A is primarily the equivalent of a commercial or light industrial zone within which residential is permitted.

4.5 In reviewing table-NOISE-2 of the proposed District Plan, I consider that the most closely aligned **noise limits** to apply within the SPZ(RA) would be either those for the Local Centre Zone (daytime 60 dB L_{Aeq} , night-time 40 dB L_{Aeq} / 70 dB L_{AFmax}), or the Sport and Active Recreation Zone (daytime 55 dB L_{Aeq} , night-time 45 dB L_{Aeq} / 75 dB L_{AFmax}).

4.6 Either would allow a wide range of activities to establish as of right, while still ensuring an appropriate level of residential amenity and sleep protection to ASANs within both Areas A and B. Compliance with such limits at sites within Areas A & B would almost certainly ensure that the noise limit within the RLZ would also be achieved.

4.7 To be clear, I do not propose that this noise limit should apply to taxiing aircraft, or to engine testing within WDC-1.

Rob Hay
7 August 2024