

Before the Commissioner appointed by
the Selwyn District Council

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of

Resource consent application for Foodstuffs (South Island)
Properties Limited to establish and operate a PAK'nSAVE
supermarket and associated access, loading, car parking,
signage, earthworks and landscaping at 157 Levi Road,
Rolleston (RC216016)

Summary Statement of Rob Lachlan Hay

2 August 2022

Applicant's solicitors:

Alex Booker
Anderson Lloyd
Level 3, 70 Gloucester Street, Christchurch 8013
PO Box 13831, Christchurch 8140
DX Box WX10009 Christchurch
p + 64 3 335 1231 | f + 64 27 656 2647
e alex.booker@al.nz

**anderson
lloyd.**

Background and scope of evidence

- 1 My name is Rob Lachlan Hay.
- 2 I prepared a statement of evidence dated 18 July 2022 in relation to acoustics. Subsequently, following the provision of Affected Party Approvals (APA) related to land covered by PC71, I prepared a Joint Witness Statement (Acoustics) dated 28 July together with William Reeve of Acoustic Engineering Services (on behalf of Selwyn District Council). My qualifications and experience are set out in that statement of evidence.
- 3 I repeat the confirmation given in that statement that I have read and agree to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court.
- 4 My role in relation to the Application is to assess matters related to acoustics – particularly noise generated by customer, goods and services vehicles, and mechanical plant.

Summary

- 5 The existing noise environment around the Application Site and the broader area is typical of a peri-urban area dominated by traffic on arterial roads. The existing noise level can be expected to increase in line with intensifying new residential development permitted to the west and north of the Application Site, as well as continuing residential development further to the south of the site along Lincoln Rolleston Road and elsewhere.
- 6 Given that the Application Site itself could be developed for residential use, and with the potential for residential use enabled by PC71 to the east and southeast, the existing ambient noise level in the area can be expected to increase due to both vehicle noise as well as general residential noise (heat pumps, people, lawn mowing etc etc).
- 7 I do not consider the area to be 'quiet' currently and I expect it to be less so in the future based on the future permitted residential intensification.
- 8 Mr Reeve and I agree as to the applicability of both the OSDP and PSDP noise limits. We agree that the PSDP noise limits represent better noise assessment criteria for the project than the OSDP noise limits.
- 9 We agree that two HGV deliveries at night are unlikely to cause additional sleep disturbance based on traffic counts carried out in the early morning of 22 July 2022.
- 10 We have also agreed on proposed conditions of consent covering construction noise, mechanical plant (including generator), reversing beepers, and noise mitigation options relating to the PC71 boundary.

- 11 I also note for completeness, since preparing my evidence, I have been provided with an Affected Party Approval (APA) for the land directly adjacent to the Site to the East. Accordingly, as noted in the JWS, I must not assess the potential for noise effects arising from the Application on the owners and occupiers of this property.

Matters raised in evidence of Mr Reeve

- 12 The only outstanding matter raised by Mr Reeve is addressed in the JWS at paragraphs 9 and 10.
- 13 This relates to whether the change in vehicle noise on Levi and Lincoln Rolleston Roads will be perceptible. This is a somewhat esoteric disagreement and, in my view, not outcome determinative as the threshold is not perceptibility. As Mr Reeve states at paragraph 9 of the JWS, he considers the noise effect acceptable.
- 14 It is my view that there will be some noise character variation but that this will be indistinguishable from the character of vehicles slowing/stopping/accelerating away from existing traffic queues, side streets and entrances. I consider the total noise level change of less than 2dB estimated by Mr Reeve to be imperceptible.
- 15 Even if there were times during the day when supermarket traffic was more numerous than general network traffic, the comparison is against the baseline over the day, not transitory and sporadic periods of time. I agree with Mr Reeves conclusion that the results are acceptable.

Conclusion

- 16 I consider that the noise related effects of the Application are acceptable, and that surrounding residential amenity will be maintained at an appropriate level should consent be granted.
- 17 I have reached this conclusion after considering:
- (i) The existing noise environment, and how this is likely to change in the medium term because of both new and intensified residential development in the area that is enabled by the District Plan and the RMA-EHS;
 - (ii) The appropriateness of the PSDP noise limits to the activity and surrounding environment;
 - (iii) The Applicant's proposed consent conditions applying to noise generation and mitigation, including site layout, mechanical plant, boundary fencing where appropriate, the location of loading areas, and management of night-time deliveries;

- (iv) That noise generated during the night will generally be well below the proposed standards, except for brief periods as limited deliveries enter and leave the site;
- (v) That vehicle noise, which makes up most of the Application Sites noise emissions, are of similar character to the dominant daytime and night-time noise in the environment, and that the level of noise emission is appropriate and unlikely to cause additional sleep disturbance at night.

Rob Lachlan Hay

Dated this 2nd day of August 2022