

BEFORE THE SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER OF

The Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF

Resource consent application  
RC216016 to establish and operate a  
PAK'nSAVE supermarket and  
associated carparking, signage and  
landscape, and to undertake soil  
disturbance under NES, at 157 Levi  
Road, Rolleston

AND

IN THE MATTER OF

FOODSTUFFS (SOUTH ISLAND)  
PROPERTIES LIMITED  
Applicant

---

SUMMARY OF WILLIAM PETER REEVE  
ACOUSTIC ENGINEER ENGAGED BY THE SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL  
DATED 3 AUGUST 2022

---

1. My full name is William Peter Reeve.
2. I prepared a statement of evidence dated the 11<sup>th</sup> of July 2022 and my qualifications and experience are outlined there. I have read and agree to comply with the Environment Court Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses.
3. I have since prepared a Joint Witness Statement (JWS) with the Applicant's acoustic expert Mr Rob Hay dated 28 July 2022.
4. We did not consider noise effects on the land directly to the east and southeast of the proposed development, when preparing this statement, on the understanding that the Affected Party Approval (APA) has been obtained.
5. I do note that the most recent condition set I have seen, attached to the evidence of Mr Allan, still includes noise limits and boundary fencing provisions along this boundary, responding to PC71 residential development. I also now understand from the Applicants presentation that the limits to heavy vehicles will now apply from 8 pm.

#### Noise on the site

6. The JWS records my agreement that the noise limits proposed for this development, based on the Proposed Selwyn District Plan, are appropriate. I agree that it is realistic for daytime transportation and servicing noise levels on the site to meet the proposed limits.
7. It is not practical for heavy vehicle deliveries at night to comply with these proposed limits at residential properties across from site accesses, so this part of the activity has been excluded from the proposed noise limits. There will be two heavy vehicle movements during the night-time period and associated loading zone activity.
8. I raised concerns in my evidence in chief that the potential for sleep disturbance from these deliveries had not been adequately assessed at the closest residential properties, especially if existing vehicle activity, including heavy vehicles on Levi / Lincoln Rolleston Roads

was minimal at this time.

9. The Applicant has since provided traffic count information for Levi and Lincoln Rolleston Roads on a weekday morning between 4 and 5 am when the night-time heavy vehicle deliveries are scheduled to occur. One heavy vehicle movement was observed on Lincoln Rolleston Road during this time, along with a moderate number of light vehicle movements on both Levi and Lincoln Rolleston Road. The volume of vehicle movements was in the order of one light vehicle a minute between 4.30 and 5.00 am.
10. While heavy vehicle movements appear to be currently infrequent at this time, I am satisfied that in the context of existing light vehicle traffic at this time, noise from two heavy vehicles arriving and departing the site is unlikely to cause additional sleep disturbance for occupants of dwellings across Levi and Lincoln Rolleston Road.

#### Conditions

11. I have recorded my agreement in the JWS with the noise related conditions proposed in the evidence of Mr Mark Allan for the Applicant. These have been further developed and now address concerns raised in my evidence in chief. One concern was that there was no specificity about when more detailed construction noise and mechanical plant assessments were to be undertaken and submitted to Council.
12. A condition requiring broadband reversing alarms on forklifts and other delivery vehicles under Foodstuffs control is now also proposed, which I consider to be best practice. Based on my experience, 'beeper' reversing alarms can be a particularly distinct noise source from supermarket loading bay areas.
13. I agree that the proposed mechanical plant noise condition, which requires a night-time noise level of 30 dB  $L_{Aeq}$  to be met, will ensure noise from this source is sufficiently controlled. An additional clarification regarding noise from the generator was discussed in

the JWS and I agree that the Applicants proposed change to address this is reasonable.

#### Change in traffic noise

14. Mr Hay and I both agree that the change in traffic noise resulting from this proposal will be acceptable. However, we have identified a slight disagreement over whether the change in traffic noise should be described as small but potentially perceptible, or imperceptible. This is a relatively minor distinction; however I have recorded it, as it may be relevant to inform an overall judgement of the effects of the development.
15. I have reviewed the traffic predictions for the relative increases in supermarket, including developments discussed in the JWS prepared by the traffic experts. I estimate that the change in traffic noise level compared to baseline resulting from the proposed supermarket development is likely be very small (less than 2 dB). This is below the 3 dB increase typically considered a just noticeable difference for the same source increasing in level.
16. However, I have reservations about describing the potential change in traffic noise as imperceptible. In my opinion, the locations of new accesses relative to residential sites (including a service lane) and the distribution of supermarket traffic and servicing movements over the day, when combined with the increase in traffic volumes, may be sufficient to lead to observable changes in character of noise for nearby residents.

William Peter Reeve

3 August 2022