

Stephen Jack Peakall – Hearing Stream 14 – Wakatipu Basin Chapter

1. My name is Stephen Jack Peakall. I am an Acoustical Consultant with Marshall Day Acoustics (**MDA**). I have prepared a statement of evidence on behalf of Trojan Helmet Limited (**THL**) (Submitter 2387 and Further Submitter 1157) in relation to the helicopter activities proposed to be enabled by the Hills Resort Zone (**HRZ**), dated 13 June 2018.
2. I have the qualifications and experiences as set out in my brief of evidence at paragraphs 2 to 5.
3. In this summary I will briefly summarise my primary evidence and respond to any rebuttal evidence as necessary.
4. My primary evidence addressed concerns raised by the Banco Trustees (**Banco**) further submission, where Banco seeks that noise levels from helicopter operations in the HRZ do not exceed a reasonable level on the Banco/HRZ common boundary. In my opinion, compliance with the NZS 6807 criteria of 50 dB $L_{dn(7day)}$ would ensure that this is achieved.
5. I predicted a noise level of less than 30 dB $L_{dn(7day)}$ at the existing dwelling on the Banco land, which is more than 20 decibels below the NZS 6807 criteria (and the equivalent limit set by PDP Rule 36.5.10). I concluded that future noise levels for the existing Banco dwelling and also any future subdivided lots on the Banco site would therefore be reasonable.
6. Only Mr Langman has made additional comments in rebuttal evidence with respect to noise, at his paragraphs 25.11 and 25.12. I respond to the issues he raises below.
7. With respect to noise impacts on residential activity, Mr Langman is correct that I had not assessed the noise effects of helicopter activities on potential residential activity within the HRZ.. However, I make a minor correction to Mr Langman's assertion that no modelling has been undertaken in respect of the impacts of noise from helicopters on these future sites. The modelling I have undertaken addresses the land within the HRZ and quantifies noise levels that may be received there. This is shown in Figure 2 attached to my evidence dated 13 June 2018.
8. In terms of noise levels received within the HRZ, at the worst-case location where residential activity is proposed (Activity A6 - as shown on the latest structure plan) the typical future allowable noise level would be 51-53 dB $L_{dn(7day)}$. For all other HRZ Activity Areas, I predict typical noise levels would be well below 50 dB $L_{dn(7day)}$.
9. I also understand that the general intent for visitor accommodation and residential activity within the HRZ is that it will have a close association to the golf club, clubhouse and ancillary facilities. Occupiers of dwellings within the HRZ would therefore likely be generally amenable to the club and its associated activities, one of which is helicopter flights.
10. Notwithstanding this, there exists an opportunity for the sites within the HRZ to contain conditions on the purchase or lease of buildings used for residential or other noise sensitive activities relating to an acceptance of helicopter operations occurring nearby (i.e. a no complaints covenant).
11. For these reasons, and due to the relatively low predicted helicopter noise levels, I consider that helicopter noise effects on residential dwellings and visitor accommodation activities within the HRZ would be reasonable.
12. With respect to Mr Langman's statements in paragraph 25.12, he is correct that there is no limit proposed on the number of movements of helicopters. However, there is a proposed noise limit which is intended to control the adverse noise effects from helicopter movements. This noise limit also effectively controls the number of movements that are possible from the HRZ. This approach is consistent with the way that helicopter noise is controlled throughout the rest of the District.

13. To expand on this point, my understanding is that the intent of the Resource Management Act is to mitigate adverse effects, and that in this case it is appropriate to impose noise limits that prevent unacceptable adverse noise effects from occurring. The methods to manage any adverse effects are then down to THL/the landowner.
14. If only a limit on the number of movements were imposed, then the use of much larger and noisier helicopters would be possible with resultant higher noise levels received in the community for the same number of movements. Conversely, the use of quieter helicopters would enable lower noise levels in the community. By imposing a noise limit, THL/the landowner can determine the best way to manage its noise emissions without exceeding acceptable noise levels (being the noise levels indicated in the proposed rule).
15. Whilst I do not consider it necessary based on the noise levels I have predicted, to provide some additional certainty to the Council, a rule or standard could be included in the HRZ provisions requiring that THL/the landowner keep a record of helicopter movements that occur in the Zone, which is to be made available to the Council upon request.