

**Before the Queenstown Lakes District Council**

In the Matter of                    the Resource Management Act

And

In the Matter of                    the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan

**Queenstown and Environs Planning Maps  
(Hearing Stream 13)**

Summary Evidence of  
**Christopher William Day**  
for Queenstown Airport Corporation  
Limited (Submitter Number 433 and  
Further Submitter 1340)

Dated: 14 August 2017

---

---

Lane Neave  
Level 1  
2 Memorial Street  
Queenstown  
Solicitor Acting: Rebecca Wolt  
Email: [rebecca.wolt@laneneave.co.nz](mailto:rebecca.wolt@laneneave.co.nz)  
Phone: 03 4501365

**lane neave.**

## SUMMARY

1. Queenstown Airport is relatively well located in terms of avoiding significant noise for the wider community. Apart from the group of houses at the western end of the airport, the noise contours for Queenstown Airport fall largely over Lake Wakatipu, the river flats to the east and the generally non residential land to the north and south of the main runway.
2. Implementation of the New Zealand Standard NZS 6805 Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning is not just about reverse sensitivity and protecting the airport – it is also about avoiding the adverse effects of aircraft noise on people. Land use planning restrictions around airports are an effective means of avoiding more people being exposed to aircraft noise.
3. A number of submitters have requested that specific land within the Outer Control Boundary (**OCB**) for Queenstown Airport be rezoned to enable residential or other noise sensitive activities to establish. I do not support these rezoning requests from a noise perspective because:
  - (a) The New Zealand Standard NZS 6805 recommends that new noise sensitive activities inside the OCB should be prohibited, as a preferred starting position.
  - (b) The operative and proposed District Plans follow this recommendation from NZS 6805 and adopt prohibited activity status for new residential activity in Rural Zones inside the OCB.
  - (c) Community response surveys show that 12% to 15% of the population are highly annoyed by aircraft noise levels of 55 dB  $L_{dn}$ .
  - (d) The general residential noise rules contained in the Operative and Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plans suggest that noise levels above 50 dB  $L_{dn}$  are not a suitable residential noise environment.
  - (e) The installation of sound insulation in buildings does not eliminate all the effects of aircraft noise. New Zealanders generally do not like living in enclosed air-conditioned houses without being able to

- open their windows. Opening the windows negates the effect of any noise mitigation installed.
- (f) New Zealand has an 'outdoor' culture, and sound insulation in buildings does not address outdoor amenity.
4. In my opinion, the recommendations of NZS 6805 should be upheld and new noise sensitive activities should not be allowed to establish within the OCB (55 dB  $L_{dn}$  noise contour) for Queenstown Airport.
5. A number of submitters have requested that land just outside the OCB be rezoned for noise sensitive activities. I also do not support these rezoning requests because:
- (a) Noise effects do not stop suddenly at the Outer Control Boundary/55 dB  $L_{dn}$  noise contour. The community response surveys and the QLDC noise rules show that there are adverse effects from noise between 50 dB and 55 dB  $L_{dn}$ . I have attached Appendix D from my primary evidence to show the gradual change in noise effects.
- (b) The current level of growth in aircraft operations at Queenstown Airport is significantly greater than the 3% annual growth used in the forecasting for PC35 based on forecasts produced in 2008. Current indications are that the airport will likely reach the PC35 noise boundaries well ahead on those initial predictions and it is likely these boundaries will need to be expanded sometime in the future.
- (c) The properties just outside the OCB may in the long term, if currently expected growth transpires, be exposed to moderately high levels of aircraft noise.
6. In my opinion, these properties are marginal for noise sensitive activities and I consider a precautionary approach should be adopted when considering the appropriateness of new noise sensitive activities in these locations.
7. Finally, I note that the notified noise boundaries contain a small error, which should be corrected in accordance with QAC's submission on this issue.

### Appendix D – Location of Rezoning Submissions

