

**BEFORE AN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL  
OF THE WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource  
Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of the proposed  
Waikato District Plan  
(Stage 1) Hearing 25

---

**EVIDENCE SUMMARY OF CRAIG MICHAEL FITZGERALD ON BEHALF OF HYNDS  
PIPE SYSTEMS LIMITED AND THE HYNDS FOUNDATION**

**NOISE**

**12 May 2021**

---

---

 **Simpson Grierson**  
Barristers & Solicitors

W S Loutit / S J Mitchell  
Telephone: +64-9-358 2222  
Facsimile: +64-9-307 0331  
Email: sarah.mitchell@simpsongrierson.com  
Private Bag 92518  
Auckland

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My full name is Craig Michael Fitzgerald. I am an Associate with Marshall Day Acoustics (**MDA**), specialising in environmental noise and vibration assessments.

1.2 I prepared a statement of evidence dated 17 February 2021 on behalf of Hynds Pipe Systems Limited and the Hynds Foundation (together, **Hynds**) in relation to their submissions/further submissions on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (**Proposed Plan**). The focus of my evidence was Hynds' request that the lower portion of its site at 62 Bluff Road site (**Expansion Land**) be zoned Heavy Industrial whilst retaining the proposed Rural zone on the upper portion of the land.

## 2. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

2.1 Hynds seeks that the Expansion Land at 62 Bluff Road is zoned Heavy Industrial, instead of Rural as in the Proposed Plan as notified, to enable a natural extension of its existing yard and warehouse operations at 9 McDonald Road.

2.2 The requirements of Hynds' resource consent generally align with the Operative Industrial 2 and Aggregate Extraction and Processing (**AEP**) noise rules<sup>1</sup>, and Proposed Heavy Industrial and Rural noise rules<sup>2</sup>, as received at Residential, Village and Rural sites. They all enable 50 – 55 dB L<sub>Aeq</sub> during the day and 40 – 45 dB L<sub>Aeq</sub> during the evening / night.

2.3 My colleague (Micky Yang) undertook noise measurements on Wednesday 10 February 2020, between 2330 and 0130 hours at three community measuring locations. I understand the period was representative of busy night operations at the Hynds site.

2.4 That monitoring established that while Hynds' existing activities were audible at times, they complied with the noise limits set by Hynds' resource consent, as well as the Operative Industrial 2 and AEP noise rules<sup>3</sup>, and Proposed Heavy Industrial and Rural noise rules<sup>4</sup>, as received at Residential, Village and

---

<sup>1</sup> Refer Operative Plan rules 29.5.1 and 35.5.7 respectively.

<sup>2</sup> Refer Proposed Plan rules 21.2.3.1 (P3), 22.2.1.1 (P2) and 24.2.1 (P2) respectively.

<sup>3</sup> Refer Operative Plan rules 29.5.1 and 35.5.7 respectively.

<sup>4</sup> Refer Proposed Plan rules 21.2.3.1 (P3), 22.2.1.1 (P2) and 24.2.1 (P2) respectively.

Rural sites. The noise effects of Hynds' operations were negligible due to masking from SH1 road traffic noise.

**2.5** I used that monitoring, as well as modelling of Hynds' existing operations, to undertake a noise effects assessment of Hynds' proposed rezoning of the Expansion Land. That assessment concluded that:

- (a) The receiving noise environment would continue to be controlled by State Highway 1 (**SH1**) (rather than Hynds' activities);
- (b) Hynds' activities on the Expansion Land would comply with the noise rules in the Proposed Plan; and
- (c) There would be a negligible change to cumulative noise levels from Hynds' sites received at the Village and Rural zone interfaces.

**2.6** Therefore, in my opinion, the noise effects of the rezoning of the smaller lower portion of 62 Bluff Road as sought by Hynds will comply with the noise rules and will be acceptable.

Craig Michael Fitzgerald

12 May 2021