

1/355 Manukau Road Epsom, Auckland 1023 PO Box 26283 Epsom, Auckland 1344

T: 09 638 8414

E: hegley@acoustics.co.nz

4 May 2018

Andrew McFarlane Bloxam Burnett & Olliver Ltd PO Box 9041 Hamilton 3240

Dear Andrew

NOTIONAL BOUNDARY

Thank you for a copy of the draft noise rules that Council are considering for the proposed Te Kowhai air park. One comment I have is in relation to the measurement position adopted by proposed rule 21.2.1.2(1), which requires that:

(1) Noise measured within the notional boundary on any other site, or at the site boundary on any vacant site, must not exceed ...

NZS6801: 2008 "Acoustics - Measurement of Environmental Sound" defines the notional boundary as a line 20m from the façade of an occupied building, or the site boundary where that is closer. While the site boundary is appropriate for a residential site, I support the use of the notional boundary for rural sites as the site boundary is often some way from the dwelling meaning that its adoption may needlessly protect areas of vacant land. I consider that the notional boundary is the appropriate measurement location for rural situations, including Te Kowhai.

I understand that Council have proposed the additional wording "... or at the site boundary on any vacant site ..." to rule 21.2.1.1(1) to ensure that any as yet undeveloped sites would be assessed to prevent any future houses being ignored. I do not consider that this additional wording is necessary or that it achieves the intended purpose. The notional boundary is not limited to houses that predate the proposal. Should a house be constructed after the proposal, there would be a new notional boundary for the proposed activities to comply with meaning that the new dwelling would receive the same level of protection as any historic dwellings.

Not only would the proposed additional wording provide no practical benefit to any as yet undeveloped sites, as written it would not even apply to the more likely situation of a second dwelling on an already developed site.

The notional boundary concept puts the onus on the noise maker to consider future possibilities. In the case of Te Kowhai Airpark, this has been addressed through the proposal of a noise buffer zone about the air park which requires any new dwelling built in close proximity to the air park to be constructed to achieve appropriate internal levels.

If the wording of the condition remains unchanged, an acoustic solution that could be investigated for the one as yet undeveloped site adjacent to Te Kowhai would be the erection

of a noise barrier along the site boundary. The fact that this noise barrier would offer no immediate practical use demonstrates that the additional wording is not needed.

Should you have any questions regarding the above please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely Hegley Acoustic Consultants

Rhys Hegley