

**BEFORE HEARING COMMISSIONERS APPOINTED BY CANTERBURY REGIONAL
COUNCIL AND WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL**

IN THE MATTER OF the Resource Management Act 1991 ("**the Act**")

AND

IN THE MATTER OF Applications CRC204106, CRC204107, CRC204143 and
RC205104 – to establish, operate and rehabilitate an
aggregate quarry at 309 West Belt, Rangiora

JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT OF

WILLIAM REEVE AND JON FARREN

NOISE

30 April 2021

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Joint Witness Statement (JWS):
- (a) Relates to the noise effects that may arise from Taggart Earthmoving Limited's proposal to establish, operate and rehabilitate an aggregate quarry at 309 West Belt, Rangiora; and
 - (b) Reports on the outcomes of expert conferencing between William Reeve, (section 42A officer for Waimakariri District Council) and Jon Farren (witness for Taggart Earthmoving).
- 1.2 The expert conference was held on Wednesday 28 April 2021 at the Christchurch office of Marshall Day Acoustics.
- 1.3 We have read Appendix 3 of the Environment Court Practice Note and confirm compliance with it.
- 1.4 We do not have any material matters of contention. Below we have discussed key items which were raised in evidence and have subsequently been resolved .

2. TRAFFIC ON RIVER ROAD

- 2.1 We agree that there will be a change in the character of the traffic noise received by residences along River Road. Whilst our traffic noise assessments differ slightly, we agree that when taking into account the character and overall noise levels, traffic noise effects will not be significantly different for the dwellings closest to River Road.
- 2.2 Ms Dawson has discussed the issue of vibration from trucks using River Road in Paragraphs 431 to 436 of her s42A report. We agree that vibration generated by quarry trucks using River Road is unlikely to result in a difference in level when compared to heavy vehicles using the road currently. However, the number of perceptible events may increase at the closest dwellings as a result of the increased heavy vehicle traffic.

3. HAUL ROUTE

- 3.1 Mr Reeve identified in his s42A report (Paragraphs 52 and 53) that the internal haul route modelling presented by Mr Farren differed from the proposal in the Application.
- 3.2 In his evidence, Mr Farren provided additional modelling with the updated location provided in the Application. This modelling shows that there is negligible change for the dwellings on Huntingdon Drive. Noise levels increase by 1 dB at the closest dwellings on West Belt.
- 3.3 We agree that this predicted increase will not be generally perceptible and the noise levels will remain below the 50 dB L_{Aeq} limit.

4. STOCKPILE ACTIVITY

- 4.1 In his evidence, Mr Reeve raised concerns about activity which could occur on the proposed stockpiles at a height of 5 metres, resulting in minimal screening from the acoustic bunds along the boundary of the site.
- 4.2 Since preparing his evidence, Mr Farren has produced additional modelling which includes trucks traversing the top of a 5 metre high stockpile. The modelling also includes the operation of an excavator which is referred to in Paragraph 5.12 of Mr. Taggart's evidence. Mr. Taggart has confirmed the excavator is unlikely to be used to compact gravel for more than 5% of the time. This modelling shows that the predicted levels from this activity remain below 50 dB L_{Aeq} at the closest dwellings on West Belt. This additional modelling is attached to this JWS as Figure 1.
- 4.3 Mr Farren considers that the modelling illustrates that if this level of activity is representative of what is proposed by the operator, compliance with the proposed 50 dB L_{Aeq} limit will be achieved at the closest dwellings.
- 4.4 Mr Reeve is satisfied that the modelling adequately demonstrates that compliance can be achieved with the 50 dB L_{Aeq} limit for most extraction locations. When extraction occurs in the north-east quadrant, closest to the stockpiles, at the same time as the stockpile activity presented in Figure 1, Mr Reeve considers that there is the potential for a small (less than 2 dB) breach of the proposed limit at the closest West Belt properties.
- 4.5 Since the Applicant will be constrained by the proposed 50 dB L_{Aeq} daytime noise limit, and there are inherent conservatisms in the modelling, Mr Reeve considers that this would be best addressed by monitoring of the actual noise levels from this scenario, to confirm the proposed noise limits are being met. This could be addressed with a minor adjustment to the proposed noise monitoring condition of consent, to ensure that noise from both stockpile and excavation activity are captured in this exercise.

5. SITE VIBRATION

- 5.1 We agree that vibration effects at surrounding properties will be negligible from the equipment used on this site.

6. CONDITIONS

- 6.1 We generally agree that the conditions of consent proposed in the s42A report are appropriate. Mr Reeve considers that the monitoring condition should now specifically cover the scenario discussed in paragraphs 4.4 – 4.5 above.
- 6.2 Mr Reeve agrees that the proposed change in paragraph 9.17 of Mr Farren's evidence to include a night-time L_{AFmax} limit is consistent with best practice.



William Reeve



Jon Farren

30 April 2021

Figure 1 – Updated noise contours with trucks driving on top of 5 metre high gravel stockpile (top image) and excavator operating up to 30% of the time (bottom image)

