

MEETING MINUTES – PRE-CONFERENCE DISCUSSION

20 September 2012 at Marshall Day Acoustics Ltd offices, 84 Symonds Street, Auckland 1010

The Project:

- MacKays to Peka Peka

Present:

- Malcolm Hunt (engaged by Kapiti Coast District Council)
- Siiri Wilkening (engaged by the NZTA)

Introduction

Mr Hunt clarified that prior to February 2012 he undertook a brief noise assessment for El Rancho. He has not acted for this party since that date and is solely engaged by KCDC as their expert witness for noise and vibration for this project.

We agree that these pre-conferencing discussions be undertaken starting from a broad base to narrow issues in relation to noise and vibration effects associated with the Project as they are of concern to KCDC. In this way we hope to minimise technical discussions taking up too much time during the hearing.

The broad effects of the Project

We agree a pattern change in the distribution of noise and (potentially) vibration in the District will occur as a result of the project. There will be a modest reduction along the existing SH1 corridor and an increase in effects around the designated corridor (from minor to significant). The designation runs through various environments (e.g. areas affected by the existing SH and local roads through to quiet areas remote from existing noise sources).

We agree that the effects need to be assessed in an objective manner (as has been undertaken) based on appropriate criteria, having regard to the latest New Zealand Standard and the District Plan as applicable.

Ambient noise levels

We agree that the number and spread of selected sites for short and long term monitoring of existing ambient sound levels is appropriate and reflects existing conditions along the alignment.

MH notes that there may be some unintentional error in the estimation on 24 hour levels based on short 15 minute samples, but this is not a significant issue given the overall scale of the monitoring.

SW notes that the generally, conservative (i.e. low) levels have been chosen as the basis of assessment (in Appendix C of Technical Report 15). Therefore, the effects assessment would not change.

Criteria

MH:

There are a number of references in the District Plan to managing noise from new roads in accordance with the 1991 Transit Guidelines (e.g. Rules D.7.2.2 and D.2.2.2). I consider that Transit

Guidelines should be accorded significant weight in the assessment of preferred mitigation options because they are referenced in the District Plan (DP). As described below, the assessment has included full reference to the mitigation options that would provide compliance with the Guidelines.

SW:

While the assessment has regard to the Transit Guidelines (i.e. the DP requirements), I consider that the DP rules do not strictly apply as this project is undertaken as a NoR and the DP states that it does not apply in this instance.

Both:

We agree that adopting all mitigation options that fully comply with the Transit Guidelines would result in a somewhat different acoustic outcome, with some positions receiving higher noise levels and other lower noise levels when compared with the preferred mitigation options chosen based on NZS6806. Strict compliance with the Transit Guidelines mitigation would not take into consideration non-acoustical effects of that mitigation, e.g. urban design and visual impact.

The overall outcome of the mitigation assessment will result in noise levels that are unlikely to be unreasonable or excessive. Changes in noise level in many circumstances will be noticeable. The evidence of Dr Black deals with health effects (e.g. from noise and vibration). He is satisfied that the Project as designed and planned will adequately minimise and mitigation potential risks to human health and welfare.

Mitigation

SW:

Several mitigation options have been developed for all area, including one option for each area designed to meet the District Plan (Transit Guideline) criteria. The Project team reviewed and discussed all mitigation options based on acoustic and non-acoustic factors and provided input in the selection of the preferred mitigation option for each area. For each area, the Mitigation option that fulfils the DP requirements has been identified, and where it was considered to be the BPO, it was chosen as the preferred option. This occurred for following areas:

- S1 Raumati Sth East of EW
- S2 Raumati Rd West of EW (mitigation beyond DP)
- S2 Rata Rd
- S2 Cheltenham (mitigation beyond DP)
- S3 Mazengarb Rd east and west of EW (mitigation beyond DP)
- S3 Kauri Rd
- S3 Te Moana Rd sth and nth of EW

(9 of the 17 areas assessed)

MH:

Noted the high degree of compliance with the older DP criteria. Will review further and provide additional feedback within the evidence he is preparing.

MH concurs with the recommended options set out in bullet points above and will review the remaining areas in more detail in consultation with the KDCDC landscape and urban design experts, reporting via evidence.

Both:

We note that NZS6806 sets out three categories: A and B setting external criteria and C an internal criterion. Dwellings in Category C are most affected requiring treatment of the dwelling.

With the recommended mitigation options proposed, it is worth noting that there are no receivers classified as Category C.

Application of NZS6806 for other projects

We agree that each major roading project to which NZS6806 has been applied has a set of unique characteristics.

MH:

I consider the treatment of NZS6806 within the two recent large scale roading projects (Waterview and Transmission Gully) is relevant to the current project and should be considered.

SW:

I consider that the projects are sufficiently different and that previous judgements do not necessarily set a precedent for following projects. Therefore, I consider that an extensive comparison is not required. A summary comparison is contained in my evidence (para 171) and indicates that outcomes would be unchanged if the conditions of either the Waterview or Transmission Gully project were applied to this project.

Online documents

As part of the investigations, we discovered that the following two parts of the documentation was not originally available online:

Technical Report 15, Appendix 15.C: Sector 2 Kapiti to Mazengarb BPO Matrix: Mitigation options 5 and 6

Technical Report 16, Appendix 16.C: Construction noise hot spots Peka Peka Interchange

The process has commenced to ensure these documents are made available online as soon as possible. Copies of these documents have been provided to MH. In our opinion, although the documents are important for completeness, their (temporary) online omission does not alter the outcome of the overall assessment.

Sini Wairangi
20/9/2012

Maleson Hunt
20/9/12