

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Julie Chambers	53.2	Oppose	Opposes PDP Noise Standards Table S1: General noise limits being greater for nighttime than daytime.	No specific relief sought. Inferred decision requested to amend Noise Standards Table S1: General Noise Limits so that the noise levels at night are not more permissive than during the daytime.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /General	Tony Michelle	73.11	Amend	Considers the importance of recognising the functional importance of noise-generating activities whilst balancing the health and wellbeing of people and communities.	Amend the Noise Section to include the following Objective: <u>The benefits of activities that generate noise are recognised, where the adverse effects from noise are compatible with the anticipated purpose, character, and amenity values of the relevant zone(s) and do not compromise public health, safety, and wellbeing of people and communities.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	Tony Michelle	73.12	Support	Supports Noise-O3: Reverse sensitivity as an important part of protecting existing and authorised activities.	Retain Noise-O3: Reverse sensitivity as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /General	Tony Michelle	73.13	Amend	Seeks to include a Policy for rural activities where they may have a functional / operational need that supports primary production including agricultural aviation.	Amend the Noise Section by including the following Policy: <u>The use of noisy equipment that has a limited duration and frequency (in particular, audible bird scaring devices, agricultural aviation and frost protection devices, and harvesters) that supports primary production in the rural environment is enabled by exempting these activities from noise limits, subject to reasonable use.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Tony Michelle	73.14	Amend	Seeks to have agricultural aviation provided for as a permitted activity in the plan.	Amend Noise-R1A as follows: 2. The noise and vibration standards in any part of the District Plan do not apply to the following, unless the District Plan specifically states otherwise. The activities listed below are therefore considered permitted activities in terms of the noise standards: a. <u>agricultural aviation activity</u> , the noise from the use of vehicles, mobile machinery, or other mobile or portable equipment where they are used on a seasonal or intermittent basis for agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, or forestry activities that are permitted by the Plan;	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R3: Noise generated from helicopter landing areas	Tony Michelle	73.15	Oppose	Considers that clarification is required that helicopters undertaking agricultural activities are provided for in Noise-R1: Noise generation (general) 2. a.	Seeks that Noise-R3: Noise generated from helicopter landing areas is amended by including the following: Note: <u>3. Helicopters undertaking agricultural aviation activities are provided for in NOISE- R1 2) a)</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Glen McLeod Anne McLeod	74.2	Oppose	Zone Residential Zones 7a.m. to 7p.m. LAeq (15min) - 50 dB 7p.m. to 10pm LAeq(15min) - 45 dB 10p.m. to 7a.m. the following day LAeq(15min) - 40 dB 10p.m. to 7a.m. the following day LAFmax - 70 dB According to the experts regarding 70 decibels all night and the impact – “extended exposure to above 55-60 dB becomes annoying and ultimately disturbing”. This is a reasonably peaceful area, and we want to keep it that way.	no relief sought.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Rick Neil Jamieson	77.5	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Peddie Street, Taradale, Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, sense of community, existing (No. 37) Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increases in noise, street parking and vehicle movement.	Seeks that Peddie Street, Taradale, Greenmeadows are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified.(Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Odette Charlotte Potgieter Henry George Potgieter	90.5	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing No. 40A Peddie Street property value and result in commercial building typologies. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification resultant lack of carparking and 1.5m front yard setbacks that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking, vehicle movement, congestion, exacerbating infrastructure deficits and loss of greenspace in road reserves and properties.	Seeks that Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified. (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Rosemary Anne Kirby Gregory John Kirby	91.4	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, existing Peddie Street property depreciation and result in commercial building typologies. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification resultant lack of carparking and 1.5m front yard setbacks that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with noise, street parking, vehicle movement, congestion, exacerbating infrastructure deficits and loss of greenspace in road reserves and properties.	Seeks consultation with residents and that Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the MRZ and HRZ as notified. (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Ross Dobbie Eileen Dobbie	92.5	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale, Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, Peddie Street property depreciation and result in commercial building typologies. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise, street parking shortages and vehicle movement congestion.	Seeks consultation with affected residents and that Peddie Street, Taradale and Greenmeadows are deleted from MRZ and HRZ provisions as notified. (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Ross Dobbie Eileen Dobbie	93.5	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale, Greenmeadows will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, Peddie Street property depreciation and result in commercial building typologies. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise, street parking shortages and vehicle movement congestion.	Seeks consultation with affected residents and that Peddie Street, Taradale, Greenmeadows are deleted from MRZ and HRZ provisions as notified. (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Jean Ferguson	94.4	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Winifred Street and around Napier South will result in a loss of neighbourhood sunlight and privacy. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with HRZ apartment buildings intensification.	Seeks that HRZ is deleted and the existing 1-2 storey building height control is retained in order to adequately control the adverse effects that would result from higher density development.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone	Kay Foley	97.1	Oppose	Notes that the Port faces increasing noise complaints despite its monitoring showing noise levels below 65dB, attributing the discrepancy to liberal averaging provisions in the existing Operative District Plan. Acknowledges the economic importance of the Port but seek fair mitigation measures for houses severely impacted by noise pollution. Considers, as per the Styles Group Port Noise Review (2022), that all dwellings exposed to 55dB or greater should be acoustically treated to achieve an indoor noise level of 40dB; adjusted mitigation budget is inadequate and progress too slow; and the number of affected dwellings is likely to increase to 51 (from 37) by 2035. Refer to original submission for full details	Amend Noise-S3: General noise limits Standard within the Port Zone to reference the need for improved/increased annual investment to reduce noise at source or for the Port to provide inflation CPI adjusted/increased acoustic mitigation to noise-affected properties. (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Cameron David Marett	98.7	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Peddie Street and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, Peddie Street property depreciation and result in commercial building typologies. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification and will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increased noise to 70dB all night due to street parking shortages and vehicle movement congestion.	Delete MRZ and HRZ in Peddie Street and Taradale in its entirety. (Inferred decision requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Lynette Harris	106.5	Amend	Submitter objects to the proposed changes in the PDP. Submitter was born in Napier and has lived on Peddie Street for many years, is a pensioner who has made alterations to their home and enjoys living in the quiet peaceful and safe area. Objects to, 19.5m high apartment blocks being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, 12m high apartment blocks being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, Commercial buildings being built in Taradale and Greenmeadows, No allowance for off street parking, Reduced privacy and sunlight, Increased vehicle movement, Increased noise to 70db all night; and The loss of neighbourhood character. Submitter is stressed about their future and believes it is unnecessary as vacant land exists in Napier.	Relief Sought is not included, however it is inferred that the submitter seeks the area around Peddie Street to be rezoned General Residential (not HRZ).	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Lilian Sandra Winnie	107.10	Oppose	Opposes noise limits of 70db at night in residential zones.	No specific relief sought. Seeks amendment to reduce night noise limits in residential zones [inferred].	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Cameron David Marett	111.5	Oppose	Opposes noise limits of 70db at night in residential zones.	No specific relief sought. Seeks amendment to reduce night noise limits in residential zones [inferred].	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Shirley Rosina Carrington	121.6	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) around Peddie Street and Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, devaluing of Peddie Street property values and result in commercial building typologies. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increases in noise to 70dB all night, street parking and vehicle movement.	Seeks that Peddie Street and Taradale are exempt from intensification in the HRZ and MRZ as notified. (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Edward Robert Woolman	122.2	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) and MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) in Elbourne Street and around Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, trees, sunlight, privacy, greenspace, birdlife and sense of community. Objective Noise-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing is inconsistent with the social mental and physical impacts upon residents (many of whom are pensioners) arising from an unreasonable standard of amenity due to the proposed intensification with increased noise arising from increased density, population, congestion and people movements.	Delete MRZ and HRZ provisions from Elbourne Street and around Taradale. (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Sandra Esther Wilson	129.4	Amend	Amend High Density Residential (HRZ) and Medium Density Residential (MRZ) for Taradale, particularly Elbourne Street. Submitter is opposed due to social impacts, on both health and well-being of residents. Considers impacts on noise, traffic, loss of green spaces, birdlife, character, sunlight, privacy, community, parking, anti-social behaviour, wind issues and the value of properties. HRZ and MRZ will impact health and wellbeing of residents by increased levels of noise and activity.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Kim Hunter	130.5	Oppose	Considers the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) at 9A Peddie Street, Taradale will result in a loss of neighbourhood character, sunlight, privacy, outlook, anticipatory decreased house values and a lack of personal safety. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ and HRZ intensification that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increases in noise, street parking and vehicle movement. The submission process should also be extended and simplified.	Delete HRZ and MRZ in their entirety from existing neighbourhoods and reconsider greenfield development locations with appropriate infrastructure.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Deborah and Dennis Dinneen	133.5	Oppose	Considers the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) at 79 McDonald Street, Napier South will result in a loss of neighbourhood character. Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard is inconsistent with MRZ intensification that will lead to an unreasonable standard of amenity with increases in noise, street parking, vehicle movement and possibly anti-social behaviour.	Delete MRZ and incompatible provisions (including Noise-S1: General noise limits Standard) from McDonald Street, Napier South.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /General	Jimmy Guerin	134.11	Amend	Considers that a new Objective should be added to better recognise the functional importance of noise generating activities.	Amend the Noise Section by including the following Objective: <u>The benefits of activities that generate noise are recognised, where the adverse effects from noise are compatible with the anticipated purpose, character, and amenity values of the relevant zone(s) and do not compromise public health, safety, and wellbeing of people and communities.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	Jimmy Guerin	134.12	Support	Supports Noise-O3: Reverse sensitivity as an important part of protecting existing and authorised activities.	Retain Noise-O3: Reverse sensitivity as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /General	Jimmy Guerin	134.13	Amend	The submitter seeks to amend the Noise Section to include a Policy for rural activities where they may have a functional / operational need that supports primary production including agricultural aviation.	Amend the Noise Section by including the following Policy: <u>The use of noisy equipment that has a limited duration and frequency (in particular, audible bird scaring devices, agricultural aviation and frost protection devices, and harvesters) that supports primary production in the rural environment is enabled by exempting these activities from noise limits, subject to reasonable use.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Jimmy Guerin	134.14	Amend	Seeks to amend Noise-R1: Noise generation (general). Noise-R1A to enable the establishment of agricultural aviation as a Permitted Activity.	Amend Noise-R1A as follows: 2. The noise and vibration standards in any part of the District Plan do not apply to the following, unless the District Plan specifically states otherwise. The activities listed below are therefore considered permitted activities in terms of the noise standards: a. the noise from the use of vehicles, mobile machinery, <u>agricultural aviation activity</u> , or other mobile or portable equipment where they are used on a seasonal or intermittent basis for agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, or forestry activities that are permitted by the Plan;	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R3: Noise generated from helicopter landing areas	Jimmy Guerin	134.15	Oppose	The submitter opposes Noise-R3: Noise generated from helicopter landing areas and considers that clarification is required that helicopters undertaking agricultural activities are provided for in Noise-R1: Noise generation (general) 2. a.	Seeks that Noise-R3: Noise generated from helicopter landing areas is amended by including the following: Note: 1. Helicopter landing areas are also subject to the activity tables of the relevant zone, precinct and/or development area. Compliance with this rule does not protect any helicopter landing area from the lawful encroachment of noise-sensitive activities. 2. Rules must be in accordance with NZS 6807:1994 Noise 3. Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas - excluding 4.3 Averaging. <u>3. Helicopters undertaking agricultural aviation activities are provided for in NOISE-R1. 2. a.</u>	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise / Introduction/	Sera Chambers	150.63	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment. Adjoining landowners should have the same rights to consultation and mitigation as landowners adjoining the port.	include mitigation requirements for HBAL to mitigate noise for affected landowners as per Port Noise Mitigation Requirements.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.64	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment. Adjoining landowners should have the same rights to consultation and mitigation as landowners adjoining the port.	include mitigation requirements for HBAL to mitigate noise for affected landowners as per Port Noise Mitigation Requirements.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.65	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment. Adjoining landowners should have the same rights to consultation and mitigation as landowners adjoining the port.	include mitigation requirements for HBAL to mitigate noise for affected landowners as per Port Noise Mitigation Requirements.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.66	Amend	amend to include right to consultation and impact mitigation for adjoining landowners premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	amend to include right to consultation and impact mitigation for adjoining landowners premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.67	Amend	amend to include right to consultation and impact mitigation for adjoining landowners premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	amend to include right to consultation and impact mitigation for adjoining landowners premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.68	Amend	amend on the basis that existing adjoining landowners should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigations at the cost of the noise generators premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	amend on the basis that existing adjoining landowners should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigations at the cost of the noise generators premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.69	Oppose	Oppose on the basis that existing adjoining landowners should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigations at the cost of the noise generators premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. the transport network (NCC/NZTA).	existing adjoining landowners who are impacted by increased road noise should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigation by the transport network in the same way that port noise is addressed.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.70	Oppose	Oppose on the basis that existing adjoining landowners should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigations at the cost of the noise generators premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. HBAL. Adjoining landowners should have the same rights to consultation and mitigation as landowners adjoining the port.	include mitigation requirements for HBAL to mitigate noise for affected landowners as per Port Noise Mitigation Requirements.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.119	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.120	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction	Sera Chambers	150.121	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.122	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.123	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment. Noting the importance of amenity values to New Zealanders.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	Sera Chambers	150.124	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues	Sera Chambers	150.125	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment. "Generally consistent with relevant NZ Standard" is not sufficient protection.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Objectives	Sera Chambers	150.126	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives	Sera Chambers	150.127	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.128	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies	Sera Chambers	150.129	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects. Submitter notes that in other parts of NZ where an airport has increased its noise effect, consideration has been given to retrofitting acoustic insulation to existing houses depending on the noise levels.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2A	Sera Chambers	150.130	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. construction company.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R3A	Sera Chambers	150.131	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment. Flight paths should be varied to ensure return flights are different paths.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R6A	Sera Chambers	150.132	Oppose	Oppose on the basis that existing adjoining landowners should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigations at the cost of the noise generators premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. the transport network (NCC/NZTA).	existing adjoining landowners who are impacted by increased road noise should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigation by the transport network in the same way that port noise is addressed.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R8: Noise generated from temporary military training activities	Sera Chambers	150.133	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners particularly given the minimum distances listed. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for further information to be available on these activities in the same way that other temporary activities are managed and for land owners to be notified and have their say including the option to have the impacts mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment of the landowners property rights.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R10A	Sera Chambers	150.134	Oppose	Oppose on the basis that existing adjoining landowners should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigations at the cost of the noise generators premised on the enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle. Excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. the transport network (NCC/NZTA).	existing adjoining landowners who are impacted by increased road noise should have the same right to consultation and impact mitigation by the transport network in the same way that port noise is addressed.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R14A	Sera Chambers	150.135	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R16A	Sera Chambers	150.136	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Sera Chambers	150.137	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects. Submitter notes that in other parts of NZ where an airport has increased its noise effect, consideration has been given to retrofitting acoustic insulation to existing houses depending on the noise levels.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /	Sera Chambers	150.138	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects. Submitter notes that in other parts of NZ where an airport has increased its noise effect, consideration has been given to retrofitting acoustic insulation to existing houses depending on the noise levels.	seeks for adjoining landowners to be notified and be able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /Public health	Sera Chambers	150.139	Amend	amend on the basis that landowners should be consulted on changes to adjoining land with regard to noise and be able to have their say and allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks to add: <u>iv. consultation on "land" changes to adjoining "land" (including over airspace and any other changes to land e.g. construction, noise development) with adjoining property/landowners should be completed. The adjoining landowner should be notified and be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /Amenity values	Sera Chambers	150.140	Amend	amend on the basis that landowners should be consulted on changes to adjoining land with regard to noise and be able to have their say and allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.	seeks to add: <u>iv. consultation on "land" changes to adjoining "land" (including over airspace and any other changes to land e.g. construction, noise development) with adjoining property/landowners should be completed. The adjoining landowner should be notified and be able to have their say on this, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC3: Noise generated from new or altered roads not meeting the activity standards (NOISE-R6)	Sera Chambers	150.141	Amend	Amend to allow adjoining landowners to have their say regarding options to mitigate noise effects to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle with the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting the enjoyment e.g. transport network – NCC/NZTA.	seeks for provision to be amended as follows: <u>a. the extent to which the road design adopts the best practicable option for enabling a safe and efficient transport network while adopting the best practicable option to mitigate noise effects on adjacent properties, in particular on noise-sensitive activities in conjunction with the adjoining landowner/s.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /	Sera Chambers	150.142	Amend	Considers the assessment criteria should be amended to allow adjoining landowners to have their say regarding options to mitigate noise effects in order to continue their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle with the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting upon their enjoyment e.g. transport network – NCC / NZTA.	Amend as follows: <u>a. whether the design, including location, methods, and construction techniques proposed, is likely to provide an internal noise environment that is likely to ensure that the internal noise levels are reasonable for the occupants and will avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on the transportation network, in particular on noise-sensitive activities in conjunction with adjoining landowner/s.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria	Sera Chambers	150.143	Oppose	Opposes on the basis that excess noise is damaging to health and noise limits should be monitored to ensure all entities are avoiding unnecessary exposure to adjoining landowners, including monitoring current flight paths over land. Adjoining landowners should be notified and be able to have their say, to allow their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity impacting their enjoyment including compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects. Submitter notes that in other parts of NZ where an airport has increased its noise effect, consideration has been given to retrofitting acoustic insulation to existing houses depending upon the noise levels.	Seeks that adjoining landowners are notified and are able to have their say, to allow for their enjoyment of property rights as a guiding principle and that there is the option to have the impact mitigated by the entity adversely affecting their enjoyment that includes compensation from the entity to pay for existing building modifications in order to alleviate reverse sensitivity effects.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /General	James Witham	165.31	Amend	Considers that the introduction does not capture a number of key issues including environments where certain activities that can make noise are prioritised. In particular, land based primary production on Highly Productive Land as set out in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. Associated with this is focussing on conflicts of uses and sensitivity effects in addition to reverse sensitivity effects. considers that the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established.	<p>Amend the Noise Introduction as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p>The purpose of the Noise chapter is to appropriately manage noise from activities within Napier city and the potential for <u>reverse sensitivity and conflicts between land uses with different amenity requirements</u>. The provisions seek to achieve a balance between efficiently enabling activities anticipated in a relevant zone to occur while balancing these with achieving public health and amenity outcomes.</p> <p>The level and type of noise generated by activities can impact on the health and wellbeing of people in our urban areas, particularly when it affects sleep or the ability to work or learn. The provisions of the Noise chapter seek to ensure noise is appropriately managed at the source and the receiving environment. The provisions also seek to manage reverse sensitivity <u>and sensitivity effects arising from noise sensitive activities choosing to establish in close proximity to existing, lawfully established activities, or in environments where activities that may generate noise are prioritised over sensitive uses.</u></p> <p>.....</p> <p>To meet the strategic objectives for the District Plan, the noise provisions provide for the following:</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	James Witham	165.32	Amend	Considers that , though the issue is generally supported, the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established.	<p>Amend NOISE-13: Noise sensitive activities can impact the operation of noise generating activities as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p>NOISE-13: Noise sensitive activities can impact the operation of noise generating activities</p> <p>Where there is high noise generating activities and infrastructure it is not reasonable or practicable for the noise generators to internalise their noise effects. Therefore, surrounding land use needs to be managed to about the potential for reverse sensitivity <u>land use conflict</u>. Depending on the level of noise, activities sensitive to noise may need to be avoided or acoustically treated to insulate from external noises and prevent potential reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	James Witham	165.33	Support	Supports the objective insofar as the effects of noise should be managed according to the anticipated amenity requirements for the receiving environment.	Retain NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing as notified	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	James Witham	165.34	Amend	Considers that the term 'authorised' is ambiguous and unclear. Proposes that the inclusion of 'anticipated' in lieu of 'authorised' provides more certainty. Also considers that it would better reflect the outcomes sought by the objectives and polices of the relevant zones, particularly where certain uses are prioritised over others. Considers that the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. Also notes that Objectives and Policies of the Proposed Napier District Plan supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another, the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply, however, the effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed.	Amend NOISE-O3 Reverse sensitivity as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: NOISE-O3 Reverse Sensitivity <u>and conflicts between uses</u> Existing and authorised <u>anticipated</u> activities that generate high levels of noise are protected from reverse sensitivity and <u>reverse sensitivity</u> effects	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	James Witham	165.35	Amend	Supports the policy as it is appropriate generally, however, the onus should be on new and expanded residential areas to avoid and/or mitigate noise effects where new zone interfaces occur. Considers the protection of existing areas is appropriate and that the amendments proposed make the policy framework more consistent with Policy 2.	Amend NOISE-P1 Amenity values, health and wellbeing as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: NOISE-P1 Amenity values, health and wellbeing Maintain the anticipated amenity values of the zone and provide for the health and wellbeing of the community by: a. controlling the noise effects throughout the city to meet the relevant objectives for the zone; b. managing the interface of different zones to protect the amenity values of <u>existing</u> residential and other less noisy areas of the city, and c. providing for higher levels of noise generation for education facilities during the day on weekdays and a limited number of temporary events where these activities contribute to community wellbeing and potential adverse effects on amenity values are minimised.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	James Witham	165.36	Support	Supports policy as it would appropriately cover the Rural Production Zone and give effect to the avoidance of sensitivity effects/ conflicts of uses as set out in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.	Retain NOISE-P2: Noise sensitive activities as notified	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity	James Witham	165.37	Amend	<p>Considers the policy is not strong enough where development is always likely to be sensitive to its environment. Preventing this type of development must be a potential option. Considers that the policy does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land without further detailing necessary and required management actions in the rural zones of the District.</p> <p>Considers the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' is narrow and only applies in circumstances where activities are established and more sensitive activities establish later. Notes that the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land directs priority to be given to land based primary production on Highly Productive Land, regardless of when it is established. Also notes objectives and policies of the PNDP supports primary production on Versatile Soils and the Rural Production Zone generally. Where sensitive activities are established and there is a change from one land based primary production activity to another the term 'reverse sensitivity' does not apply. Considers that the effects of land based primary production should be prioritised and sensitivity issues managed.</p>	<p>Amend NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p>Noise-P4: Reverse sensitivity <u>and sensitivity to noise</u> Restrict <u>or avoid</u> development of noise-sensitive activities within:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the Air Noise Boundary, and other locations where ventilation and acoustic insulation standards are not met <u>and</u> <u>zones where the character and amenity of the relevant zone favours land based primary production activities.</u> 	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /General	James Witham	165.38	Amend	<p>Considers that the proposed District Plan appropriately exempts or prioritises certain short term rural noise making activities but there is no policy support in the framework so where issues occur in terms of implementation there is a lack of guidance as to the management direction provided. Considers that the inclusion of a policy would give better effect to the implementation of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land</p>	<p>Insert new Policy NOISE-Pxx Temporary and short-term noise from primary production as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p><u>Policy NOISE-Pxx Temporary and short-term noise from primary production</u></p> <p><u>Provide for and prioritise temporary and short term noise, including appropriate exemptions from quantitative noise standards, for primary production activities located on Highly Productive Land and Versatile Land/Rural Production Zone, including but not limited to the following activities:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>harvesting;</u> <u>haymaking</u> <u>frost protection</u> <u>bird scaring</u> <u>spraying</u> <u>use of fixed and mobile machinery</u> 	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	James Witham	165.39	Support	<p>Supports as it will assist in giving effect to avoiding sensitivity effects and conflicts of uses as directed by the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.</p>	<p>Retain NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general) as notified and grant all relief sought by submitter for this chapter.</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R5: Noise generated from rural production activities	James Witham	165.40	Amend	<p>Supports rule generally and notes that it appears to be similar to the rolled over provisions in the Hastings District Plan. Considers that substantial improvements in fan technology have occurred since that time in terms of noise levels and the removal of special acoustic characteristics as set out in section 6.3 of the New Zealand Standard 6802:2008 Acoustics – Environmental Noise through blade design and number of fan blades. Four blade fans can achieve 55dB LAeq(15 min) at 240 metres and five blade fans at 180m from the fans, and without special acoustic characteristics. Considers that with the limits proposed for the Proposed District Plan, contemporary fan performance, and also the matters set out in s.16 of the Resource Management Act outside and in addition to the Proposed District Plan, fans with special acoustic characteristics are unlikely to be acceptable.</p> <p>Considers that a performance standard to manage sensitivity effects would be more appropriate and provide more clarity</p>	<p>Amend NOISE-R5A: Noise generated from rural production activities as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p>NOISE-R5A: Noise generated from rural production activities Frost protection fans</p> <p>12. Frost fans shall <u>must</u>:</p> <p>a. <u>have a minimum of 4 fan blades and not have special acoustic characteristics;</u></p> <p>b. <u>be located and operated such so</u> that noise from a frost fan shall not exceed 65dB LAeq(15 min) when measured outdoors at a distances that is the lesser of:</p> <p>c. 300 m from the device</p> <p>i. at any notional boundary (other than on the property on which the fan is situated) existing at the time the frost fan is established, or</p> <p>ii. at any point within a residential zone.</p> <p>Whichever is the lesser distance.</p> <p>13. Any new <u>or additions to a building for a</u> noise sensitive activity</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /General	James Witham	165.41	Amend	<p>Considers that the meaning and effect of the provision in NOISE-R5 13 is unclear. It is more appropriate, and provides more clarity, to specify a performance standard to manage sensitivity effects. The standards proposed appropriately avoid, or mitigate noise, sensitivity and reverse sensitivity effects and are adapted from similar provisions in the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<p>Insert new standard Noise Sx – Acoustic treatment for new and expanded sensitive activities within 300m of a frost fan as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission:</p> <p><u>Noise Sx – Acoustic treatment for new and expanded sensitive activities within 300m of a frost fan</u></p> <p>1. <u>New buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings within 300m of a frost fan containing a sensitive activity must be designed to achieve an indoor design sound level 40 DB LDN within any habitable rooms while the frost fan is in operation.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Compliance must be demonstrated with 1 above must be demonstrated by submitting an acoustic design report. The report must be:</u></p> <p>i. <u>Submitted to Council prior to construction</u></p> <p>ii. <u>Be prepared by a suitable qualified acoustic expert, and</u></p> <p>iii. <u>Certify that the proposed design and construction will achieve the indoor design sound levels</u></p> <p>3. <u>The building must be designed, constructed, and maintained in accordance with the acoustic design certification.</u></p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and/or vibration	James Witham	165.42	Support	<p>Supports proposed assessment criteria as appropriate.</p>	<p>Retain NOISE-AC: General assessment criteria for activities generation noise and/or vibration as notified.</p>	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC2: Noise generated from rural production activities not meeting the activity standards (NOISE-R5)	James Witham	165.43	Amend	Considers that the proposed assessment criteria appears to inappropriately give weight to non-primary production activities and does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land. Additional matters of discretion are required to appropriately balance the priority of activities.	Amend NOISE-AC2: Noise Generated from rural production activities not meeting the activity standards (NOISE-R5) as follows or alternative and any consequential relief required to address the matters raised in the submission: The following assessment criteria apply in addition to NOISE- AC1: Rural Production a. The extent to which productive rural activities can be activities can be undertaken while mitigating or managing noise effects on adjacent properties, in particular on noise sensitive activities. <u>b. The priority of land based primary production activities on Highly Productive Land and Versatile Land.</u> <u>c. The extent to which the design, construction and location of noise sensitive activities can avoid sensitivity effects.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /	Sheena McGuire	168.93	Amend	Seeks the inclusion of a new Vibration Alert Area Overlay to identify areas susceptible to rail vibration, within 60m of the rail corridor boundary. Seeks the inclusion of an overview of this overlay and its purpose within the introduction section.	Amend as follows: ... The RMA empowers territorial authorities to regulate activities on land and water affecting amenity values but does not enable the authorities to control noise from overflying aircraft. Noise from overflying aircraft is controlled under section 29B of the Civil Aviation Act 1990. The approach to noise management set out within this chapter is generally consistent with the NZ Standard. <u>A Rail Vibration Alert Overlay has been applied which identifies the vibration-sensitive area within 60 metres each side of the railway designation boundary as properties within this area may experience rail vibration effects. No specific district plan provisions apply in relation to vibration controls as a result of this Rail Vibration Alert Area. The Rail Vibration Alert Overlay is to advise property owners of the potential vibration effects but leaves with the site owner to determine an appropriate response.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Sheena McGuire	168.94	Support	Supports that the health and wellbeing of people and communities should be protected from adverse noise levels.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	Sheena McGuire	168.95	Support	Supports the protection of existing and authorised activities, such as rail operations, from reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O4: Transport network	Sheena McGuire	168.96	Amend	Submitter continuously works to reduce existing sound exposure and to manage the effects of our operations on existing sensitive activities, however, due to the nature of rail operations, are unable to internalise all noise effects associated with rail activities. Seeks amendment to reflect this in this policy.	Amend as follows: The operators of transport corridors adopt the best practicable option to ensure noise levels are reasonable and seek to minimise the effects from transport noise on noise-sensitive activities, as far as reasonably practicable.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	Sheena McGuire	168.97	Support	Supports this policy which recognises the need to prevent noise-sensitive activities in certain locations and provide appropriate acoustic treatment to protect amenity. Also supports that the rail corridor is a high noise-generating which may be located in the residential zone.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity	Sheena McGuire	168.98	Support	Supports restricting noise sensitive activities where ventilation and acoustic insulation standards cannot be met.	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P5: Transport network	Sheena McGuire	168.99	Amend	Seeks amendment to this policy to recognise the functional and operational requirements of maintaining, operating, and improving the railway network.Considers that clause a. would impose an impractical restriction and narrow focus on the best practicable option for upgrades to and development of the rail network. Seeks to manage adverse noise effects of rail activities, however considers that this is just one in a range of considerations for the provision a safe and efficient transport network. Seeks for the deletion of clause a. to remove the narrow outcome for the delivery of a safe and efficient transport network. Seeks minor amendment to clause b. as management of noise sensitive activities includes treatments beyond noise insulation to ensure that an appropriate level of amenity is provided within buildings containing noise sensitive activities in proximity to the rail corridor.	Amend as follows: Minimise potential conflicts between noise generated from the transport network and noise-sensitive activities by: a. requiring the adoption of the best practicable option to minimise the noise effects on all new and upgraded state highways, arterials, collector roads, and railways constructed in the city, and b. requiring insulation treatment of new or altered noise-sensitive activities where they are located <u>within</u> a High Land Transport Noise Overlay.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Sheena McGuire	168.100	Amend	Seeks amendment to ensure that all rail operations are exempt/considered permitted activities in terms of noise standards. Clause e. needs to be broadened slightly to include all ancillary rail movements (hi-rail vehicles etc) and level crossing alarms.	Amend as follows: 1. For all activities other than those specifically addressed in NOISE-R2 – NOISE-R8 (inclusive), NOISE-S1 and NOISE-S2 apply. 2. The noise and vibration standards in any part of the District Plan do not apply to the following, unless the District Plan specifically states otherwise. The activities listed below are therefore considered permitted activities in terms of the noise standards: a. the noise from the use of vehicles, mobile machinery, or other mobile or portable equipment where they are used on a seasonal or intermittent basis for agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, or forestry activities that are permitted by the Plan; b. the noise from animals on farms unless they are confined within a building or enclosure on a permanent or semi- permanent basis. This does not apply to dog breeding, kennels, or dog-stay facilities; c. the noise from normal residential activity that is part of a residential land use, such as children’s play, informal social activities, lawnmowing, and home maintenance work undertaken by the occupier, provided the activity is undertaken during	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R10: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay	Sheena McGuire	168.101	Amend	KiwiRail supports a rule aligning with their noise mitigation model provisions sought to be included in District Plans across New Zealand . Notes that rail operations run 24/7, and train characteristics can change without community consultation. Noise can have an impact on the internal amenity of a building. Mitigation measures are essential to prevent adverse effects on the health and wellbeing of nearby residents and workers. Seeks a new rule and standard to ensure appropriate internal amenity in buildings for sensitive activities. This is most effectively achieved at the time of construction. The further removed from the rail corridor a building is, the less additional mitigation may be required. Mitigation levels are based on World Health Organisation standards, considering intermittent train noise and community acceptance. Notes requiring a greater setback from the rail boundary as a means of addressing noise effects at smaller residential sites near the rail corridor may not be feasible. Non-compliance requires consent as a restricted discretionary activity under the proposed plan. Balancing efficient rail network use with community wellbeing and safety is crucial. KiwiRail and NZTA seek to protect the safe and efficient operation of their respective transport networks, and the amenity of those who reside and work within proximity to transport corridors. Both collaborate to produce a refined rule and standard to manage noise-sensitive activities within the High Land Transport Noise Overlay. Both seek the same framework of controls in terms of managing noise effects, with some variation in criteria and distances between road and rail. The purpose of the provisions sought is to protect the health of occupants of new and altered buildings, and in turn to avoid or mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects on the operations of KiwiRail and NZTA.	Replace NOISE-R10 with the rule provided in Appendix A as below <u>NOISE-R10: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay</u> <u>NOISE-R10A</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>Any new buildings or alterations to existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to noise which complies with the noise standards in NOISE-S7.</u> <u>NOISE-R10B</u> <u>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. Whether the activity sensitive to noise could be located further from the state highway or railway network.</u> <u>2. The extent to which the noise criteria are achieved and the effects of any noncompliance.</u> <u>3. The character of, and degree of, amenity provided by the existing environment and proposed activity.</u> <u>4. The reverse sensitivity effects on the state highway or rail network, and the extent to which mitigation measures can enable their ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade.</u> <u>5. The outcome of any consultation with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency or KiwiRail.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /General	Sheena McGuire	168.102	Amend	KiwiRail supports a rule aligning with their noise mitigation model provisions sought to be included in District Plans across New Zealand . Notes that rail operations run 24/7, and train characteristics can change without community consultation. Noise can have an impact on the internal amenity of a building. Mitigation measures are essential to prevent adverse effects on the health and wellbeing of nearby residents and workers. Seeks a new rule and standard to ensure appropriate internal amenity in buildings for sensitive activities. This is most effectively achieved at the time of construction. The further removed from the rail corridor a building is, the less additional mitigation may be required. Mitigation levels are based on World Health Organisation standards, considering intermittent train noise and community acceptance. Notes requiring a greater setback from the rail boundary as a means of addressing noise effects at smaller residential sites near the rail corridor may not be feasible. Non-compliance requires consent as a restricted discretionary activity under the proposed plan. Balancing efficient rail network use with community wellbeing and safety is crucial. KiwiRail and NZTA seek to protect the safe and efficient operation of their respective transport networks, and the amenity of those who reside and work within proximity to transport corridors. Both collaborate to produce a refined rule and standard to manage noise-sensitive activities within the High Land Transport Noise Overlay. Both seek the same framework of controls in terms of managing noise effects, with some variation in criteria and distances between road and rail. The purpose of the provisions sought is to protect the health of occupants of new and altered buildings, and in turn to avoid or mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects on the operations of KiwiRail and NZTA.	Add new standard provided in Appendix A as below <u>NOISE-S7: Acoustic treatment for noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay</u> <u>Outdoor road noise</u> <u>1. Any new building, or alteration to an existing building, that contains an activity sensitive to noise where:</u> <u>a. external road noise levels are less than 57 dB LAeq(24h) at all points 1.5 metres above ground level within the proposed notional boundary; or</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. Whether the activity sensitive to noise could be located further from the state highway or railway network.</u> <u>2. The extent to which the noise criteria are achieved and the effects of any noncompliance.</u> <u>3. The character of, and degree of, amenity provided by the existing environment and proposed activity.</u> <u>b. there is a noise barrier at least 3 metres high which blocks the line of sight to the road surface from all points 1.5 metres above ground level within the proposed notional boundary.</u> <u>Indoor road and railway noise</u> <u>2. Any new building, or alteration to an existing building, that contains an activity sensitive to noise where the building or alteration is:</u> <u>a. designed, constructed and maintained to achieve indoor design noise levels resulting from the road or railway not exceeding the maximum values in in Table-S7; or</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R7: Noise generated from temporary events	Cameron Drury	170.8	Amend	Considers that it would be advantageous to enable McLean Park and the Church Road concert venues to accommodate a limited number of performances that may be characterised by infrequent and minor increase of noise above the 85 dB LAeq (5 min) limit.	Amend by increasing the NOISE-R7 limit to 90 dB LAeq (5 min) for no more than 2 Temporary Events in Stadium Zone and on Section SO 9752.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O5: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport	Mark Leggett	180.9	Support	Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objective and policy (in comparison to the equivalent Operative District Plan provisions)	Retain provisions as notified.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P6: Port noise	Mark Leggett	180.10	Support	Supports the more specific wording of the proposed objective and policy (in comparison to the equivalent Operative District Plan provisions)	Retain provisions as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S5: Acoustic treatment for activities sensitive to aircraft noise inside the Outer Control Boundary	Simon Bradshaw	182.3	Amend	The standard as currently drafted would result in significant compliance costs for purchasers of sites in the eastern portion of Area 4 at Parklands. It is considered this is unnecessarily onerous and should not be extended to this existing residentially zoned area in principle. Alternative, to achieve an appropriate internal noise environment while enabling growth and operation of the Airport, alternative measures should be explored to reduce compliance costs, including an option to adopt standardised acoustic treatment measures that do not require a report from a "suitably qualified acoustic expert" and/or compensation by the Airport similar to the approach taken with the Port Noise overlay.	Remove the overlay from applying to the zoned land at Parklands. Alternatively, Review standard NOISE-S5 to reduce compliance costs on residential development.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /	Alan Petersen	187.1	Amend	Considers Napier city's regionally significant infrastructure includes Hawke's Bay Airport and Napier Port. These activities are situated near residential zones and have operating requirements that make it impracticable for them to internalise their noise effects. Seeks to add the following to paragraph 4 for emphasis. For Port to "fully" internalise their noise effects.	Seeks to add the following to paragraph 4 for emphasis. For Port to "fully" internalise their noise effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /	Alan Petersen	187.2	Amend	Acoustic treatment requirements for noise-sensitive activities in areas affected by the "port noise".	Seeks - Submission 2 - P2 - 3rd bullet point 'acoustic treatment requirements for noise-sensitive activities in areas affected by "port noise" '. Make it more specific to noise.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /	Alan Petersen	187.3	Amend	limits on vibration generated by construction activities to protect buildings and to limit disruption to people and businesses; Submission 3 – P2 – last bullet point. Disruption to normal recreational rest and business activities. This should include for outdoor living space as defined in the Definitions Section including in PREC3 – the Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct. An outdoor living space "means an area of open space for the use of the occupants of the residential unit or units to which the space is allocated". In reality it is treated like an outside room for quiet and peacefulness not to be impacted by disturbance including adverse noise effects.	Submission 3 – P2 – last bullet point. Disruption to normal recreational rest and business activities. This should include for outdoor living space as defined in PREC3 – the Napier Hill Mataruahou Amenity Precinct. An outdoor living space "means an area of open space for the use of the occupants of the residential unit or units to which the space is allocated". In reality it is treated like an outside room for quiet and peacefulness not to be impacted by disturbance including adverse noise effects.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I2: Noise generation can detract from amenity values	Alan Petersen	187.4	Oppose	Submission 4 - P3 – NOISE I2 - The degree of quiet or peacefulness in an area contributes to the amenity values appreciated by its occupants. Noise from the Port means this is simply not achievable. It cannot be avoided and can only be mitigated to a certain extent and the allowable noise levels are still too high to meet the normal expectations of quiet and peacefulness in a residential area.	Submission 4 - P3 – NOISE I2 - The degree of quiet or peacefulness in an area contributes to the amenity values appreciated by its occupants. Noise from the Port means this is simply not achievable. It cannot be avoided and can only be mitigated to a certain extent and the allowable noise levels are still too high to meet the normal expectations of quiet and peacefulness in a residential area.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I3: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	Alan Petersen	187.5	Amend	Submission 5 – P3 – Noise I3 - In the Port Noise Zones this is not reasonable or practicable.	Seeks to change "not reasonable" to "not possible".	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise	Alan Petersen	187.6	Amend	Regionally significant infrastructure, such as Hawke's Bay Airport and Napier Port, is situated near residential zones and has operating requirements that prevent it from fully internalising its noise effects.	Seeks to amend, Submission 6 - P4 – NOISE - I6 - First line "is" should be "are".	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise	Alan Petersen	187.7	Amend	Despite adopting all practicable options to internalise noise, the port may, at times, generate a level of noise outside its zone boundary that is greater than would otherwise be expected in adjacent zones. Residents overlooking or near to Napier Port should be aware that the level of effects may be higher than experienced in other residential areas of the city and in some cases at a level that would normally be incompatible with traditional residential activity. Special noise standards and a noise management plan are appropriate, permitting the port to operate while recognising and mitigating its adverse effects on nearby noise-sensitive activities.	Amend Submission 7 - Second paragraph – Add that it should be noted the noise sensitive activities, including the residential areas within the current noise boundaries, were largely in place before the Port was established in its current location.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Alan Petersen	187.8	Amend	Submission 8 – P 5 - NOISE - O1 - Agreed. But this should include outdoor living spaces during the day and at night – especially in evenings.	Amend to include outdoor living spaces during the day and at night – especially in evenings.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O5: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport	Alan Petersen	187.9	Amend	Submission 9 – P5 - Noise – O5 – Agreed – but the Port Noise limits are too high and therefore fail to achieve this objective.	Submission 9 – P5 - Noise – O5 – Agreed – but the Port Noise limits are too high and therefore fail to achieve this objective.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	Alan Petersen	187.10	Amend	Enable the functional operation of noise sensitive activities by: a. preventing noise sensitive activities from establishing in inappropriate locations; b. preventing high noise-generating activities other than roads and railway lines from establishing in residential zones, and c. where noise-sensitive activities establish in areas exposed to high noise-generating activities, require the acoustic treatment to achieve an appropriate internal noise level to enable uninterrupted sleep at night and an internal environment for uses that do not involve overnight accommodation that protects people from unreasonable noise.	Submission 10 – P5 - NOISE – P2 - c. This should also include outdoor living spaces during the day and at night – especially in the evenings. It's an interesting conundrum that residents that live there are expected to tolerate the noise, but visitors are not and therefore are not allowed to be accommodated!	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P6: Port noise	Alan Petersen	187.11	Amend	Submission 11 – P6 - NOISE P6 – Add d. If noise cannot be avoided or fully mitigated and breaches the levels for internal or outdoor living spaces, then the Port shall pay the affected persons with the Port Noise areas suitable compensation. This to be determined by a valuer & other experts to design a fair & reasonable formula. After all it is consistent with the polluter pays principal. Refer attached report “Port Noise Proposals in the Napier District Plan Review” (the updated version 11/12/2023).	Add d. If noise cannot be avoided or fully mitigated and breaches the levels for internal or outdoor living spaces, then the Port shall pay the affected persons with the Port Noise areas suitable compensation. This to be determined by a valuer & other experts to design a fair & reasonable formula. After all it is consistent with the polluter pays principal.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	Alan Petersen	187.12		Time Period Maximum noise levels LAeq (dB) 7.30 a.m. - 6.00 p.m. - 75 6.00 p.m. - 7.30 a.m. - 80	Submission 12 – P8 - Noise R2A - point 3 - Why is noise between 6.00PM – 7.30am (i.e. night-time) at 80 LAeq (dB) and daytime is lower at 75. Correct this possible anomaly.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R12: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay	Alan Petersen	187.13		1. Aan acoustic design report must be provided to the Council prior to any application for building consent or, where no building consent is required, prior to the commencement of the use. The acoustic design report must be prepared by a person qualified and experienced in acoustics. The report is to indicate the means by which the noise limits specified in this rule will be complied with and is to contain a certificate by its author that the means given therein will be adequate to ensure compliance with the noise limits specified in this rule.	Submission 13 - P20 – NOISE – R12A – point 3 – Typo – “Aan” should be “An”.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R12: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay	Alan Petersen	187.14	Amend	Building Element - Wall Requirement - 1. 20 mm timber weather boards exterior cladding. Internal lining two layers of 10 mm thick gypsum plasterboard. Minimum 75 mm thick fibreglass or polyester or wool insulation in wall cavity. 2. Brick veneer. Internal lining 1 layer of 10 mm thick gypsum plasterboard.	Submission 14 - P21 – A physicist engineer who redeveloped the Farmers building in Auckland Hobson St into apartments found after much testing that having a party wall made of two panels with an 150mm airgap was the most effective way to prevent noise transmission from one side to the other. Therefore allow other methods.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R12: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay	Alan Petersen	187.15	Oppose	Floor 1. On grade slab. 2. Two layers of 20 mm thick particle board	Submission 15 - P22 - 4. Add for other flooring systems that meet the insulation standards (that I have worked on). Don't just specify particle board – a very sub-standard product.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone	Alan Petersen	187.16	Oppose	<p>Submission 16 - P29 & 30 – NOISE – S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone & S4 – Noise limits for container repair and maintenance within the Port Zone.</p> <p>The time over any consecutive five-day period at 65dB. This simply not fair. This averaging means any noise above this which happens intermittently at any time over a 5-day period is considered to be acceptable because the 5-day averaging is always results in a lower noise level. If retained the limit should be 60dB. It is my understanding that no other noise rule in the Proposed District Plan has this averaging rule.</p> <p>All the other noise limits should be lowered by 5.</p> <p>If the noise levels remain as they are the Port should do more acoustic treatment at their full cost on affected dwellings in the Port Noise Zones and pay appropriate compensation to residents.</p>	If the noise levels remain as they are the Port should do more acoustic treatment at their full cost on affected dwellings in the Port Noise Zones and pay appropriate compensation to residents.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and/or vibration	Alan Petersen	187.17	Amend	Submission 17 - P32 – NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and/or vibration – Public health – a – add iv – quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC7: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay (NOISE-R11)	Alan Petersen	187.18	Amend	Submission 18 - P34 – NOISE – AC7: - New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay (NOISE – R11). Include “quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces”.	Seeks to include “quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces”.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC8: New noise sensitive activity within the Port Zone (NOISE-R12)	Alan Petersen	187.19	Amend	Submission 19 - P34 – NOISE –AC8: New noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay (NOISE – R12). Include “quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces”.	Seeks to include “quiet enjoyment of outdoor living spaces”.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	Richard Milner	190.1	Support	NZHA Supports NOISE-R2A as a variety of construction, maintenance and demolition activities are relied on through the use of helicopters where cranes are not suitable for a variety of reasons. Construction noise therefore should be the limiting factor for aircraft noise in this instance.	Seeks consideration from council that aircraft noise while conducting construction activities for the temporary and infrequent take off and landing should be acceptable within this rule and exempt those commercial action activities from Noise R3.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R3: Noise generated from helicopter landing areas	Richard Milner	190.3	Amend	<p>NZHA supports the rule above for private operations from a fixed location heliport, like at a private residence.</p> <p>NZHA Opposes the rule as it does not take into consideration the commercial temporary and infrequent operations that are necessary for the positive outcomes for the Social, Economic and Cultural benefits of the district.</p> <p>Commercial helicopters are used in a wide range of public good activities. (See Submission for full details). Such activities are essential to the wellbeing of the public. If restricted it would remove jobs, economic benefits and impact helicopter operators' ability to thrive in the region. TC Gabrielle saw the positive good helicopters can do. restrictions would impact commercial helicopters ability to to respond quickly when needed.</p> <p>Operations such as Powerline and Telecommunication Construction, Maintenance and Utility operations are conducted with Helicopters. Limiting the number of run flights from a Temporary landing area to two per week will result in much longer and costly transit times from known airports or a significant increase in Resource Consent applications. Longer transit times will result in increased costs and risk to operators and the public.</p> <p>Operations such as moving plant and equipment onto sites would require large setbacks often rendering them no compliant with either R3 or R3a and therefore unable to be completed. Also the two return flights per day would be exceeded.</p> <p>Submitter Provided examples of operations that would be impacted with</p>	<p>Noise R3A</p> <p>NZHA seeks to have a Commercial Aviation limitation to be included in Noise R3 of: <u>no more than 315 hours or 30 days which ever is greater in a calendar year of helicopter operations on the same site.</u></p> <p>NZHA would also like to see that Setback limitations are removed for Commercial Helicopter operations that are temporary and infrequent and abide by the above limitation.</p> <p><u>Noise R3B</u></p> <p>Should Helicopter activities be conducting Construction, Maintenance or Utility work then Noise R2 applies in place on R3B</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R9: Noise sensitive activities in the City Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone, or Industrial Zone	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.69	Amend	This rule is intended to apply to noise sensitive activities in the Industrial Zone (in the event they are authorized in the zone) however this is not clarified in activity condition (1). This is an error.	Amend NOISE-R9A(1) to add “Industrial Zones” after City Centre Zone or Mixed Use Zone.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.85	Amend	The Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Treatment Zone should have the same noise limits as the Open Space Zones, rather than the Light Industrial Zone. This is an error.	Amend table in NOISE-S1 to add “and Te Whanganui-a-Orotū (Ahuriri Estuary) Ecology and Stormwater Treatment Zone” after “Open Space Zones”.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /	Ellen Robotham	198.56	Amend	<p>Amend the introductory text to ensure consistent use and interpretation of the terms “Aircraft Noise Overlay”, “Air Noise Boundary”, “Outer Control Boundary” and “Outer Air Noise Overlay” throughout the Proposed Plan. Note new definitions are proposed to assist with this matter. Amendments will ensure the term “boundary” is used to described cadastralised datasets, as opposed to “contours” which are the model outputs (irrespective of property boundaries).</p> <p>Seek that the last sentence of the introduction is deleted as it is not clear which New Zealand Standards are being referred to. If this reference is to remain, the relevant standards should also be identified.</p>	<p>Amend the introduction as follows:</p> <p>The purpose of the Aircraft Noise Overlay is to assist in managing the effects on the community that arise from aircraft noise from and around Hawke’s Bay Airport and assist with managing potential reverse sensitivity effects on the airport. The Aircraft Noise Overlay comprises: the Outer Control Boundary.</p> <p>— Air Noise Boundary: being a boundary line identifying properties lying between the airport and a modelled 65dB Ldn contour fitted to property boundaries; and</p> <p>— Outer Air Noise Overlay: being properties lying between the 65dB Ldn contour and a modelled dB Ldn contour, fitted to property boundaries.</p> <p>Within the Aircraft Noise Overlay, se noise boundaries, different land use management controls are in place to manage new and existing activities sensitive to aircraft noise.</p> <p>The provisions of the Aircraft Noise Overlay work in tandem with the HBAL-2 <u>designation</u>. The designations includes conditions that must be met by Hawke’s Bay Airport, as the requiring authority for Hawke’s Bay Airport.</p> <p>.....</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I1: Noise generation can impact on the health and wellbeing of Napier’s communities	Ellen Robotham	198.57	Oppose	Considers that as the section 32 evaluation does not reference the source material with respect to this issue statement, particularly the itemised “adverse health effects and symptoms of adverse health effects of noise...”, the itemised matters should be deleted.	<p>Remove the itemised list from the issue statement as follows:</p> <p>Noise has the potential to adversely affect people’s health and amenity. Noise may be defined as unwanted sound. Sound may be described in terms of level, frequency, timing, and duration, but noise has connotations of annoyance and disturbance which are subjective factors. Community reaction to noise is determined not only by the sound level, but also by the characteristics of the noise itself, the timing</p> <p>and duration of the noise, and the general level of exposure of the community to noise.</p> <p>Adverse health effects and symptoms of adverse health effects of noise include:</p> <p>physiological and chronic health effects, including cardiovascular disease, hypertension, cognitive impairment, and sleep disturbance;</p> <p>—annoyance;</p> <p>—interference with communications;</p> <p>—interference with the learning process and education;</p> <p>—interference with mental activity;</p> <p>—interference with rest and sleep, and</p> <p>disruption to normal recreational rest and business activities.</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	Ellen Robotham	198.58	Amend	<p>Amend issue statement to recognise that the nature of the noise may also contribute to the noise management response.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Where there are <u>is</u> high noise-generating activities and infrastructure it is not reasonable or practicable for the noise generators to internalise their noise effects. Therefore <u>the</u> The surrounding land use needs to be managed to avoid the potential for reverse sensitivity. Depending on the level <u>or nature</u> of <u>the</u> noise, activity sensitive to noise may need to be avoided or acoustically treated to insulate from external noises and prevent potential reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-16: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise	Ellen Robotham	198.59	Amend	<p>The issue statement also needs to recognise that reverse sensitivity effects can and do arise from new and intensification of existing activities sensitive to aircraft noise establishing with the Aircraft Noise Overlays. The issue is therefore much greater than existing uninsulated development being established within the overlays (refer to full submission for more detail).</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>NOISE-16: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise</p> <p>Regionally significant infrastructure, such as Hawke's Bay Airport and Napier Port, is situated near residential zones and has operating requirements that prevent it from fully internalising its noise effects.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Noise generated by <u>aircraft operations take-off/approach and landing of aircraft</u> at Hawke's Bay Airport results in <u>amenity and health environmental</u> effects on noise sensitive activities <u>both within and beyond the Aircraft Noise Overlay. experienced well beyond the boundaries of the Airport.</u> Reverse sensitivity effects generated by the establishment of <u>new and intensification of existing activities sensitive to aircraft noise uninsulated development inside the airport noise overlays</u> can also potentially impact the <u>efficient and effective operation of</u> Hawke's Bay Airports operation.</p> <p>Airport noise is addressed through noise limits for the Airport and controls of development of noise-sensitive activities inside the Aircraft Noise Overlays. The approach to noise management is generally consistent with the relevant NZ Standard (<u>NZS6805</u>).</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Ellen Robotham	198.60	Support	<p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail). The ANB has not been cadastralised, as is generally best practice. This prevents parcels of land being located partially inside of / outside of the</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	Ellen Robotham	198.61	Amend	<p>This objective must also apply to NOISE-16 to ensure consideration is given to potential reverse sensitivity effects on “Significant Infrastructure”, in accordance with SD-TI-O4 and NOISE-16.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail).</p>	Amend as follows:Existing and authorised activities that generate high levels of noise and significant infrastructure are protected from reverse sensitivity effects.Relates to Noise-13, and Noise-14, and Noise-16.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O5: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport	Ellen Robotham	198.62	Support	<p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail). The ANB has not been cadastralised, as is generally best practice. This prevents parcels of land being located partially inside of / outside of the</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	Ellen Robotham	198.63	Oppose	<p>Further refinements are required to ensure the intention of the policy is clear.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is not clear what "functional operation" of a noise sensitivity activity means; - The use of "enable" in the chapeau of the policy by "preventing" the activity in the subparagraphs is contradictory. - Subparagraph (a) seeks to prevent noise sensitive activities establishing in inappropriate locations, yet subparagraph (c) allows them to establish in near "high noise generating activities". - It is not clear what comprises a "high noise generating activity". <p>Refer to full submission for more detailed explanation.</p>	Substantial amendments are made to the policy to address the matters identified.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity	Ellen Robotham	198.64	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). - It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail). - The ANB has not been cadastralised, as is generally best practice. This prevents parcels of land being located partially inside of / outside of the 	<p>Delete NOISE-P4 and P7 and insert the following new provisions:</p> <p><u>NOISE-P7 Management of Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise: Within the Aircraft Noise Overlay:</u></p> <p>1. <u>Avoid the establishment of new noise sensitive activities within the Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production and Airport Zones (excluding Section 25, Survey Office Plan 3286 Record of Title HBW4/665);</u></p> <p>2. <u>Discourage the establishment of new or the intensification of existing noise sensitive activities within all other zones unless the reverse sensitivity effects on Hawke's Bay Airport can be appropriately avoided.</u></p> <p><u>NOISE-P8: Acoustic treatment of activities sensitive to aircraft noise</u></p> <p><u>Require, as necessary, acoustic treatment and/or mechanical ventilation within any new buildings or any additions or alterations to existing buildings that contain noise sensitive activities within the Aircraft Noise Overlay.</u></p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P7: Hawke's Bay Airport Noise Overlay	Ellen Robotham	198.65	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). - It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail). - The ANB has not been cadastralised, as is generally best practice. This prevents parcels of land being located partially inside of / outside of the 	<p>Delete NOISE-P4 and P7 and insert the following new provisions:</p> <p><u>NOISE-P7 Management of Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise: Within the Aircraft Noise Overlay:</u></p> <p>1. <u>Avoid the establishment of new noise sensitive activities within the Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production and Airport Zones (excluding Section 25, Survey Office Plan 3286 Record of Title HBW4/665);</u></p> <p>2. <u>Discourage the establishment of new or the intensification of existing noise sensitive activities within all other zones unless the reverse sensitivity effects on Hawke's Bay Airport can be appropriately avoided.</u></p> <p><u>NOISE-P8: Acoustic treatment of activities sensitive to aircraft noise</u></p> <p><u>Require, as necessary, acoustic treatment and/or mechanical ventilation within any new buildings or any additions or alterations to existing buildings that contain noise sensitive activities within the Aircraft Noise Overlay.</u></p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Ellen Robotham	198.66	Amend	<p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). - It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail). - The ANB has not been cadastralised, as is generally best practice. This prevents parcels of land being located partially inside of / outside of the 	Amend Noise-R1 to ensure it does not capture aircraft and address other issues of interpretation.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	Ellen Robotham	198.67	Oppose	<p>The proposed rule seeks to emulate NZS6803, however lacks the nuances that allow for exceedances to occur and how to manage those exceedances. Without recognition of potential exceedances, undue consenting costs will be incurred for development throughout the District.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities</p>	Delete the rule or include reference to NZS6805 as a standard for construction activities.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R3: Noise generated from helicopter landing areas	Ellen Robotham	198.68	Oppose	<p>The proposed rule should refer to NZS6807, as per the approach used in NOISE-R8. For clarification purposes, the rule should also expressly exclude helicopter operations at Hawke’s Bay Airport which are already accounted for in the Aircraft Noise Boundaries.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities</p>	Update the rule as per NOISE-R8 and exclude helicopter noise from the Airport as this is managed by way of designation.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R14: Activities sensitive to aircraft noise inside the Outer Control Boundary (55dB LDN)	Ellen Robotham	198.69	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail). The ANB has not been cadastralised, as is generally best practice. This prevents parcels of land being located partially inside of / outside of the</p>	<p>Amend and include new provisions as follows:</p> <p>NOISE-R14 Activities sensitive to aircraft noise inside the <u>Aircraft Noise Overlay Outer Control Boundary (55dB LDN)</u></p> <p>NOISE-R14A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p>1. <u>the activity is a residential activity located within the General Residential, Rural Lifestyle Zone or located on Section 25, Survey Office Plan 3286 Record of Title HBW4/665 and:</u></p> <p>2. <u>the density does not exceed the following:</u></p> <p>a. General Residential Zone: 1 dwelling per 350m2; or</p> <p>b. Rural Lifestyle Zone: 1 dwelling per 2,500m2 ; or</p> <p>c. <u>Section 25, Survey Office Plan 3286 Record of Title HBW4/665: two dwellings.</u></p> <p>3. Compliance with standard NOISE-S5.</p> <p><u>Activity Status: Discretionary Where:</u></p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /General	Ellen Robotham	198.70	Amend	<p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail). The ANB has not been cadastralised, as is generally best practice. This prevents parcels of land being located partially inside of / outside of the</p>	<p>Include new provisions as follows:</p> <p><u>NOISE-R16 Short term Visitor Accommodation with the Aircraft Noise Overlay</u></p> <p>Activity Status: Restricted discretionary Where:</p> <p><u>1. Compliance with standard NOISE-S5 (1).</u></p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p><u>1. Constraints on the maximum duration of stay to minimise exposure to aircraft noise.</u></p> <p><u>2. The acoustic treatment and ventilation of buildings to reduce aircraft noise exposure.</u></p> <p><u>3. The use of building layout and design to minimise aircraft noise exposure.</u></p> <p><u>4. The extent and location of outdoor amenity areas.</u></p> <p><u>5. The extent to which effects as a result of the activity could give rise to adverse reverse sensitivity effects on Hawke’s Bay Airport.</u></p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R16: Aircraft noise at Air Noise Boundary and Outer Control Boundary	Ellen Robotham	198.71	Oppose	<p>It is inappropriate to replicate the aircraft noise management obligations that are managed under the proposed Airport Purposes Designation.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). - It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package 	Delete NOISE-R16.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S1: General noise limits	Ellen Robotham	198.72	Oppose	<p>The noise limits as they apply to the Airport Zone are unduly restrictive and require further refinement. In the context of the Airport, compliance with the noise limits should be measured at the notional boundary.</p> <p>Furthermore, reference to NZS6802:2008 should be sufficient to management noise effects.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p>	Amend to address the issues raised in the submission.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S5: Acoustic treatment for activities sensitive to aircraft noise inside the Outer Control Boundary	Ellen Robotham	198.73	Oppose	<p>Oppose standard 5.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). - It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to be adopted in the Proposed Plan (see full submission for more detail). 	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Purpose: to manage activities sensitive to aircraft noise <u>within the General Residential or Rural Lifestyle Zone or existing Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise within the Airport Zone where exposed to in areas around the Hawke's Bay airport that are exposed to aircraft noise levels over 55 dB LDN. This will ensure that the continued operation of the airport is not compromised and the outdoor amenity and health of the community is adequately managed.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Any noise sensitive space inside an activity sensitive to aircraft noise or an addition or alteration to an activity sensitive to aircraft noise which creates a new noise sensitive space within the <u>Air Noise Overlay Outer Control Boundary</u> shall be designed to achieve an indoor design sound level of 40 dB Ldn. Within the General Residential or Rural Lifestyle Compliance with 1 above shall be demonstrated by <u>either</u>: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>submitting a certificate to the Council from a person suitably qualified in acoustics stating that the proposed construction will achieve the Indoor Design Sound Level with the windows open; or</u> <u>installing and maintaining a mechanical ventilation system in the noise sensitive rooms that:</u> 	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria	Ellen Robotham	198.74	Amend	<p>Amend AC-9. The assessment criteria is too narrowly focused on achieving an internal noise environment to manage reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>The Proposed Plan should maximise the opportunity to adopt a planning framework that is wholly consistent with the recommendations set out in the New Zealand Standard for Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning (NZS6805), future proof the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects and manage the potential amenity and health effects on the community by seeking to include objectives, policies and methods that seek to avoid (prohibit) the establishment of new activities sensitive to aircraft noise where the land is zoned for Sport and Active Recreation, Open Space, Natural Open Space, Ahuriri Estuary Stormwater and Ecology, Rural Production purposes and located within the aircraft noise boundaries (refer to full submission for more detail on reasoning and changes requested) that support this approach. Such rules are primarily located within the Noise chapter of the Proposed Plan, HBAL submits that the above framework should also be reflected in the subdivision chapter and the respective zone provisions, particularly with respect to the density of residential development within the General Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.</p> <p>HBAL supports, in part, the mapping of the Aircraft Noise Overlays as depicted on the planning maps. However, due to the land use controls proposed by HBAL, it is unnecessary to identify an ANB as:</p> <p>The proposed provisions do not differentiate between land use activities occurring inside of the ANB and OCB (see full submission for more detail). It allows for a more efficient and cost-effective acoustic treatment package to</p>	<p>Amend the assessment criteria as follows:</p> <p>NOISE-AC9: Activities sensitive to aircraft noise in the Aircraft Noise Overlay (NOISE-R14 <u>and R15</u>)</p> <p>The following assessment criteria apply in addition to NOISE-AC1:</p> <p>Reverse sensitivity effects on the safe and efficient operation of the airport</p> <p>a. Whether the design, including location, methods, and construction techniques proposed is likely to provide an internal noise environment that is likely to ensure that the internal noise levels are reasonable for the occupants and will avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on the airport.</p> <p>b. <u>The ability to achieve acceptable outdoor acoustic amenity;</u></p> <p>c. <u>The extent to which effects, as a result of the sensitivity of activities to current and future noise generation from aircraft, are proposed to be managed, including avoidance of any effect that may limit the operation, maintenance or upgrade of Hawke's Bay Airport.</u></p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /General	Grant Russell	202.27	Amend	<p>Considers Noise - Noise Introduction should be amended for specificity and to better correlate with NOISE-R4: Noise generated from Watercraft.</p>	<p>Amend Noise - Noise Introduction as follows:</p> <p>- noise limits for helicopter landing areas, watercraft-jet boats, audible bird scaring devices, and frost protection fans;</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /General	Grant Russell	202.28	Amend	<p>Considers Noise - Noise Introduction should be amended to reference acoustic treatment for both the Port and the Airport.</p>	<p>Amend Noise - Noise Introduction as follows:</p> <p>- acoustic treatment requirements for noise-sensitive activities in areas affected by the Port <u>and Hawke's Bay Airport.</u></p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /	Grant Russell	202.29	Amend	<p>Considers that Noise - Noise Introduction "The purpose of the Aircraft Noise Overlay..." should be amended / moved for relevance to NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise.</p>	<p>Amend Noise - Noise Introduction "The purpose of the Aircraft Noise Overlay..." for relevance by moving this instead to NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise.</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Introduction /General	Grant Russell	202.30	Amend	<p>Considers an amendment is necessary as the approach to noise management is consistent with BOTH the Port and Airport Noise Standards i.e. plural.</p>	<p>Amend Noise - Introduction wording (last paragraph) to include that the approach to noise management set out within this chapter is generally consistent with the NZ Standards.</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-11: Noise generation can impact on the health and wellbeing of Napier's communities	Grant Russell	202.31	Amend	Considers NOISE-11: Noise generation can impact on the health and wellbeing of Napier's communities contains unnecessary duplication.	<p>Amend NOISE-11: Noise generation can impact on the health and wellbeing of Napier's communities as follows:</p> <p>Noise has the potential to adversely affect people's health and amenity. Noise may be defined as unwanted sound. Sound may be described in terms of level, frequency, timing, and duration, but noise has connotations of annoyance and disturbance which are subjective factors. Community reaction to noise is determined not only by the sound level, but also by the characteristics of the noise itself, the timing and duration of the noise, and the general level of exposure of the community to noise. Adverse health effects and symptoms of adverse health effects of noise include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · physiological and chronic health effects, including cardiovascular disease, hypertension, cognitive impairment, and sleep disturbance; · annoyance; · interference with communications; · interference with the learning process and education; · interference with <u>concentration</u> mental activity; · interference with rest and sleep, and 	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	Grant Russell	202.32	Amend	Considers that NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities contains unnecessary duplication.	<p>Amend NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities as follows:</p> <p>NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities</p> <p>Where there are <u>are</u> high noise-generating activities and infrastructure, and where <u>and where</u> it is not reasonable or practicable for the noise generators to internalise their noise effects, Therefore the surrounding land use needs to be managed to avoid the potential for reverse sensitivity.</p> <p>Depending on the level of noise, activity sensitive to noise may need to be avoided or acoustically treated to insulate from external noises and prevent potential reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise	Grant Russell	202.33	Amend	Considers Additional wording is necessary for consistency with the Hawke's Bay Airport paragraph (last paragraph in NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise.	<p>Amend NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise as follows:</p> <p>NOISE-I6: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport noise</p> <p>Regionally significant infrastructure, such as Hawke's Bay Airport and Napier Port, is situated near residential zones and has operating requirements that prevent it from fully internalising its noise effects.</p> <p>Despite adopting all practicable options to internalise noise, the port may, at times, generate a level of noise outside its zone boundary that is greater than would otherwise be expected in adjacent zones. Residents overlooking or near to Napier Port should be aware that the level of effects may be higher than experienced in other residential areas of the city and in some cases at a level that would normally be incompatible with traditional residential activity.</p> <p>Special noise standards and a noise management plan are appropriate, permitting the port to operate while recognising and mitigating its adverse effects on nearby noise-sensitive activities. The approach to noise management is generally consistent with the relevant NZ Standard.</p> <p>Noise generated by take off / approach and landing of aircraft at Hawke's Bay Airport results in environmental effects on noise</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	Grant Russell	202.34	Amend	The submitter considers that NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities contains unnecessary word duplication from that already discussed in the Introduction and Noise - Issues e.g. NOISE-I1: Noise generation can impact on the health and wellbeing of Napier's communities.	<p>Amend NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities as follows:</p> <p>Enable the functional operation of noise sensitive activities by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> preventing noise sensitive activities from establishing in inappropriate locations; preventing high noise-generating activities other than roads and railway lines from establishing in residential zones, and where noise-sensitive activities establish in areas exposed to high noise-generating activities, require the acoustic treatment to achieve an appropriate internal noise level to enable uninterrupted sleep at night and an internal environment for uses that do not involve overnight accommodation that protects people from unreasonable noise. <p>Relates to NOISE-O1 and Noise-O3</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity	Grant Russell	202.35	Amend	Considers that with regards to NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity, there are controls proposed for noise sensitive developments in the residential zones inside the Port Noise Boundary to specifically address reverse sensitivity.	<p>Amend NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity as follows:</p> <p>Restrict the development of noise-sensitive activities within:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>the Port Noise Boundary;</u> the Air Noise Boundary, and other locations where ventilation and acoustic insulation standards are not met. 	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P6: Port noise	Grant Russell	202.36	Amend	The submitter considers that NOISE-P6: Port noise should be reworded to align with NOISE-R12: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay.	Amend NOISE-P6: Port noise as follows: NOISE-P6: Port noise The adverse effects of port noise are managed by a combination of controls, including: a. District Plan rules on noise generation within the relevant zone; b. a Port noise management plan, and c. <u>minimum sound insulation performance requirements for any new or altered noise sensitive activities within the Port Noise Overlays, and</u> d. acoustic treatment of other noise-sensitive activities within the Port Noise Overlays.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P8: Construction	Grant Russell	202.37	Support	Supports the intent of NOISE-P8: Construction Policy with amendments proposed for the corresponding NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration.	Retain NOISE-P8: Construction Policy in its entirety as notified. (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /General	Grant Russell	202.38	Support	Supports Noise - Rules Table subject to suggested amendments to Rules in the Table for the purposes of clarity.	Retain Noise - Rules Table provisions in general apart from amendments for clarity.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table / NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	Grant Russell	202.39	Amend	Considers NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration should be amended to better align with NOISE-P8: Construction Policy.	Amend NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration as follows: <u>Exceedances of the construction noise limits are common, often unavoidable and not necessarily unreasonable provided a Construction noise management plan is in place to address residual effects.</u> <u>Construction 'noise limits' should be applied as 'trigger levels' for closer scrutiny (as applied, and more explicitly labelled, in the newer version of British Standard BS5228 on which 6803 was based).</u> <u>Very few urban construction activities would comply with the noise limits at all times and would require a consent. The consents add time and cost, but routinely end up with a requirement for a construction noise and vibration management plan (CNVMP). The consenting process would be low value. In short, consider that exceedances should be enabled via a certification process, whereby a suitably qualified and experienced professional prepares the CNVMP that is required to be certified by Council before the works commence.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table / NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	Grant Russell	202.40	Amend	Considers that NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration should be amended.	Amend NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration as follows: 1. Noise (including vibration) from construction activities shall be measured and assessed in accordance with NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics Construction noise. except where varied by the rules below.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	Grant Russell	202.42	Amend	The submitter considers that NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration Clause 6. should be amended to provide greater clarity.	Amend NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration Clause 6. as follows: Where there is no practicable way of measuring outside a building, and where the windows and doors of the building are normally closed, the upper limits for noise inside the building shall be those set out in clauses 2 - 5 and 3 above minus 20 dB.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	Grant Russell	202.43	Amend	The submitter considers that NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration should be amended around a certification process, lower daytime PPV threshold and a newer 2016 version of the DIN standard reference.	Amend NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration so that limits are used as a trigger for a construction noise and vibration management plan (CNVMP) certification process and the daytime threshold is lowered to 1mm/s Peak Particle Velocity (PPV) if that approach is adopted as per Submission 202.39. The submitter also recommends referencing the newer 2016 version of the German Industrial DIN Standard for Vibrations in buildings [DIN 4150-3:2016 presumably as opposed to DIN 4150-3:1999 in Clause 7. a.]. (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R4: Noise generated from Watercraft	Grant Russell	202.44	Amend	Considers NOISE-R4: Noise generated from Watercraft Rule is relevant to jet boats on rivers and not all watercraft.	Amend NOISE-R4: Noise generated from Watercraft Rule as follows: NOISE-R4: Noise generated from <u>jet boats</u> Watercraft 1. Powered <u>jet boats</u> watercraft shall be fitted with effective mufflers during all movement on water.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R10: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay	Grant Russell	202.45	Amend	Considers that in relation to the NOISE-R10: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay Rule, people building next to SH50 should be required to protect themselves from road noise. Noise generated from trucks heading to the Port affects noise complaints and social license. This is referenced in the Port noise Rule NOISE-R12.3, and is also consistent / repeated in NOISE-R9.3, the Airport rule NOISE-S5 and NOISE-S6. "Measured and assessed in accordance with NZS 2107" is also preferred.	Amend NOISE-R10: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay Rule references as follows: does not generate more than 35 dB LAeq(30s) when measured 2-m away from any grille or diffuser in accordance with AS/NZS 2107:2016 "Acoustics - Recommended design sound levels and reverberation times for building interiors".	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R12: New or altered noise sensitive activity within the Port Noise Overlay	Grant Russell	202.46	Support	Supports NOISE-R12: New or altered noise activity within the Port Noise Overlay Rule.	Retain NOISE-R12: New or altered noise activity within the Port Noise Overlay Rule in its entirety.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R13: New noise sensitive activity within the Port Zone	Grant Russell	202.47	Support	The submitter considers that NOISE-R13: New noise sensitive activity within the Port Zone Rule is supported.	Seeks to retain NOISE-R13: New noise sensitive activity within the Port Zone Rule as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S1: General noise limits	Grant Russell	202.48	Oppose	Opposes NOISE-S1: General noise limits Clause 3. as it conflicts in part, or duplicates, Noise-S1.2 which is appropriate and sufficient on its own.	Delete NOISE-S1: General noise limits Clause 3. in its entirety as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone	Grant Russell	202.49	Amend	Considers NOISE-S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone Standard reference to NZS 6809 refers to NZS 6801 for measurement except where it varies the measurement method.	Amend NOISE-S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone Standard as follows: 6. Noise must be measured in accordance with the provisions of NZS 6801:2008 Acoustics Measurement of Environmental Sound and assessed in accordance with NZS 6809:1999 Acoustics Port Noise Management and Land Use Planning.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S5: Acoustic treatment for activities sensitive to aircraft noise inside the Outer Control Boundary	Grant Russell	202.50	Support	Supports NOISE-S5: Acoustic treatment for activities sensitive to aircraft noise inside the Outer Control Boundary.	Retain NOISE-S5: Acoustic treatment for activities sensitive to aircraft noise inside the Outer Control Boundary as notified.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and/or vibration	Grant Russell	202.51	Support	Considers NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and / or vibration Assessment Criteria are supported in part with changes in wording required for clarity and consistency.	Amend NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and / or vibration Assessment Criteria as follows: NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and / or vibration Public health a. The extent to which the noise or vibration generated will adversely affect health and wellbeing of people, including consideration of <u>having regard to</u> : i. whether the noise or vibration generation will occur at night when disturbance to rest and sleep should be avoided or minimised; ii. interference with speech communications, the learning process and education, instruction from caregivers or teachers, and <u>concentration mental activity</u> , and iii. existing background levels and the total cumulative level of noise.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise /	Mike Doesburg	209.6	Oppose	Opposes internal noise rules as the provisions provide for greater internal noise amenity during the day than at night.	Amend Rule NOISE-R10A 1. as follows: Type of use Internal noise limits Bedrooms and sleeping areas Rail noise - 35 40 dB LAeq(1hr) between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m., and 40 35 dB LAeq(1hr) between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. Road traffic noise - 40 dB LAeq(24hr) ...	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /	Dominic Adams	221.5	Amend	It is important to recognise the benefits of activities that generate appropriate levels of noise during the support of primary production, whilst balancing the health and wellbeing of people and communities.	Seeks to insert new objective: <u>The benefits of activities that generate noise (such as primary production activities and supporting activities) are recognised, where the adverse effects from noise are compatible with the anticipated purpose, character, and amenity values of the relevant zone(s) and do not compromise public health, safety, and wellbeing of people and communities.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	Dominic Adams	221.6	Support	It is important to protect existing and authorised activities from reverse sensitivity effects.	Seeks to retain the objective.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /	Dominic Adams	221.7	Amend	Ballance seeks inclusion of a policy that enables noise generating activities and recognises agricultural aviation as an ancillary activity supporting primary production.	Seeks to Insert new policy: <u>Noise generating activities that have a limited duration and frequency and support primary production in the rural environment (in particular, audible bird scaring devices, agricultural aviation and frost protection devices, and harvesters) is enabled by exempting these activities from noise limits, subject to reasonable use.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Dominic Adams	221.8	Amend	Ballance seeks to have agricultural aviation provided for as a permitted activity in the plan.	Seeks to Amend the rule by adding: a. the noise from the use of vehicles, mobile machinery, agricultural aviation activity or other mobile or portable equipment where they are used on a seasonal or intermittent basis for agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, or forestry activities that are permitted by the Plan;	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R7: Noise generated from temporary events	Amelia Longley	222.127	Amend	Clarify limits for consistency with the recommendations for temporary events made Council's acoustic expert. (Styles Groups Noise Review 8 August 2019).	<p>Amend noise limits for temporary events rules to be consistent with recommendations in Council's acoustic expert report (Styles Groups Noise Review 8 August 2019) (or words to similar effect).NOISE-R7: Noise generated from temporary noise events NOISE-R7A</p> <p>Activity Status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:1. Amplified sound equipment must only be operated between the hours of:</p> <p>a. 10.00 a.m. to 11.0010.00 p.m. <u>Sunday to Thursday inclusive</u></p> <p>b. <u>10am-11pm Fridays, Saturdays and day preceding a public holiday.</u></p> <p>2. The following are exempt from compliance with clause 1 above:</p> <p>a. on 31st December of any calendar year, amplified sound equipment may be used until 1.00 a.m. the following day.3. Any sound checks that include testing and balancing of sound systems, sound equipment and vocal checks by performers must not:</p> <p>a. exceed a cumulative period of six<u>3</u> hours, and</p> <p>b. commence before 9.00 a.m. on any day and shall be completed by 7.00 p.m. of any day of the temporary activity.</p> <p>4. Noise generated from temporary events must not exceed <u>75 dB L Aeq (5 min) for events on Sunday to Thursday</u> 85<u>or 80</u> dB L Aeq (5 min) <u>for events held on Saturdays or Sundays or any day preceding a public holiday</u> when measured at any other site,</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S1: General noise limits	Alicia McKinnon	230.12	Amend	<p>opposes any increase to the noise limits for the Mixed Use Zone and the proposed new General Industrial Zone in Ahuriri</p> <p>The noise limits that are proposed for the Mixed Use Zone should be at least the same as those in the Napier Operative District Plan. However, from experience it is unlikely that the noise limits proposed on their own will be adequate to mitigate against any adverse effects of noise from industrial activities on residential amenity.</p> <p>NCC has a responsibility to manage the effects of land use and noise, including the effects on amenity values that may be affected by noise.</p> <p>Unreasonable noise can be managed at the source, through for example: modification of equipment used that emit low levels of noise, moving activities on a site to be far away as possible from residential boundaries, narrowing hours of operation particularly for noisy activities, or barriers to control/reduce noise. It is also possible to incorporate Noise Management Plans into a district plan through permitted activity standards.</p>	<p>Amend the NOISE-S1 General noise limits standards table as follows:</p> <p>Zone</p> <p>Mixed Use Zone</p> <p>7am to 7pm LAeq(15min) - <u>55dB</u></p> <p>7am to 10pm LAeq(15min) - <u>50dB</u></p> <p>10pm to 7am the following day LAeq (15min) - <u>45dB</u></p> <p>10pm to 7am the following day LAFMax - <u>75dB</u></p> <p><u>General industrial zone in Ahuriri</u></p> <p><u>7am to 7pm LAeq(15min) - 55dB</u></p> <p><u>7am to 10pm LAeq(15min) - 50dB</u></p> <p><u>10pm to 7am the following day LAeq (15min) - 45dB</u></p> <p><u>10pm to 7am the following day LAFMax - 75dB</u></p> <p>NCC should explore further ways to manage unreasonable noise for the Mixed Use Zone. Where residential amenity is being impacted, this could include establishing Noise Management Plans for each occupier of land in the Mixed Use Zone. Residents should be consulted in the preparation of any Noise Management Plan to ensure all options are considered and appropriate noise mitigation measures are explored.</p>	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-12: Noise generation can detract from amenity values	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.32	Amend	Supports that educational facilities are generally located within residential zones. requests that 'education facilities' be amended to read 'educational facilities for consistency across the plan.	Amend to: Noise generation can detract from amenity values The degree of quiet or peacefulness in an area contributes to the amenity values appreciated by its occupants. Suburban residential areas, for example, are generally quieter than commercial centres. However, non-residential activities such as neighbourhood shops, cafes, educational facilities, and churches can be accommodated in these communities even though they generate noise. Appropriate noise standards need to be established and complied with to ensure that these activities are enabled while maintaining the amenity values of the residential area. Excessive noise can also be created by the use of high-powered stereo systems by residents.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-13: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.33	Amend	The link for the definition for activity sensitive to noise in NOISE-13 is not consistent to the plan's definition for 'Activities Sensitive to noise'. The ministry seeks the link to this definition be amended to match the proposed definition in the definitions chapter.	Amend to: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities Where there is high noise-generating activities and infrastructure it is not reasonable or practicable for the noise generators to internalise their noise effects. Therefore, the surrounding land use needs to be managed to avoid the potential for reverse sensitivity. Depending on the level of noise, activity sensitive to noise may need to be avoided or acoustically treated to insulate from external noises and prevent potential reverse sensitivity effects. Definition link states: Activities sensitive to noise means any dwelling, visitor accommodation, boarding house, marae, papakāinga, integrated residential development, retirement village, supported residential care, care centres <u>means any dwelling, visitor accommodation, boarding house, marae, papakāinga, integrated residential development, retirement village, supported residential care, care centres, lecture theatres in tertiary education facilities, education facilities, and healthcare facilities with an overnight stay facility.</u>	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.34	Amend	<p>Supports the allowance of higher levels of noise from educational facilities during school hours and the occasional temporary event. Educational facilities are a critical form of social infrastructure required to meet the needs of surrounding residential catchments. Educational facilities often do generate noise from various outdoor activities, like sports events or lunchtime play. These noise events are periodic and only occur during daylight hours mostly on weekdays. The Ministry support any provisions that accommodates noise generated from educational facilities.</p> <p>The Ministry does request that 'education facilities' be amended to read 'educational facilities' for consistency across the plan and to match the definition of the term.</p>	<p>Amend to:</p> <p>Amenity values, health, and wellbeing</p> <p>Maintain the anticipated amenity values of the zone and provide for the health and wellbeing of the community by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> controlling the noise effects throughout the city to meet the relevant objectives for the zone; managing the interface of different zones to protect the amenity values of residential and other less noisy areas of the city, and <p>providing for higher levels of noise generation for educational facilities during the day on weekdays and a limited number of temporary events where these activities contribute to community wellbeing and potential adverse effects on amenity values are minimised.</p> <p>Relates to NOISE-O1</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.35	Amend	<p>Supports the provision NOISE-P2 which protects noise sensitive activities from the effects of high noise-generating activities. Recommends the removal of a) as it is not clear what an 'inappropriate location' would be and b) already address's the concerns of a). Also considers the removal of the word unreasonable from b) as unreasonable noise cannot be measured. This should be amended to discourage noise that exceeds the permitted noise levels in the relevant zoning provisions.</p>	<p>Seeks to Amend NOISE-P2 to the following:</p> <p>Noise-sensitive activities</p> <p>Enable the functional operation of noise sensitive activities by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> preventing noise sensitive activities from establishing in inappropriate locations; preventing high noise-generating activities other than roads and railway lines from establishing in residential zones, and where noise-sensitive activities establish in areas exposed to high noise- generating activities, require the acoustic treatment to achieve an appropriate internal noise level to enable uninterrupted sleep at night and an internal environment for uses that do not involve overnight accommodation that protects people from unreasonable noise that exceeds the noise standards <u>unreasonable noise that exceeds the noise standards for the zone as defined in this District Plan.</u> <p>Relates to NOISE-O1 and NOISE-O3</p>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.36	Support	<p>Supports a restricted discretionary activity status when the noise standards in NOISE-S2 are not meet. As the Ministry recognises that educational facilities can generate noise from outdoor activities like sports and children playing.</p>	Retain as Proposed.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R9: Noise sensitive activities in the City Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone, or Industrial Zone	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.37	Support	<p>Supports the proposed noise standards for noise sensitive activities (which includes educational facilities). The Ministry excepts restricted discretionary activity status if compliance cannot be met.</p>	Retain as proposed.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)						
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S2: Noise from education facilities	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.38	Amend	Amend NOISE-S2, the Ministry requests that 'education facilities' be amended to read 'educational facilities' for consistency across the plan and to match the proposed definition of the term. The Ministry also requests that noise is measured from the boundary not within the school site. Often the Ministry school sites can be designed in ways to locate the noise generating activities away from the boundary of residential areas so noise can dissipate before reaching the boundary. However, the Ministry supports a restricted discretionary activity status when the noise standards in NOISE-S2 are not meet.	<p>Seeks to Amend the following:</p> <p>Noise from educational facilities</p> <p>1. Noise generated from any educational facility when measured from within the boundary of any <u>adjacent or adjoining</u> site in a residential zone or any <u>adjacent or adjoining</u> notional boundary within a rural zone must not exceed the levels below unless the relevant zone in which the facility is located provides for higher noise levels in Rule NOISE-S1:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Time</td> <td>Noise Level</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Monday to Friday 7.00 a.m.</td> <td>55 dB LAeq (15 min) to 6.00 p.m.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All other times and all day on public holidays</td> <td>40 dB LAeq(15min) and 75 dB LAFmax</td> </tr> </table> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Public health; Amenity values, and Functional and operational requirements of educational facilities. 	Time	Noise Level	Monday to Friday 7.00 a.m.	55 dB LAeq (15 min) to 6.00 p.m.	All other times and all day on public holidays	40 dB LAeq(15min) and 75 dB LAFmax	Open Submission
Time	Noise Level											
Monday to Friday 7.00 a.m.	55 dB LAeq (15 min) to 6.00 p.m.											
All other times and all day on public holidays	40 dB LAeq(15min) and 75 dB LAFmax											
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC1: General assessment criteria for activities generating noise and/or vibration	Sian Stirling Jessica Ensing	231.39	Amend	Amend NOSIE-AC1, to refer to the 'learning environment' rather than the 'learning process', as council's proposed wording is unclear. 'Learning environment' provides clarity to plan users that effects on productive classroom environment need to be assessed. However, the Ministry does support NOISE-AC1 as it allows the effects of noise generating activities to be assessed in relation to the effects on education to reduce or prevent interference or disruption to productive learning environments.	<p>Seeks to Amend the following:</p> <p>Public health</p> <p>a. The extent to which the noise or vibration generated will adversely affect health and wellbeing of people, including consideration of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> whether the noise or vibration generation will occur when disturbance to rest and sleep should be avoided or minimised; interference with speech communications, the learning environment and process and education, instruction from caregivers or teachers, and mental activity, and existing background levels and the total cumulative level of noise. 	Open Submission						

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R2: Construction noise and vibration	James Whitlock	232.1	Amend	Notes that the noise rules are copied from the Auckland Unitary Plan, with some minor improvements including fixing wording and technical errors. Considers that these rules have caused huge consenting issues in Auckland, adding unnecessary hurdles and expense - especially to small projects. Notes that consenting planners have come to treat the noise and vibration limits as absolute thresholds, but they should be applied as trigger levels for consultation and management to address potential effects. For condition 1, Considers that NZS 6803 only addresses noise, not vibration so there is nothing in the following rules that would require this exception. For condition 2, considers that construction noise infringes the noise levels in NZS 6803 all the time - particularly in cities and small-lot residential areas. The distances between construction equipment and neighbouring buildings are too short for compliance. Activities that cause infringements of these limits should be managed and mitigated in accordance with the best practicable option (BPO). A management plan approach is the best way to address this, and all construction projects and Auckland (and other cities around NZ) successfully implements this approach. For condition 7, notes that the 1999 version of DIN 4150-3 is outdated. Submitter proposes deletion of daytime vibration limits (2 mm/s PPV) due to lack of standard basis and causing consenting issues. Notes Peak value nature of PPV makes compliance difficult and predictions conservative. Like noise, vibration can be managed via a management plan; night-time limits are retained. Notes that the Australasian Association of Acoustic Consultants is currently drafting a guideline document to accompany NZS 6803. Its objective is to help its members to apply the standard's provisions sensibly and consistently. Refer to original submission for full details and attachment.	Amend as below: 1. Noise (including vibration) from construction activities shall be measured and assessed in accordance with NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics Construction noise, except where varied by the rules below. 2. Noise from construction activities in all zones must be <u>managed to comply with not exceed</u> the levels in the table below, as far as practicable, when measured 1 m from the facade of any building that contains a noise-sensitive activity that is occupied during the works. ... 7. Construction and demolition activities must be controlled to ensure any resulting vibration does not exceed: a. The limits set out in German Industrial Standard DIN 4150-3 (1999 2016) : Structural vibration - Part 3: Effects of vibration on structures when measured in accordance with that standard on any structure not on the same site, and b. The <u>vibration amenity</u> limits in the table below when measured in the corner of the floor of the storey of interest for multi-storey buildings, or within 500 mm of ground level at the foundation of a single-storey building. Receiver - Occupied <u>building containing</u> a noise sensitive activity Period - Night time 10.00 p.m. to 7.30 a.m. Daytime 7.30 a.m. to 10.00 p.m.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	Peter Holley	234.7		Sometimes sound checks an exceed noise limitations, therefore sound checks within the specified times are exempt from the noise limitations.	Seeks to Amend PREC5-R3(6) so that concert and entertainment activities in compliance with the condition are exempt from noise limits in the noise chapter NOISE-S1. Details are stated in the full submission.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /Noise-S1: General noise limits	denise fastier	245.2	Oppose	Considers that there is unreasonable traffic noise outside excepted hours in a mixed residential/ commercial zone. Seeks quiet times between 10pm to 6am so residents can sleep.	Seeks quiet times between 10pm to 6am so residents can sleep. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S3: General noise limits within the Port Zone	denise fastier	245.3	Oppose	Considers that there is unreasonable traffic noise outside excepted hours in a mixed residential/ commercial zone. Seeks quiet times between 10pm to 6am so residents can sleep.	Seeks quiet times between 10pm to 6am so residents can sleep. No specific relief sought	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.79	Amend	Considers that Objective Noise-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing should be amended as this objective aims to protect amenity values and people's well-being from adverse noise levels, consistent with the nature of the receiving environment. This objective is generally supported as it reflects the outcomes anticipated from the management of noise under the RMA. However, rather than referring to 'adverse' noise levels, it is understood that the duty to avoid 'unreasonable' noise (section 16 of the RMA). An amendment to the objective to reflect this terminology is therefore proposed.	Amend Objective NOISE-O1 as follows: Amenity values and peoples' health and wellbeing are protected from adverse-unreasonable noise-levels, particularly at night, consistent with the anticipated outcomes for the receiving environment.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.80	Support	Supports NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity as from Ravensdown's perspective, the continued effective operation of industrial activities, that are appropriately located in industrial zones (which tend to accommodate noisier activities), should not be constrained, or put at risk, by reverse sensitivity effects where more sensitive activities locate within industrial zones, or through the placement of residential zones immediately adjacent to industrial zones.	Retain Objective NOISE-O3 as notified in its entirety.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.81	Support	Supports Policy NOISE-P1: Amenity values, health and wellbeing as this policy is supported as it is appropriate to control noise levels throughout the city in a manner consistent with the activities provided for within different zones and the level of amenity anticipated. In addition, it is important to manage noise levels at the interface of different zones.	Retain Policy NOISE-P1 as notified.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.82	Support	Supports Policy NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities as it articulates the key requirements for ensuring that the amenity anticipated by sensitive activities are provided for, and that reverse sensitivity effects do not arise for activities appropriately located in appropriate zones (e.g., industrial activities in industrial zones).	Retain Policy NOISE-P3 2 as notified. (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.83	Support	Supports NOISE - Rules Table NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general) as Rule NOISE-R1A permits noise generation for all activities, unless Rules NOISE-R2 to NOISE-R8 apply, provided Standards NOISE-S1 and NOISE-S2 are complied with. Where the requirements of the permitted activity rule are not complied with, a restricted discretionary land use consent is required (Rule NOISE-R1B). As Rules NOISE-R2 to NOISE-R8 do not apply to Ravensdown's industrial activities in the city, this Rule does apply. As discussed below in relation to Standard NOISE-S1, the noise limits that apply in the GIZ, seem consistent with the noise limits applied to industrial zones throughout New Zealand. Given this context, the general noise framework provided for by this rule is supported.	Retain Rule NOISE-R1 as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R9: Noise sensitive activities in the City Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone, or Industrial Zone	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.84	Amend	Considers NOISE-R9: Noise sensitive activities in the City Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone, or Industrial Zone should be amended as while the rule framework of the GIZ chapter of the PDP makes it difficult for noise sensitive activities to establish in the zone (non-complying activity, under Rule GIZ-R7, for activities not provided for in the GIZ chapter), for the purposes of clearly managing potential reverse sensitivity effects, it is considered that this noise mitigation rule should also apply in industrial zone (as inferred by the rule title).	Amend Rule NOISE-R9 as follows: NOISE-R9A Activity Status: Permitted Where: 1. Any new or altered noise sensitive space of any noise sensitive activity within the City Centre Zone, or Mixed Use Zone or Industrial Zones (Light and General) must be located, designed, or screened by suitable barriers on the property so that the internal noise levels in those rooms do not exceed: ...	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R20: Activities infringing standards NOISE-S1-S4	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.85	Support	Supports Rule NOISE-R20: Activities infringing standards NOISE-S1-S4 as although this rule possibly does not need to refer to Standards NOISE-S1 and NOISE-S2 (i.e., given that Rule NOISE-R1 applies a restricted discretionary activity status when the standards are not complied with), the rule is supported as it acts as a 'catch-all' rule.	Retain Rule NOISE-R20 as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S1: General noise limits	Ella Shields Carmen Taylor	246.86	Support	Supports NOISE - Standards Table NOISE-S1: General noise limits as this standard sets the noise limits for the various zones within the city. The noise limits for the GIZ are 70dB LAeq(15min) all day and 85dB LAFmax between 10pm and 7am. These noise limits, based on Ravensdown's operations throughout New Zealand, seem consistent with the noise limits applied to industrial zones throughout New Zealand. For these reasons, the proposed noise limits are supported.	Retain Standard NOISE-S1 as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I3: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	Leanne Roberts	257.48	Support	Considers it is important to recognise that reverse sensitivity effects need to be avoided.	Seeks to retain NOISE-I3.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	Leanne Roberts	257.49	Support	Considers it is important to recognise that reverse sensitivity effects need to be avoided.	Seeks to retain NOISE-O3.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	Leanne Roberts	257.50	Amend	Considers it is important that the anticipated outcomes for the receiving environment are taken into account. For instance, the rural area is not a quiet area, even though some perceive it as such. There should be a policy that clearly provides for activities that generate noise.	Seeks to retain NOISE-O1 but include a new objective to provide for noise generating activities.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /General	Leanne Roberts	257.51	Amend	Amend to add a new objective to provide for activities that need to generate noise in the district.	Seeks to add new objective: Recognise and provide for activities that generate noise whilst ensuring that the noise levels are compatible with the character and activities undertaken in the zone in which it occurs, which will vary across the district.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Policies /General	Leanne Roberts	257.52	Amend	States a new policy is needed to provide for noise from primary production activities. This is needed to support NOISE-R1A 2a).	Seeks to include a new policy: Provide for primary production activities which generate noise within the Rural Production Zone and ensure that they are not constrained from reverse sensitivity effects arising from noise sensitive activities located in the Rural Production Zone.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P2: Noise-sensitive activities	Leanne Roberts	257.53	Amend	States that the policy is focused on the noise sensitive activities not the activities that need to generate noise. It is unclear what would be included a high-noise generating activities in clause c).	Seeks to Clarify what is intended to be included as 'high noise generating activities'.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P4: Reverse sensitivity	Leanne Roberts	257.54	Amend	Considers the Rural Production Zone should be included in NOISE-P4.	Amend as follows: <u>Added to NOISE-P4</u> <u>d) Rural Production Zone</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Leanne Roberts	257.55	Support	Supports the permitted activity in NOISE-R1A 2a) that provides for noise from horticultural activities.	Seeks to retain NOISE-R1A 2a).	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R5: Noise generated from rural production activities	Leanne Roberts	257.56	Amend	Considers Rural production activities are not defined in the Plan. States, the rule should refer to primary production activities.	Seeks to amend NOISE-R5 to Noise generated from primary production activities.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R5: Noise generated from rural production activities	Leanne Roberts	257.57	Amend	Supports the rules for audible bird scaring devices, Hail cannon, Gas guns, firearms, Audible avian distress alarms and frost protection fans. However, submitter states that the provision in 13 is inappropriate. Considers the condition should be that any noise sensitive activity establishing within 300m of an existing frost fan should have to provide acoustic insulation. A rule is sought in RPROZ to this effect.	Seeks to amend NOISE-R5A by deleting 13 and replacing with a rule requiring noise insulation for noise sensitive activities within 300m of a frost fan.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S1: General noise limits	Leanne Roberts	257.58	Support	Supports a daytime noise limit of 55db for the Rural Production Zone which recognises that the rural production zone is a noisier environment than the residential zone.	Seeks to retain a 55dB 7am – 7pm noise limit for the Rural Production Zone.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC2: Noise generated from rural production activities not meeting the activity standards (NOISE-R5)	Leanne Roberts	257.59	Support	The assessment criteria for noise from rural production activities is supported.	Seeks to retain NOISE-AC2.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Standards Table /NOISE-S1: General noise limits	Dominic McClarey	275.5	Oppose	Objects increased noise to 70db all night.	Relief Sought is not included.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I3: Noise-sensitive activities can impact on the operation of noise-generating activities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.82	Support	Supports the recognition of reverse sensitivity through issue NOISE-I3. Notes that to encourage increased housing density and greater integration between land use and transport, in some instances sensitive activities will need to be acoustically treated to ensure they maintain internal amenity.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Issues /NOISE-I4: Increased residential activity in the City Centre and Mixed Use Zone (city centre fringe and Ahuriri) can lead to reverse sensitivity effects on the established noise-generating activities	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.83	Support	Supports the recognition of reverse sensitivity through issue NOISE-I4. Consider that where more intense land use is encouraged, particularly to drive the aspirations of the Spatial Picture, sensitive activities will need to be acoustically treated to ensure they maintain internal amenity. Managing reverse sensitivity effects will also support more intense integration and connectivity between land use and transport.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O1: Amenity values, health, and wellbeing	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.84	Support	Considers that it is important that the district plan manages both compatible and non-compatible land uses. Considers that separation of non-compatible land use is the best solution however, where this is impractical, treatments need to be applied to ensure that sensitive receivers enjoy reasonable internal amenity while established activities are not compromised through reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O2: Vibrancy of the city centre and Ahuriri	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.85	Support	Considers it is important that the district plan manages both compatible and non-compatible land uses. Considers that the separation of non-compatible land use is the best solution, however, where this is impractical, treatments need to be applied to ensure that sensitive receivers enjoy reasonable internal amenity while established activities are not compromised through reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O3: Reverse sensitivity	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.86	Support	Considers it is important that the district plan manages both compatible and non-compatible land uses. Considers that the separation of non-compatible land use is the best solution, however, where this is impractical, treatments need to be applied to ensure that sensitive receivers enjoy reasonable internal amenity while established activities are not compromised through reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Objectives /NOISE-O5: Napier Port and Hawke's Bay Airport	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.87	Support	Considers it is important that the district plan manages both compatible and non-compatible land uses. Considers that the separation of non-compatible land use is the best solution, however, where this is impractical, treatments need to be applied to ensure that sensitive receivers enjoy reasonable internal amenity while established activities are not compromised through reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /Policies /NOISE-P5: Transport network	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.88	Amend	Seek to amend the policy to recognise the functional and operational requirements of maintaining, operating, and improving the state highway network. Subclause 'a' would impose an impractical restriction and narrow focus on the best practicable option for new and upgraded state highways. Submitter considers management of adverse noise effects, but notes this is just one in a range of considerations for the provision a safe and efficient transport network. Seeks for the deletion of subclause 'a' to remove the narrow outcome for the delivery of a safe and efficient transport network. Seek a minor amendment to subclause 'b.' as management of noise sensitive activities includes treatments beyond insulation as outlined in NZTA's submission on NOISE-R10 below. Seek to replace insulation with treatment to expand the directive of the policy to include the range of treatment available to manage for noise sensitive activities.	Amend NOISE-P5 as follows: Minimise potential conflicts between noise generated from the transport network and noise sensitive activities by: Requiring the adoption of the best practicable option minimise the noise effects on all new and upgraded state highways, arterials, collector roads, and railways constructed in the city, and Requiring insulation treatment of new or altered noise sensitive activities where they are located near a High Land Transport Noise Overlay.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.89	Support	Support excluding vehicles traveling on public roads in this standard.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R6: Noise generated from new or altered roads	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.90	Support	Supports rule NOISE-R6 as it recognises NZS6806:2010 provides best practice guidance on mitigating road traffic noise for new and altered state highways.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R10: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.91	Amend	Supports a rule aligning with their noise mitigation model provisions sought to be included in District Plans across New Zealand . Notes that Statehighway networks run 24/7, and train characteristics can change without community consultation. Noise can have an impact on the internal amenity of a building. Mitigation measures are essential to prevent adverse effects on the health and wellbeing of nearby residents and workers. Seeks a new rule and standard to ensure appropriate internal amenity in buildings for sensitive activities. This is most effectively achieved at the time of construction. The further removed from the rail corridor a building is, the less additional mitigation may be required. Mitigation levels are based on World Health Organisation standards, considering intermittent train noise and community acceptance. Notes requiring a greater setback from the state highway corridor as a means of addressing noise effects at smaller residential sites near the state highway corridor may not be feasible. Non-compliance requires consent as a restricted discretionary activity under the proposed plan. KiwiRail and NZTA seek to protect the safe and efficient operation of their respective transport networks, and the amenity of those who reside and work within proximity to transport corridors. Both collaborate to produce a refined rule and standard to manage noise-sensitive activities within the High Land Transport Noise Overlay. Both seek the same framework of controls in terms of managing noise effects, with some variation in criteria and distances between road and rail. The purpose of the provisions sought is to protect the health of occupants of new and altered buildings, and in turn to avoid or mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects on the operations of KiwiRail and NZTA. Refer to original submission for full reasons and attached proposed rules, standards and Section 32 Report on Noise and Vibration	Replace NOISE-R10 with the rule and standard provided in Appendix 1. (Refer to original submission for attached proposed standard) <u>NOISE-R10: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay</u> <u>NOISE-R10A</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>Any new buildings or alterations to existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to noise which complies with the noise standards in</u> <u>NOISE-S7.</u> <u>NOISE-R10B</u> <u>Activity Status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>Whether the activity sensitive to noise could be located further from the state highway or railway network.</u> <u>The extent to which the noise criteria are achieved and the effects of any non-compliance.</u> <u>The character of, and degree of, amenity provided by the existing environment and proposed activity.</u> <u>The reverse sensitivity effects on the state highway or rail network, and the extent to which mitigation measures can enable their ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade.</u> <u>Special topographical, building features or ground conditions</u>	Open Submission

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /Assessment Criteria /NOISE-AC6: Noise sensitive activities in the High Land Transport Noise Overlay (NOISE-R10)	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.92	Amend	Notes if noise sensitive activities are designed in accordance with the permitted activity assessment criteria internal level will be considered reasonable. Seeks amendments to rephrase the criteria in a manner that assesses whether unreasonable noise levels resulting from not complying with the permitted activity standard are an acceptable compromise and appropriately managed.	Amend to redraft subclause a as follows: Whether the design, including location, methods, and construction techniques proposed, is likely to provide an internal noise environment that is likely to ensure that the internal noise levels are reasonable for the occupants and will avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on the transportation network <u>The design, including orientation, location and methods and construction techniques proposed provide an appropriate compromise to manage internal noise environments that avoid or mitigates reverse sensitivity effects on the transportation network.</u>	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise /General	Dionne Best	278.1	Amend	Submitter provides background and context for the Meeanee Speedway, located at Papakura Domain, Sandy Road, Meeanee, which has been a fixture since 1961, serving as the home of the Hawkes Bay Speedway club. Notes that the speedway operates consistently from October to May, with no intention of expansion but notes concerns about proposed restrictions in the District Plan. Considers that restrictions could negatively impact the viability of the club and the speedway's operation, potentially leading to its closure. Notes that the club has provided correct information to address potential noise issues but remains unclear about the reasoning behind the proposed limitations in the District Plan.	No specific relief sought. See additional submissions or original submission for full details.	Open Submission
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R17: Noise generated by Meeanee Speedway	Dionne Best	278.2	Amend	Considers that the conditions for rule Noise-R17A could have significant negative impacts on the operation of the speed way. Considers that condition 5 does not accommodate for meetings in may which are weather dependent, and allows the Club to ensure it is able to meet its obligations around the number of events offered to each class across the season, and to allow for National and Regional Title events to be completed. Also considers the condition would also result in competitors preferring to contract to alternative out-of-town tracks – to see local competitors, their supporters, and many spectators travelling out of our region to race (rather than attracting visitors to our region), which would have a downward spiral effect on the long-term viability of Meeanee Speedway. Considers that condition 6(a) is inconsistent with the typical speedway season which would consist of around 20 pre-scheduled events or more (accounting for a National Title or other major event). Also considers that weather events/ rainouts may increase number of noise events that take place throughout the season. This restricts Meeanee Speedway to operating at a level less than it currently does. Considers that condition 6(b) does not accommodate for title events which run over two or three nights (it's not possible to run them in fewer nights), and are also typically held in January and February, which is also the busiest time on the racing calendar. Condition 6(b) has the effect of limiting the events Meeanee Speedway can host at the time such events are traditionally hosted, and reducing the operation of the track, to a level below that at which the track currently operates. Considers that this would compromise long-term viability. Considers that condition 6(c) fails allow Meeanee speedway to meet requirements set by Speedway New Zealand, to run a minimum of three practice events per season. Notes that common practice has been for practices to run for around three hours, and to be held	Amend condition 5 so that noise events and noise practice events are limited to the racing season (1 October to 31 May inclusive), so that Meeanee Speedway may continue operating as it currently does. Amend condition 6(a) to increase to 25 events per season (not including practice noise events) to enable Meeanee Speedway to continue to operate as it always has. Amend condition 6(b) to make this requirement no more than five noise events in any 4-week period to more accurately reflect current practice, and more reasonably allow Meeanee Speedway to operate as it currently does. Amend condition 6(c). to allow for six three-hour practice events, to be run on any day of the week between the hours of 9am and 9pm, at any time throughout the season to accommodate what happens currently and meet obligations to Speedway New Zealand. Amend condition 7 to allow for eight events to take place on days other than Saturday and amend to allow for a four hour window of scheduled racing starting any time between 4pm and 6pm, with a 45 minute allowance for overruns, and provision for races to be started during the 45 minute allowance if it were necessary to do so to complete an event.	Open Submission

NOISE - Noise

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
NOISE - Noise /NOISE - Noise - Rules Table /NOISE-R1: Noise generation (general)	Alec Duncan	288.56	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency supports NOISE-R1(2) that exempts the noise of sirens used for emergency purposes from the noise and vibration standards in any part of the District Plan and are therefore considered permitted activities.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency however seeks that this exception be extended to the use of generators and mobile equipment (including vehicles) for emergency purposes and activities at emergency service facilities associated with emergency response, re-commissioning and emergency response training.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>f. the noise of sirens, generators and mobile equipment (including vehicles) used for emergency purposes.</p> <p><u>g. Activities at emergency service facilities associated with emergency response, re-commissioning and temporary emergency services training.</u></p> <p>or similar effect.</p>	Open Submission