

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

AND

IN THE MATTER of a Board of Inquiry appointed under s149J of the Resource Management Act 1991 to consider Notice of Requirements and applications for Resource Consent made by the New Zealand Transport Agency in relation to the Northern Corridor Improvements roading proposal in Auckland.

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF RHYS LEONARD HEGLEY ON
BEHALF OF AUCKLAND COUNCIL**

NOISE AND VIBRATION

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This statement provides a summary of matters I raised my Evidence in Chief (**EIC**) in relation to the assessment of noise and vibration as a result of the NCI Project and then identifies how those matters were addressed through the expert conferencing and the subsequent Joint Witness Statement (**JWS**).

2. ASSESSMENT OF CONSTRUCTION EFFECTS

2.1 My largest concern with the evidence of the NZ Transport Agency was the limited assessment of construction noise and vibration effects. Paragraphs 7.2 and 7.7 to 7.9 of my EIC relate to construction noise while paragraphs 7.3 and 7.10 – 7.13 address construction vibration.

2.2 I considered that the JWS addresses construction effects in some detail. In particular:

- (a) Sections 10 to 18 of the JWS identify day time construction activities that will result in high levels of noise and vibration, their anticipated magnitude and durations with a summary provided in section 19;
- (b) Sections 20 to 22 provide an assessment on the effects of day time construction noise and vibration;
- (c) Section 23, in conjunction with Annexure 5, describes night time construction noise levels and their duration to the surrounding receivers; and
- (d) Section 24 provides the noise expert's views on the assessment, management and mitigation of night-time construction noise effects.

2.3 For completeness, I note that the noise experts understand¹ that there are currently no night time activities proposed that have the potential to breach the vibration limits of the proposed conditions.

¹ Paragraph 9(p) of the JWS.

2.4 In my view, the information referenced above provides a comprehensive understanding as to the effects that noise and vibration from the construction of the NCI Project will have on the surrounding environment.

3. BPO ASSESSMENT

3.1 In paragraphs 7.15 and 7.16 of my EIC I noted that while the mitigation proposed for the NCI Project was developed to satisfy the requirements of the New Zealand traffic noise standard (NZS 6806), no consideration had been given to what else could be done to control traffic noise, as I believe is required by section 16 of the Act.

3.2 I consider that this issue was adequately dealt with during the experts' conferencing and is recorded in paragraph 16a) of the JWS where barriers along the majority of the southern boundary of the Upper Harbour Highway designation boundary are recommended by the noise experts.

4. ON.4

4.1 Paragraph 8.1c) of my EIC discusses my concern over the lack of certainty that the then proposed conditions (ON.4 in particular) would provide on the level of traffic noise that surrounding properties will receive.

4.2 Proposed condition ON.2 developed during caucusing adequately addresses my concerns. This condition requires that the traffic noise levels are to meet specified numerical limits, as defined within Appendix A of the conditions. A 2dB tolerance is provided as a practical solution that will allow minor amendments to the design without the need for a new hearing provided that those changes will have no noticeable noise effect ($\leq 2\text{dB}$).

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 In conclusion, it is my view when considered in conjunction with the JWS, the NZTA evidence on operational and construction noise and vibration provides a comprehensive understanding of the effects of the NCI Project. The proposed activities will result in high levels of noise during both the day and night time and high levels of day time vibration to individual receivers, and groups of receivers, for discrete periods. I consider that the proposed conditions provide a robust

mechanism with which to address the resulting effects noting that, due to the nature of construction, it may not be practicable to fully avoid, remedy or mitigate all of these effects.



Rhys Leonard Hegley

7 August 2017