

Before the Independent Hearings Panel at Gore District Council

Under Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of Hearing Submissions and Further submissions on the
Proposed Gore District Plan.

**Statement of supplementary planning evidence of Tina Carlson-McColl on behalf
of Gore District Council**

Date: 26 September 2024

Introduction:

1. My full name is Tina Carlson-McColl, I am the author of the Section 42A report for Designations
2. The Section 42A reports sets out my qualifications and experience as experts in planning.
3. I confirm that I continue to abide by the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's practice Note 2023, as applicable to this independent hearing panel.
4. I have prepared this statement of evidence to provide a response to expert evidence presented in relation to Hearing Stream 5A – Designation GDC-10 East Gore Water Treatment Plant and in accordance with Minute 17 of the Hearings Panel.
5. In forming my opinions I have had input from Mr. Jon Styles, Director and Principal, Styles Group Acoustics and Vibration Consultants, his recommendations are attached to my statement.
6. The submitter expert evidence responded to in in this statement of evidence includes:

Gore District Council (Requiring Authority)

- a. Matthew Bayliss
- b. Brendon Shanks (Marshall Day Acoustics)

Recommendations Overview

7. The Section 42A report provides an overview of issues raised in submissions and the changes recommended relating to Hearing Stream 5A. I do not propose to repeat those here but instead focus on responding to Gore District Council expert evidence.
8. Recommended changes to the GDC-10 Designation are shown in **Appendix 1**.
9. In response to Gore District Council I recommend to confirm the requirement and impose amended conditions to manage noise effects, in addition to light spill and landscaping conditions as per the Section 42A report, as shown in **Appendix 1**.

Detailed Responses to Gore District Council (Requiring Authority)

10. The Section 42A report for the Gore District Council (GDC) designations recommends in response to submissions to include conditions for the new designations, including GDC-10 East Gore Water Treatment Plant, in relation to noise levels to be consistent with the underlying zone, and light spill and landscaping to soften the visual effect of their facilities within residential areas.

However, no technical expert effects assessment was provided with the Notice of Requirement.

11. The Hearings Panel issued updated Minute 17 on 23 August 2024 directing the Gore District Council to submit written evidence from appropriate experts outlining planned future activities and use at the East Gore Water Treatment Plant site, its potential adverse effects as identified by the submitters, and steps to be taken to avoid, remedy or mitigate those effects.
12. The evidence provided by GDC consists of a statement from Mr Bayliss who in his previous role was the 3 Waters Asset Manager at the Council and was involved in the submission of the Notice of Requirement (NOR) for the East Gore Water Treatment Plant, and Mr Shanks in relation to noise expertise.
13. Mr Bayliss notes in his evidence that following a major upgrade to the water treatment plant in 2022 there were initial noise exceedances, however mitigation measures to ensure the plant meets the current district plan noise limits were installed. There is potentially a requirement to increase the capacity of the treatment plant, fluoridate the water supply and install additional or improved monitoring equipment at the treatment plant in the future but the treatment plant has been designed with this in mind and due to this, no significant new structures are anticipated to be required at this site in the short to medium term. However, there is a risk that the noise limits may be exceeded when an interconnecting pipeline is installed, and the treatment plant is required to treat a greater volume of water.
14. Mr Shanks have assessed the noise for the aeration tower at the southern boundary of the site which is the most critical noise source and compliance position for the operation of the site. He submits that noise from the aeration process currently complies with the relevant noise limits, and can continue to comply with an increased operating load with a basic upgrade to the mitigation of the tower, and consider that the noise effects are adequately controlled by the operative and proposed District Plan noise limits.
15. Mr Styles has reviewed the acoustic evidence and notes that the PDP noise limits for the General Residential Zone are slightly more restrictive in the daytime than the operative plan limits, and that there are no specific limits designed for network utilities that are located in or close to residential activity. The General Residential Zone noise standards are designed to control noise sources that are anticipated and provided for in the zone and are not specifically designed to control noise from mechanical plant that operate constantly.
16. Mr Styles provides three general options for noise limits and the amenity level at receiving sites, these options are outlined below:

Option 1 – Noise limits of 55dB LAeq during the day and 45dB LAeq at night are the highest acceptable noise limits. These limits are 5dB higher than the PDP noise provisions and the amenity level would be 'low' or 'poor'

Option 2 – 50dB LAeq during the day and 40dB LAeq at night are typical for the zone and are the same as the PDP provisions. The amenity level could be described as ‘moderate’ and the noise from the plant would likely be clear and often prominent feature in the noise environment, in particular in the mornings and evenings.

Option 3 – 50dB LAeq during the day and 35dB LAeq at night. In this option, the daytime noise limit is the same as the PDP provisions but the night time noise limit is 5dB lower. This provides additional benefit for noise sources that are constant, and the amenity level could be described as ‘good’ or ‘very good’.

17. Mr Styles recommends options 2 or 3 are applied in this case and I accept his advice. Option 2 is what is recommended in the Section 42A report, however I agree that the zone noise limits do not anticipate a constant mechanical noise which is characteristic for the zone, and I therefore consider option 3 to be more appropriate to manage the effects on the environment consistent with Section 168A(3).

18. For the above reasons I recommend that amended conditions are imposed on GDC-10, as shown in **Appendix 1**, and as follows:

1. Any emission of artificial outdoor light shall be consistent with LIGHT-R1 permitted activities.
2. The Noise (rating) level and maximum noise level arising from any activity shall not exceed:
 - (a) 7am to 10pm – 50 dB LAeq
 - (b) 10pm to 7am – 35 dB LAeq and 70 dB LAFmaxWhen measured and assessed at or within the boundary of any other site in the GRZ, LLRZ & MRZ.
3. A landscape plan shall be developed for the site by a suitably qualified person, and planting shall be undertaken and maintained in conformity with the plan. The landscaping shall provide visual relief of the facility as viewed from surrounding properties and the road. This plan shall:
 - a) Generally identify areas and the range of species to be planted.
 - b) Identify any restrictions for plantings necessary for the safety and operation of the facility and access.
 - c) Be prepared and submitted for certification to the Gore District Council within six months of the designation being approved.
 - d) Be reviewed at intervals not exceeding five years.