

**Before the Hearings Panel  
At Waimakariri District Council**

**Under** the Resource Management Act 1991

**In the matter of** the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

---

**Joint Witness Statement – NOISE McAlpines**

**Date: 15 November 2023**

---

## **INTRODUCTION:**

- 1 This Joint Witness Statement (JWS) relates to expert conferencing on noise with respect to the submission from McAlpines requesting a Timber Processing Noise Contour around their site in Southbrook.
- 2 The following participants were involved in this conferencing and authored this JWS:
  - (a) Stuart Camp, for Waimakariri District Council, and
  - (b) William Reeve for McAlpines.
- 3 Mr Camp and Mr Reeve have communicated by email on several occasions, in order to produce the information required for this JWS.
- 4 In preparing this statement, the experts have read and understand the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses as included in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2023<sup>1</sup>.

## **PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF CONFERENCING:**

- 5 The conferencing was focused on matters relating to a noise contour requested in the submission by McAlpines.
- 6 We have been advised that discussion about whether a noise rule should accompany the contour is out of scope, given this was not sought in the McAlpines submission.
- 7 This joint witness statement addresses the issue of the validity and appropriateness of the noise contour requested by McAlpines.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.environmentcourt.govt.nz/assets/Practice-Note-2023-.pdf>

## **MATTERS THAT THE EXPERTS AGREE ON:**

### ***Modelled contours***

- 8           The noise contour provided by Mr Reeve in evidence was primarily based on noise monitoring at two key locations within property owned by McAlpines.
- 9           The contour used the noise monitoring data to produce a reasonably simple computer model of the site.
- 10          To ensure that the noise contour forms an appropriate basis for controlling reverse sensitivity effects, Mr Camp requested additional information from McAlpines. In particular, he requested additional noise monitoring, particularly at the western and northern extents of the proposed contour.
- 11          Mr Reeve has provided the requested data for review by Mr Camp. In addition, Mr Reeve has now prepared a more detailed computer model of the McAlpines site. The 55 dB noise contour generated by this model is shown in Appendix A attached, on the same plan as the contour provided in evidence.

### ***Site Operation***

- 12          Mr Camp also requested information on the major items of equipment in use at the McAlpines site, including broad details of any noise control treatment present. This information was sought to ensure that McAlpines are adopting industry best practice in controlling noise emissions, such that the requested noise contour is reasonable.
- 13          Mr Camp has reviewed details of McAlpines equipment and operation provided by Mr Reeve, including detailed photos. He has also viewed the site from the surrounding roads. He is satisfied that the site is being operated in general accordance with industry best practice, and as such, the noise contour is reasonable.

- 14 McAlpines have taken steps to manage the potential for reverse sensitivity, and control noise emissions from their site, including purchasing buffer land around the sawmill. Mr Reeve is working with McAlpines on noise management on the site, including a trial of non-tonal reversing beepers, and implementing a Noise Management Plan. However, we agree that these would not significantly change the extent of the contour shown.

***Reverse sensitivity***

- 15 We agree that it is appropriate to control potential noise sensitive dwellings encroaching on the McAlpines site, in order to protect their existing sawmilling operations.
- 16 We agree that any contour for this purpose should be based on actual noise levels. For this site, a location that represents the 55 dB  $L_{Aeq}(15\text{ min})$  daytime noise emissions assessed in accordance with NZS 6802:2008 would be an appropriate threshold to commence such controls.
- 17 There is very good agreement between the original contour and the detailed contour which includes further calibration points from the additional monitoring. On this basis we agree that the contour originally supplied in Mr Reeves evidence represents a reasonable location for a control boundary.
- 18 The noise contour would be best called "Timber Processing Noise Contour" or similar, as requested by McAlpines. There should not be any reference to noise level attached to the contour line.
- 19 We agree that it is appropriate to restrict the construction of new noise sensitive activities within the proposed contour.

**MATTERS THAT THE EXPERTS DISAGREE ON:**

- 20 There are no matters of disagreement.

**Date:** 15 November 2023

**Signatories**



.....  
**STUART CAMP – FOR WAIMAKARIRI  
DISTRICT COUNCIL**



.....  
**WILLIAM REEVE – FOR McALPINES**

APPENDIX A – MODELLED NOISE CONTOURS

