

**BEFORE THE CHRISTCHURCH REPLACEMENT  
DISTRICT PLAN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management  
Act 1991 and the Canterbury  
Earthquake (Christchurch  
Replacement District Plan) Order  
2014

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Specific Purpose Ruapuna  
Proposal (Stage 3)

---

**STATEMENT OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF STUART CAMP  
ON BEHALF OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

**NOISE**

**13 May 2016**

---

 **Simpson Grierson**  
Barristers & Solicitors

D J Laing / H P Harwood  
Telephone: +64-4-499-4599  
Facsimile: +64-4-472-6986  
Email: [hamish.harwood@simpsongrierson.com](mailto:hamish.harwood@simpsongrierson.com)  
PO Box 2402  
WELLINGTON 6140

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My name is Stuart Camp. I am a principal in the national acoustical consulting firm of Marshall Day Acoustics. I hold a Science degree from Auckland University, majoring in Mathematics and Acoustics. I have worked in the field of acoustics with Marshall Day Acoustics for the last 32 years. I established the Christchurch office in 1997.

1.2 I have previously given evidence to the panel in relation to noise on a number of other chapters of the replacement plan.

1.3 My specific experience relevant to the preparation of noise rules includes:

- (a) Kiwirail Reverse Sensitivity Guidelines: Development of reverse sensitivity guidelines for rail noise in New Zealand;
- (b) Ashburton District Plan: Complete review and rewrite of District Plan Noise Rules, including presentations to Council, review of submissions, reporting, and hearings;
- (c) Hurunui District Frost Fans: Development of noise rules for frost fans, including reverse sensitivity provisions;
- (d) Ashburton Industrial Zone: Plan change to create new business park adjacent to established rural residential properties;
- (e) Invercargill District Plan. Detailed city-wide review and measurement of noise issues, revision of noise rules, and review of submissions;
- (f) Southland District Plan: Brief review of noise rules;; and
- (g) Christchurch Entertainment Noise: Review of central city noise provisions, and preliminary drafting of new rules.

1.4 I have also been involved in a number of projects involving noise at Ports, including:

- (a) Pacifica Shipping: Monitoring of ship unloading noise, and mitigation advice at Lyttelton Port;
- (b) Ravensdown Fertiliser: Detailed assessment of proposed 24 hour ship unloading operation, including measurements and mitigation; and
- (c) Port Otago: Detailed mitigation investigation for affected dwellings adjacent to Port Chalmers.

1.5 Of particular relevance to this proposal, I assisted the Council with the development of Plan Change 52, including meetings with all parties, preparation of the notified noise limits, and evidence at the Plan Change hearing. I continued on through the Environment Court process, attending all meetings of the working group, assisting with

the development of the noise management plan, and presenting evidence at the Environment Court hearing.

**1.6** I acknowledge that I have read and am familiar with the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses, contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014, and agree to comply with it. Other than where I state that I am relying on the advice of another person, I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

**2. SCOPE**

**2.1** My rebuttal evidence is provided in response to the evidence in chief filed by Quieter Please on 9 May 2016.

**3. ZONE NOISE LIMITS**

**3.1** A number of the issues raised by Quieter Please are addressed by the proposed rules for "all other activities" given in Table 4. The noise limits for these activities are essentially identical to the usual noise limits for rural and residential zones in Table 1 of Rule 6.1.4.1.1.1. I have summarised the maximum permitted noise limits from both rules below:

Rule	Daytime		Night-time	
	L <sub>Aeq</sub>	L <sub>Amax</sub>	L <sub>Aeq</sub>	L <sub>Amax</sub>
Specific Purpose Zone (Ruapuna) Table 4	50	75	40	65
Proposed General Rules for rural and residential zones, Table 1 of Rule 6.1.4.1.1.1	50	-	40	65

**3.2** As can be seen, the only difference between the Ruapuna noise limit and the proposed noise limit for all rural and residential zones is that the Ruapuna rules retain a daytime L<sub>Amax</sub> control. This control has been removed from all other zones in the district.

**3.3** All activities at Ruapuna that are not specifically provided for on the racetrack will have to comply with the Table 4 noise limits. This means that noise from these activities will be no louder than any other permitted activity on other sites which border rural zones. In addition, these activities will be much quieter than the permitted on-track activities,

and are unlikely to be heard at neighbouring dwellings given the relatively large separation distances.

- 3.4** If any of the proposed additional activities were to breach these noise limits, the activity would require consent as a discretionary activity under rule 21.10.2.3.4 D1.

#### **4. FABRICATION AND REPAIR FACILITIES**

- 4.1** Quieter Please are concerned about likely noise effects arising from fabrication and repair facilities at Ruapuna.

- 4.2** Based on my experience, I expect there to be two aspects to this type of work.

- 4.3** First, there will be workshop based activities. While this could theoretically involve some relatively noisy engineering type work, all this activity will need to comply with the stringent Table 4 noise limits discussed above. This will require all such activities to be undertaken within buildings, and any noise effects will be minimal.

- 4.4** Secondly, there will be some engine testing. Any testing within the workshop will need to comply with the Table 4 noise limits. Any testing on the track will be controlled by the rules for track-based activities. Given that Ruapuna is the only major race track in Christchurch, I expect that such testing will happen at Ruapuna irrespective of where the repairs take place, and as such, this activity does not constitute an additional source of noise.

#### **5. GO KARTS**

- 5.1** I support the proposal to include go-karts in the definition of Motorised Sports Facility. I consider it appropriate to ensure that a definition of this sort applies to all facilities in Christchurch, and therefore should include reference to go-karts. I do not expect this inclusion to result in any additional noise from Ruapuna.

- 5.2** There is currently no go-kart track at Ruapuna. If go-karts were allowed on the main track, they would be controlled by the same rules that apply to any other motorised activity. In addition, go-karts are quieter than most full sized racing vehicles, and the overall noise level during go-kart activity would therefore be lower than other typical days.

**5.3** If a new go kart track was to be constructed at Ruapuna, the Table 4 noise rules would apply. I do not expect go-kart activity to be able to comply with these stringent limits, and a resource consent would therefore be required.

## **6. FUNCTIONS**

**6.1** As with my earlier discussion, any functions at Ruapuna would be subject to the stringent Table 4 noise limits. As such, I would not expect functions to be noticeable at neighbouring dwellings.

**6.2** The only possible noise concern associated with functions would be additional traffic generated on the surrounding road network. I understand that functions are limited to no more than 100 people and are restricted to the period between 0700 and 2300.

**6.3** Based on the evidence of Mr Milne, such functions are likely to generate between 33 and 100 vehicle movements during the night-time as attendees depart. It is reasonable to assume that almost all of these departures would occur within one hour.

**6.4** Despite both Haskett and Barters Road both being relatively low volume roads, I do not expect any significant noise effects from this volume of evening traffic.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Stuart Camp', with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the left.

**STUART CAMP**

**13 May 2016**