

UNDER the Resource Management Act
1991 ("**RMA**")

IN THE MATTER of the Proposed Porirua District
Plan

HEARING TOPIC Hearing Stream 4 - Noise

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF JON ROBERT STYLES ON BEHALF OF
KĀINGA ORA-HOMES AND COMMUNITIES**

NOISE AND VIBRATION

11 February 2022

**ELLIS GOULD
LAWYERS
AUCKLAND**

**Level 17 Vero Centre
48 Shortland Street, Auckland
Tel: 09 307 2172 / Fax: 09 358 5215
PO Box 1509
DX CP22003
AUCKLAND**

REF: Douglas Allan / Alex Devine

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Jon Robert Styles. My experience, qualifications and involvement in the Porirua District Plan review process is set out in my evidence in chief (**EiC**).
- 1.2 This statement sets out a summary of the main issues raised in my EiC, my statement of Rebuttal Evidence and the Joint Witness Statement prepared by Dr Chiles, Mr Lloyd and myself (the **JWS**). I also briefly respond to the legal submissions submitted on behalf of KiwiRail and Waka Kotahi.
- 1.3 I remain of the views expressed in my EiC and rebuttal evidence. I do not resile from any points made in those statements.

2. SUMMARY OF POSITION ON KEY MATTERS

Road noise mapping

- 2.1 In my view, a noise mapping process is required to accurately inform the PDP provisions. I note that Dr Chiles and Mr Lloyd record their agreement with me in the JWS.
- 2.2 Noise mapping will ensure that the rules apply only to land that is expected to be affected by noise above an identified level. The “standard” distances set out in the JWS (e.g.: a 100 m wide area alongside a corridor) are sufficiently wide in my opinion to ensure that the controls capture all or most of the receivers that would potentially be exposed to noise levels above the health-based criteria. The problem with this approach, however, is that it will also include a large number of receivers where noise levels are lower due to a number of factors including screening and topography. I consider that these fixed distances are likely to be highly inefficient and will place an unnecessary burden on large areas of land / development that are not exposed to noise levels above the relevant noise level.
- 2.3 I consider that noise mapping is especially important given the upcoming changes to the noise generated by the network as a result of the Transmission Gully project opening. I understand that the opening of the Transmission Gully project will significantly reduce traffic flows through SH59 and therefore the noise levels into the community. I consider that the provisions in the PDP should recognise this.

- 2.4 I note that Waka Kotahi have provided traffic flow predictions and noise level predictions for their network once Transmission Gully is open through the NoR process for the Transmission Gully project. In my opinion the noise mapping should take into account the post-Transmission Gully environment.

Rail noise mapping

- 2.5 As with road noise, I consider that the noise generated by trains on the rail network should be mapped and these maps used to define the extent of the rail noise controls.

Road and rail vibration

- 2.6 My EiC and Rebuttal Evidence makes it clear that in my opinion, robust and relevant technical evidence and data is required to:

- (a) Quantify the extent of rail vibration by robust and relevant vibration measurements.
- (b) Quantify whether vibration from traffic on state highways is likely to extend beyond the road corridor to the extent that provisions controlling development in the receiving environment are necessary, following the adoption of the BPO to manage the effects at the source.

- 2.7 I have reviewed the evidence from Waka Kotahi and KiwiRail and in my view it does not provide such technical data.

- 2.8 I agree with Mr Lloyd that the rail vibration controls are likely to create a significant hurdle or barrier to new development when applied in practice. I consider that management and mitigation at the source is the most appropriate method to control vibration from road and rail.

- 2.9 Any controls in the PDP should be based on the effects arising after the BPO has been adopted to minimise the effects inside the road and rail corridors.

Mechanical ventilation

- 2.10 The evidence of Mr Lloyd states that clause G4 of the Building Code is sufficient to achieve adequate fresh air and thermal comfort for the occupants of noise

sensitive activities that have to keep their windows and doors closed to reduce the noise level from state highways or rail to a reasonable level¹.

- 2.11 The evidence of Dr Chiles is that additional controls on mechanical ventilation and fresh air supply are necessary (over and above clause G4 of the Building Code)². I agree in principle with Dr Chiles.

3. LEGAL SUBMISSIONS FROM WAKA KOTAHI

- 3.1 I have read the legal submissions submitted on behalf of Waka Kotahi (the **Waka Kotahi submissions**) and KiwiRail. I am concerned that the Waka Kotahi submissions mischaracterise my views in some respects.

- 3.2 With respect to paragraph 6.2(c) of the Waka Kotahi submissions, the JWS records my view regarding the distance that might be adopted if the fixed distance approach is used. I remain of the view expressed in my EiC and Rebuttal Statement that a fixed distance approach is not appropriate.

- 3.3 With respect to paragraph 6.2(a) of the Waka Kotahi submissions, I consider that the absence of any attempt to control existing effects is a problem. As I have set out in my EiC and my Rebuttal Evidence, I consider that the BPO needs to be adopted inside the transport corridors to minimise the significant adverse effects on existing houses arising from high levels of noise from the transport networks (for example, slowing down freight trains at night through residential areas).

Jon Robert Styles

11 February 2022

¹ Paragraph 31, Mr Lloyd EiC

² Paragraph 7.16, Dr Chiles EiC