

Medium Density Plan Change – PC:I - Summary Statement

Sean Syman - Noise

- [1] My name is Sean Syman. My experience and qualifications are set out in the s 42A Report.
- [2] The scope of my engagement and s 42A report was limited to consideration of technical noise related matters arising in the Plan Change I (“**PC:I**”) submissions on MRZ-R2, MRZ-R3 and MRZ-S21 specifically:
- (a) S184 from Chris Teo-Sherrell;
 - (b) S185 from Phocus Planning Limited; and
 - (c) S199 from Kāinga Ora.

Submission S184 – Chris Teo-Sherrell

- [3] Submission S184 from Chris Teo-Sherrell seeks amendments to how the Residential Noise Limits of R10.8.1 should apply for MRZ-R2 for Home Businesses and MRZ-R3 for Home-based childcare services. The amendments sought for MRZ-R2 and MRZ-R3 in the submission are summarised as follows:
- (a) A reduction in the permitted daytime hours from 7am – 10pm Monday to Saturday to 7am – 7pm Monday to Friday.
 - (b) A maximum noise limit (L_{max}) to apply for daytime activities as well as night-time activities.
 - (c) The noise limits of R10.8.1 to be applied not only to fixed mechanical plant but also to non-fixed machines and the activities of people, with short term exclusions allowed for certain activities.
- [4] I attended a pre-hearing meeting with Mr Teo-Sherrell on 14 August 2025, along with Ms Jenkin and Mr Mori, to discuss Mr Teo-Sherrell’s submission in more detail and noise management within the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone (“**MRZ**”). I understand Mr Teo-Sherrell’s concerns with regards to noise are that residential intensification will result in more hard surfaces reflecting sound with fewer noise absorbing surfaces, and that more people within the area would result in more noise generation. Mr Teo-Sherrell also considers that the existing Residential noise rules lack nuance with regards to the types of noise and noise generating activities within the Residential Zone. Mr Teo-Sherrell therefore considers that more restrictive noise limits should be applied in the MRZ.

- [5] I consider the existing Residential noise limits in R10.8.1 are appropriate for the MRZ. I note that the proposed R10.8.1 limits are more restrictive than the Guideline Residential Upper Noise Limits provided in 8.6.2 Table 3 of NZS 6802:2008 – Acoustics: Environmental Noise. NZS 6802:2008 recommends an upper guideline daytime noise limit of 55 dB $L_{Aeq(15min)}$, and an upper evening (7pm – 10pm) noise limit of 50 dB $L_{Aeq(15min)}$. R10.8.1 has a daytime noise level of 45 dB $L_{Aeq(15min)}$ (10 dB lower), and no evening noise level limit. I note that the existing R10.8.1 limits are also more stringent than commonly applied in other District Plans, where the daytime residential noise limit is 50 dB $L_{Aeq(15min)}$ (7am – 7pm) with an evening noise limit of 45 dB $L_{Aeq(15min)}$ (7pm – 10pm), some examples being New Plymouth, Wairarapa, Porirua and Wellington.
- [6] Maximum noise limits (L_{max}) are most commonly set during night-time hours to manage potential sleep disturbance effects, in combination with lower average (L_{Aeq}) noise level limits. I do not agree that a daytime L_{max} limit is appropriate in this instance as the average noise limit is already lower than common. Introducing a daytime L_{max} limit would also add a level of complexity to acoustic assessments and greater restrictions on the daytime operation of activities under MRZ-R2 and MRZ-R3.
- [7] R10.8.1 applies to sound emission from any fixed mechanical plant or from any non-residential activity, and this includes noise from mobile equipment or activities of people related to the operation of home businesses or home-based childcare services. Any activities related to construction or demolition are separately assessed and measured with respect to *NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics – Construction Noise* under Rule 6.2.6.2(g). In the case of noise from typical residential activities (such as lawn mowing or other day to day maintenance activities), the overarching requirement of the Section 16 of the RMA, the duty to avoid unreasonable noise, applies.
- [8] I do not consider that any changes to MRZ-R2 or MRZ-R3 are required based on Submission 184 from Chris Teo-Sherrell with regards to noise, as I consider the residential noise rules and limits in R10.8.1 are already more restrictive than is typical.

Submissions 185 and 199 – MRZ-S21

- [9] I set out my opinions regarding Submission 185 from Phocus Planning and Submission 199 from Kāinga Ora in my s 42A report. I have seen no further evidence provided by either submitter which would change my view. I remain of the opinion that no change is required to this standard for the reasons set out in my s 42A report.

Dated: 29 August 2025