

11 April 2022

Terra Consultants  
PO Box 5028  
Frankton  
Hamilton 3242

**Digitally Delivered**

Dear Chris

### **Resource Consent Application – Further information request**

**Application number:** LU/0323/21  
**Applicant:** Global Contracting Solutions Limited  
**Address:** 401 Racecourse Road, Te Awamutu  
**Proposed activity(s):** Construct and operate plant to generate power through combustion of refuse derived fuel

Further to my previous letter dated 4 March 2022, following a review of the acoustic assessment by Council's consultant, Hegley Acoustic, the following further information is requested under section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991 to enable an accurate and informed assessment to be undertaken.

The reasons for requesting the information and further discussion / context for the requests made are contained in the letter from Hegley Acoustic dated 8 April 2022, attached for your information.

The following information is requested. Note that the below items are numbered to carry on from the letter dated 4 March 2022:

#### **8. Acoustic effects**

##### ***Construction effects***

8.1. Please provide further comment on noise effects associated with the formation of the accessway, including the noise levels to the receivers on the opposite side of Racecourse Road.

##### ***Application of the Best Practicable Option during construction***

8.2. With reference to Sections 16 and 17 of the Resource Management Act 1991, please provide comment on the application of the best practicable option and in particular:

- a) Given that driven piles are significantly noisier than bored piles and that it is often the case that bored piles are a suitable alternative, are driven piles consistent with the best practicable option?
- b) Given that barriers are proposed to line the entrance way for the control of operational noise, is their installation prior to the earthworks for the accessway being undertaken consistent with the best practicable option?

### ***Operational Effects***

- 8.3. Can SLR confirm that noise from the substation does not contain a special audible characteristic?
- 8.4. SLR identify several sources as having a special audible characteristic. Can SLR please confirm how they have implemented the penalty that NZS 6802 attributes to such sounds? In particular, have they added the penalty to the individual source with the special audible characteristic or have they added the penalty to the overall noise from the site at each receiver?
- 8.5. In section 6.3.5, SLR report vehicle movements per hour, both in terms of peak traffic and again as an average before stating it is the average movements they have used for analysis. For example, for the Heavy Production Motor Vehicles, they report 10 movements (arrivals and departures) during the peak hour but have modelled an average of 4 movements.
  - a) Please explain why the averaging method differs from that described by NZS 6802? This question relates to the fact that the approach adopted averages traffic noise rather than plant noise.
  - b) Please confirm that the average noise level reported in Table 10 will not be more than 5dB below the noise level from the site during the hour of peak traffic flow?
- 8.6. SLR has considered the potential future development of the racecourse. The assessment point of these future dwellings is reported as being 50m from the site boundary. Can SLR confirm whether this is an assumed distance to allow for analysis or is it based on a provision of the WDP? If the 50m was reduced, what effect would it have on the assessment? Does the WDP permit two storey houses and, if so, was the Racing Club receiver modelled as a two storey dwelling? Would a two storey receiver be protected by the 1.8m barrier proposed for this boundary?

### ***Mitigation***

- 8.7. Given a 3.5m barrier is considered appropriate for the southern side of the accessway, can SLR comment on whether increasing the northern barrier above 2.5m would provide a better solution for the northern dwelling?
- 8.8. Did SLR investigate taller barriers to the southern side of the accessway to achieve a daytime level of 50dB  $L_{Aeq}$  to the upper floor of 381 Racecourse Road?

### **Noise Levels**

8.9. The Assessment points out that the major contributor to the receivers about the accessway is vehicles on the accessway. Could SLR please include the dwellings on the opposite side of Racecourse Road immediately adjacent to the accessway in their assessment (382 and 400 Racecourse Road)?

### **Noise Assessment**

8.10. With reference to assessment criterion 21.1.7.13(a), SLR identify the heavy vehicles using the accessway as the source of non-compliance with the daytime limit and limit their discussion to those vehicles in particular. In responding to the time that the activity occurs, SLR note that trucks will not visit the site during the night time. While this is correct, and is reported as being for the mitigation of noise effects, I do not believe that it is a mitigating factor for the daytime levels, which is what is being discussed. Could SLR please elaborate on their response to part (a).

8.11. With reference to assessment criterion 21.1.7.13(b), SLR note that the reported levels would be temporary and intermittent as truck movements are not continuous. Ignoring private vehicle movements and trucks exporting recycled material from site, there are reported to be 260 truck movements daily, or approximately one truck passing every 2 minutes 20 seconds. This would indicate that the accessway is reasonably busy which, combined with the fact that the reported level is the average noise over the day (and not the noise from a single truck passing) leads to the query for SLR to provide future comment on this issue.

8.12. With reference to assessment criterion 21.1.7.13(c), please comment on the following:

- a) Given that SLR report the level of noise to 381 and 417 Racecourse Road is currently controlled by the activities of Fonterra, should the Assessment consider the cumulative effects from both activities, as it is this cumulative level that the neighbours will experience?
- b) Can SLR provide an assessment of the predicted levels against the current ambient sound levels, particularly the  $L_{A90}$ ?
- c) If the ambient sound to 417 Racecourse Road is controlled by Fonterra, will the result of MP1 be representative of the ambient sound once the 2.5m tall accessway barrier is installed and which may screen the dwelling from Fonterra?

### **Next steps**

The next steps in terms of process are as set out in the original request for further information dated 4 March 2022.

If you are not sure how to respond, please call me and we can discuss your options.

Yours Sincerely



Aidan Kirkby-McLeod  
**Project Planner**