BEFORE THE HUTT CITY COUNCIL

Proposed District Hearings Panel

IN THE MATTER	of the Resource Management Act 1991
AND	
IN THE MATTER	of the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan, **Hearing Stream 7**

EXPERT EVIDENCE OF JAMIE EXETER ON BEHALF OF WINSTONE AGGREGATES (ACOUSTICS & VIBRATION)

Dated 19 November 2026

PHERNNE TANCOCK

Barrister, Harbour Chambers
phernne.tancock@legalchambers.co.nz
+64 21 496 823
+64 4 992 684

Comments in response to Minute 22 from Jamie Exeter, acoustics & vibration expert, on behalf of Winstone Aggregates

1. Minute 22 sets out the following requests under items 18 and 19:

> *18. Mr Exeter is requested to consider the difference between the noise measuring points for the Quarry Zone under the Operative District Plan provisions and consider any implications arising from the proposed changes to the noise measuring points under the Proposed District Plan, particularly with respect to the 1 decibel effective difference.*
> *19. We also request that Mr Exeter reviews section 5.0 of the joint memorandum provided by Mr Hunt and Mr Davis and to provide any comments on this matter within two weeks of the date of this minute.*

Noise measuring points

2. My understanding of the Operative District Plan (**ODP**) and Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) assessment locations (noise measuring points) is:
    a) ODP: '*anywhere within a residential or rural activity area*' as stated in 14.C.2.1.8.
    b) PDP: '*at the boundary of, or outside, the Quarry Zone*' as stated in NOISE-APP1.

3. I do not consider there to be any material difference between the assessment locations under the ODP and PDP. I therefore do not consider the assessment locations under the respective plans to have any implication on determining the numerical noise limits.
4. Mr Heffernan will address the appropriate interpretation of the ODP standard 14.C.2.1.8 in planning evidence.

Review of joint memorandum

5. Section 5.2 of the joint memorandum of Stephen Davis and Malcolm Hunt states, '*the Operative District Plan sets a 70 dB LA10 noise limit which applies at the quarry boundary with either State Highway 2 or 58 (depending on which quarry)*'. [1]

[1] *Initial Reply Memorandum of Stephen Davis and Malcolm Hunt, Noise and Acoustics*, 19 October 2026

6. The application of the assessment locations at the State Highway boundaries is different to how I have interpreted the rule in my previous assessments and evidence (see Paragraph 2).

7. Adopting the State Highway boundaries as assessment locations would present the following issues:

    a) Quarry noise could not be reliably monitored at the assessment locations due to heavy contamination by road traffic noise.

    b) The noise limits would only apply where there are no noise sensitive receivers.

    c) There would be no noise controls for the noise sensitive receivers nearest to the activities in the northern portion of Belmont Quarry.

8. Mr Hunt states in Section 5.5 of the Initial Reply Memorandum of Stephen Davis and Malcolm Hunt that changing the PDP permitted noise limit from 67 dB $L_{Aeq(15\ min)}$ to 68 dB $L_{Aeq(15\ min)}$ would result in very minor, if not insignificant, adverse noise effects. I agree with Mr Hunt.

9. A difference of 1 dB can however make a difference to design work and compliance monitoring.

10. In my opinion, retaining 67 dB $L_{Aeq(15\ min)}$ would result in a standard that is approximately 1 dB more stringent than the equivalent limit derived from the ODP framework. I have not identified an acoustic effects reason for imposing that additional reduction.

11. I therefore remain of the opinion that the PDP permitted noise limit should be increased by 1 dB to become 68 dB L_{Aeq} to account for the difference between applying the 1991 and 2008 versions of NZS 6802.



JAMIE EXETER

Dated 19 November 2026