

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan –
Chapter 36 – Noise, Hearing Stream T05.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE - SEAN DENT ON BEHALF OF TOTALLY TOURISM
LIMITED (#571) & SKYLINE ENTERPRISES LIMITED (#574)**

Dated: 15th September 2016

SOUTHERN PLANNING GROUP

Resource Management Consultants

PO Box 1081

QUEENSTOWN

Phone: (03) 409 0140

Fax: (03) 409 0145



INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. My name is Sean Dent. I am a resource management planning consultant with Southern Planning Group and I am here today presenting expert planning evidence on behalf of Totally Tourism Limited and Skyline Enterprises Limited.
- 1.2. The primary matters which have been addressed in my pre-circulated evidence relate to the inclusion of NZS 6807:1994 *Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas* in Table 2 Rule 36.5.13 of the PDP Noise Chapter and the identification of a site specific noise limit for helicopter operations at the Skyline heli pad.
- 1.3. With respect to the PDP provisions for assessment of helicopter noise I agree with the Council's approach to recognise and stipulate through proposed Rule 36.5.13 that NZS 6807:1994 is the most appropriate acoustic standard by which to assess the impulsive sound emitted by helicopters.
- 1.4. As noted within my pre-circulated evidence, NZS 6807:1994 has been the acoustic standard recommended and used by all of the acoustic consultants I have worked with in regards to helicopter landing area resource consents within the Queenstown Lakes District and further afield such as Mackenzie and Westland Districts. While these consultants are not here today presenting expert evidence I have read and agree with the expert evidence of Dr Chiles which supports the views of the acoustic consultants that I have worked with.
- 1.5. I have acknowledged the limitations of NZS 6807:1994 with respect to sites that are utilised for very few landings and specifically, that NZS 6807:1994 can understate the noise effects in these scenarios. However, I concur with Dr Chiles at paragraph 13.12 of his evidence where he notes that the proposed Rule 36.5.13 does not work in isolation but alongside the proposed informal airport rules in Chapter 21 of the PDP. These rules include other tools to remedy this effect such as a limitation on the number of daily flights and a minimum setback distance from residential units, building platforms and other Zone boundaries.
- 1.6. Collectively, NZS 6807:1994 in proposed Rule 36.5.13 and the informal airports rules in Chapter 21 of the PDP provide a far more efficient and effective management regime for helicopter landings and assessment of noise than the ODP noise rules which don't have the scope to consider helicopter noise and as a result of PC27A, are incredibly ambiguous.

- 1.7. With respect to the imposition of site specific noise limit for the Skyline helipad neither Dr Chiles nor Ms Evans consider it appropriate to impose a site specific noise limit. This would appear to be largely because the limit sought (65 dB L_{dn}) is greater than that which was ultimately approved by the Environment Court. I agree it would not be appropriate to impose a noise limit in excess of the Environment Court's recommendations and have therefore recommended the limit be reduced to 60 dB L_{dn}.
- 1.8. As identified in paragraphs 50 – 53 of my pre-circulated evidence there is no guidance in the ODP or PDP noise rules of an appropriate helicopter noise limit for a commercial recreation reserve. In addition, the Designation conditions, the Ben Lomond and Queenstown Hill Reserve Management Plan and NZS 6807:1994 do not provide any guidance of an appropriate helicopter noise limit for a commercial recreation reserve.
- 1.9. Accordingly, it is my opinion that it would be erroneous of the Council not to impose a noise limit specified as appropriate for this incredibly unique site by the Environment Court.
- 1.10. Relying on the existing noise limit in proposed Rule 36.5.13 for this site would mean having to apply the limits of acceptability from NZS 6807:1994 for a residential area in which the Skyline heli pad clearly does not sit.
- 1.11. My proposed re-drafted Rule refers to assessment of sound from a helicopter landing area in the Ben Lomond Recreation or Scenic Reserves. I acknowledge that this is a very broad area but have outlined at paragraphs 60 – 63 of my pre-circulated evidence as to how a proliferation of helicopter landing areas (and therefore cumulative helicopter noise emissions) is highly unlikely under the Reserves Act 1977 and Conservation Act 1987.
- 1.12. Overall, subject to the amendments discussed herein and those in my primary brief of evidence I consider that the provisions of the PDP are an appropriate response to the assessment of helicopter noise emissions within the Queenstown Lakes District. I am happy to answer questions from the commissioner that are within my area of expertise.