

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF TIMOTHY CARR WALSH
ON BEHALF OF PRIMEPORT TIMARU LIMITED
AND TIMARU DISTRICT HOLDINGS LIMITED**

HEARING STREAM F

Dated: 6 June 2025

-
1. My name is Tim Walsh. I am a consultant planner practicing with Novo Group Limited in Christchurch.
 2. My evidence relates to the submissions and further submissions of PrimePort Timaru Ltd and Timaru District Land Holdings on the Proposed Timaru District Plan.
 3. This statement provides a response to the Panel's invitation to confirm whether I adopt the s32 report relevant to the Noise chapter in support of my recommendations and provide any further comment or s32AA analysis I consider necessary.

NOISE S32 REPORT

4. The Panel's Minute 34 notes the following as relevant to this statement:

The Panel has reviewed the TDC s32 Noise Report and the technical reports prepared by AES and Mr Malcom Hunt, available on the Council website and attached to evidence. The Panel observes that despite the detailed technical reports which support the use of the Noise Control Boundary (NCB), the s32 Noise evaluation is high level and covers a range of noise topics. The technical reports and the s32 evaluation do not expressly consider the costs of the proposal to owners of properties within the NCB. The Panel asked Mr Walsh if he adopted the TDC s32 evaluation for the purposes of his evidence. Mr Walsh advised he had reviewed the reports but would like an opportunity to reconsider them before confirming he adopts the reports in support of his recommendations.

5. After thoroughly reviewing the Noise s32 report, I confirm that I support its findings where applicable to the Port NCB. Given its district-wide scope and coverage of multiple noise-related issues, it is understandably relatively high level. I would not expect it to provide extensive detail on what I understand to be relatively minor additional costs associated with the NCB noise insulation requirements, which would affect only a small number of properties. Relevantly, the s32 includes the following in respect of the economic costs (see page 26):

The proposed acoustic insulation requirements will add additional costs to new buildings and alterations to existing buildings used for noise sensitive activities.

Achievement of the proposed 35 dB requirement is estimated to represent about 10-15% of the build cost for a standard habitable room.

6. In respect of City Centre zoned properties that also fall within the Port NCB, I refer to my summary statement which notes that the acoustic insulation requirements for the City Centre Zone impose a higher standard than those within the NCB. As a result, the NCB does not practically introduce any additional cost for these properties. Notably, these properties make up a significant portion of the total number affected by the NCB.
7. Additionally, in respect of the Medium Density Residential Zone affected by the Port NCB (The Terrace) and the Mixed Use Zone similarly affected at Turnbull Street, it appears that all but seven sites in those two zones are within 40m of the railway line and therefore subject to acoustic insulation requirements in respect of that infrastructure¹. For the General Residential Zone to the north/northwest of the PORTZ that is affected by the Port NCB, the very large majority of those sites are similarly affected either by state highway acoustic insulation requirements and/or railway line insulation requirements. There is likely only one property² in the General Residential Zone that is not affected by rail or state highway noise³. Regardless, I am confident that very few sites within the district are subject to acoustic insulation requirements resulting from the Port NCB alone.
8. Further, it is important to highlight that the potential reverse sensitivity costs for the Port – and their broader economic impact on the district – are significantly greater than the insulation expenses borne by landowners within the NCB.

¹ Refer Rule NOISE-R9, NOISE-S3 (notified version).

² 20 Richmond Street, Timaru.

³ Without sourcing the titles for the larger multi-unit sites to determine whether they meet the District Plan definition of a site in their entirety, I cannot confirm this with absolute certainty.