

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF JEREMY TREVATHAN (ACOUSTICS)
ON BEHALF OF PRIMEPORT TIMARU LIMITED
AND TIMARU DISTRICT HOLDINGS LIMITED**

HEARING STREAM F

Dated: 1 May 2025

1. My name is Jeremy William Trevathan. I am the Principal Acoustic Engineer and Director of Acoustic Engineering Services, an acoustic engineering consultancy with offices in Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch.
2. This statement summarises my evidence in chief dated 9 April 2025 on behalf of PrimePort Timaru Limited and Timaru District Holdings Limited, and provides an update on my views following consideration of evidence lodged for other submitters on Hearing F.

PORT NOISE CONTROL BOUNDARIES

3. The Port Noise Control Boundaries have been developed based on the procedure described in the New Zealand Port Noise Standard NZS 6809:1999 and are representative of a realistic future operational scenario for port activities occurring within Precinct 7. An Inner Control Boundary (65 dB Ldn (5day)) and Outer Control Boundary (57 dB Ldn (5 day)) have been proposed (the **Port NCBs**). New noise sensitive activities establishing within the Port NCBs must be provided with sound insulation.
4. There are several submitters (Submitter 38 (G.D.M. Officers Limited) and 202 (22 The Terrace Limited) which dispute the placement of the Outer Control Boundary (**OCB**) over their sites and have supplemented their submissions with further evidence. I have reviewed that evidence, and continue to be of the opinion that the OCB should be as currently drawn.
5. I note that the sites at 12, 14 and 22 The Terrace will be located within the City Centre Zone under the Proposed Timaru District Plan, which requires a higher level of noise insulation than that for Port Noise, in any event.

NOISE-S3 ACOUSTIC INSULATION

6. There is some discussion in the evidence in relation to NOISE-S3 around the use of either an 'internal noise level' or 'façade reduction' approach to determine the extent of acoustic mitigation required for new noise sensitive development. Although both

methods have their pros and cons in various circumstances, in my opinion either approach is suitable in the context of the Port, for achieving the ultimate goal of protecting the Port from reverse sensitivity effects.

NOISE-R8 PORT NOISE PROVISIONS

7. There are several submissions which discuss what noise limits should apply for activities outside Precinct 7, but inside the Port Zone. As outlined in my evidence, in my opinion it would be logical for the noise limits in Table 24 to apply for such activities. However, I agree with Mr Walton and Hay that the situation which this places existing operators in needs to also be considered.

NOISE-R9 / NOISE-S3 ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING DWELLINGS

8. A submission from Rooney Holdings Limited (174.72) has led to a discussion around how noise insulation requirements should be applied for building alterations, and whether the scale of the alteration should affect whether NOISE-R9 applies.
9. The S42A report based on input from Mr Hunt has recommended that a 20% habitable space floor area increase threshold be adopted. This has subsequently been discussed by various parties, including by Dr Chiles on behalf of NZTA (143) and KiwiRail (187), who considers that no demarcation should be made between the scale of alterations, and Mr Pearson on behalf of NZTA who introduces the concept of a '5 m² floor area increase every 10 years' approach – one taken in the Waikato District Plan.
10. I accept Dr Chiles' point that we should take every opportunity to reduce noise effects on people. However, in some scenarios a 'no exemption' approach would genuinely lead to increased building costs, with no perceptible benefit on people. My view on this whole discussion is also influenced by my experience which is that 'small alterations' do not come up for review very frequently (in comparison for requests to review whole new dwellings, or large alterations). Reasons for this may include that for very minor alterations the home owner may not apply for Building Consent at all, or because the cost / benefit of small increases to a building footprint may not stack up, when considering the impact on foundations, waterproofing and complexities of structurally connecting a new and old structure. Where such situations do arise, the circumstances vary, and it is difficult to be certain about what Rule wording would lead to better outcomes on average. Therefore, I have no strong view as to which wording is preferable, from an acoustics perspective.