

BEFORE SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of a Resource Consent Application by RC185627 and a change of  
Resource Consent RC192408-414 by Fulton Hogan Ltd

---

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF JEREMY WILLIAM TREVATHAN

DATED 11 December 2019

---

## INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Jeremy Trevathan. I am an Acoustic Engineer and Director of Acoustic Engineering Services Limited, an acoustic engineering consultancy with offices in Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch. I have set out my qualifications and experience in my Statement of Evidence dated 2 September 2019.
2. I participated in conferencing with the other acoustics experts, which resulted in a Joint Witness Statement (JWS) dated 6 November 2019.
3. Many matters have been agreed between the noise experts. This statement only comments of the remaining areas of disagreement, which were described in paragraphs 14 to 20 of the JWS.

## AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT

### *Tonal alarms on site*

4. I consider that tonal alarms should not be used on site. However I accept that if it is determined that the evidence regarding how infrequently tonal alarms are expected to be used is compelling, a condition which still permits tonal alarms during the daytime (for trucks not owned by Fulton Hogan) may be appropriate.

### *Management plans*

5. I do not consider a specific condition allowing the Community Liaison Group (CLG) to comment on drafts of the Noise Management Plan to be necessary. The CLG process will allow the operator to 'talk to the people' and gather concerns and feedback. It is appropriate for quarry and noise experts to then devise the technical measures that may need to be integrated into the Noise Management Plan in response.

### *Mobile processing plant*

6. Noise from any mobile processing plant, when considered cumulatively along with whatever other activity may be underway on the site at the time, is required to comply with the operational noise limits. Whether this is the case will depend on many variables (including the noise level and proposed location of a specific configuration of mobile crushing plant), which will need to be analysed at the time any mobile plant is to be deployed. In this context I did not consider a specific increased arbitrary setback is necessary. However, I understand the Applicant has now agreed to restrict the location of mobile processing plant further.

### *Off-site trucks*

7. I consider that the Condition which requires all quarry heavy vehicles to travel on the most direct route to and from the State Highway should apply from 2000 to 0700 hours (rather than 2000 to 0600 hours) because:

7.1 This is consistent with the other three conditions which have been agreed relating to noise limits, hours and heavy vehicle movements.

7.2 As per paragraph 29 of my Statement of Evidence, I consider in general terms that ambient noise levels are not currently consistently high enough between 0600 and 0700 hours to justify the commencement of 'daytime' controls at 0600 hours.

7.3 With regard to 151 Curraghs Road specifically – I do not agree with paragraph 68 of Mr Farren's Evidence in Chief that even if four quarry trucks were to pass along Curraghs Road between 0600 and 0700 hours there would only be a 1 dB change in noise levels and no noticeable noise effect. Given only two heavy vehicles on average travel along the road currently during that period, I consider the increase will be larger and the change would be noticeable. I note Mr Farren's view that there will only be a 1 dB change is conditional on "all vehicular, air and rail noise sources" being considered - however 151 Curraghs Road is some

PGR-038777-295-136-V1

distance from the railway line, and air traffic did not control the ambient noise levels during my site visit at that time. Similarly, noise from traffic on Maddisons Road does not dominate in this location.

8. With regard to off-site trucks between 0700 and 2000 hours. I continue to consider there is also the potential for a significant adverse effect at 151 Curraghs Road, should demand lead to periods where there are a high number of quarry truck movements on this road. In my view this would most easily be mitigated by including Curraghs Road in the Condition currently already proposed to manage quarry heavy vehicle movements through Templeton. However, if it is determined that the traffic evidence has conclusively demonstrated that a high number of quarry truck movements will never occur on Curraghs Road, then no change to that Condition would be required.
9. I consider that if road design features to minimise noise effects of heavy vehicles between the site and State Highway are practical, they should be adopted. Similarly, I consider that trucks capable of engine braking should be prohibited from site, as this will lead to potential benefits along all routes that these trucks would have travelled. However, if it is determined that the Applicant's evidence that this is not practical is robust, then I accept that a prohibition is not possible.

Jeremy William Trevathan

11 December 2019

PGR-038777-295-136-V1