

**Before the Hearings Panel appointed by
the Christchurch City Council**

Under

the Resource Management Act
1991 (**Act**)

And

In the Matter of

an application under section 88 of
the Act for land use consent to
establish and operate a new
supermarket and associated small
scale retail including signage,
servicing, access, carparking and
landscaping

**Statement of Evidence of
Jeremy William Trevathan
for Woolworths New Zealand Limited**

Dated: 18 July 2025

Lane Neave
141 Cambridge Terrace
PO Box 2331
Christchurch 8140
Solicitors Acting: Joshua Leckie / Sarah
Anderton
Email: joshua.leckie@laneneave.co.nz /
sarah.anderton@laneneave.co.nz
Phone: 03 409 0321

lane neave.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 2

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE..... 2

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3

SITE AND SURROUNDING ACOUSTIC ENVIRONMENT..... 3

THE PROPOSAL 4

OPERATIONAL NOISE EFFECTS 6

CONSTRUCTION NOISE AND VIBRATION EFFECTS 6

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS..... 7

RESPONSE TO SECTION 42A REPORT 9

PROPOSED CONDITIONS OF CONSENT 9

CONCLUSION 9

INTRODUCTION

Qualifications and Experience

1. My full name is Jeremy William Trevathan.
2. I am the Principal Acoustic Engineer and the Managing Director at Acoustic Engineer Services, an acoustic engineering consultancy based in Christchurch.
3. I hold the degrees of Bachelor of Engineering with Honours and Doctor of Philosophy in Mechanical Engineering (Acoustics) from the University of Canterbury. I am an Associate of the New Zealand Planning Institute and a Member of the Acoustical Society of New Zealand. I have over nineteen years' experience in the field of acoustic engineering consultancy and have been involved with a large number of environmental noise assessments on behalf of applicants, submitters and as a peer reviewer for councils.

Background and Involvement

4. My company was engaged by Woolworths New Zealand Limited (**Applicant**) to provide an Assessment of Environmental Noise Effects for a new supermarket and associated retail (**Proposal**) to be located on Madras Street in St Albans Christchurch (**Site**).
5. The Assessment of Environmental Noise Effects report submitted with the application was prepared under my supervision.

Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses

6. Although this is not an Environment Court hearing I have read and agree to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on material produced by another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

7. The topics covered in my evidence are as follows:
 - (a) the Site and surrounding acoustic environment;
 - (b) the Proposal;
 - (c) operational noise effects;

- (d) construction noise and vibration effects;
 - (e) response to submissions;
 - (f) response to Section 42A Report; and
 - (g) proposed conditions of consent.
8. I have read the Section 42A Report prepared by Scott Blair and all accompanying reports including specifically the acoustic advice provided by Kirsten Rayne, an Environmental Health Officer with the Council.¹
 9. I have read all other evidence prepared for the Applicant. I explain in my evidence where I refer to or rely on that assessment or evidence for the purposes of my evidence.
 10. I have reviewed submissions as they relate to noise.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

11. I have assessed all noise sources expected to be associated with the operation of a proposed new supermarket and associated retail located on Madras Street, St Albans.
12. I have calculated noise emissions from the activity and assessed this against relevant guidelines for the protection of residential amenity.
13. Based on my analysis I expect noise effects from the activity to be minimal at all nearby sites, which aligns with the view of the Council peer reviewer. Noise is also expected to be compliant with the Christchurch District Plan (**District Plan**) noise limits except at Lot 3 at 472 Madras Street (Affected Persons Approval provided), and 479 Madras Street and 483 Madras Street (a 1 dB exceedance, which is not an audible difference).

SITE AND SURROUNDING ACOUSTIC ENVIRONMENT

14. Rewa Satory from my office visited the Site on the 12th of July 2024 between 0700 and 0800 hours to undertake noise measurements and observe the existing ambient noise environment during a period of low vehicle traffic. I also undertook a site visit on the 10th of July 2025.
15. Currently the noise environment at the Site is dominated by traffic on nearby roads - Madras Street in particular. At some measurement locations bird noises was

¹ S42A report, Appendix M.

observed, as well as construction and train horn noises in the distance. Noise levels were measured to be in the order of 64 – 66 dB LAeq along Madras Street, reducing to in the order of 43 – 48 dB LAeq in the vicinity of the proposed loading bay area / eastern end of the proposed carpark. Traffic count data shows that traffic on Madras Street peaks between 1700 and 1800 hours, and this will increase ambient noise levels in the area in the order of a further 5 dB.

THE PROPOSAL

16. The Proposal is to establish a supermarket with a floor area of 3,550m² (including mezzanine office (200 m²), excluding plantroom and lobby (205m²), an online pick-up area (150 m²), three to four small retail/commercial tenancies within a total floor area of 1390m², and a carpark.
17. The supermarket and associated retail will operate between 0700 – 2200 hours daily and will include an online order pick-up area at the southern end of the store frontage and a separate loading bay area located in the northeast corner of the Site. A 3 metre high acoustic fence is proposed around the internal boundary of the loading bay. As described below, I have reviewed the noise-related conditions attached to the evidence of Mr Cleese, and this assessment assumes that those conditions are in place.

OPERATIONAL NOISE EFFECTS

18. To determine what noise levels may be appropriate for this development, I reviewed the District Plan and NZS 6802:2008 and the World Health Organization (**WHO**) guidelines. I also considered the current and expected future noise environment in the vicinity of the Site.
19. The relevant noise limits from the District Plan are as follows:
 - (a) *Noise received in all residential zones (other than in the Accommodation and Community Facilities Overlay)*
 - (i) *Daytime (0700 to 2200 hours)* 50 dB LAeq
 - (ii) *Night-time (2200 to 0700 hours)* 40 dB LAeq / 65 dB LAmax
 - (b) *Noise received in all commercial zones*
 - (i) *Daytime (0700 to 2200 hours)* 55 dB LAeq
 - (ii) *Night-time (2200 to 0700 hours)* 45 dB LAeq / 65 dB LAmax

20. I have assessed daytime noise levels at nearby sites from the operation of the proposed new supermarket and associated retail, including from the carpark and click and collect bays, loading bay / back of house, and small retail tenancies. Predicted cumulative daytime noise levels are as follows:

Location	Zone	Noise limit (dB L _{Aeq})	Measurement point	Predicted noise rating level (dB L _{Aeq})
Lot E	RMD	50	Boundary	47
Lot 4 ²	RMD		Boundary	48
Mike Greer homes	RMD		Boundary	46
			1F façade	48
14/93 Packe Street	RMD		Boundary	50
12/93 Packe Street ³				48
75 Packe Street (Church)	RMD		Boundary	48
			1F offices façade	41
101 Purchas Street	RMD		Boundary	45
			1F façade	50
466 Madras Street ⁴	CL	55	Boundary	53
			1F façade	53
Lot 3 - 472 Madras Street ⁵	CL		Boundary	56
459 - 477 Madras Street	RMD	50	Boundary	46 – 49
479 Madras Street	RMD		Boundary	51
483 Madras Street	RMD		Boundary	51
489 Madras Street	RMD		Boundary	49 ⁶

24. My analysis therefore indicates that noise levels will comply with the District Plan daytime noise limits at most locations except for Lot 3 – 472 Madras Street, 479 Madras Street and 483 Madras Street, where exceedances of 1 dB are expected.
25. I note that the owner of Lot 3 – 472 Madras Street has provided Affected Persons Approval and therefore the effects of noise at this location cannot be considered in

² Property has provided Affected Persons Approval.

³ Submitter #7.

⁴ Submitter #100.

⁵ Property has provided Affected Persons Approval.

⁶ Noise levels are lower in locations further from the site entry / exit points.

accordance with s104(3)(a)(ii) of the Resource Management Act 1991. In any event, I note that a 1 dB difference in noise levels is typically not audible, and the ambient noise levels in the area are already moderate, as described above.

26. With regard to potential noise effects at 479 and 483 Madras Street, again I note that a 1 dB difference in noise levels is typically not audible, and as described above, during the daytime period road traffic noise from Madras Street is already elevated in these locations (in excess of 60 dB L_{Aeq} at the eastern boundaries of these sites). I therefore expect the potential adverse effects of the 1 dB exceedances at these locations to be minimal, which aligns with the view of the Council peer reviewer.
27. The District Plan night time noise limits apply between 2200 and 0700 hours. An offered condition of the application is that the supermarket will not be open to the public during these hours. Therefore, during night time period, supermarket noise sources will be limited to staff and residual customer movements, as well as mechanical plant. The following noise levels are expected, at the closest neighbouring sites:
 - (a) 467 and 483 Madras Street, located to the west of the carpark – 38 dB L_{Aeq} (District Plan noise limit – 40 dB L_{Aeq}); and
 - (b) Lot 3 at 472 Madras Street,⁷ located to the south of the carpark – 47 dB L_{Aeq} (District Plan noise limit – 45 dB L_{Aeq}).
28. Based on these noise levels, when also considering the existing ambient noise levels in the area, I expect any night time noise effects associated with the supermarket to be minimal.
29. With regard to any proposed activities in the non-supermarket tenancies during the night time period (such as a 24 hr gym) – it is expected to be realistic for these to comply with the District Plan noise limits, and an advice note is proposed to ensure that such activities are reviewed prior to commencement of operations.

CONSTRUCTION NOISE AND VIBRATION EFFECTS

30. Construction noise is expected during the establishment of the supermarket and associated facilities.
31. I recommend that the Applicant adopt best practice procedures to reduce the likelihood of annoyance, nuisance, and adverse health effects to people in the vicinity of construction work.

⁷ Property has provided Affected Persons Approval.

32. The District Plan specifically excludes construction activities from the noise standards of all zones. Rule 6.1.6.1.1 P2 refers to NZS 6803:1999 for construction noise rules. I recommended in my assessment that all construction activities are planned and managed in accordance with NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics – Construction Noise, and that construction is undertaken to ensure as far as practical that noise does not exceed the relevant sound levels specified in that Standard.
33. Where construction activity takes place between 0730 and 1800 hours, Monday to Saturday, the relevant noise limits from NZS 6803:1999 are as follows:
- (a) 70 dB LAeq; and
 - (b) 85 dB LAmax
34. The proposed conditions include a requirement for a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (**CNVMP**) to be provided by the Applicant and certified by Council. I consider that this condition, which references Annex E of NZS 6803:1999, will provide for a suitably detailed CNVMP which covers key aspects of noise and vibration management and support the inclusion of that condition.

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

35. The submissions from Chapman & Christie (118 Canon Street), Smith (9A Morice Place), Allsop (32 Westminster Street) are in support of or neutral to the Proposal however also raise noise related concerns.
36. The submissions from Mei & Zeng (2/97 Packe Street), Volkens (Unit 12, 93 Packe Street), Gillespie (450C Madras Street), Switalla (5/163 Edgeware Road), Ryan (3 Abberfield Lane), McPherson (17 Exeter Street), O'Malley (4/102 Rossall Street), O'Keefe (72 Dover Street), Twaddell (25 Courtenay Street), and Faulkner (70A Packe Street) are in are in opposition to the Proposal and include noise related concerns.
37. I note that apart from Mr Volkens (discussed specifically below), none of the other submitters in opposition are immediate neighbours. As such, many of the above submissions voice a general concern regarding the general impact of operational and construction noise on the amenity of residential life in the area, rather than having a specific focus on the effects received at their property boundary.
38. With regard to operational noise, the underlying District Plan noise limits are typical of those in a residential area in that they enable a moderate level of noise during the daytime hours.

39. My analysis indicates that noise levels received at all of the submitters' properties are expected to comply with the District Plan daytime and night-time noise limits. Therefore, even though noise in the area is expected to increase, the ambient noise environment is expected to remain as typical and appropriate for residential areas in Christchurch.
40. As also explained above, the District Plan specifically excludes construction activities from the noise standards for all zones, Rule 6.1.6.1.1 P2 refers to New Zealand Standard NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics – Construction Noise for construction noise rules. I have therefore recommended that the Applicant adopts best practice procedures to reduce the likelihood of annoyance, nuisance and adverse health effects to people in the vicinity of construction work, and that these activities are planned and managed in accordance with NZ 6803:1999 Acoustics – Construction Noise, and that construction is undertaken to ensure noise does not exceed the noise levels specified in Tables 2 and 3 of the standard.
41. My response to other specific noise related concerns is set out below.

Volkers (Unit 12, 93 Packe Street)

42. Mr Volk's submission raises concerns relating to the performance of the acoustic fence between 93 Packe Street and the proposed loading bay.
43. My analysis shows that with the proposed acoustic fence, the levels at 93 Packe Street will comply with the District Plan noise limits and therefore are acceptable levels which could be anticipated within a residential area.

O'Malley (4/102 Rossall Street) and O'Keefe (72 Dove Street)

44. The O'Malley, O'Keefe and Allsop (Alison) submissions raise concerns relating specifically to activity in the loading bay including deliveries (including early morning truck movements) and forklift beeping.
45. The Proposal addresses the potential adverse noise effects of early morning truck deliveries by restricting deliveries to the daytime. I have also recommended that a condition is adopted to ensure the forklifts are electric and that non-tonal reversing alarms are fitted to the forklifts.
46. My analysis indicates that where the physical noise mitigation measures outlined in my report are adopted, that noise from all other activities in the loading bay are expected to comply with the District Plan noise limits at relevant properties.

RESPONSE TO SECTION 42A REPORT

47. Ms Rayne generally agrees with my analysis and findings with regard to noise effects. Ms Rayne also discussed various conditions, which I comment on below.

PROPOSED CONDITIONS OF CONSENT

48. I have reviewed the latest set of proposed conditions, attached to the evidence of Mr Clease. Condition 2.d., 17 and 18 relate to construction noise and vibration, and are in line with current good practice.
49. Ms Rayne has recommended the conditions be extended to ensure noisy works on-site do not commence until 0730 hours. I note the noise limits outlined in NZS 6803:1999 which the current condition 18 refers to are considerably more stringent before 0730 hours, and so this will achieve the outcome sought by Mr Rayne, without the need for further modification to the condition.
50. Conditions 27 to 32 are appropriate, based on my analysis and assumptions.

CONCLUSION

51. I have assessed all noise sources expected to be associated with the new supermarket and associated retail to be located on Madras Street in St Albans.
52. Noise sources associated with the development include the carpark, loading bay / back of house, mechanical plant, and small retail tenancies. Overall, I expect the noise levels associated with these activities to be modest, and noise effects to be minimal.
53. I consider that the proposed conditions of consent attached to the evidence of Mr Clease are reasonable and consistent with my assessment.



Jeremy William Trevathan

18 July 2025