

1. My name is Edward Dyer, I am providing the noise summary for the proposal. My evidence, read alongside Mr. Halsteads provides a background and general understanding of the noise involved with this proposal.
2. I have commented on submitter points which required further clarification from my initial evidence. Beyond that I can take questions.
3. I agree with the applicants' noise evidence. My evidence covers what was brought up in the submissions today. The following points I have clarified further.
4. 7 Dekka street, the key points are the noise is different in nature (duration, level, type) than the existing noise seen in the area. The duration is all day and out of character for the general area.
5. Mr. Halstead and I have stated the noise is predicted to not have Special Audible Character (SAC) as set out in the New Zealand Standard 6802:2008. Therefore, as the noise does not have SAC and it is predicted to comply with the district plan, it is acceptable on an objective level. Subjectively there could still remain issues regarding the type of noise to be expected in a residential area, Mrs. Camilleri has spoken to that.
6. A submitter has stated the proposed acoustic fence will not protect the second floor as it sits above the fence line, therefore questioning the mitigation properties of the fence. I am in general agreement [25-27] as set out in my evidence. Mr Halstead has provided the means of the calculation and adjustment provided. None the less, the effectiveness of an acoustic fence does rely on line of sight being broken between the source and receiver.
7. A submitter has stated Trolley movements and abnormal noises such as car alarms were not included in the predictions. These types of noise as Mr Halstead alluded to, are not the dominant noise source and would essentially be drowned out by vehicle movement and general car park noise. There remains the possibility for annoyance a to an extent a different noise level if these were present.
8. A submitter has raised concern over the use of delivery vehicles. As per [46-47] of my evidence, delivery times were set out in the existing consent and will be managed through the compliance of the existing conditions on the existing consent.
9. Construction noise will exceed the NZ construction noise standard. This is entirely normal for any medium to large size construction. Certain activities when done near to a boundary will almost always exceed the standard.
10. To reiterate from the amended Marshall Day Acoustics report *section 7.6*, they have stated the construction noise will be "clearly distinguishable in the ambient noise environment". There is no doubt the construction will be audible for the duration and at times could cause disruption to the nearby properties.
11. Yesterday comments on the vibration conditions and construction noise exceedances were raised by a commissioner, condition (15) allows for the predicted noise sources/activities in the CNVMP to exceed the standard, it limits methods and activities that were not set out in the plan. I note the applicant did not suggest any changes to the construction or vibration conditions.

12. The construction vibration standard includes structural damage levels, these levels are not for amenity, given the demolition and large construction of the proposal it is logical to include this and standard practice as seen in the 2024 district plan with its requirements under Noise-R2 and S2.

13. In summary I am in general agreement with the applicant's noise expert and their evidence. The actual suitability of noise in a given area and the effect on the neighboring properties is best spoken to by Mrs. Camilleri. I accept the submitters points that the noise being a large carpark is not what would be expected in a residential area even though it may meet the district plan levels.