shearer

consulting

PO Box 60240 Titirangi Auckland mob: 021 735 914 e: craig@craigshearer.co.nz

· · Strategy · · Policy · · Planning · ·

3 June 2020

Auckland Council Private Bag 92300 AUCKLAND 1142

The Manager, Resource Consents Auckland Central Office Graham Street Attention: Patrick Moss, Senior Planner

Dear Patrick

RE: RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION LUC60134603-A

Thank you for your request dated 14 May for further information under section 92 of the Act.

Neville Hegley of Hegley Acoustic has discussed the S92 request with Andrew Gordon, Council's acoustic expert. Please discuss this response with Andrew.

Most of the answers to your questions are set out it the attached letter from Hegley Acoustic. However, some comments are also offered below.

Bullet point 4

The response from Hegley Acoustic refers to clause "4.3.2" – note that this is referring the NZ Standard.

Bullet point 5: Please comment if the proposed maximum number of flights per week/per day are likely to occur and if not, please advise what the typical number of movements per week/per day are anticipated to be.

Response: Yes, 3 flights per day up to 10 per week are likely to occur at times, although clearly this will be the exception rather than the rule. With the maximum number of flights being 104 proposed per year, there will be several weeks when no flights may occur at all.

Bullet Point 8. The AEE states compliance will be achieved with AUP (OP) E25.6.32 however the maximum noise level is not assessed in the acoustic report. Accordingly, please provide predicted

LAFmax levels at affected receiver locations and if an infringement is predicted, an assessment of effects.

<u>Response.</u> See response from Hegley Acoustic. As pointed out in the second sentence of that response there was a misinterpretation by the planner in referring to E25.6.32 when reading the technical assessment – as stated in the response from Hegley Acoustic it is unclear exactly what was required in Rule E25.6.32.

I suggest the AEE be re-submitted with the <u>deletion</u> of the sentence at the top of page 7 which states "The assessment of effects shows the proposal complies with the rule" because clearly the Acoustic wording does not reflect this statement. An amended AEE report is attached to this letter.

Please contact the undersigned if you have any queries re this response. I look forward to your decision on this application.

Yours faithfully

Craig Shearer Director

Shearer Consulting Limited