

CAN I ASK LINDSAY WEITCH WAY 163 AND  
191 SETTLEMENT RD WERE NOT INCLUDED IN  
YOUR ACOUSTIC REPORT. 163 IS 100m FROM THE  
BOUNDARY OF 9 TAWA AVE. ALSO WE HAVE FARM  
ANIMALS RIGHT ON THE BOUNDARY OF 9 TAWA AVE.  
YOU HAVE NOT GIVEN A DEFINITIVE REPORT ON  
THE IMPACT OF POTENTIAL NOISE ON THESE ANIMALS.  
NOT ONLY AM I INVISIBLE MAYBE OUR FARM  
ANIMALS ARE TOO. HOW LONG AGO SINCE YOUVE  
BEEN IN A Paddock WITH NEWLY WEANED  
CALVES?? WHAT NOISE CAN THESE ANIMALS  
TOLERATE?? CONSTRUCTION, CHILDREN AND  
ADULTS YELLING AND SCREAMING HAVING FUN  
THIS NOISE CAN SCARE/SPOOK THEM THROUGH  
THE BEST OF FENCES/GATES POTENTIALLY ON  
TO SETTLEMENT RD TO CAUSE AN ACCIDENT.  
PLEASE EXPLAIN?? THIS IS A REAL LIFE  
IMPACT AND COULD YOU LIVE WITH A  
TRAGIC OUTCOME??

---

~~ANSWER?? YOU'VE NOT ANSWERED MY QO.  
YOUR REPORT IS FLAWED!!~~  
PTO

THIS IS YOUR FROM YOUR  
PLANNING EVIDENCE REPORT

- 5.26 - NOISE IS UNPROVEN
- 5.28 - NOISE CANT DEMONSTRATE COMPLIANCE
- 5.29 - CHILDREN PLAYING IN CONCENTRATED AREA  
CANNOT OR CAN ACHIEVE NOISE LIMITS.  
- UNCERTAIN.
- 5.30 RISK IS LOW TO EXCEED KDP LIMITS.  
TOO MANY WHAT IF'S
- 5.31 Ms LETCH - YOUVE PROVED NOTHING  
AT ALL !!  
MORE DOUBTS THAN CERTAINTY.

WILL YOU NOW INCLUDE 163.

THE COMMISSIONER EVEN MENTIONED  
THIS

change my assessment. The existing daily traffic flows are low, with 44 vehicle movements on Tawa Avenue and 748 vehicle movements on Settlement Road. I consider that this low level of vehicle movements is unlikely to cause any adverse noise effects within the site, especially as the Kura will need to comply with the DQLS.

## 8 Submissions

8.1 Submissions have been made on the following matters:

- (a) Concerns around noise from the Kura negatively impacting residents' quiet rural way of life.
- (b) Noise from traffic.
- (c) Noise from after-hours events at the Kura.
- (d) The effect of noise on livestock.
- (e) Reverse sensitivity from farm machinery.
- (f) Queries around noise propagation to dwellings further from the site.

8.2 Several submissions raise concerns around noise from the school negatively impacting residents' quiet rural way of life, with different noise sources to the existing rural noise sources. I remain of the opinion that the overall scale of noise effects will be reasonable for surrounding residents.

8.3 I have addressed noise from traffic in paragraph 7.1. Although there will be a perceptible increase in traffic noise during the morning and afternoon peak hours, overall noise levels remain low and will not affect residential amenity.

8.4 There may be after hours activities on the site at times, as is typical for a school site. Noise levels from occasional events will need to comply with the Minister's standard condition and I do not anticipate any difficulty in them doing so. Accordingly, I do not consider that noise effects from events will be unreasonable for receivers.

8.5 Concerns were raised around the effects of noise on livestock being stressed by noise from the school, in particular when animals walk past the site and from traffic noise. Although there is no guidance on levels of noise suitable for avoiding stress in livestock, in my opinion the relatively low level of noise from the site activities is unlikely to adversely impact on livestock.

8.6 Other rural noise sources may include background noise from surrounding areas, animals, farm vehicles and machinery. Various noise sources in the surrounding area as a quiet rural area, was considered in the assessment. No reverse sensitivity effects were identified for noise sources due to low levels of ambient noise in rural spaces to comply with DQLS.

8.7 Although the noise assessment focusses on noise effects on dwellings further away would normally expect. Noise propagation is explained in Paragraph 7.1. Noise effects for dwellings further from site are explained in Paragraph 7.1.

YOUR REPORTS HAVE FAILED IN TOO MANY SCENARIOS - I SUGGEST THIS WILL FAIL OUR EXPERIENCED