

16. Noise

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	General		
94.2 Niagara Properties Ltd	General	<p>The submitter is concerned that the limits on the adjoining rural land are more stringent than the Industrial 3 Zone and that changes to the noise provisions could limit their ability to undertake permitted activities under the Industrial 3 Zone.</p> <p>The submitter also considers that there has been inadequate assessment of the noise provisions in the s32 report</p>	To provide an assessment of the alternatives, benefits and costs of the noise provisions, and more specifically the change in the manner in which noise is measured and assessed.
65.95 ICC Environmental and Planning Services	General	The submitter notes that the terminology needs to be tidied up to ensure that the references are enforceable, consistent, accurate and compatible with the relevant noise standard	<p>Amend wording.</p> <p>For example, any reference to "...dBA L_{eq}" (or L_{dn}) should be amended to "...dB L_{Aeq}" (or L_{Adn}).</p> <p>At 3.13.8(B)(b)(1), there is an L_{eq} term where the "eq" has not been subscripted.</p>
105. 8 ICC Environmental Health and Compliance Services	General	The submitter notes that conflicts arise where industrial activity interfaces with noise-sensitive activities and seeks the development of buffers.	<p>For new Industrial subdivision or noise generating activities the submitter recommends that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. An appropriate buffer zone is determined to protect the existing nearby residential properties. b. Buffer zones to be included to protect the future residents of Residential Subdivisions near any Industrial Zones.
105.9 ICC Environmental Health and Compliance Services	General	The submitter notes that conflicts arise in relation to noise in mixed-use urban environments. The submitter supports the exclusion of noise generating activities from residential areas	The submitter recommends that the Plan includes a provision to mitigate or reduce the effects where noise-generating activities seek to establish in noise-sensitive environment

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
117.24 Southern District Health Board	General comment	The submitter supports the Proposed Plan in general insofar as it incorporates amendments to rules to avoid, mitigate and reduce adverse effects of noise on environmental health, and to promote the health of the people and communities in the District in a sustainable manner.	Supports, subject to amendments detailed in the submitter's other submissions
SECTION 2 ISSUES, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES			
117.55 Southern District Health Board	Zone specific Objectives and Policies	The submitter supports the Zone specific issues, objectives, and policies set out in 2.21-2.43. The submitter states that references to noise in these sections are important as they recognise potential for reverse sensitivity problems, and the need for avoidance of adverse effects to other activities within the zones and in adjoining zones while permitting Zone objectives consistent with policies.	Retain
SECTION 3.13 RULES			
79.33 KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	New rule and assessment criteria	The submitter considers that vibration should be addressed in the Plan, in particular the potential for reverse sensitivity issues in the operation of the rail network arising from vibration. The submitter suggests a standard that they believe should be applied to noise sensitive activities within 60m of the railway designation boundary.	Add a further rule to Section 3.13 to address "Ground-borne Noise" or vibration (as detailed in submission) AND Add new assessment criteria for vibration in order to consider the size, nature and location of the building, any special topographical, building features or ground conditions which may mitigate vibration effects and any characteristics of the proposed use that make compliance with the standard unnecessary.
105.7 ICC Environmental Health and Compliance Services	3.13	The submitter supports the use of NZS6801:2008 and NZS 6802:2008 as basis for measurement and assessment	Retain reference to NZS6801:2008 and NZS 6802:2008
117.25 Southern District Health	3.13.1 Noise Measurement	The submitter supports the use of NZS6801:2008 and NZS 6802:2008 as basis for measurement and assessment except where otherwise stated.	Allow provision subject to amendments:

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
Board		Heading should be amended to clarify scope.	Add to heading after word “measurement” the words “and assessment.”
28.7 Harvey Norman Properties (NZ) Ltd and Harvey Norman Stores (NZ) Pty Ltd	3.13.2	The submitter supports this provision as it allows for an increased noise level to reflect the type of activities anticipated in the proposed Business 3 Zone.	Not stated.
59.3 Quenton Stephens	3.13.2	<p>The submitter opposes some of the changes to noise limits for the Rural 1 and Industrial 3 zones and is concerned that the proposed changes to noise limits for the Industrial and Rural zones will legitimise the emissions of noise that are already having a detrimental effect on the amenity of neighbours. The submitter is unsure why the changes appear to be creating a more permissive level of noise where the Rural 1 Zone meets the Industrial 3 Zone when there is a history of noise issues in Kennington.</p> <p>The submitter opposes the introduction of a range of noise limits (LAeq and LAmax) for daytime and night time which appears to provide more scope for increased noise effects from industrial land uses at Kennington.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The noise provisions in the Plan need to effectively address the potential for conflict between rural residential and industrial land uses at Kennington. Introduce noise limits into the Plan that will avoid, remedy or mitigate the emission of noise from industrial activities in the Industrial 3 Zone. 2. Retain Rule 3.13.2(1) as proposed. 3. Retain lower noise LAmax limit of the existing District Plan (70dB LAmax) for the Rural 1 Zone in Rule 3.13.2 instead of 80dB LAmax 4. Retain the 50dB LAeq noise limit for daytime noise in the Rural 1 Zone as proposed. 5. Change the LAmax of 80dB for the Rural 1 Zone in the daytime and retain a LAmax of 65dB for both daytime and night time. 6. If the existing 65dB for both daytime and night time is not retained and the limits stay as amended retain the night time limits of 40dB LAeq and 65dB LAmax for the Rural Zone 7. Retain existing Plan approach whereby the noise limits of the adjoining zone apply for the

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
			<p>Industrial zones when measured at or beyond the Zone boundary.</p> <p>8. Retain the existing maximum noise limit that applies to industrial activity in Kennington of 70dBA L_{max} for the Industrial 3 Zone where it adjoins another zone.</p>
71.54 NZAS Ltd	3.13.2	<p>Oppose in part. The submitter considers that noise generated within the Smelter Zone should only be required to comply with the noise limits of the Rural Zone at the notional boundary of any residence located outside the Smelter Zone.</p> <p>The submitter also notes some confusion in the use of the term “site” and “sites” within the rule, but understands that it is intended that the zone standards of the surrounding sites apply</p>	<p>That the “no limit” reference be retained in relation to noise in the Smelter Zone.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend 3.13.2(1) as follows: “(1) For clarity, noise from any site (<u>except for any site located within the Smelter Zone</u>) shall comply with the relevant <u>zone</u> limits for all surrounding sites. Hence, at the boundaries of zones, measurements of noise emissions will be based on the zoning of the site affected by the noise, not of the site generating the noise.</p> <p><u>(1A) Noise generated by any activity within the Smelter Zone is not required to comply with the relevant limits of any other zone except at the notional boundary of any residence within the other zone.</u>”</p>
75.19 McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Ltd	3.13.2 (A) Table	The submitter supports the noise limits as being generally consistent with similar zones throughout the country	Retain the noise limits
94.3 Niagara Properties Ltd	3.13.2 (A) Table	<p>The submitter opposes the provisions as they relate to the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity within a zone.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the noise limits on the rural land adjoining the Industrial 3 zone should be the same as those for the Industrial 3 area.</p>	Amend 3.13.2 (A) to remove limits on noise “when measured at the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity within a zone”.
94.3 Niagara	3.13.2 (A)	Support. The submitter supports the change to the daytime L _{Amax} for the	Retain:

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
Properties Ltd	Table	Industrial 3 zone, and the night-time noise limit for the Rural 1 Zone	a. the night-time noise limit for the Rural 1 Zone b. the daytime L_{Amax} for the Industrial 3 zone
117.26 Southern District Health Board	3.13.2 (A) Table	The submitter supports the proposal with amendments to ensure terminology in the heading is consistent with the terminology used in the measurement and assessment standards cited and with words in (A)	Allow provision subject to amendments: Replace heading “noise levels from” with “Noise limits for”
117.27 Southern District Health Board	3.13.2(A) Table	<p>The submitter supports the proposal with amendments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The submitter supports the time frames for day and night. – The submitter suggests amendments to the descriptors to ensure they are consistent with the measurement and assessment standards cited. – The submitter supports L_{AFmax} limits at less stringent Zones with amenity values tolerating less stringent noise limits, particularly at night-time to avoid sleep disturbance in more sensitive Zones. However, the submitter raises concerns that the proposed reduction in night-time noise limits in some of the Zones will lead to confusion, particularly for enforcement of existing activities compared to new activities. The submitter also believes these proposed night-time noise limits are contrary to the objectives and policies within the Business 1 Zone which seek to “reinvigorate” the Invercargill CBD. 	<p>Allow the provision in part and amend as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Replace both instances of “L_{Aeq}” as column headings with “$L_{Aeq(15min)}$” b. Replace both instances of “L_{Amax}” as column headings with “L_{AFmax}” c. Reconsider changes to Operative Plan L_{AFmax} noise limits during night time
117.28 Southern District Health Board	3.13.2(A) Table	<p>The submitter opposes certain provisions and believes they should be disallowed except to the extent an amendment may rectify the defect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Opposes measurement location expressed as “at or within” being an expression subject of adverse comment in the Environment Court and implying two measurement locations. B. Opposes row 11 heading phrase “measured at the notional boundary.” The word “at” implies close proximity to a lot boundary that may be impractical to access for numerous reasons e.g. ditches, hedges. C. Opposes row 13 heading phrase “measured at any site” The word 	<p>Allow the provision in part and amend as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Replace third row instance of “at or within” with the words, “at any point within” b. Replace in Row 11 heading “measured at” with “measured at any point within” c. Replace in Row 13 heading “measured at” with “measured at any point” d. Replace in the second to last row the phrase

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		<p>“at” implies close proximity to a lot boundary that may be impractical to access for same reasons in paragraph B.</p> <p>D. Opposes in second to last row phrase “at or within” for same reasons in paragraph A.</p> <p>E. Opposes in last row phrase “at the notional boundary” for same reasons in paragraph B and should apply to a noise sensitive activity not just a dwelling.</p> <p>F. Opposes the addition of a daytime L_{AFmax} limit in all zones as an unprecedented provision that lacks justification, will complicate enforcement of noise control and is unnecessary for the reasonable protection of public health or the amenity values of any zone during the daytime.</p> <p>G. Opposes row 6 (Business 1-5 Zone) night-time noise limits being made more stringent than the operative District Plan because the submitter believes that this lacks justification, will complicate enforcement of noise control and is unnecessary for the reasonable protection of public health or the amenity values of these Business zones. The submitter states that having regard to the effect of 3.13.2 (A) sub-clause (1) (under the table) to apply the more stringent noise limit for an adjoining site zoning, the proposed night time $L_{Aeq(15min)}$ noise limit will frustrate the proposed Objectives and Policies for all the Business Zones .particularly Business 1 CBD Zone Policy 5.</p>	<p>“at or within the boundary of any site” with the words, “On any site.”</p> <p>e. Replace in the last row the phrase “at the notional boundary” with “At any point within the notional boundary of any noise sensitive activity.”</p> <p>f. Reconsider changes to Operative Plan $L_{Aeq(15min)}$ night time noise limits.</p>
<p>117.29 Southern District Health Board</p>	<p>3.13.2 (A) Noise Levels from Activities sub-clauses (1)-(5)</p>	<p>The submitter supports the proposal in part but with amendments.</p> <p>A. Opposes words used in 3.13.2 (A) sub-clause (1). The submitter believes the words “For clarity,” implies something needs to be made clear but there is nothing in the table above the sub-clause to imply the intent of the sub-clause. The submitter believes this is poor drafting given the attitude of the Courts to “notes” after tables and rules. The intent is in fact a critical component of noise rules</p>	<p>Allow the provision in part and amend as follows:</p> <p>a. Insert in sub-clause (1) before the words “for clarity...”a new sentence, “Sound received on any site must comply with the noise limit in the above table for the Zoning of that site.” and consequentially renumber others.</p>

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		<p>replacing a section with plain meaning found in the Operative Plan rules (4.34.3). The submitter believes the provision's intent needs re-drafting to avoid uncertainty of application</p> <p>B. Opposes sub-clause (2) on the grounds that the submitter believes it contradicts section 6.1 of NZS 6802:2008 and may not be an appropriate location for measurement of noise because of other technical reasons explained in the standard. The submitter states that the use of the term "façade" is problematic due to connotations of frontage. Further, the submitter states that the effect of the clause will in some circumstances compel a measurement to be made in a completely irrelevant location when an appropriate location may in fact exist.</p> <p>C. Supports sub-clauses (3) and (4) except for word "intended for outdoor living" in (3) which are problematic due to the uncertainties of "intent" and possible exclusion of "Juliet balconies" from the scope of the sub-clause.</p> <p>D. The submitter believes that the words in (5) "fence or other noise control structure" are problematic as it implies all fences have a noise control function which many do not to any extent whatsoever. The sub-clause adds nothing to the rule which is not already expressed addressed in NZS 6801:2008 and NZS6802:2008 when making an assessment, without the uncertainty of the poor drafting in the proposed sub-clause</p>	<p>b. Delete sub-clause (2)</p> <p>c. In (3) delete "intended for outdoor living."</p> <p>d. Delete sub-clause (5)</p>
<p>65.96 ICC Environmental and Planning Services</p>	<p>3.13.3(B)(a)</p>	<p>Support in part. The submitter considers that the activity status for shooting ranges should be made clearer to ensure that comprehensive assessment of noise effects is undertaken on a case-by-case basis, given the absence of a relevant NZ Standard for assessing shooting noise</p>	<p>Review the definition of commercial recreation activities and ensure the status of those activities reflects this concern</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Include shooting ranges in the activity status lists for</p>

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
			each zone OR Include restrictions on shooting ranges in the noise rule
53.72 NZ Transport Agency	3.13.3(B)(b)	Support	Retain Rule 3.13.3(B)(b) as proposed.
88.85 Federated Farmers	3.13.3	Support in part. The submitter considers an extra category should be included to account for the noise generated by livestock within the rural zones, particularly around weaning time and other seasonal activities.	Adopt the rule but include an additional exemption clause as follows: (B) Within the Rural 1 and 2 zones, the keeping of livestock as part of normal farming activities is exempt from the noise limits detailed in Rule 3.13.2 above.
117.30 Southern District health Board	3.13.3 Exemptions	The submitter supports this provision in part with amendments A. The exemption for trains and warning devices is unnecessary for land designated for rail purposes. The submitter believes that trains on private sidings should not be exempted from general rules. B. The submitter believes there should be additional activities added to the list of exemptions: i. Warning devices used by emergency services ii. In residential areas, activities of a normal domestic nature including recreational activities, such as sporting events, that do not involve powered motorsport, powered aviation, gunfire or amplified music. iii. Where any residential activity exists on the same site as a noise source being assessed	Allow the provision in part and amend as follows: a. Delete sub-clause (B) (c) b. Add to sub-clause (B) the following “In any Residential Zone to activities of a normal domestic nature including recreational activities, such as sporting events, that do not involve powered motorsport, powered aviation, gunfire or amplified music.
65.97 ICC Environmental	3.13.4	Support in part. The submitter considers that the wording of this provision is misleading and inaccurate in that construction noise standard is more than a	Amend 3.13.4 by replacing the wording “...is to comply with...”

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested																																
and Planning Services		set of noise limits to be complied with.	with “... <u>shall be measured and assessed in accordance with...</u> ”																																
71.55 NZAS Ltd	3.13.4	The submitter considers a minor amendment is required to make it clear that construction noise complying with the standard is permitted	Amend 3.13.4 as follows: “Construction noise <u>that complies is to comply with NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics Construction Noise is a permitted activity.</u> ”																																
117.31 Southern District Health Board	3.13.4	The submitter supports this provision as the appropriate standard for construction noise assessment	Support																																
117.32 Southern District Health Board	3.13.5	The submitter supports this provision in part but notes that the title to the standard for the assessment of helicopter landing area noise needs amended	Supports but with amendment: Replace “Pads” with “Areas”																																
88.86 Federated Farmers	3.13.6	Support.	Not stated.																																
117.33 Southern District Health Board	3.13.6	The submitter supports this provision as the appropriate standard for the assessment of wind farm noise	Support																																
65.98 ICC Environmental and Planning Services	3.13.7 Business 1 Zone – Entertainment Precinct	Support in part. The submitter considers that this rule needs to clearly specify what the external noise source is, in order for an applicant to design to achieve a specified internal noise level.	Add the following to the end of the 3.13.7(A)(a): “...based on an incident external noise level as follows:” with the following table added: <table border="1" data-bbox="1512 1013 2128 1313"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="7">Octave Band Centre Frequency (Hz)</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>6</th> <th>12</th> <th>25</th> <th>50</th> <th>100</th> <th>200</th> <th>400</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <td>3</td> <td>5</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Design sound pressure level incident</td> <td>62</td> <td>56</td> <td>52</td> <td>56</td> <td>57</td> <td>53</td> <td>45</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Octave Band Centre Frequency (Hz)								6	12	25	50	100	200	400		3	5	0	0	0	0	0	Design sound pressure level incident	62	56	52	56	57	53	45
	Octave Band Centre Frequency (Hz)																																		
	6	12	25	50	100	200	400																												
	3	5	0	0	0	0	0																												
Design sound pressure level incident	62	56	52	56	57	53	45																												

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
			on building façade (dB re 2 x 10 ⁻⁵ Pa
75.20 McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Ltd	3.13.7 Business 1 Zone – Entertainment Precinct	The submitter considers that the reverse sensitivity issues that may arise in the Entertainment Precinct may also arise where residential activities are established elsewhere and that it is appropriate to extend this rule to apply all noise sensitive activities within all the Business Zones	Amend 3.13.7 as follows: “Noise sensitive activities in Business 1-5 zones Business 1 Zone – Entertainment Precinct (A) All new noise sensitive activities and additions to existing noise sensitive activities within the Business 1 Zone – Entertainment Precinct <u>Business 1 – 5 zones shall:...</u> ”
117.34 Southern District Health Board	3.13.7 Business 1 Zone – Entertainment Precinct	Supports the proposal as the submitter believes that the provisions address potential reverse sensitivity problems and enable Objectives and Policies for Zone to be complemented by necessary rules for internal design levels.	
118.2 Bruce Maher	3.13.7 Business 1 Zone – Entertainment Precinct	The submitter would like the Council to address the level of noise tolerance within the entertainment precinct	Not specified
24.63 South Port NZ Ltd	3.13.8	Support. The submitter considers the noise limit proposed to be consistent with best practice management of Port noise and should be retained.	Retain.
117.35 Southern District Health Board	3.13.8 Seaport Zone	The submitter supports the provision subject to a minor amendment. The submitter states that the provisions refer to are appropriate for the special needs of a port and are consistent with settlements of appeals.	Support subject to a minor amendment: Delete the colon between the words “Noise” and “Management” in the title of the NZS 6809:1999
53.73 NZ Transport Agency	3.13.9 Activities Near Transport Corridors	Support.	Retain Rule 3.13.9 as proposed.

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
79.32 KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	3.13.9 Activities Near Transport Corridors	<p>Oppose. The submitter seeks the insertion of the acoustic performance standard into all zones in the Plan or in a location in the Plan which will apply district-wide</p> <p>The submitter considers that noise sensitive activities raise similar reverse sensitivity issues regardless of where they are located and that a performance standard addressing these adverse effects should be a district-wide rule.</p> <p>The submitter suggests a standard that encourages the internalisation of effects to achieve a reasonable level of internal acoustic amenity through building and section layout and design.</p>	<p>Delete Rule 3.13.9 as it applies to the railway corridor and replace with a new rule (detailed in submission)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add new assessment criteria for noise sensitive activities in all zones to consider the degree of noise attenuation proposed and the effects of reverse sensitivity on the operation of the rail network.</p>
90.24 H W Richardson Group Ltd	3.13.9 Activities Near Transport Corridors	Support. The submitter considers that noise sensitive activities that locate near transport corridors should be designed, sited and constructed to prevent issues of reverse sensitivity arising	Retain Rule 3.13.9
117.36 Southern District Health Board	3.13.9 Activities Near Transport Corridors	<p>The submitter supports the provision in part, subject to amendments.</p> <p>The submitter believes that provisions fail to include orientation and possible use of barriers against sound propagation which are likely to be more cost-effective than acoustical treatment of the building envelope. Further, the submitter states that the words “internal noise levels” are imprecise when the intention is to set indoor design levels without complementary verification methods.</p> <p>Sub-clause (a) requires qualification to require its performance standard is met with doors and windows required for ventilation shut, as is provided in APPENDIX VI – NOISE SENSITIVE INSULATION REQUIREMENTS.</p>	<p>Support subject to amendment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In (B) replace “ noise levels” with “design levels” In (B) after the word “exceeded” add” having regard to any noise barriers:” Add a new sub-clause “(b) Where (a) applies, if design sound levels must be met with doors and windows required for ventilation closed, ventilation in bedrooms and other habitable areas shall comply with Appendix VI table 2 and its accompanying clauses as if the site was within the Outer Control Boundary (OCB)

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
			and Single Event Sound Exposure Boundary (SESEB) as shown on the District Planning maps.”
26.3 NZ Defence Force	3.13.10	<p>Oppose (in part)</p> <p>The submitter wishes to ensure that the noise standards included in the Proposed District Plan are up-to-date, appropriate for the type of noise generated and relatively simple to understand and assess compliance with. In doing so the submitter has developed revised noise control standards to control noise effects from Temporary Military Training Activities that it is seeking to have included in District Plans nationwide. The replacement noise standards proposed by the submitter are attached to the submission and focus on compliance at dwellings, residentially zoned sites and buildings used for residential, education or healthcare purposes.</p>	That the noise standards attached to this submission be included for Temporary Military Training Activities in all zones.
117.37 Southern District Health Board	3.13.10	<p>The submitter supports the provision in part, subject to amendments.</p> <p>The submitter believes that the provisions need to be amended to ensure that they utilise the correct terminology to be consistent with the rest of the Plan and the measurement and assessment standards cited.</p> <p>The submitter states that description of the explosives noise metric frequency is inaccurate and contradictory stating that there is no frequency weighting</p>	<p>Support subject to amendment:</p> <p>a. In (B) Replace “noise levels shall not exceed” with “sound levels within any other Zone or at any point within the notional boundary of an noise sensitive activity on another site, shall not exceed”</p> <p>b. Replace L10 with “L_{Aeq(15min)}” in the table</p> <p>c. In the proviso under the table delete the phrase “non-frequency weighted”</p>
101.9 NZ Fire Service Commission	3.13.11	Oppose. The submitter believes that the exemption in (B) should be extended to include warning devices associated with emergency service training activities to allow for the drills and training activities it carries out on its sites	Amend 3.13.11 to read: (B) Sound from warning devices used by emergency services are exempt from all noise limits, <u>this includes warning devices associated with emergency service training activities</u> ”

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
103.63 Invercargill Airport Ltd	3.13.11	Support. The submitter considers it appropriate to permit aircraft operations for use during emergencies	Retain
117.38 Southern District Health Board	3.13.11	The submitter supports the provisions as this is essential for the health and safety of people and communities and notes that emergency landing of aircraft are outside the scope of the RMA being within CAA jurisdiction	Support
117.39 Southern District Health Board	3.13.12 Temporary Activities/Events	The submitter supports the provision in part, subject to amendments. The submitter raises concern that the possibility of contiguous activity at one location over six days may not be sustainable if there are noise sensitive activities nearby, so intermittency on one site should be limited. The submitter note that the intermittency frequency is a matter for local governance.	Support subject to amendment similar to: Add to (C) "provided no single event shall exceed 3 days on the site and no further event shall occur on the same site within 3 weeks."
65.99 ICC Environmental and Planning Services	3.13.13	Support in part. The submitter considers that it needs to be clarified that this rule was drafted to apply to the Invercargill Airport, as it could unintentionally be applied to applications for other airfields, for example.	Include a rule either before or after 3.13.5 "Noise from aircraft operations is to be measured and assessed in accordance with NZS6805:1992 Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning" Amend Rule 3.13.13 to clarify the fact that the provisions apply only to operations that are the subject of designations by Invercargill Airport Limited.
103.64 Invercargill Airport Ltd	3.13.13	Oppose in part. The submitter considers (B) to be superfluous as it repeats requirements inherent in the designation. The submitter does not consider the rules relating to noise sensitive activities are appropriate.	Retain 3.13.13(A) Delete 3.13.13(B) Delete 3.13.13 (C) and replace with rules detailing different activity statuses and design requirements within the Outer Control Boundary and the Single Event Sound Exposure Boundary
117.40 Southern	3.13.13 Aircraft	The submitter supports the provision as they state it is consistent with	Support

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
District Health Board		designation conditions and necessary for sustainable management of a physical resource of the district and protection of people and communities from unreasonable noise	
117.41 Southern District Health Board	3.13.14 Activity Status and Matters of Consideration	The submitter supports the list of topics to be taken into account but suggests amendment of terminology to ensure consistency with standards cited.	Support subject to amendments: a. In (a), insert after “nature” the word “,timing” b. In (d), replace “ambient noise levels” with “ambient sound.”
53.74 NZ Transport Agency	3.13.14(A)	Support.	Retain Rule 3.13.14(A) as proposed.
53.75 NZ Transport Agency	3.13.14(B)	The submitter considers that it would be appropriate that the written approval of the NZTA as a requiring authority be included as a matter for the discretion of Council.	Amend Rule 3.13.14 (B) by inserting an additional matter, as follows: <i>(h) Whether the written approval of the NZ Transport Agency has been obtained.</i>