

Consulting Advice Note

P. 09 308 9015
E. info@stylesgroup.co.nz
W. www.stylesgroup.co.nz
Saatchi & Saatchi Building,
L2, 125 The Strand, Parnell
PO Box 37857, Parnell,
Auckland 1151

Date	9 August 2025
From	Jon Styles
To	Bevan Hudson
Project	RC14513(L) - Glen Isla Dune Coastal Protection Society
Re	Summary Statement- Construction Noise and Vibration

Western Bay of Plenty District Council (the **Council**) engaged Styles Group to provide a technical review of the acoustic information submitted with the resource consent application for the Glen Isla Coastal Protection Project (the **Project**) at Glen Isla Dune, Waihi Beach.

I have been asked to provide a statement that provides a summary of my involvement, input to the draft conditions, comments on the relevant evidence prepared by the applicant, and any outstanding areas of disagreement.

1.0 Background

Styles Group¹ reviewed the acoustic assessment prepared by Marshall Day Acoustics (**MDA**) that accompanies the resource consent application. We reviewed the following documents:

- The MDA noise and vibration memo²
- The MDA section 92 response³.
- The supplementary MDA section 92 response dated 2 April 2025

I have read the relevant sections of the AEE, other application plans and documents, and submissions made on the application. I visited the site on 30 October 2024.

I have provided advice to the Council on various aspects of the Project and I have worked with the Council on the proposed conditions of consent.

2.0 Conditions of consent

I have worked with Council to prepare suitable conditions of consent to manage construction noise and vibration levels at all receivers that have not provided written approval to the activity.

¹ Myself and Mr Jamie Exeter from Styles Group

² Glen Isla Protection Society – Coastal Protection Project, Noise and vibration trial summary, dated 12 July 2024

³ Glen Isla Coastal Protection Project – Response to s92 queries, dated 6 December 2024

The conditions have been updated to preclude any construction works commencing before 07:30.

As set out below, I agree with Mr Whitlock's suggested changes to enable construction work to be undertaken between the hours of 07:30 and 18:00 (instead of 17:00).

3.0 Review of Mr Whitlock's evidence

I have reviewed the statement of evidence prepared by Mr Whitlock. Mr Whitlock cites substantial agreement with me on a range of matters. I agree with Mr Whitlock's findings, including his assessment of potential effects on submitters.

3.1 Proposed modifications to conditions of consent

Paragraph 8.2 of Mr Whitlock's evidence questions the reason why Council's draft conditions refer to a proposed works finish time of 17:00pm (rather than 18:00). I sourced the 17:00 works finish time from the original application documents. It is not a typo.

Notwithstanding, I agree with Mr Whitlock's proposed changes to the conditions to enable works between 07:30 and 18:00 on the basis that the Project can comply with the permitted construction noise limits applying during this timeframe (at receivers that have not provided written approval).

I note that the 17:00 curfew that was originally proposed by the applicant may result in an extended construction programme, which would prolong the period of construction noise.

4.0 Submissions

Submitters have raised general concerns about unacceptable construction noise and vibration. The predicted construction noise levels do not exceed the limits set by the District Plan for permitted activities at any site where written approval has not been obtained, so I consider them to be reasonable.

My advice to Council has recommended a condition for a CNVMP that will set out mitigation and management measures to ensure that the permitted standards are complied with.

The predicted vibration levels are considerably lower than the most stringent values of the DIN standard, including those for structures that are particularly sensitive to vibration.

Based on the guidance of the DIN Standard, I do not expect vibration from the proposed work to cause damage in any building. However, to address the concerns raised by submitters, I have recommended a vibration monitoring condition.

I have read the evidence of Mr Whitlock where he addresses submissions and I agree with him.

5.0 Reasons for consent - construction noise

I note that the Assessment of Environmental Effects prepared by Mitchell Daysh and the evidence of Mr Faithfull⁴ states the Project will comply with the permitted construction noise standards in Rule 4C.1.3.1 of the District Plan.

This is inconsistent with the findings of Mr Whitlock⁵ and myself – we both predict that the construction noise levels will exceed the permitted standards at at least one close-by dwelling. The owner of this dwelling has given their written approval so I have not considered the effects on them.

I recommend that non-compliance with the permitted construction noise standards in Rule 4C.1.3.1 is identified as a reason for consent in the decision-making process. As set out above, written approvals are provided from all properties where an infringement is possible (the GIPS properties) so the adverse effects on them must be disregarded.

6.0 Moving the revetment west

I understand that the proposal may involve moving the protection structure to the west so it is close to (≈1.5m) or on the residential boundary.

Mr Whitlock has assessed the change in construction noise and vibration levels arising from this in paragraphs 9.3 to 9.5 of his evidence. He states:

“9.4.

... revetment construction in the alternative location will:

- > *Increase noise levels by 2 - 5 dB L_{Aeq} , at both GIPS-owned and non-GIPS owned dwellings.*
- > *Increase vibration levels by up 0.05 - 0.1 mm/s PPV for all dwellings.*
- > *Not change the compliance status of predicted noise and vibration levels at non-GIPS owned dwellings.*
- > *Mean that noise at one additional GIPS-owned dwelling (15 Glen Isla Place) may infringe the limits.*

9.5 *In summary, I predict that the compliance status for non-GIPs dwellings will be the same for both revetment location options. But in my opinion, the original location is preferable because noise and vibration levels will be lower.”*

I generally agree with Mr Whitlock.

⁴ Paragraphs 5.1.4 and 7.22 of Mr Faithfull's evidence

⁵ Paragraph 5.15 of Mr Whitlock's evidence

I consider that the increase in construction noise and vibration effects arising from shifting the structure west will indeed be greater than the proposal as it was lodged, but the difference is minimal.

7.0 Summary

I have reviewed the MDA advice and relevant evidence for the resource consent application for the Project.

I consider that the applicant's proposed conditions (with Mr Whitlock's minor amendments) are appropriate.

Mr Whitlock and I agree on all construction noise and vibration issues.

Overall, I consider that noise and vibration generated by the proposed construction work will not cause unreasonable disturbance at any potentially affected site if the recommended conditions are adopted.