

<b>Project:</b>	Mission Bay Development	<b>Document No.:</b>	Mm 002
<b>To:</b>	Drive Holdings Ltd	<b>Date:</b>	21 June 2022
<b>Attention:</b>	c/- Gerard Thompson	<b>Cross Reference:</b>	
<b>Delivery:</b>	Email	<b>Project No.:</b>	2016907A
<b>From:</b>	James Whitlock	<b>No. Pages:</b>	1
		<b>Attachments:</b>	No
<b>Subject:</b>	Evidence summary for MFE FTCA Application		

### Summary of noise and vibration evidence

1. My name is James Andrew Travis Whitlock. I am an Associate at Marshall Day Acoustics with 21 years' experience in acoustics. I have a Bachelor of Science in Physics, and a Master of Architectural Studies in Acoustics, both from the University of Auckland.
2. I have been asked to summarise the construction noise and vibration and the operational noise issues relating to the application by Drive Holdings Limited for resource consents relating to the construction of seven new multilevel buildings on 75-79, 81-87 & 89-97 Tamaki Drive, 6, 8-10, 12 and 14 Patteson Avenue, 26, 28, and 30 Marau Crescent, Mission Bay ("**the Site**") providing for retail, food and beverage, and residential activities and supporting car parking, loading bays, vehicle manoeuvring areas, landscaping and plant ("**the Project**"). I have reviewed drawings of the Project prepared by Buchan Group (dated 12 May 2022).
3. The following comments are informed by the extensive work that I undertook from 2018 to 2022 in relation to a previous development proposed for the Site of generally similar overall scale to the Project ("**Previous Proposal**"). The Previous Proposal was declined consent in the Environment Court for reasons relating to its bulk and height but not its noise and vibration effects. I understand The Project adopts the same construction techniques as were proposed in the Previous Proposal and that were acceptable to Auckland Council in that context.
4. My conclusions regarding construction noise and vibration are as follows:
  - a. Construction noise will generally comply with the Auckland Unitary Plan standards at most neighbouring receivers, but I predict that exceedances may occur during certain construction phases – most notably at the 32 Marau Rd apartments (directly to the south-east of the site). Exceedances will, as a proportion of the overall construction period, occur infrequently but must be managed.
  - b. I predict that construction vibration levels will comply with the Unitary Plan limits for all neighbours.
  - c. I have prepared a Draft construction noise and vibration management plan (CNVMP) that sets out the mitigation and management measures required to undertake construction in accordance with the Best Practicable Option.
5. My conclusions regarding operational noise are as follows:
  - a. I predict that operational noise from activities associated with the Project will generally comply with the relevant Auckland Unitary Plan noise rules.
  - b. Retail noise from food and beverage outlets may exceed the noise limits at some commercial receivers – particularly at low frequencies. But the existing noise levels in the area already exceed these limits (as demonstrated by noise measurements carried out by my company), and the new activities will be in keeping with the character level of the existing neighbourhood.
  - c. My assessment takes account of the appellant's confirmation that it is not seeking consent for bars, taverns or outdoor dining within 30 metres of any residential zone.
6. Overall, I conclude that noise and vibration effects from constructing and operating the Project will be reasonable, provided the activities adhere to the controls in the noise and vibration conditions agreed with Auckland Council for the Previous Proposal.