

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL  
MANAWATU DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of Plan Change 55 to the Manawatu District Plan

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF SARAH ANN BEVIN  
ON BEHALF OF NEW ZEALAND DEFENCE FORCE  
SUBMITTER S08 AND FURTHER SUBMITTER FS3  
1 December 2016**

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1 My full name is Sarah Ann Bevin. I am a Resource Management Planner at Tonkin & Taylor Limited, and have over ten years of planning experience both in New Zealand and the United Kingdom. I hold the qualification of Bachelor of Resource Studies from Lincoln University.
- 2 I am an associate of the New Zealand Planning Institute and a member of the Resource Management Law Association.
- 3 My experience spans most aspects of planning, with a particular emphasis on resource consenting under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). I also have experience in the preparation of submissions on district and regional planning documents.

## **SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

- 4 I have been engaged by the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) to provide expert planning advice in relation to Plan Change 55 to the Manawatu District Plan (District Plan)<sup>1</sup>.
- 5 I am familiar with Plan Change 55 to the District Plan to which these proceedings relate. I have read those parts of the relevant Section 42A Hearing Report (referred to as the 'Hearing Report') which relate to Temporary Military Training Activities (TMTA), in relation to NZDF's submission.
- 6 Ms Rebecca Davies has explained the background to NZDF's original submission, the importance of the Manawatu District to NZDF, particularly the RNZAF Ohakea Air Base and Raumai Weapons Range in the District and the nearby Linton and Waiouru Military Camps. Ms Davies also described the relationship between NZDF and the Manawatu District Council, in particular the recent Statement of Intent between NZDF, the Manawatu District Council and Palmerston North City Council. Ms Davies has also described the nature of temporary military training activities, emphasising in particular those undertaken in the Manawatu District. My evidence relies on this statement.

---

<sup>1</sup> NZDF did not submit on Plan Changes 52 or 60 (noting that the existing designation for the Ohakea Air Base in the Manawatu District was rolled over as part of the District Plan review process).

- 7 I understand that the fundamental issue is whether TMTA provisions should apply district-wide and therefore be included in the District Wide chapter through PC55, or whether TMTA are appropriate only within the Rural Zone and therefore subject to the future Rural Zone plan review process.
- 8 I consider that TMTA provisions are appropriate within District Wide chapter for the following reasons:
- a The nature of TMTA means that they can and need to take place in any zone;
  - b The potential effects, and the manner of controlling these through NZDF's proposed provisions, means it's appropriate to provide for TMTA across all zones; and
  - c This approach is consistent with NZDF's project promoting national consistency for TMTA in District Plans across the country. Numerous other councils have agreed with NZDF's approach and have inserted TMTA provisions in their district wide chapters.
- 9 Sitting beneath this overarching planning argument is the manner in which the potential noise effects of TMTA are managed in the District Plan. NZDF has developed a set of bespoke noise standards specific to TMTA and is requesting that these be inserted in District Plans nationwide. My evidence discusses these provisions and explains why I consider they are appropriate for managing the types of noise that may result from temporary military training activities across all zones within the Manawatu District. The standards have been developed by NZDF in conjunction with Mr Malcolm Hunt, an acoustic engineer familiar with the complexities of noise resulting from weapons and explosives. Mr Hunt has prepared evidence on this technical matter.

## **CODE OF CONDUCT**

- 10 I confirm that I have read the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's Code of Practice Note 2014. I agree to comply with this Code. I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise and that I have not omitted to consider any material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my opinions expressed in this evidence.

## **INTRODUCTION TO TEMPORARY MILITARY TRAINING ACTIVITIES**

- 11 NZDF undertakes TMTA both on land and within the Coastal Marine Area. Ms Davies has provided a description of the nature of land-based TMTA in her evidence. TMTA may be undertaken over a period of days or weeks, on an intermittent or continuous basis, during the day time, and occasionally at night. In order to maintain capability for real-life situations, Ms Davies has explained the importance for training to be undertaken in a range of environments and locations, and not just at NZDF facilities. As a result, these activities can be undertaken almost anywhere in the country, subject to landowner agreement.
- 12 The first thing that comes to mind when considering TMTA is the use of weapons and explosives. However as highlighted by Ms Davies, this is only one aspect of TMTA and in fact there are a broad range of activities undertaken by NZDF on a day-to-day, regular, or intermittent basis which also fall within this definition.
- 13 Related to this is that while TMTA have some unique characteristics, the actual effects of many TMTA are unlikely to be of note compared to a broad range of other more usual day-to-day activities. For example, these activities include search and rescue operations, medical and dental services, camp setup, small construction tasks, search exercises (in commercial or industrial buildings as well as outdoors), and physical training.
- 14 Considering the broad range of activities that personnel need to be trained for, it is imperative that these activities are able to be undertaken in various locations and 'real world' situations, and across all areas of a district rather than just in rural areas.
- 15 The importance of NZDF personnel being well trained has recently been seen in NZDF's response to the North Canterbury earthquakes. More than two weeks on, NZDF continues to provide assistance to the area, including helicopter movements, air drops of supplies, setting up temporary camps and facilities for the public, and operating desalination units to provide fresh water to the community. These activities are targeted to where the need is and are not limited to rural land. Proper training is absolutely fundamental to providing this assistance and relief in a responsive and effective manner to people and communities in a time of need.

## EXISTING PROVISIONS FOR TEMPORARY MILITARY TRAINING ACTIVITIES

- 16 Rule A2 of the Operative District Plan sets out: **Rules applying throughout the District.** The Operative District Plan provides for ‘military training activities’ (which are not defined) within the definition of ‘temporary activities’ under Rule A2.2.1 in this section of the Plan. Rule A2.2.2 provides for temporary activities as permitted activities in all zones provided they comply with the standards in Rule 2.2.3. Rule 2.2.3 does not contain any specific standards for either noise or TMTA.
- 17 The Operative District Plan also contains a definition of ‘military exercises’ as follows:

*for the purposes of the Manfeild Park Zone, means military training activities which are temporary in nature and are restricted to orienteering exercises, communications training, tactical exercises, escape and evasion exercises which are undertaken by the New Zealand Defence Forces provided that these activities do not involve the discharge of explosives, guns or other weapons or the use of explosive simulators.*

- 18 Military exercises, albeit only those provided for within the definition, are a permitted activity in the Manfeild Park Zone under Rule B8.1.1(A)(i) of the Operative District Plan.

## APPROACH TO PLAN CHANGE 55

- 19 Military training activities are currently provided for under the ambit of temporary activities as a permitted activity throughout the district in the district-wide rules, subject to meeting permitted activity standards. Through its submission and in this hearing, NZDF is effectively seeking the status quo, although with bespoke noise standards specifically developed to manage the effects of noise from TMTA.
- 20 The rationale for changing from this current approach has not been clearly articulated by the Council, and importantly there is no Section 32 analysis to support such a change in approach. Instead it has to be presumed that the Council will rely on a future Section 32 analysis undertaken for the future Rural Zone plan change to justify taking TMTA provisions out of the district-wide provisions and limiting them to the Rural Zone (or to be considered on a zone by zone basis through a series of Plan Changes and associated Section 32 analyses). In my

view this predetermines the outcome and precludes TMTA from being included in the district-wide provisions, but with no supporting Section 32 analysis to support this change from the status quo.

- 21 NZDF relied on the submission and further submission process to be heard in respect of this Plan Change, as it has done on a number of other district plan changes nationwide. However it appears that the Officer has disregarded NZDF's submission on the basis that it has been labelled 'out of scope'. As NZDF submitted on PC55, the Council Officer has a duty to consider the planning merits of the submission in relation to the Plan Change at hand.
- 22 The Officer's s42A report also identifies perceived issues with fairness to other parties who may be affected by TMTA due to the 'real risk that persons directly or indirectly affected by the relief sought by NZDF would be denied an effective opportunity to respond to the changes'. With respect I do not agree with this statement. The further submissions process provides exactly the appropriate procedural step for any party to formally state support for or opposition to other submissions. Therefore, I consider that there is little risk in a party being disadvantaged by including TMTA provisions in the District Wide chapter through PC55.
- 23 Therefore, the remainder of my evidence discusses the merits of inserting TMTA provisions in the District Wide chapter of the District Plan.

#### **DISTRICT-WIDE PROVISIONS FOR TEMPORARY MILITARY TRAINING ACTIVITIES**

- 24 In the Section 42A report, the Council Officer recommends the TMTA be reviewed as part of the upcoming Rural Zone plan change, and other zone reviews as they occur (paragraph 5.2 on page 9 of the Hearing Report) i.e. on a zone by zone basis. Previous discussions with Council staff stated that TMTA would be provided for within the Rural Zone only. Therefore, no TMTA provisions have been included in PC55, which is the subject of this hearing.
- 25 I disagree with this approach, as I consider that providing for TMTA as a permitted activity in the district wide chapter to be the most efficient and effective method of providing for these activities, and avoids the need to duplicate identical provisions across each of the individual zone chapters. NZDF deals with District Plans nationwide, and is well aware of the practicalities of undertaking TMTA on a national basis, and as such providing for TMTA across the District is considered

best practice. This regime is simple for personnel to understand, as they are likely to transit across multiple zones during an exercise and therefore consistency in provisions is essential.

- 26 Undertaking TMTA in various locations and situations is important to ensure the training achieves the required level of realism. While personnel train and learn skills within Defence facilities such as Linton Military Camp near Palmerston North, this location can become familiar to personnel. To achieve a dynamic and 'real-life' training scenario, it is essential that training is undertaken at various locations around the district and indeed around New Zealand. Such training activities in the Manawatu District could include, for example:
- a physical training activity (i.e. jogging) in the Residential Zone and elsewhere;
  - b a medical training activity proposed in the Recreation Zone at Manchester Square, Fielding;
  - c undertaking a search and rescue exercise within an industrial building;
  - d bomb deactivation training in the Business Zone in Fielding.
- 27 Providing for TMTA across the district would be consistent with particularly considering that in the Operative District Plan provides for TMTA as permitted activities in the 'Rules applying across the District' section. NZDF is not aware of any issues or concerns that Council has in relation to undertaking TMTA within the Manawatu District.
- 28 I consider it appropriate that TMTA are provided for as a permitted activity within the District Wide chapter of the District Plan. TMTA include a wide variety of activities, and it is appropriate and necessary to undertake training on these activities in a broad range of situations. Further, I understand that a number of Councils provide for TMTA as a permitted activity in the 'District Wide', 'General' or 'Temporary Activities' chapters of their Plans. Examples include the South Waikato District Plan, Wanganui District Plan and the Dunedin City Plan.
- 29 As recently seen in North Canterbury, NZDF may be required to respond anywhere at any time, including here in New Zealand. It is therefore essential that the personnel are fully trained in all manner of scenarios and situations. This training must take place under the Defence Act 1990 and it is in New Zealand's best interests that this training is enabled through District Plan provisions.

- 30 PC55 also includes the District Plan's noise provisions, which apply on a district wide basis. For example, the proposed provisions include Table 3C.1 which lists the relevant noise standards for all zones in the District. For efficiency and clarity, this chapter should also include NZDF's requested noise provisions for TMTA. As noise is the only potential effect from TMTA, it is appropriate that the TMTA noise standards are included in this chapter of the District Plan.
- 31 Further, PC55 includes provisions for temporary activities. Similar to TMTA, these activities could also occur in various locations across the District, they include a number of different types of activity, and potentially have short term effects. In this regard TMTA are not dissimilar to these activities. Therefore, again, NZDF considers it appropriate that TMTA provisions are included in this District Wide chapter. This would be consistent with the treatment of other types of temporary activities.

#### **PERMITTED ACTIVITY STATUS**

- 32 This reflects the important nature of these activities, while also enabling NZDF to fulfil its obligations under the Defence Act 1990. I consider that providing for TMTAs as permitted activities in the District Wide chapter of the District Plan, with appropriate effects-based controls, is consistent with approaches being employed across the country.
- 33 As Ms Davies has described, NZDF is undertaking a nationwide project to achieve consistency in TMTA provisions in District Plans, and has made a significant investment in this project to date. Aside from the operational difficulties created by such variation in TMTA provisions nationwide, from a planning perspective I consider there to be little merit in each City or District Plan having its own set of rules for TMTA. A nationally consistent approach, as promoted by NZDF, is in line with the Government's proposed reforms to the RMA that would introduce nationwide templates and strengthen national planning tools.
- 34 I consider that the only standard relevant to TMTA is noise, and I discuss this further below.

#### **NOISE STANDARDS FOR TEMPORARY MILITARY TRAINING ACTIVITIES**

- 35 As set out in Ms Davies statement, NZDF has commissioned professional acoustic advice from Malcolm Hunt Associates which has developed a set of noise standards specific to TMTA. This standardised approach greatly simplifies and

- reduces the cost for NZDF to plan cross-zone and cross-District training exercises, and also makes it easier for both the Council and public to understand what is permitted. These noise standards were appended to NZDF's submission.
- 36 The only potentially significant effect of TMTA relates to noise effects from weapons firing and explosives. The provisions requested by NZDF work by using separation distances from sensitive receivers in the first instance. As described by Mr Hunt, these minimum setback distances are based on modelling which shows relevant noise limits can be met with a factor of safety/ conservatism built into modelling to allow for site differences.
- 37 Alternatively, TMTA involving firing and the use of explosives would also be permitted within the minimum separation distances where specific conditions regarding peak sound pressure levels at sensitive receivers can be met. Where these controls cannot be met then a resource consent would be required (or the activity cannot proceed at that particular location).
- 38 Appendix 4 to the S42A Report contains the statement of evidence from Nigel Lloyd of Acousafe Consulting and Engineering Limited. In his statement, Mr Lloyd considers that TMTA should not be provided for as Permitted Activities throughout the district, as noisier activities are more appropriate in the Rural Zone than in the Residential/Village Zone. Mr Lloyd recommends that TMTA provisions are considered in each zone by zone sectional review. I disagree.
- 39 The noise standards developed by NZDF have been designed to apply throughout a district to the four main types of noise sources related to TMTA. These are: firing of weapons and use of explosives, mobile sources, fixed sources, and helicopter landings. As noted earlier in my evidence, not all TMTA include the firing of weapons and explosives. In instances where they do include these aspects, then these standards are used to manage the potential noise effects, by setting an appropriate setback from a sensitive receiver. For example, an activity such as search and rescue training would not trigger the setback requirement as no weapons or explosives are involved. Instead, the noise standards relating to fixed and mobile noise sources would likely be relevant, if the activity included use of generators, machinery etc.

40 I understand that Mr Lloyd has not questioned the technical assessment behind the setback standards proposed by NZDF. The technical evidence presented to you therefore supports NZDF's statement that the setbacks proposed are sufficient to ensure that the amenity of sensitive receivers will be protected.

41 In my opinion, as a planner who has to interpret and understand rules and standards of a technical nature in plans and resource consents, a setback standard is easier for a person not trained in noise assessment to understand. Therefore, the proposed TMTA controls represent an applied approach to managing the noise effects of weapons firing and explosives use, and should be incorporated into PC55. Use of minimum setback distances as an alternative to actual noise measurement creates a practical tool for planning and compliance that is effective and efficient for both NZDF and Council.

#### **ACTIVITY STATUS WHEN THE PERMITTED STANDARDS ARE NOT MET**

42 I consider that TMTA that do not meet the permitted activity standards should be provided for as restricted discretionary activities in the District Wide chapter of the District Plan.

43 In my view, a restricted discretionary activity status is appropriate for activities that can be adequately managed through specific matters of discretion and conditions of consent. As explained by Mr Hunt, the noise generated by TMTA has been well studied and is known. My opinion is that the noise effects of TMTA can be adequately managed by standards and conditions.

44 NZDF must undertake training in order to fulfil its statutory obligations under the Defence Act 1990. As such, I understand it requires a degree of certainty that training activities can take place where and when required. I believe that a restricted discretionary status for TMTA that cannot meet the permitted standards provides the ability to appropriately manage and assess the relevant matters, providing a streamlined consent process for NZDF should a resource consent be required. This activity status also allows Council to manage noise effects resulting from activities that cannot comply with the permitted activity standards.

#### **CLASSIFICATION AND DEFINITION OF TMTA**

45 The Operative District Plan refers to TMTA within the broader 'temporary activities' definition. NZDF prefers that TMTA are provided for in a definition separate to that

of other temporary activities, and requests the following definition for insertion in the District Plan:

**‘Temporary Military Training Activity** *means a temporary military activity undertaken for defence purposes, as described in the Defence Act 1990.*’

## **OBJECTIVE AND POLICY MATTERS**

46 I consider that the proposed TMTA noise standards will give effect to the various objectives and policies of PC55, particularly Noise Objective 1 and underlying policy 1.1 which seeks to ensure standards protect dwellings and noise sensitive activities from unreasonable noise levels, and Temporary Activities Objective 1 and policy 1.2 which seek to ensure that a wide range of temporary activities are provided for in the District, while ensuring that any adverse effects, including noise, are managed. The TMTA noise standards proposed by NZDF will achieve these outcomes.

## **REVERSE SENSITIVITY**

47 NZDF submitted on reverse sensitivity matters, requesting that this issue was provided for in the Plan through PC55. I understand that a definition for reverse sensitivity was introduced through Plan Change 52. NZDF has reviewed this definition and considers it appropriate.

48 Contrary to the opinion expressed in the Council Officer’s s42A report, NZDF considers it appropriate and good practise to include specific objectives and policies in District Plans to address reverse sensitivity. This provides guidance to Plan users in relation to this issue. However considering the location of NZDF’s facilities within the District (i.e. Ohakea and Raumai), NZDF will focus on reverse sensitivity provisions within the future Plan Change for the Rural Zone.

## **CONCLUSION**

49 TMTA undertaken by NZDF contribute to maintaining the nation’s security and ultimately provide for the well-being, health and safety of people and the community.

50 In my opinion, providing for TMTA in the district-wide rules subject to NZDF’s bespoke noise standards, enables NZDF to meet its obligations under the Defence

Act 1990 while giving effect to the objectives and policies of Plan Change 55 and Part 2 of the Resource Management Act.



---

Sarah Bevin

1 December 2016

p:\85566\assorted jobs (old active work folder)\manawatu dp\pc 55 - district wide\hearing\sdb edits of klb comment on draft sarah bevin planning evidence 30 november 2016.docx

## Attachment 1: NZDF's submission

---

## Submission on Proposed Plan Change 55: District-wide Provisions Manawatu District Plan

*Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991*

**To:** Manawatu District Council  
**Address:** Private Bag 10 001  
Fielding 4743  
**Email:** [districtplanreview@mdc.govt.nz](mailto:districtplanreview@mdc.govt.nz)

**Submitter:** New Zealand Defence Force  
**Contact Person:** Rebecca Davies, Senior Environmental Officer

**Address for Service:** New Zealand Defence Force  
C/- Tonkin + Taylor  
PO Box 2083  
Wellington 6140

**Phone:** +64 21 445 482  
**Email:** [rebecca.davies@nzdf.mil.nz](mailto:rebecca.davies@nzdf.mil.nz)

### Preliminary Matters

This is a submission on Proposed Plan Change 55 to the Manawatu District Plan.

The New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) has military interests throughout New Zealand.

NZDF has a long history in the Manawatu District, with the RNZAF Ohakea Air Base and Raumai Air Weapons Range located within the District. This enduring relationship has recently been acknowledged with the signing of a Statement of Intent between New Zealand Defence Force, Manawatu District Council and Palmerston North City Council in November 2015, citing mutual benefits between the three parties and recording the intention of these parties to work together in mutual areas of interest.

NZDF needs to ensure that its existing facilities are protected from reverse sensitivity effects through the relevant District Plan provisions. At some stage in the future it may wish to extend its existing facilities or establish additional facilities in the Manawatu District. NZDF may also undertake training activities in the Manawatu District outside of its existing facilities. NZDF requests that these activities are appropriately provided for in Proposed Plan Change 55 and in particular, that Temporary Military Training Activities (TMTA) are provided for through the District Wide Rules contained in Chapter 3.

NZDF's submission is detailed on the attached sheet. NZDF has taken the opportunity through the re-notification process to provide additional details of the activities undertaken by NZDF in and around the Manawatu District. NZDF has also undertaken a comprehensive

review of its proposed noise limits for TMTA. While this is still being finalised an updated draft version is attached to this submission.

With the Statement of Intent in mind, NZDF has met with Manawatu District Council and its technical advisors to discuss NZDF's interests in the district and NZDF's preferred method of providing for these activities. NZDF reiterates its preference set out in its original submission to resolve the issues set out in the attached submission prior to the hearing.

NZDF **could not** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

NZDF **wishes to be heard** in support of this submission.

If others make a similar submission, **we will consider** presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.



10/8/16

Date

---

Person authorised to sign  
on behalf of New Zealand Defence Force

Point	Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision Sought
1.	Chapter 2. Definitions  Definition of "Military Exercises"	Oppose	The current definition restricts TMTA to the Manfeild Park Zone only and does not allow for the discharge of explosives, guns or other weapons or the use of explosive simulators.	Delete the proposed definition and replace with a new definition for "Temporary Military Training Activities". Suggested wording as follows:  <b>'Temporary Military Training Activity means a temporary military activity undertaken for defence purposes. The term 'defence purposes' is as defined in the Defence Act 1990.'</b>
2.	Chapter 2. Definitions  Definition of "Temporary Activities"	Support in part	NZDF supports TMTA being deleted from the definition of 'temporary activities'.  TMTA are unique activities and the effects are distinct from other temporary activities. It is appropriate for them to be excluded from the definition for "Temporary Activities", and provided for within their own specific definition.	Delete TMTA from the definition of 'temporary activities'. Include a definition for "Temporary Military Training Activities" as follows:  <b>'Temporary Military Training Activity means a temporary military activity undertaken for defence purposes. The term 'defence purposes' is as defined in the Defence Act 1990.'</b>
3.	Chapter 2. Definitions  Definition of "Network Utility"	Oppose in part	A network utility is defined as an activity or operation of a network utility operator and includes those facilities which provide an essential service to the public.  Defence facilities and activities are critical to the health, safety and wellbeing of people and communities. This is recognised in the Policy 3-1 of the Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council One Plan. To give effect to this plan, NZDF considers it appropriate for "defence facilities" to be added as a bullet point on this list.	Add "defence facilities" to the list of network utilities.
4.	Chapter 2. Definitions  Definition of "Infrastructure of regional and national"	Support	The current definition refers to Policy 3-1 of the Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council One Plan. NZDF facilities are included within the definition of 'Infrastructure of regional and national importance.	Retain definition of "Infrastructure of regional and national importance"

Point	Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision Sought
	importance”			
5.	Chapter 3A – Network Utilities	Support	NZDF support the provisions for network utilities, including, but not limited to, Section 3A.2 Resource Management Issues, Objective 2, Policies 2.1 and 2.3	Retain provisions as notified or wording to similar effect.
6.	Chapter 3C – Noise (District wide rules).	Oppose in part	<p>Due to the broad and varied nature of TMTA, they can be undertaken in any zone within a district. NZDF therefore seeks TMTA specific noise provisions to be included in district-wide rules in a District Plan. As activities are uniquely military in nature, it is appropriate to have specific TMTA provisions to address their effects.</p> <p>NZDF has commissioned professional acoustic advice from Malcolm Hunt Associates and has developed a set of noise standards specific to TMTAs to replace those currently included in district plans. For weapons firing and explosives, the TMTA noise provisions work by using separation distances from sensitive receivers.</p>	Adopt the noise provisions as requested by NZDF. See attached Permitted Activity Noise Standards for TMTA. <u>These have recently been updated and should be considered as ‘draft’.</u>
7.	3C.4.2 Standards for Permitted Activities Table 3C.1 – Noise levels	Oppose	This table states that the potentially affected zone is to be measured at any point within the boundary of any other site in the zone. However the notional boundary is the generally accepted approach to applying the relevant noise limits and there is no robust rationale provided to deviate from this.	Retain the notional boundary as the measurement requirement for measuring noise levels at the property boundary.
8.	Chapter 4.2 General Objectives – Policy d)	Oppose	<p>NZDF opposes the deletion of existing Policy d) as temporary activities and TMTA should be acknowledged as having a minor effect on the environment over a short period of time.</p> <p>Policy currently states: “<i>To recognise that certain land uses, including temporary signs, generally have a minor effect on the environment due to their limited duration.</i>”</p>	Retain Policy d) as currently written, with suggested wording for the explanation as follows: “ <i>The Plan needs to provide for temporary land uses which only have minor effects, as permitted activities (Policy d)), including temporary military training activities.</i> ”
9.	Chapter 3 – District	Oppose	NZDF requests that TMTA are provided for under Chapter 3 – District Wide Rules as it is inappropriate to confine temporary	Provisions for temporary military training activities need to be included under Chapter 3 –

Point	Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision Sought
	Wide Rules		<p>military training activities to particular zones due to the varied nature of the activities. Provisions for TMTAs should provide for the variety of activities that are undertaken, including activities such as search and rescue training, classroom based learning, potable water training in urban areas and bomb deactivation training, as well as physical training and orienteering.</p> <p>We understand that Council intends to include provision for TMTA within the Rural Chapters of the Plan as approximately 96% of the District is zoned Rural (statistic obtained from Council during our meeting dated 22 June 2016). Nevertheless, TMTA include a broad range of activities, some of which need to occur in zones other than those zoned rural. Examples of the activities undertaken in and around the Manawatu District over the past 5 years include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Civil Defence support training;</li> <li>• Searches along road and adjacent properties;</li> <li>• Establish temporary camp;</li> <li>• School visits and school displays;</li> <li>• Physical training (jogging etc);</li> <li>• DoC hut construction activities;</li> <li>• Assistance in setting up community events;</li> <li>• Re-roof Scout Hall</li> <li>• Assistance with Habitat for Humanity construction;</li> <li>• Maintenance of unsealed roads;</li> <li>• Medical unit training including treatment of casualties;</li> <li>• Site surveys; and</li> <li>• Searches for a 'high risk person' in built up areas.</li> </ul> <p>As shown, the breadth of activities undertaken is extensive and not limited to those undertaken in the Rural Zone. Having to obtain consent for an activity, simply because it is not within the Rural Zone, is inappropriate, inefficient and unacceptable to NZDF. Importantly is not related to the 'effects' of the</p>	<p>District Wide Rules.</p> <p>Temporary Military Training Activities added as an additional bullet point under 3.1 Introduction. There should then be a subsection added for TMTA including the noise provisions for TMTA as the permitted activity standard. TMTA which do not comply with the permitted activity standards should be provided for as restricted discretionary activities. Discretion should be restricted to the timing/duration of the activity and noise effects.</p>

Point	Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision Sought
			activity, particularly where the effects of many TMTA are the same or similar to a broad range of other day-to-day activities and/or activities undertaken by emergency services.	
10.	Chapter 4.11 – Noise Management	Support	Defence facilities and activities are critical to the health, safety and wellbeing of people and communities. This is recognised in the Policy 3-1 of the Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council One Plan. The provisions in this section of PC55 appropriately acknowledge the importance of the Ohakea Air Base.	Retain specific recognition of the importance of the Ohakea Air Base within the Noise Management chapter as currently contained in the PC55 or wording to similar effect.
11.	Reverse sensitivity	Oppose	<p>Reverse sensitivity is a significant issue for NZDF as well as other infrastructure providers, industrial operators and rural uses and activities. The District Plan needs to provide a framework for avoiding reverse sensitivity effects as far as practicable, and otherwise remedying or mitigating such effects.</p> <p>It is important that the defence facilities in the Manawatu District are adequately protected from incompatible land uses in the District Plan to avoid reverse sensitivity effects. This includes the Ohakea Air Base which is both a regionally and nationally significant defence facility.</p>	<p>Include more comprehensive and robust provisions to address reverse sensitivity by way of appropriate objectives, policies, rules and land zoning including in the sections of the plan which address subdivision, land use management, the rural zone, and network utilities.</p> <p>Include a definition for “Reverse sensitivity”. Suggested wording as follows:</p> <p><b>‘Reverse sensitivity occurs when existing activities are affected by newer uses establishing that may have sensitivity to, and subsequently complain about, the effects of the existing activity; and seek to limit the ability of the existing activities to continue. Common examples are new residential development establishing next to farming or industrial operations, which can lead to new residents complaining about noise, odour or other nuisance effects from those established activities.’</b></p>
12.	Other rules in the District Plan	Support in part	Due to the temporary and specialised nature of TMTA, NZDF considers that it is generally appropriate that TMTA be exempt from the rules in other chapters of the District Plan	If TMTA are to be subject to specific chapters or rules, such as for earthworks or permanent structures, NZDF requests that this is clearly

Point	Provision	Support / Oppose	Reasons	Decision Sought
			such as transportation.	noted in the relevant parts of the District Plan.

## Attachment 1: DRAFT UPDATED 2016 Permitted Activity Noise Standards for Temporary Military Training Activities

Rule x.x: Temporary Military Training Activities are permitted activities, provided they comply with the noise standards specified in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Noise controls for TMTA**

Noise Controls				
Type of military noise source	Standards			
<b>1. Weapons firing and/or the use of explosives</b>	1. Notice is provided to the Council at least 5 working days prior to the commencement of the activity.			
	2. Compliance with the noise standards below:			
		<b>Time (Monday to Sunday)</b>	<b>Separation distance required between the boundary of the activity and the notional boundary to any building housing a noise sensitive activity</b>	
	<b>Firing of weapons and single or multiple explosive events</b>	0700 to 1900 hours	At least 500m	Less than 500m if condition (a) below is complied with
		1900 to 0700 hours	At least TBC m	Less than TBCm if condition (b) below is complied with
	<b>Condition</b>	<b>Time (Monday to Sunday)</b>	<b>Noise level at the notional boundary of any building housing a noise sensitive activity</b>	
	(a)	0700-1900hrs	Peak sound pressure level of 95 dBC	
(b)	1900-0700hrs	Peak sound pressure level of TBC dBC		
<b>2. Mobile noise sources</b>	Compliance with the noise limits set out in Tables 2 and 3 of <i>NZS6803:1999 Acoustics – Construction Noise</i> , with reference to ‘construction noise’ taken to refer to mobile noise sources* <b>Note:</b> Mobile noise sources include personnel, light and heavy vehicles, self-propelled equipment, earthmoving equipment			
<b>3. Fixed (stationary) noise sources</b>	<b>Time (Monday to Sunday)</b>	<b>Noise level at the notional boundary to any building housing a noise sensitive activity *</b>		
	0700 to 1900 hours	55 dB L <sub>Aeq</sub> (15 min)	n.a.	
	1900 to 2200 hours	50 dB L <sub>Aeq</sub> (15 min)		
	2200 to 0700 hours the next day	45 dB L <sub>Aeq</sub> (15 min)	75 dB L <sub>AFmax</sub>	
<b>Note:</b> Fixed (stationary) noise sources includes power generation, heating, ventilation or air conditioning systems, or water or wastewater pumping/treatment systems.				
<b>4. Helicopter landing areas</b>	Compliance with <i>NZS6807:1994 Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas</i> *			

\* Noise levels shall be measured in accordance with NZS6801:2008 Acoustics – Measurement of Sound

## Attachment 2: Background Information and Explanation

NZDF wishes to make sure that the noise standards included in District Plans are up-to-date, appropriate for the type of noise generated and relatively simple to understand and assess compliance with. To this end, NZDF has commissioned professional acoustic advice on appropriate standards to control noise effects from Temporary Military Training Activities. This report can be provided on request. Based on this advice, NZDF has developed revised noise control standards that it is seeking to have included in proposed district plans nationwide.

The replacement noise standards proposed by NZDF focus on compliance at dwellings, residentially zoned sites, and buildings used for residential, educational or healthcare purposes.

In summary, the NZDF's proposed standards divide noise sources from Temporary Military Training Activities into four categories: weapons firing and explosions; other mobile sources such as vehicles and earthmoving equipment; fixed noise sources such as power generators and water pumping, and helicopter landing areas. Each of these noise sources has different noise characteristics, and therefore a different set of standards for controlling noise. NZDF considers that this division allows a more comprehensive and appropriate method for controlling noise from Temporary Military Training Activities.

1. For weapons firing and explosives, the noise control standard used is separation distances between the activity and any sensitive receiver. The separation distances are conservative (i.e. incorporate an additional buffer), and have been arrived at after review and analysis of data measured from real military activities, to ensure that the sound levels received at the specified distances will be reasonable (generally less than 55 dBA for daytime and less than 45 dBA for nighttime). Using separation distance as a standard has the advantage of being an easy to comply with and easy to monitor standard. In cases where these separation distances cannot be met, then the specified noise limits apply, which also ensure that amenity at receiving sites is maintained.
2. For mobile noise sources (other than weapons firing and explosives), compliance with the construction noise standards is recommended, as this standard most appropriately addresses this type of noise.
3. For fixed noise sources, which can be located to ensure compliance with standards, dB LAeq levels are specified, in line with NZS6802:2008 Acoustics – Environmental Noise. This is considered the most appropriate way to control noise levels from these sources.
4. NZDF has also considered noise from helicopters associated with temporary military training activities. NZDF proposes the use of NZS6807:1994 Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas to control this type of noise.

## Attachment 2: TMTA noise standards

---

## Permitted Activity Noise Standards for Temporary Military Training Activities

**Rule X:** Temporary Military Training Activities are permitted activities provided they comply with the following noise standards:

### 1. Weapons firing and/or the use of explosives

- a. Notice is provided to the Council at least 5 working days prior to the commencement of the activity.
- b. The activity complies with the following minimum separation distances to the notional boundary of any building housing a noise sensitive activity:  
0700 to 1900 hours: 500m  
1900 to 0700 hours: 1,250m
- c. Where the minimum separation distances specified above cannot be met, then the activity shall comply with the following peak sound pressure level when measured at the notional boundary of any building housing a noise sensitive activity:  
0700 to 1900 hours: 95 dBC  
1900 to 0700 hours: 85 dBC

### 2. Mobile noise sources

Shall comply with the noise limits set out in Tables 2 and 3 of *NZS6803:1999 Acoustics – Construction Noise*, with reference to ‘construction noise’ taken to refer to mobile noise sources\*.

Note: Mobile noise sources (other than firing of weapons and explosives) include personnel, light and heavy vehicles, self-propelled equipment, earthmoving equipment.

### 3. Fixed (stationary) noise sources

Shall comply with the noise limits set out in the table below when measured at the notional boundary of any building housing a noise sensitive activity\*.

Time (Monday to Sunday)	L <sub>Aeq</sub> (15 min)	L <sub>AFmax</sub>
0700 to 1900 hours	55 dB	n.a.
1900 to 2200 hours	50 dB	
2200 to 0700 hours the next day	45 dB	75 dB

Note: Fixed (stationary) noise sources (other than firing of weapons and explosives) include power generation, heating, ventilation or air conditioning systems, or water or wastewater pumping/treatment systems.

### 4. Helicopter landing areas

Shall comply with NZS6807:1994 Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas\*.

\* Noise levels shall be measured in accordance with NZS6801:2008 Acoustics – Measurement of Sound.