

**Before the Expert Panel appointed
under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024**

Under

the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024

And

In the Matter of

an application for approvals by Mt
Iron Junction Limited to develop 250
medium to high density residential
dwellings, a childcare centre, a retail
building, a café, reserve areas and
recreation amenities

**Statement of Evidence of
Rewa Jane Satory on behalf of
Mt Iron Junction Limited in response to
comments made under Section 53**

Acoustic Engineering

Dated: 26 June 2026

Lane Neave
Level 1, 2 Memorial Street
PO Box 7348
Queenstown
Solicitors Acting: Joshua Leckie/Charlotte Coyle
Email:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

lane neave.

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Rewa Jane Satory.
2. I am an Associate Acoustic Engineer with Acoustic Engineering Services Limited and have over 10 years' experience in the field of acoustic engineering consultancy. I have been involved with a large number of environmental noise assessment projects throughout New Zealand on behalf of applicants, submitters and as a peer reviewer for Councils. I hold a Bachelor of Engineering from the University of Canterbury and am a Member of the Acoustical Society of New Zealand and the Resource Management Law Association.
3. This statement is given as part of Mt Iron Junction Limited's (**MIJ** or **Applicant**) response to comments on the Mt Iron Junction Housing Scheme (**Project**) made under Section 53 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (**FTA**). This statement responds to specific comments raised by:
 - (a) Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**);
 - (b) owners and occupiers of adjacent land; and
 - (c) New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (**NZTA**).
4. My original findings are provided in full in:
 - (a) Substantive Application, Appendix U: Assessment of Environmental Noise Effects titled *Mt Iron Junction Mixed Use Development, 237 Wanaka – Luggate Highway, Wanaka* dated the 19th of December 2025 (**AENE**); and
 - (b) response to Peer review questions for QLDC (**RFI**) titled *Mt Iron Junction Mixed Use Development - Fast Track Application*, dated the 7th of May 2026 (**RFI Response**).
5. In preparing this evidence I have also used information from the Internal and External Integrated Transport Assessments submitted with the application in Appendices K and K1.
6. I have prepared this statement in the limited time available for the Applicant to respond to comments under the FTA. If the Panel requires elaboration on any of the matters raised in this statement, I am available to provide further information on request.
7. Although this is not an Environment Court proceeding my confirmation of compliance with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court

Practice Note 2023 is included in Appendix Seven (Expert Confirmation of Compliance with Code of Conduct) of the Legal Overview submitted as part of the substantive application and further Code of Conduct Table confirming my qualifications and experience provided to the Expert Panel on 26 June 2026.

SPECIFIC RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

8. In my evidence, I respond to the noise matters raised in comments and expert reviews on the application. The evidence focuses on the key areas of agreement and difference. The discussion that follows focuses on the substantive issues that remain in dispute, rather than repeating matters where there is broad alignment.
9. I have responded to noise matters raised, in comments and expert reviews of the application, from the following parties:
 - (a) QLDC, Section 53 Comments dated 19 June 2026 including:
 - (i) Appendix 3 - Styles Group Acoustic Peer Review dated 18 June 2026; and
 - (ii) Appendix 9 - Proposed changes to conditions.
 - (b) Various Section 53 Comments from owners and occupiers of adjacent land.
 - (c) NZTA, Section 53 Comments dated 18 June 2026.

Queenstown Lakes District Council

Styles Group Peer Review – Mr Exeter

Noise effects on internal and external receivers

10. There appears to be some difference of opinion between myself and Mr Exeter around what sources of guidance should be relied on when assessing noise effects; however, we have both considered the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) limits, the existing environment, and the frequency and timing of noise emissions in order to determine the level of potential adverse effects on noise sensitive receivers – so any difference does not seem to be material. We appear to agree that where there is compliance with the PDP noise limits at external sites, noise will not cause unreasonable disturbance or annoyance.¹
11. During the RFI process with QLDC, noise from the development was remodelled using a less conservative application of NZS 6802:2008 as was requested by Mr

¹ Queenstown Lakes District Council, Section 53 Comments, Appendix 3 – Acoustic Peer Review, 18 June 2026 at Section 6.1

Exeter at that time. Noise levels reduced from what was predicted in the original AENE, and full compliance with the PDP limits is now expected for external receivers. Mr Exeter agrees with the revised assessment.² There therefore appears to be no issue as to noise effects experienced by external receivers.

12. With regard to internal receivers, Mr Exeter has recommended noise-related conditions for the pickleball court and truck deliveries at the loading bay associated with the market.³ While the QLDC has not adopted these recommendations, in order for the market loading bay to be able to operate I agree that a condition allowing up to 61 dB L_{Aeq} at nearby apartments in Lot 102 is appropriate, as proposed by Mr Exeter.
13. It would also be appropriate to include a condition requiring the fencing of the loading bay that was assessed in the AENE to be installed before operation of the market and maintained to be acoustically effective.

Potential adverse effects associated with State Highway noise experienced within the development

14. During the RFI process, Mr Exeter queried whether the internal traffic noise level design target of 40 dB L_{Aeq} (24 hour), which I had proposed for new noise sensitive spaces within the development, would adequately control noise within dwellings in the early morning period between 0500 and 0800 hours. Based on the further analysis I provided in response, it appears that Mr Exeter now agrees that noise from traffic during these times is not expected to cause sleep disturbance, if dwellings are designed to comply with the 40 dB L_{Aeq} (24 hour) requirement.⁴
15. Mr Exeter has however now questioned whether the indicative constructions I provided, as examples of what may be needed to achieve an internal design sound level of 40 dB L_{Aeq} (24 hour), will be adequate, without providing any particular technical data to support to this assertion.⁵ There are various combinations of upgraded external elements (glazing, façade and roofing) that will ensure the internal noise levels can be met, and as Mr Exeter states the important observation at this stage is that there will be practicable options to meet the requirements. Condition A.9.c requires a design report to be submitted to QLDC demonstrating compliance with the internal design sound level in due course. I consider the design report required by Condition A.9.c can adequately resolve Mr Exeter's concerns on this point.

² Section 6.0.

³ Section 8.6.

⁴ Section 7.0, page 7.

⁵ Section 7.0, page 6.

Construction noise

16. Mr Exeter has reviewed the construction noise assessment provided in the RFI and stated that construction noise and vibration from the project will not cause unreasonable disturbance if the PDP limits for permitted activities are complied with⁶ where noisy activities take place between 7:30 am and 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday.
17. He then recommends changes to the proposed conditions to limit the noise and vibration between 0700 and 0730 hours to 45 dB $L_{Aeq(15\text{ min})}$ and a vibration limit of 0.3 mm/s peak particle velocity at any occupied dwelling.
18. This noise limit is lower than the PDP construction noise limit which applies during this time Monday to Friday but is consistent with the PDP construction noise limit before 0730 hours on Saturdays – and it is surprising that Mr Exeter considers that additional evidence is needed before a limit is put in place which already applies generally in the PDP. As the construction noise limits given in the PDP have undergone review for acceptability and are in line with NZS 6803:1999 and the Association of Australasian Acoustical Consultants *Guideline for interpreting and applying NZS 6803:1999*, I consider the PDP noise limits should apply.
19. With regard to the vibration limit proposed by Mr Exeter for the early morning period – this is also lower than the PDP vibration limit that is designed to protect buildings and is not related to effects on occupants of buildings. The 0.3 mm/s limit proposed by Mr Exeter for the early morning period is at the level that is generally considered just perceptible in normal residential environments, and I agree that it is suitable for this early morning period.

Overall Queenstown Lakes District Council comments and proposed changes to conditions

20. The overall QLDC comment states that operational noise from the development will not cause unreasonable disturbance or annoyance at nearby external sites nor will there be unreasonable disruption within internal residential units from operational noise.⁷ This is consistent with my conclusion that noise from the development will have minimal adverse effect at the relevant external boundaries and internal noise sensitive locations.
21. With the exception of Condition B.19, I recommend the QLDC Appendix 9 suggested tracked changes to proposed draft consent conditions relevant to noise be adopted.

⁶ Section 5.0

⁷ Page 6, para 3.4.2

22. I propose the following wording for Condition B.19 with changes from the QLDC proposed wording:

*The CNVMP may authorise some work to take place at other times where the CNVMP demonstrates that those works will comply with **the PDP construction noise limits** ~~a construction noise limit of 45 dB L_{Aeq(15 min)}~~ and a vibration limit of 0.3 mm/s PPV at any occupied dwelling (for example, light vehicle movements, works well separated from any receivers, site meetings, electrical fitout, painting etc).*

Owners and occupiers of adjacent land

23. There are six comments from the following owners and occupiers of adjacent land, that mention noise:

- (a) Wayne Malcom Casey and Euan Stewart Simpson as trustees of the Casey Family Trust [REDACTED]
- (b) Luke Paul Smeets and Vida Joyce Mercedes Laird ([REDACTED]
[REDACTED])
- (c) Christopher Mark Morgan, Jane Charlotte Morgan and Paul Alexander Johnston [REDACTED]
- (d) Gordon David Lang [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- (e) Gillian Ryan and Scott Johnson [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; and
- (f) Jonathan David Fitchew and Janine Lesley Fitchew-Carroll [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

24. Most concerns are related to increased noise from the development – for example “*shattering the peace and quiet*” of the area, along with increased disturbance and reduction of quiet enjoyment. Two commenters (35 and 29/29a Old Racecourse Road) mention traffic noise specifically and other submitters mentioning increased noise in general.

25. All of the commentors properties are currently exposed to elevated noise from traffic on State Highway 6 (carrying an average of over 11,000 vehicles per day in 2025) and State Highway 84 (carrying an average of over 14,000 vehicles per day in 2025). Existing traffic noise levels are therefore expected to already be in the order of at least 55 dB L_{Aeq(24 hour)} over parts of the commentors’ sites. This is not a quiet environment.

26. When the site is developed as per the current scheme the traffic noise from State Highway 6 and State Highway 84 will actually be reduced over most of the commentors' sites by up to 8 dB, as the new buildings will provide screening. Noise from vehicles inside the development is not expected to contribute in a meaningful way to overall traffic noise levels received at the commentors' properties to the north, as the traffic volumes are relatively low, and shielding will be provided by the new dwellings to be located on the northern boundary of the development. Noise from other sources such as heat pumps will be required to comply with the PDP noise limits, and will have minimal effect in this ambient environment.
27. Luke Paul Smeets and Vida Joyce Mercedes Laird of [REDACTED] mention construction noise frightening Kārearea. While I am not an expert in bird behaviour, as described above the area is not currently quiet due to traffic noise. I also observe that construction noise and other transient louder sounds (for example helicopter overflights) are common in the wider Mt Iron area. I therefore do not expect construction noise associated with this development to be uniquely prone to disturbing wildlife.

New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi

28. NZTA have commented on my proposed approach to the management of noise effects from State Highway 6 and State Highway 84. In paragraph 8.1 the NZTA confirm that they support the wording of Condition A.9. noting that the condition refers to sensitive activities within 100 metres of the edge of the State Highway 6 and/or State Highway 84 carriageway and provides an appropriate internal decibel level. This internal level will be achieved through appropriate design of external facades as required by Condition A.9.



Rewa Jane Satory

26 June 2026