

MEMO

<b>Project:</b>	Downtown West	<b>Document No.:</b>	Mm 018
<b>To:</b>	Precinct	<b>Date:</b>	1 April 2026
<b>Attention:</b>	c/- Karl Cook	<b>Cross Reference:</b>	
<b>Delivery:</b>	Email	<b>Project No.:</b>	20230126
<b>From:</b>	Shaun King	<b>No. Pages:</b>	3
		<b>Attachments:</b>	No
<b>Subject:</b>	Acoustic Assessment Addendum		

Following the preparation of our Assessment of Effects and draft Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP), I have had discussions with experts from Auckland Council and MCK (MSocial). This memo summarises where changes to Conditions of Consent are proposed and additional detail, clarification or changes to my assessment has occurred based on the discussions.

### Conditions of consent

The following changes to the Conditions of Consent are recommended, with exact wording of these changes to be developed as part of the Fast Track process.

1. A change to Condition 30, which relates the objective of the CNVMP. This is provided below.  
*“The objective of the CNVMP is to identify and adopt the Best Practicable Option for minimising adverse construction noise and vibration effects, including defining the procedures to be followed to achieve compliance with the criteria in Conditions 65 and 67 where practicable; and where compliance cannot practicably be achieved, ensuring that a Schedule to the CNVMP is prepared in accordance with Condition [70].”*
2. That Condition 72 requires Council certification of a Schedule. Additionally, I recommend amending “...except in unforeseen circumstances...” to better refine the relevant circumstances, such as when stopping an activity has health and safety risks.
3. Changes to the part of Condition 67 that allows an exceedance of the vibration amenity limits. Compliance is practical at all receivers except for 29 Customs Street West (Aon) and the conditions would be updated to reflect this.
4. Strengthening Condition 73 to require a Schedule for all night works, including activities that comply with the noise limits.
5. That Condition 75 be reworded to ensure it applies to cumulative noise from site.
6. That Condition 114 be revised to make it clear that a post condition survey is required 20 working days after the high vibration activity completes, rather than completion of all works.

## Acoustic assessment

The following clarifications are made with regards to the Acoustic Assessment of Effects (Appendix 38 to the application, dated 5 November 2025).

1. My assessment covers the proposed demolition activities in Section 5.6. The heading for this section should say "Demolition and Construction Noise". The predicted worst case demolition noise is a concrete saw and is in column 4 of Table 7. There is a small risk of other demolition activities exceeding the limits, such as a small excavator mounted concrete breaker, when working at the edge of the existing building. However, these noise levels would be less than predicted in Table 7 and wouldn't extend the duration of infringement.
2. The assessment predicts that early morning concrete pours can comply with the night-time noise limit of 60 dB  $L_{Aeq}$ . Noise levels within hotel/bedrooms of MSocial and Sebel would be less than 30 dB  $L_{Aeq}$  for this activity, which is considered suitable for sleeping.
3. The assessment includes removal of the pedestrian and vehicle bridges. The cutting of the bridge elements will be undertaken with a wire saw during the day. These bridge elements will then be removed at night with a crane. These activities are assessed to comply with the daytime and night-time noise limits.
4. Predicted noise levels at adjacent buildings are without screening unless noted with a super script 1. This ensures that predictions are accurate for upper floors of adjacent buildings that will look over noise barriers. At lower levels of the neighbouring buildings where they do not look over the barrier, noise levels will be 5-10 decibels lower depending on proximity of the noise source to the barrier.
5. The worst case noise levels don't consider cumulative noise, but in practice, multiple work fronts are typically separated spatially such that one source dominates at any given receiver. Cumulative noise is unlikely to increase worst-case levels in practice. When two activities are at a similar large distance there would be some cumulative effect, but noise levels would be compliant. Worst case could mean that noise levels increase by 3 dB, which is just perceptible and is unlikely to change the effects assessment.
6. I make the following clarification on my assessment of 40 dB  $L_{Aeq}$  being an acceptable internal noise level for hotels during the day.

At 40 dB  $L_{Aeq}$ , normal activities including conversation and sleeping are possible, although sensitive sleepers may be disturbed. This is consistent with the AS/NZS 2107 design range for sleeping areas (35–40 dB  $L_{Aeq}$ ). The assessment acknowledges that daytime sleeping (e.g. air crew) may be affected during the closest works. However the hotel is large and noise levels will be significantly less on higher floors. It is anticipated that MSocial would be able to manage which rooms day sleepers such as air crew are assigned.

7. I make the following clarification on effects for noise levels that comply with the permitted activity construction noise limit in the context of this project.

Compliance with the NZS 6803 limits is the accepted benchmark for reasonable construction noise. The AUP adopts these limits as the permitted activity standard. This does not mean effects are absent, but it represents the level at which effects are accepted as reasonable within the regulatory framework. For clarity, noise levels of 75 dB  $L_{Aeq}$  at the (southern) façade of the MSocial building is predicted to generate noise levels of 35 dB  $L_{Aeq}$  or less within hotel rooms. This is unlikely to impact occupants use of their hotel room.

### Construction noise and vibration management plan

The following comments are made with regards to the draft CNVMP. It is intended that these will be included in an updated version to be provided with the applicant's response to comments.

1. A section will be added for drop shaft noise and vibration management.
2. Table 4 incorrectly lists MSocial as requiring a Schedule for sheet piling. The corrected text is as follows:  
*A Schedule (see Section 5.10) will be required for the following activities:*
  - *Concrete saws – 196 – 200 Quay Street*
  - *D-wall piling – 29 Customs Street West & 196 – 200 Quay Street*
  - *Bored piling – 29 Customs Street West & 196 – 200 Quay Street*
  - *Sheet piling – 90 Customs Street West, 85 Customs Street West & 188 Quay Street*
3. The monitoring requirements have been refined. The updated text is as follows:  
*...Construction noise will be monitored:*
  - *At the first occurrence of an activity to which a Schedule relates, to verify that predicted noise levels are representative of actual conditions*
  - *At the first occurrence of using the drop zones as part of the demolition process*

...

*...Construction vibration will be monitored:*
  - *At the first occurrence of an activity to which a Schedule relates, to verify that predicted vibration levels are representative of actual conditions*
  - *At the first occurrence of using the drop zones as part of the demolition process*

...
4. CNVMP will be updated to clarify that for Schedules certification from Council is required.