



Outlook

State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass (Belfast to Pegasus) — Comment from Jan Vlk, Kaiapoi Noise Mitigation

From [REDACTED]**Date** Mon 4/05/2026 9:12 PM**To** FastTrack Substantive <substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz>

2 attachments (158 KB)

Community Support SH1 Noise Mitigation in Kaiapoi.pdf; [REDACTED].pdf;

Kia ora Fast track Team,

Please accept this email as my formal comment on the State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass (Belfast to Pegasus) project under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024.

I am a resident of [REDACTED], located near the existing State Highway 1 corridor. I understand that the Expert Panel has invited comments on the application, and I respectfully request that this email and the attached documents be placed before the Panel as part of that process.

I support the wider purpose of the project in principle. I recognise the importance of improving transport capacity, safety, resilience, and regional connectivity for North Canterbury. This submission is not made in opposition to the project.

However, I have serious concerns regarding the operational road-traffic noise effects on the existing residential community in Kaiapoi beside the current SH1 corridor, particularly the area around Whitefield Street, Sneyd Street, Epworth Street, Bayliss Drive, Hayson Drive, Wyatt Street and nearby residential streets.

My concern is that this established residential area may not receive sufficiently specific, transparent and enforceable noise mitigation as part of the project, despite being directly affected by the existing SH1 corridor and by proposed works that may materially change the future traffic-noise environment.

This submission asks the Expert Panel to ensure that the Kaiapoi residential area is properly assessed under the relevant road-traffic noise framework and that any required mitigation is secured through clear, measurable and enforceable conditions.

The issue is not whether the project should proceed. The issue is whether an existing community living beside the upgraded SH1 corridor will be properly protected from avoidable and increased operational noise effects.

1. Existing Kaiapoi residential environment

The residential area around Whitefield Street and Sneyd Street is already affected by SH1 traffic noise.

The attached local sound measurement record shows a measured LAeq of 63.31 dB over a 15-minute measurement period. The same measurement also recorded LAF10 of 65.41 dB, LAF50 of 63.00 dB and LAF90 of 60.05 dB.

I acknowledge that this is not a full LAeq(24h) assessment under NZS 6806. It is a short duration local measurement and should not be treated as a substitute for formal road traffic noise modelling.

However, it is still important local evidence. It demonstrates that the existing noise environment is already significant and persistent. In particular, the LAF90 value of 60.05 dB indicates that the acoustic environment is not simply affected by occasional isolated loud events, but by a sustained underlying traffic-noise condition.

The measurement was taken in the Whitefield Street area. It does not necessarily represent the highest exposure experienced at all affected dwellings, dwelling boundaries, rear yards or outdoor living spaces. Some properties may have a more direct line of sight to SH1, less shielding, or outdoor living areas more exposed to the carriageway.

For that reason, this local evidence should be treated as a warning signal requiring proper LAeq(24h) modelling and receiver-specific assessment for the Kaiapoi residential area.

2. The project represents a material change in the operational environment

The project is not simply a passive continuation of the existing SH1 environment.

The works include changes to the existing SH1 corridor in and around Kaiapoi, including the Kaiapoi River Bridge area, additional southbound lane capacity, and wider corridor improvements. These changes may affect how traffic noise is experienced by the adjoining residential community.

Relevant factors may include:

1. Increased traffic throughput.
2. Future traffic growth.
3. Heavy vehicle volumes.
4. Lane position relative to existing dwellings.
5. Traffic speed and flow characteristics.
6. Road-surface type and acoustic performance.
7. Bridge and pavement geometry.
8. Barrier, bunding or screening effects.
9. Cumulative LAeq(24h) exposure.
10. The duration and character of traffic noise during daytime, evening and early-morning periods.

For residents living beside SH1, these are not abstract technical assumptions. They affect the practical use and enjoyment of homes, gardens, outdoor living areas, sleep, conversation, and the ability to open windows and doors.

It is therefore essential that the Kaiapoi section is assessed transparently by comparing:

1. The existing noise environment.
2. The future do nothing environment.
3. The future project environment without mitigation.
4. The future project environment with proposed mitigation.

Without that comparison, affected residents cannot understand whether the project will improve, maintain, or worsen the road-traffic noise environment.

3. Application of NZS 6806 and LAeq(24h) modelling

I respectfully request that the Panel require NZTA Waka Kotahi to clearly demonstrate how NZS 6806 has been applied to the existing SH1 corridor through Kaiapoi.

In particular, I request confirmation of whether updated LAeq(24h) acoustic modelling has been undertaken for the existing Kaiapoi residential area adjoining SH1, including Whitefield Street, Sneyd Street, Epworth Street, Bayliss Drive, Hayson Drive, Wyatt Street and nearby streets.

The modelling should clearly identify:

1. All relevant Protected Premises and Facilities in the Kaiapoi section.
2. Existing road-traffic noise levels.
3. Future do nothing road traffic noise levels.
4. Future project road-traffic noise levels without mitigation.
5. Future project road traffic noise levels with proposed mitigation.
6. Design-year traffic volumes.
7. Heavy vehicle percentages.
8. Design speeds.
9. Lane configuration.
10. Road-surface assumptions.
11. The effect of the additional southbound lane and Kaiapoi River Bridge works.
12. The predicted noise level at each affected receiver, or at clearly defined logical receiver groups.
13. The assumptions used for ground absorption, topography, barriers, building screening, reflections and line of sight.

The assessment should not be limited to dwelling façades only. Outdoor living areas should also be considered.

Road traffic noise does not only affect the internal amenity of buildings. It affects the ability of people to use their gardens, sit outside, hold normal conversations, keep windows and doors open, and enjoy residential outdoor spaces. This is particularly important in an established suburban environment such as Kaiapoi, where outdoor living is a normal and important part of residential amenity.

4. Consistency and equity of mitigation

The project material refers to noise mitigation measures such as noise barriers, bunds and low noise surfacing in relation to parts of the wider project.

However, from the publicly available information available to affected residents, it is not clear whether the existing Kaiapoi residential area beside the current SH1 corridor has been given the same level of specific mitigation consideration as other locations affected by the project.

This raises an important issue of consistency and equity.

If new sections of motorway receive detailed noise-mitigation consideration because nearby receivers may be affected, then existing communities exposed to increased or altered traffic flows on the upgraded SH1 corridor should also receive careful, transparent and equivalent consideration.

Kaiapoi residents should not be disadvantaged simply because their homes already sit beside the existing SH1 corridor. Existing exposure to road traffic noise should not become a reason to avoid mitigation. On the contrary, existing exposure, combined with a major infrastructure upgrade and future traffic growth, strengthens the need for careful assessment and practical mitigation.

The key question should not be whether residents already experience traffic noise.

The key question should be whether the project will maintain, increase or alter that exposure, and whether practicable mitigation is available to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects.

5. Need for specific and enforceable mitigation

I am concerned that general wording such as “noise mitigation will be provided where practicable” may not provide affected residents with sufficient certainty.

The final conditions should not leave the Kaiapoi noise outcome to later discretion, internal detailed design, or broad judgement without clear parameters. The conditions should require a transparent, measurable and enforceable outcome.

If noise barriers are proposed or required for the Kaiapoi section, the final plans should clearly show:

1. The exact barrier location.
2. The side of SH1 on which each barrier is located.
3. The length of each barrier.
4. The height of each barrier.
5. The top level or effective acoustic height of each barrier.
6. The proposed material.
7. The required acoustic performance specification.
8. Any gaps, access breaks or discontinuities.
9. The relationship between the barrier, the road surface, bridge structures, embankments and adjoining ground.

10. Whether the barrier interrupts line of sight between the traffic lanes and affected dwellings / outdoor living areas.

11. How the barrier will be maintained so that its acoustic performance is retained over time.

This is important because a short, fragmented or poorly positioned barrier may appear to provide mitigation while delivering limited acoustic benefit. The final design must demonstrate actual acoustic performance, not merely nominal treatment.

6. Low noise surfacing

I also request that low-noise road surfacing be specifically considered for the Kaiapoi section of SH1.

If low noise surfacing is relied upon as part of the mitigation package, it should be installed before the upgraded traffic arrangement is opened to general traffic.

Residents should not be exposed to avoidable increased traffic noise for an interim period if the required mitigation is already known and forms part of the project's predicted noise outcome.

Low noise surfacing should not be treated as a delayed or optional enhancement where it is necessary to achieve the assessed acoustic performance.

7. Community evidence

I have attached a community support summary for SH1 noise mitigation in Kaiapoi.

The community feedback includes residents from Whitefield Street, Sneyd Street, Bayliss Drive, Epworth Street, Hayson Drive and other nearby streets. The responses show strong local support for practical noise mitigation, including sound barriers, low-noise asphalt, bunding, planting, or a combination of measures.

The comments raise concerns about:

1. Loss of outdoor amenity.
2. Difficulty enjoying gardens and outdoor spaces.
3. Needing to keep windows and doors closed.
4. Early morning traffic disturbance.
5. Increasing traffic volumes over time.
6. Concern that the SH1 upgrade and future growth will worsen the existing noise environment.
7. The need for long-term, practical mitigation.

This evidence demonstrates that the issue is not limited to one property or one individual resident. It is a wider community concern affecting an established residential area beside SH1.

8. Requested outcomes / conditions

I respectfully request that the Expert Panel require the following outcomes or conditions:

1. A specific Kaiapoi road-traffic noise assessment for the existing SH1 corridor through Kaiapoi.

2. Confirmation that all relevant Kaiapoi residential receivers / Protected Premises and Facilities have been identified and assessed.
3. Publicly available LAeq(24h) modelling results for existing, future do nothing, future project without mitigation, and future project with mitigation scenarios.
4. Clear disclosure of traffic assumptions, including design-year traffic volumes, heavy vehicle percentages, speeds, lane configuration and road-surface assumptions.
5. Assessment of outdoor living areas as well as dwelling façades.
6. Specific consideration of feasible mitigation for the Kaiapoi section, including noise barriers, vegetated bunds, low-noise surfacing, or a combination of those measures.
7. Publicly available plans showing the location, length, height, material and acoustic performance of any proposed Kaiapoi noise barriers.
8. Installation of low-noise surfacing before opening of the upgraded traffic arrangement where such surfacing is relied upon to achieve the predicted mitigation outcome.
9. Direct consultation with affected Kaiapoi residents before the final noise mitigation design is confirmed.
10. Post-construction noise monitoring at representative Kaiapoi residential locations.
11. A requirement for additional remedial mitigation if post construction monitoring shows that the predicted noise outcomes have not been achieved.
12. A clear maintenance obligation for any installed noise barriers, low-noise surfacing, bunds or other acoustic mitigation relied upon to achieve the required outcome.
13. A requirement that the final noise mitigation design be provided in a form that affected residents can understand and review, including maps, receiver tables, predicted noise levels and a plain English explanation of the proposed mitigation.
14. Conclusion

This submission is not in opposition to the State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass project.

It is a request for fairness, transparency and proper environmental mitigation.

The existing Kaiapoi residential community beside SH1 should not be left with a worsened or inadequately mitigated noise environment as a consequence of a major infrastructure upgrade. Residents who already live with significant traffic noise should be assessed under the relevant road traffic noise framework and given fair consideration for practical mitigation.

The project should deliver a clear, specific and enforceable noise outcome for Kaiapoi, not a general assurance that the issue will be considered later.

I respectfully ask the Panel to ensure that the Kaiapoi section of the existing SH1 corridor is not overlooked and that the final conditions provide certainty for affected residents.

Please confirm receipt of this comment and the attached supporting documents.

I also request that I be included in any later opportunity to comment on draft conditions, particularly any conditions relating to road traffic noise, noise barriers, road surfacing, post

construction monitoring and mitigation performance.

Please withhold my private contact details from public publication to the extent permitted. I understand that my name may be publicly available as an individual submitter.

Attachments:

1. 55 Whitefield Street Kaiapoi.pdf — local sound measurement record.
2. Community Support_ SH1 Noise Mitigation in Kaiapoi.pdf — community support summary for SH1 noise mitigation.

Ngā mihi,

Jan Vlk

