

Hearing 16: Light

Questions from the Hearing Panel

As foreshadowed by paragraph 12 of Minute 1, having read the Section 42A Report for the Light hearing, the Hearing Panel members have a number of questions that they would appreciate being answered by the Section 42A Report author(s) in writing prior to the hearings commencing.

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
8 Chapter Overview 8.3 Table Waka Kotahi	It appears that some very important driver safety provisions were omitted from the PDP Objectives, Policies, Rules, Rule Requirements and Matters. This is evident by the amount of Waka Kotahi submissions points that have been accepted by the s42A report (ie) accept (9), accept in part (3), reject (2). Please explain why these very important safety provisions were omitted, many of which are fairly obvious to road users?
10 Light P1 10.4	The report states: <i>It is therefore recommended that additional policy specific to infrastructure activity is not inserted into the Light Chapter as it would duplicate policy in the GIZ chapter which is already considered to satisfy the submitters relief. Overall, it is recommended that this submission point be rejected.</i> Is there any merit in providing a cross reference to that Chapter?
10.5	The report states: <i>With respect to the Fonterra processing plant, the DPZ objectives and policies recognise that dairy processing activities and facilities are important infrastructure which contribute to the economic vitality and wellbeing of the region, whilst also managing adverse effects.</i> Is the wellbeing of the region in this sentence based on economic vitality? <i>It is also of note that the spill light lux levels that apply to GRUZ land adjoining DPZ is higher than that recommended by AS/NZS4282:2019 to provide these established factories and important infrastructure with some greater leniency.</i> Please clarify - is the reason why spill light levels are higher than the standard AS/NZS4282:2019 in the DPZ, is because the DPZ contains important infrastructure that contributes to the economic vitality and wellbeing of the region and because the DPZ is in the rural area and therefore less people will be effected by light spill?
10.6	The report states:

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	<p><i>Accordingly, it is recommended that the policy reference the management of light spill onto adjoining sites including roads to make this specific. The addition of “effective” in addition to efficient is considered to add clarity</i></p> <p>While the safety aspect is well understood, how can lighting be said to have an impact on the ‘effective’ use of roads. In other words what type of evidence would be brought before a decision maker to establish that excessive light spill affects the effective use of a road?</p>
12 Light-P3 12.9	<p>Also a Question for Mr Muir:</p> <p>Please explain the evidential basis for controlling sky glow to protect people’s and the ecosystem’s health (item 3 below) :</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Minimise potential upward light that causes sky glow, <u>whilst ensuring the safe, effective and efficient operation of roads, public pedestrian access and public sports courts and grounds</u>, by controlling new artificial outdoor lighting to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. maintain people’s ability to view the night sky; and 2. maintain the distinct character and amenity values of the district’s night sky; and 3. protect the health and well-being of people and ecosystems.
16 Light-R4 16.4	<p>The report states:</p> <p><i>In the EI Chapter, EI-R6 permits the operation, maintenance and repair of existing above and below ground network utilities, without being subject to any lighting provisions. Therefore, emergency repairs or maintenance of network utilities involving any outdoor artificial lighting is already permitted by EI-R6. On this basis it is considered there is no need to amend LIGHT-R4 and that the submission point be rejected.</i></p> <p>Please confirm is it always the case that if the EI does not cross reference Light, or other chapter rules, then those rules will not be relevant?</p>
23 Light - Mat 1 23.3	<p>The report states:</p> <p><i>Given that LIGHT-REQ1 is now proposed to apply to roads (as per the recommendation at paragraph 8.17), it is recommended that LIGHT-MAT1 also enables consideration of the effects of spill lighting on roads.</i></p> <p>Would an alternative option be to instead add LIGHT-MAT2 to the matters of discretion for LIGHT-REQ1?</p>
25 Light -Mat3 25.4	<p>The report states:</p> <p><i>Rather than singling out activities, a new clause like LIGHT-MAT1.1 is preferred as it is more encompassing and is considered to address both submitters relief in principle.</i></p>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question
	<p><i>The recommended amendment is</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Whether the artificial outdoor lighting is location-specific and necessary to provide for the safe operation of sites, security for buildings and to enhance the health, safety and wellbeing of people.</u> <p>In what instances would outdoor lighting not be “location-specific”?</p>