

**Attachment 1:**

**Further information requested under Section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991**

NoR#	NoR name	Category of information	Specific Request	Reasons for request
<b>All NOR's (Local, HIF &amp; Strategic)</b>				
All	All	Lighting	<p>The local NOR AEE Section 9.1.3 states that lighting 'does not affect designation boundary or effects'. It appears a similar approach has been taken for all of the NOR AEE's. We disagree. At present there is insufficient information to assess whether lighting effects can be suitably mitigated.</p> <p>Please address lighting effects in the same level of detail as other elements and consider the following aspects as applicable within each NOR;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lighting effects to people and other biota (especially the NZ long-tailed bat)</li> </ol>	<p>Lighting can and does have effects. The AUP (particularly chapter E24) and the Auckland Transport TDM (especially the street lighting section) both have environmental lighting requirements that need to be addressed. These both address effects to people in terms of light spill, glare, safety and amenity.</p> <p>If the designation boundary is too close to the road within the designation, then the lighting required for traffic safety may not be possible to implement. Similar issues could apply to important ecological locations. The topography and lighting requirements within the road designation could also potentially generate a nuisance to residents and motorists beyond the designation. Sites such as airfields have additional concerns re obtrusive light.</p> <p>In addition, recent consenting processes elsewhere in the country to date have been required (by Territorial Authorities and/or the Environment Court), to address biota such as the national critically endangered NZ long-tailed bat. These have resulted in specific physical interventions and lighting restrictions to address lighting</p>

NoR#	NoR name	Category of information	Specific Request	Reasons for request
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Lighting effects to air traffic safety and navigation (e.g. Whenuapai Airbase)</li> <li>3. Related Management Plans (e.g. Construction, Environmental &amp; Bat) – Either inclusion of a lighting section in each and/or provision of a separate Lighting Management Plan for each element)</li> <li>4. An ecological assessment should propose a specifically defined buffer zone adjacent each identified bat habitat. Then related lighting effects limits and mitigation measures should be set</li> <li>5. Propose Draft Conditions addressing Lighting effects</li> </ol>	<p>effects. Hence, it follows for consistency that such measures should be applied to all projects where such biota are present. Examples of such measures include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buffer zone beside identified bat habitat area (BHA)</li> <li>• Building setback beyond buffer</li> <li>• Vegetative screening from headlight sweep/glare effects</li> <li>• Spill light limits at buffer boundary</li> <li>• Luminaire colour temperature limit near a BHA</li> <li>• Luminaire upward light output limit</li> </ul> <p>Other biota such as migrating seabirds can also be affected by obtrusive lighting.</p>