

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE – JOHN MCKENSEY – LIGHTING

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is John Kinross Mckensey. My qualifications and experience are as stated in my evidence at paragraphs 2.2 to 2.4.
- 1.2 My evidence has been prepared on behalf of Perry Group Ltd, as the applicant, in relation to lighting effects. Rather than read my evidence in full, I propose to provide a summary of principle elements.
- 1.3 I confirm that I have complied with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses.

2. TECHNICAL REPORT

- 2.1 In my evidence at paragraphs 5.3 to 5.9, I summarise the findings from my earlier Technical Report. In particular;
 - a) There are existing residential locations near the Site. These properties contain typical residential lighting. The closest of these are located on the opposite side of the Waikato River. The nature of the topography surrounding the Site is such that these locations cannot see or be seen from the majority of the Site, other than any new residences that may be built at the eastern most edge of the site. In my opinion, lighting effects in either direction will be low-nil.
 - b) The most significant existing source of light at night is the roadway lighting on the Waikato Expressway. In my opinion, the effects of this lighting on future residents on the Site, will be low-moderately low for the closest residential properties, diminishing to low-nil effects elsewhere.
 - c) Other existing sources of light at night include Industrial facilities. The Fonterra dairy factory is the closest of these and produces the greatest lighting effects. However, in my opinion, the effects will be low, as local lighting within the site will be considerably more obvious to residents than the Fonterra lighting. The effects from locations further afield will, in my opinion, be low-nil.
 - d) The Lighting Assessment also concluded that the requirements already within the Operative District Plan are appropriate while not onerous, and that lighting

on other sites can readily satisfy the requirements without imposing a burden, by using good lighting design practice.

- e) When the Site is developed, the lighting intensity and effects generated within the Site will be comparable to those generated by developments beyond The Site.

3. COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS

3.1 At paragraphs 7.1 through 7.7, I commented in relation to submissions. In summary;

- a) A submission from Steven & Alison Hodgkinson of 2171a River Road, expressed concern that the lighting effects generated by the medium density housing proposed (remote from the river edge) could be very significant. As mentioned earlier, this will not be the case as there will be very little visibility of these areas given the topography and intervening buildings and vegetation.
- b) A number of submissions have raised the prospect of potential reverse sensitivity. These include Fonterra, AFFCO, Ports of Auckland, Open Country Dairy, Waikato District Council, Waikato Regional Council and Contact Energy. I have read these submissions and nothing in these submissions changes my view. Hence, for the reasons stated in my evidence, in my opinion, reverse sensitivity effects with respect to lighting will be low-nil.

4. CONCLUSION

4.1 At paragraphs 8.1 and 8.2, I concluded that, in my opinion, lighting effects will be;

- a) Low-nil for primary effects generated by developments within The Site;
- b) Low-Moderately low for effects generated by the Expressway road lighting (including reverse sensitivity effects); and
- c) Low-nil for effects generated by other locations beyond The Site (including reverse sensitivity effects);

4.2 I also stated that in my opinion, Statutory Requirements for lighting control will be adequate to ensure these outcomes on adjacent land without being onerous.