

## **Speaking Notes – PC9 Session 2 Hearing (The Adare Company Ltd)**

1. I prepared EIR dated 6 October 2023 which addresses several changes that Ms Sycamore has recommended in her planning evidence for DOC.
2. **SNA mapping** – Ms Sycamore has suggested amended policies in Chapter 20 which relate to SNA mapping. I consider the approach that HCC has taken to identifying SNAs is consistent with the NPS-IB. A citywide assessment has been undertaken and SNAs are proposed to be identified in the district plan via maps and schedules. Clauses 3.8 and 3.9 of the NPS-IB clearly set out HCC's obligations if they become aware of additional areas that may qualify as SNAs under the NPS-IB, including the requirement for those areas to be included in the district plan via a plan change notified by the Council. I do not agree with the additional policies that Ms Sycamore has recommended.
3. **Indigenous Biodiversity outside SNAs** – Ms Sycamore has recommended a new policy in Chapter 20 for indigenous biodiversity outside SNAs. I've set out the reasons why I disagree with this in my EIR, including that it is out of scope of PC9 which relates to indigenous biodiversity within SNAs. To the extent that PC9 is not able to fully implement the NPS-IB in relation to indigenous biodiversity outside SNAs, this will need to be addressed by a future plan change notified by HCC. I understand from Mr Muldowney's opening legal submissions that HCC agrees that Ms Sycamore's recommended changes are out of scope (para. 117).
4. **Noise** – Ms Sycamore cites the precautionary approach as a reason for supporting the new policy that she suggested in the Session 1 hearing which relates to effects of noise on indigenous fauna in SNAs. I continue to disagree with her recommended policy for the reasons set out in my EIR for Session 1. Furthermore, my reading of the evidence on PC9 does not suggest the effects of noise on SNAs are such that significant or irreversible damage may occur which is one of the criteria for adopting a precautionary approach under clause 3.7 of the NPS-IB.
5. **Lighting and glare** – Ms Sycamore's evidence refers to amendments that she suggests to a new rule that HCC has recommended for lighting and glare. The rule specifically excludes the Peacocke Precinct so I have no further comments to make.
6. In summary, I consider the changes that Ms Sycamore has recommended are inappropriate and unnecessary, which I understand is also the view of HCC's experts.

Ben Inger

9 November 2023