

DDPR_feedback_0452s	
Name	Terry Kent
Organisation	
Email	
Response Date	Aug 31 22 03:30:18 pm
Notes	Oamaruvian
Q 1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on
	Light
Q 2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?
Q 3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
	Designation of area around Meon Street as 'Muddy Creek' Flooding Zone
Q 4	Feedback/Comments
	The naming as 'Muddy Creek' flooding is inaccurate & jumps to an assumption not backed up by facts. General poor performance of stormwater assets in local streets is not connected to the Muddy Creek watercourse. I have photo & video evidence from 2007 to 2022 from rain events. Muddy Creek performs it's purpose unless, 1. Lack of maintenance after natural activity, such as fallen trees or uncontrolled growth of such as Gorse. 2. Human interference by construction of devices or reduction in bank height. Videos attached.
Q 5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
	Installation of incorrect street lighting without a plan to remediate same. eg LED ratings too high or lack of baffles too restrict light from shining the full length of properties to the far end.
Q 6	Feedback/Comments
	Acknowledge poor choice with 'subsidised' LED street lamps. Adopt a policy to replace with suitable lamps. Set a standard regarding over height fittings. Allow for & install baffles to prevent excessive lighting of private residential homes! Strengthen rules regarding commercial outdoor light on commercial premises to reduce lighting shining out to other properties. Also adopt a dark skies policy to reduce/eliminate wasted lighting upwards, to no purpose.
Q 7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q 8	Feedback/Comments
Q 9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q 10	Feedback/Comments

Q 1 1	supporting documents?
	0
Q 1 2	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here