

Hearing Statement

1. My name is Sarah Jenkin. The statement of my experience is provided in paragraphs 1.2-1.6 of my Evidence in Chief.
2. My EIC identified four key issues in the relief sought by Port Nelson Limited which I considered had not been addressed:
 - a. The status of Port Nelson as nationally significant infrastructure and the inclusion of a definition;
 - b. Amendments to objectives and policies to reinforce the unsuitability of land within the Port Effects Control Overlay for intensification;
 - c. Adoption of a consistent approach to the requirement for acoustic insulation within the PECO regardless of the underlaying zone; and
 - d. Adoption of a consistent approach for minimum site areas/allotments in the PECO.
3. Since preparing my EIC I participated in two rounds of expert conferencing on the topic of Infrastructure, on 24 July and 3 August 2024. Each round culminated in a Joint Witness Statement (Infrastructure – JWS and Infrastructure Part 3 – JWS).
4. The outcome of the Infrastructure expert conferencing has resolved the first, second and fourth outstanding issues. In my opinion, the proposed amendments more strongly signal, and reinforce the operative provisions, about the unsuitability of land within the Port Effects Control Overlay (which identifies those part of Nelson which may exposed to varying degrees of noise from port operations).
5. As noted by Mr Styles on Monday, we also agreed to step back from any amendments to the operative acoustic treatment requirements (point three). As the Chair has already noted, the operative Port Noise provisions are complex. Any review is more appropriately left to a full review of the Nelson Resource Management Plan, and I too am interested in the timing of that.
6. I would note that the success of PC29 in relation to intensification in the Port Effects Control Overlay, and indeed the operative Port Noise provisions, still relies on the future resource consent decisions implementing the NRMP policy direction. There are historic examples where resource consents have been granted for intensive development in the Port Effects Control Overlay which I suspect did not meet the minimum site size requirements and these have resulted in subsequent complaints despite the application of acoustic treatment.
7. One matter which hasn't been addressed by the relevant s42A officers in their rebuttal or hearing statements is what appear to be missing recommendations on PNL submissions and further submissions (as identified in paragraph 7.1 of my EIC) and inconsistencies in recommendations

on PNL submission and further submission points (see paragraph 9.9 and Appendix A of my EIC), particularly in relation to intensification along Haven Road and Wakefield Quay. Whilst I assume some, or all, of these recommendations will change as a result of the outcome of expert conferencing, this is not currently evident.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to this summary. I am available to answer any questions from the Commissioners.

Sarah Lea Jenkin

29 August 2024