

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:
(give details, attach on separate page if necessary)

entire application.

This submission is: (attach on separate page if necessary)

Include:

- whether you support or oppose the specific parts of the application or wish to have them amended; and
- the reasons for your views.

see attached letter doc ref: rhsdec.1
rhsdec.2

I/We seek the following decision from the consent authority:
(give precise details, including the general nature of any conditions sought)

Refusal of this application in its entirety

I ~~support~~ oppose the application OR neither support or oppose (select one)

I wish do not wish to be heard in support of this submission (select one)

I ~~am~~ am not* a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991 (select one)

*I/We ~~am/am not~~ (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

(a) adversely affects the environment; and

(b) ~~does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.~~

~~*Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor.~~

***I/We will consider presenting a joint case if others make a similar submission**

***Delete this paragraph if not applicable.**

I request/do not request (select one), pursuant to section 100A of the Act, that you delegate your functions, powers, and duties to hear and decide the application to 1 or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority. "See note 4 below as you may incur costs relating to this request."

Signature

(to be signed by submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Date

19-12-2024.

In lodging this submission, I understand that my submission, including contact details, are considered public information, and will be made available and published as part of this process.

Notes to submitter

- 1. If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use form 16B.**

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

- 2. You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant as soon as is reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the consent authority.**
- 3. If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in Part 11A of the Resource Management Act 1991.**
- 4. If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991, you must do so in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions and you will be liable to meet the additional costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners, compared to our hearing panel. Typically these costs range from \$3,000 - \$10,000.**
- 5. Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):**
 - it is frivolous or vexatious:**
 - it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:**
 - it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:**
 - it contains offensive language:**

it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

To: The Chief Executive /
Central Otago District Council
ALEXANDRA
resourceconsents@codc.govt.nz

ref: RC 240065

I am completely opposed to the application made by Helios ref RC 240065.

My reason is that approval of this application would put at risk not only the lifestyles of the people and families, the businesses, agricultural and conservation status of this area, but also risks the very core nature of The Maniototo. Lower need for infrastructure makes The Maniototo what it is and should always be. People make their homes here for that very reason. A company seeking profit and one greedy land-owner should not have the right or the opportunity to so drastically, permanently and unnecessarily forever change an otherwise productive and functioning area of New Zealand.

There are many studies and reports surrounding the risks posed by large scale battery energy storage systems (BESS) such as mentioned in the application. Risk can be mitigated, of course, but safety cannot be guaranteed. A disaster made possible by this proposed structure would be absolutely catastrophic with the real possibility of destroying our ecosystem. Most of our first response fire fighting teams are small and voluntary and do not have the capability to manage a major problem as could arise.

Do we even have effective local codes and regulations and independent expertise covering structures of this type.

What assurance do we have concerning ongoing responsibility for the Solar Farm covering its expected life span. We are regularly made aware of failings surrounding large scale industry and the local government involvement and unintentional contribution to these failings. Responsibility seems to be the escapee in these cases and eventually, usually falls to the ratepayers to pick up. The very scale of the costs involved in ongoing maintenance, re-augmentation (approx 10years) and ultimate removal and disposal (approx 25-30years) is beyond the capability of our council/ ratepayers.

Aviation is also a factor. For both recreational and commercial local aviation operations including low level agricultural operations, glare from the 660ha, half million plus, revolving solar panels will be a very real negative factor. The Civil Aviation Authority is currently receiving reports of near incidents/accidents due to laser strike and is working to eliminate these happenings. The effect of sudden sunstrike to an operating pilot is debilitating. To suddenly be confronted with a sunstrike that an area of glass as described in the application could render a pilot blind for a possibly catastrophic period of time. This would become a real risk particularly to agricultural pilots, aerial fire fighting pilots and rescue pilots - there is a heli pad at the nearby Ranfurly Hospital.

Global companies aggressively seeking profit will expose and quickly capitalise on any naivety found within our local and government systems. With respect I do not have confidence that the CODC, the RMA or the EPA are equipped to manage the proper execution of an activity of this nature and scale at this time - and nor should they. Refusal of this application is the only sensible and responsible decision.

The CODC's responsibility is to the ratepayers in its constituency, not to offshore companies seeking to profit here.

Please don't allow this to happen. Don't ruin our home.