

Submission on Notified Resource Consent

18

PL241213253



1 Dunorling Street
PO Box 122, Alexandra 9340
New Zealand

03 440 0056

Info@codc.govt.nz
www.codc.govt.nz



Submission on Notified Resource Consent

Reference PL241213253 **Submitted** 07 Dec 2024 10:11

Notified Submission

SUBMISSION ON NOTIFIED APPLICATION CONCERNING RESOURCE CONSENT

(Form 13)

Section 95A (public) Resource Management Act 1991

To: The Chief Executive
Central Otago District Council
PO Box 122
Alexandra 9340

This is a submission on the following resource consent application:

Resource Consent Number	240065
Valuation Number	2828012800
Applicant	Helios OTA Op LP
Location of Site	48 Ranfurly-Naseby Road, Ranfurly
Brief Description of Application	Land use consent to construct, operate and maintain a 300MWac solar farm
Submissions Close	19 December 2024

Writing a submission

The following will be required during this process:

- Your full name and address, telephone number and email address
- Whether you support or oppose the application for resource consent
- The reason for your submission
- The decision you wish the Council to make, including any conditions sought
- Whether you wish to be heard.

Privacy

The information you provide is official information and is used to help process your application. The information is held and used in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 2020. This means that your information may be disclosed to other people who request it in accordance with the terms of these Acts. Under the Privacy Act 2020 you have the right to see and correct any personal information that Council may hold about you.

Declaration

By continuing with this application you certify that: The information you provide is true and correct to the best of your knowledge. Yes

Notified Submission

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.

In lodging this submission, your submission, including contact details, become public information and will be available for anyone to view.

DETAILS OF SUBMITTER

Full name	Marielle and Mike Craighead
Contact person (if applicable)	Marielle
Electronic address for service of submitter:	marielle.craighead60@gmail.com
Phone number - day time	021896654
Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the Act):	PO BOX 99, NASEBY 9354

Your Application

Please select one regarding the application	I oppose
Do you wish to be heard in support of this submission?	No - I do not want to be heard
Are you a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991?	I am not
I would consider presenting a joint case if others make a similar submission	No

Details of submission

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are: The building, maintaining and operating of a solar farm at 48 Ranfurly-Naseby Road.

The submission - include:

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

We, Mike and Marielle Craighead, of Naseby, hereby wish to object the application by Helios "To construct, operate and maintain a Solar Farm (Māniatoto Plain Solar Farm)", for the following reasons:

Regarding the shelter belt planting along Ranfurly-Naseby Road, Boffa Miskell states: "Maintaining the proposed planting to a lower height will minimise the enclosure and retain some sense of the big skies and mountain backdrop to the north"

The Maniototo is all about big skies and mountain views, and having more trees planted on what is one of the most stunning vistas in the whole of Central Otago, with only "some sense of big skies and mountain backdrop" is not acceptable. We must retain an unobstructed view of the mountain backdrop and an unobstructed sense of big skies. That is what the Maniototo is known for, why films are shot here, why people visit and to have even one more obstruction in place, for the sake of power being sent to a city somewhere where no one cares what price their power is exacting on a rural landscape (of national significance!) is not ok. EVER. Yes, they talk about maintaining a max height of 3m but even that is too high – when you are driving or cycling along the road, 3

meters might as well be 6 metres.

The roads affected by the solar farm are the ONLY roads leading in to Naseby from the State Highway and Ranfurly. They provide the first views of our unique and incredible landscape. To have visitors instead be confronted by hundreds and hundreds of solar panels, and their glare, will ruin the sense of calm and the feeling of having arrived somewhere special for everyone. Many people who visit Naseby talk about feeling a sense of relief as they turn off the highway on the road to Naseby, and feel their shoulders drop and their worries leave them. Our slogan is “2000 feet above worry level” – and many people agree. This enchanting and wonderful experience of driving up to Naseby will be lost.

ITP Renewables state in their technical document that the glare visible from the road at the proposed site “has low potential to cause temporary after-image”. Low potential does not equal no potential and is therefore not acceptable. Glare is (according to Pagerpower) “a continuous source of bright light” – meaning travellers along this stretch of road will be distracted from the road by a continuous source of bright light. Given this will, apparently, mostly happen in the winter, this could lead to more road traffic accidents – we have many visitors travelling to and from Naseby in the winter to participate in the winter sports Naseby has become famous for, and these visitors are unfamiliar with our roads and winter driving conditions. The Property Group states “Ranfurly-Naseby Road and Ranfurly Back Road are considered low volume roads” but that doesn’t mean people don’t use them and those people may potentially be put in harm’s way. And yes, I know the experts are trying to minimise this danger – but they would, wouldn’t they? We fail to see how a glare profile for an incoming flight can be extrapolated to a rural country road. Full moon nights also cause glare – what impact will that have on our burgeoning night sky tourism?

The submission states there are a number of positive effects (section 5.2).

Great noise has been made about employing 250 people. There is no mention of how many of these employees would come from the local population. The Resource Consent application does state though that “Once the solar farm is operational, activity will be very limited. No staff will live or permanently work onsite as the componentry is operated / monitored remotely.” So, to say this project will benefit the local employment situation is just rubbish. It may provide some jobs for a 2-year period, but no long-term benefits can be seen in any of the documentation. And to suggest the ancillary support requirements will be a benefit is questionable – we believe it is, in fact, the opposite. The pressure put on our small communities to provide the services required, for such a short time frame, will, in our opinion, be anything but beneficial.

We disagree the effects listed are all positive. In fact, whereas they may be considered positive in far off towns and cities, we believe the effects are nothing other than negative for the Maniototo. And whereas producing renewable energy may be a matter of national significance, it should not be considered remotely positive when it adversely affects unique landscapes of national significance. Furthermore, the benefits of renewable energy are greatly overstated – solar energy is not a fast-start power source, and in our winter, we can go days without any solar input. All solar energy should have the same amount of fast-start energy as a backup. So, to say it is the answer to NZ's power woes is, in our view, misleading.

The applicants state that the role of "human endeavours" like mining, viticulture, and energy generation activities such as the Clyde Dam have been positive in shaping the landscape values of the district. Those human endeavours have indeed contributed to our landscape values, and continue to do so. Not only that, all those human endeavours continue to provide employment, many, many years after they were established, and will continue to do so for many years to come. By their own admission, this solar farm won't provide permanent landscape or employment values, as it will be dismantled. So, there are no lasting values, and nothing but negative impacts on our stunning landscapes. For Helios to try and align themselves with those human endeavours is insulting and misleading, to say the least.

A further negative effect for the entire community, and those travelling through the Maniototo, will be 24 months of heavy traffic on our already very fragile and under-maintained roads. Council doesn't have enough money to keep them at anything like a decent standard, let alone trucks with 40-foot containers pounding them to bits for 24 months!

In our view, the only beneficiaries of this proposal will be Helios and the farmers on whose land these solar panels will be built.

Therefore, we strenuously oppose the application.

Please upload any documents / photos that are relevant

I seek the following decision from the consent authority.

Give precise details, including the general nature of any conditions sought To decline the application.

Select below - 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 (second tab) as you may incur costs relating to this request." I do not request

Any other comments?

In lodging this submission, I understand that my submission, including contact details, are considered Yes

public information, and will be made available and published as part of this process.

Please sign (click on the words CAPTURE)

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of stylized initials that appear to be 'MC'.

Date signed:

07/12/2024