





03 440 0056

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



SUBMISSION ON NOTIFIED APPLICATION CONCERNING RESOURCE CONSENT

(Form 13)

Section 95A Resource Management Act 1991

The Chief Executive To:

Central Otago District Council

PO Box 122 Alexandra 9340

resource.consents@codc.govt.nz

DETAILS OF SUBMITTER

Full name: Melissa Jean Indev
Contact person (if applicable):
Electronic address for service of submitter: <u>Markemelissal farmside</u> . Co.nz. Telephone: <u>0274449305</u>
Postal address (or alternative method of service under <u>section 352</u> of the Act):
24 Geddes Road, Rd3 Ranfurly - 9397

This is a submission on the following resource consent application: RC No: 240065

Applicant: Helios OTA Op LP Valuation No: 2828012800

Location of Site: 48 Ranfurly-Naseby Road

Brief Description of Application: Land Use Consent to Construct, Operate and Maintain a Solar Farm (Maniatoto Plain Solar Farm) being a Renewable Electricity Generation Activity in a Rural Resource Area.



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

Refer to Seperate page.	
his submission is: (attach on separate page if necessary)	
nclude:	
 whether you support or oppose the specific parts of the application or wish to have them amended; and the reasons for your views. 	
because the risk to our community	tic
because the risk to our community	
far artweighs any benefits we will	
See.	
We seek the following decision from the consent authority: give precise details, including the general nature of any conditions sought)	
1 Want to see this Consent	
declined.	
support oppose the application OR neither support or oppose (select one)	
wish) de not wish to be heard in support of this submission (select one)	
amagement Act 1991 (select one)	
/We and an not (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the	
ubmission 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.	

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:

FIRE

If, in the event one of these 32 shipping container sized batteries catches fire, this will create an irreversible thermal event.

It cannot be put out.

It must burn itself out. This will take days...

Helios has not stated what type of batteries they will be installing or their chemical makeup, they have not stated what steps will be taken to prevent leeching of toxic chemicals into the aquifers/ underground water tables which flow underneath this entire solar farm. If a fire was to happen, there is no information in Helios application saying these batteries will be bunded and there is no Emergency Management Plan.

This is of huge concern as any leeching will result in serious water contamination for stock, irrigation of pastures, stock water, Ranfurly bore water supply. There are creeks running through the Ranfurly township, alongside residents' properties that this ground water/aquifers feed and then the water ends up in the Taieri River.

Then there is the threat from toxic by-products of combustion-Hydrogen Fluoride.

In the event of a battery fire, there is also the toxic gases it will emit, within a certain area/range/circumference (smoke) this will be life threatening to any living thing if they were exposed to it. Helios have not included a sound or realistic Plume Report in their application-the area the gas is likely to cover and distance it could potentially travel, so essentially an evacuation range.

There is no Emergency Management Plan.

Will there be a siren sounding an alarm?

DECOMMISSIONING OF SOLAR FARM

There has been no official plan from Helios regarding, once this solar farm comes to the end of its life. What is going to happen? Are these over half a million solar panels and 32 batteries going to be shipped off farm to be recycled? There are NO recycling facilities in NZ. There is nothing in our district plan holding large companies like Helios financially accountable, guaranteeing the land will be returned to its original state.



*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)

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 <u>form 16B</u>.

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.

- 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 <u>Part 11A</u>of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- 4. If you make a request under <u>section 100A</u> 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.