

RECEIVED  
19/12/2024  
CODC

119



1 Dunorling Street  
PO Box 122, Alexandra 9340  
New Zealand

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

To: The Chief Executive  
Central Otago District Council  
PO Box 122  
Alexandra 9340  
[resource.consent@codc.govt.nz](mailto:resource.consent@codc.govt.nz)

### DETAILS OF SUBMITTER

Full name: lynette Olga Davison

Contact person (if applicable):  
\_\_\_\_\_

Electronic address for service of submitter: lyndie@xtra.co.nz

Telephone: 027 4 839 122

Postal address (or alternative method of service under [section 352](#) of the Act):  
\_\_\_\_\_

P.O Box 98  
Naseby

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)

The construction and operation of a solar farm.

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.

Attached

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

Decline the proposal.

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**

18-12-24

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.

## I Oppose the Resource Consent application lodged by Helios OTA Op LP

Currently the South Island generates more electricity than is required here in the SI. When this excess power is being transmitted to its point of use in the North Island it loses 30% capacity during transmission.

As the solar power is being generated to be used in the NI where the largest population lives then it makes sense that it should be generated in the NI. This would enable size of the plant to be reduced by 30% with the same outcomes and a cheaper price. Alternatively the same size plant generation power in the NI would deliver 30% more power as there would not be any loss in transmission.

Concern is the large amount of hazardous material contained within the storage facility and the potential harm of fire and leaching into the soil and waterways. Currently there isn't a satisfactory cleanup process.

This area lives in a 'restricted' fire zone year around and as these fires from the batteries are not able to be controlled this causes a huge concern. The winds we suffer from are often at extreme and will add to this concern.

Only 20% of wetlands remain in NZ and even though the Maniatoto is a highly modified environment these wetlands should be a predisposing factor to further preserve them rather than put them further at risk. It is not a reason to further degrade the area

Due to the soil and environmental conditions in the district any planting here are very slow to establish and it will be quite some time before any 'screening' plantings are effective.

Dust generation especially during the 2 years of construction will be difficult to control as the heat and winds have a major drying affect and will need to be continuous. Where will this water come from as we are a low rainfall area and the rivers run low all year except when there is sufficient snow melt?

Increase traffic will become a hazard with increase in the amount of and heavy trucks and machinery. Having this moving on a public road that also caters for cyclists, caravans, motor homes and tourists is a recipe for disaster. Deterioration in the road which is not made for this type of traffic will need to be constructed.

There are no guarantees for 'the end of life disposal'. Recent events have shown the responsible party for disposal has declared 'self-liquidation' and walked away from their responsibility. This has left the small local community with the disaster of cleaning up

Who will be policing the compliance of making sure the correct conditions are complied with throughout its life and cleanup?