

RECEIVED
19/12/2024
CODC

121



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.consents@codc.govt.nz

DETAILS OF SUBMITTER

Full name: Solar Installation Specialist Ltd

Contact person (if applicable): Rhys Laraman

Electronic address for service of submitter: rhys@solarpiling.nz

Telephone: 0272 372 861

Postal address (or alternative method of service under [section 352](#) of the Act):
9 Anfield Way, Lincoln. Canterbury. 7608

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 building of a solar farm between Ranfurly and Naseby on two local farmers properties, Smith's and Shaw's, and the ongoing utilisation and maintenance of the infrastructure the solar farm, I believe, will require.

1. The building of the solar farm will generate local temporary jobs for two years or so and the revenue for this district would give the local businesses and schools a basis for investment as they could count on there being a revenue stream and body count that would justify their expenditures. It is believed the numbers of contractors would be in the proximity of 200 -250 pax. The revenue spend is believed to be \$420 million dollar build cost so by my calculations there would be a wage generation directly attributed to the solar build of approximately \$20,000,000.00. This money spread across the region will give local businesses a direct cash injection from disposable income that relates to household products, whiteware, cars, electronics etc. The local real estate will benefit from rental increases and the local housing prices are likely to increase a few percentages due to demand in the short term.
2. The scale of the energy that this farm will produce is one that is of a size that counts toward the national grid. Other smaller solar farms are for local supply only but this farm is one that can contribute to the whole of the countries needs due to its size and that benefits all New Zealanders and not just a few.
3. The maintenance of the solar farm will require a full-time solar panel cleaner. This business will require a tractor or similar to transport a cleaning brush/water and trainer to clean the residual dust etc from the glass of the solar panels. This business is not currently in the Maniototo so this is an addition business the farm creates. There are ongoing maintenance requirement for a solar farm and it is estimated that local staff will be required for these maintenance requirements. Even if these roles are later contracted out to qualified contractors, the roles are still required and more importantly generating revenue for the people of the area.
4. The visual impact aspect of the solar farm is one I believe can be reduced to a minimal or even completely addressed by low vegetation hedges. A perimeter hedge of dense trees or ToiToi or flax will grow higher than 2m and block any persons view whilst driving past the site. Consideration to have access ways offset to the road so there is no direct line of sight to the panels is an easy solution to the so-called commercial pollution (visually) of the natural landscape. (By using return access lanes, along a boundary hedge row)
5. In my experience and industry research for my own business, the solar energy sector has a silent, low-cost solution to the energy needs of countries across the world and it is a cheap solution for building a large-scale energy centre for a national grid requirement. The construction of a large-scale solar farm does not impact the soils or surrounding area of the farm and in fact seems to be the only solution that improves the ground around the infrastructure. (farming practices can be greater dry matter yields but only allows a graze only status on the land)
6. My view is the solar farms around the world have shown that there is revenue growth in the surrounding areas of the farms directly related to build and maintenance of the farms, there is not pollution from the farms except from visual pollution. The visual pollution can be cancelled out at close proximity by plantings and offset accessways to the farms. Long view pollution for elevated locations is something that can not be combatted but is something the public will have to be educated on as a requirement for a system of energy that has great benefits to New Zealand as it offsets the Hydro infrastructure we currently have in NZ. When the sun shines the power can be 100% solar and the lakes can be our batteries that are charging with snow melt and rainfall. When the sun is not out (cloudy) the hydro is turned on to support the countries power consumption. Hydro can be a secondary source of energy to solar and we lose no more land for farmers in any construction for the Solar farms.
7. WIN / WIN for New Zealanders requiring a reliable power supply and for local businesses around the farms through extra revenue streams.

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.*

No amendments requested.

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

NIL.

I support the application

I do not wish to be heard in support of this submission

I am not* a trade competitor for the purposes of [section 308B](#) of the Resource Management Act 1991

***I am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:**

(a) adversely affects the environment;

.

I do not request, 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

Date: 19/12/2024



(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 [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.