

Submission Form 16 to the Otago Regional Council on consent applications

This is a Submission on (a) limited notified/publicly notified resource consent application/s pursuant to the Resource Management Act 1991.

Submitter Details: [REDACTED]

Full Name/s: Richard and Rebecca Bell

Postal Address: [REDACTED]

Post Code: [REDACTED]

Phone number: Business: [REDACTED]

Private: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Email address: [REDACTED]

We wish to **OPPOSE** the application of:

Applicant's Name: Dunedin City Council

And/or Organisation:

Application Number: Application No. RM20.280

Location:

Corner of Big Stone Road and McLaren Gully Road, Brighton

Purpose:

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A LANDFILL

The specific parts of the application/s that my submission relates to are: *(Give details)*

Environmental Impacts. Loss of Property Value. Lack of information in recent years for purchasers and investors in Brighton and surrounds . Impact on Brighton & Surrounds image. Aviation Safety. Odour.

Our submission is **opposing** the application:

While filming our TV series we fell in love with Dunedin. We committed to living here as we saw it to be a beautiful, exciting and progressive place, believing the DCC to be open minded pioneers with a strong eye towards the future. A great place to bring up our son. We remain very committed to building our Production Business here, bringing Film and Television projects to the area. Having enjoyed shooting our Series *WANTED* (NBCU, Netflix) in Dunedin and Otago, Rebecca also brought *UNDER THE VINES* (Acorn, TVNZ. World Premiere coming soon) to the region early this year and is soon to commence shooting Season 2 in the coming months. That is approximately \$28,000,000 of production brought to Otago and NZ and there is

plenty more in the planning, including a feature film in development inspired by, and set in, Brighton.

We believe in Dunedin. We love it here and thought this was going to be our forever home.

We are sure the DCC are aware of the great deal of anxiety and opposition surrounding the proposed Landfill at Smooth Hill, Brighton.

We would like to express our clear opposition to the proposal for the reasons outlined below.

CONCERNS

**LACK OF INFORMATION and PROPERTY VALUE DECREASES.
(NOT THE NEIGHBOUR WE HOPED FOR)**

Like many of our neighbours we purchased our Brighton property without any knowledge of the proposed Landfill. Meaning we paid prices that did not factor in a Landfill on our doorstep. Should this development go ahead a significant number of residents face a loss of property value.

The reintroduction of the ageing twenty-nine-year-old plan for Smooth Hill, Brighton site appears to have been initially resurrected with some stealth. Shouldn't our own council be as forthright as possible — sharing information much earlier than it did, and with far greater transparency and openness?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

We are extremely concerned about the negative impacts this Landfill would have on our local area. The risk of pollutants leaching into the water system would appear unacceptable especially as the catchment that originates from the proposed site flows to Brighton Beach.

Endangered birds including the New Zealand Falcon and wildlife inhabit this area. This development has the potential to impact these precious creatures.

ODOUR

Odour from the Landfill is also a cause of concern. The prevailing breezes here will push odours and gases towards the coast and communities such as Brighton, Ocean View and Taieri Mouth.

PERCEPTION. THE VALUE OF IMAGE.

This potential Landfill site planning was conceived some thirty years ago but the area has changed greatly since then and we would argue this site is now inappropriate.

Brighton Beach is a jewel in Dunedin's beautiful environment. It is an extremely popular destination for swimming, surfing and all manner of beach and recreational activities for all of Dunedin. Brighton is thriving as a community. Many are investing in the area with new homes and extensions / renovations part of the mix. How a Landfill fits this image is beyond us? It feels a few decades out of whack as a plan. We feel the DCC should be protecting Brighton, not damaging it's wonderful image. Would we have invested in the area if we had known about the Landfill plan? Definitely not!

We know our industry can bring many benefits for the Dunedin area. Film and Television can do so much to help underpin image and create brand for a region or country. The regions other arts,

first and secondary associated and parallel businesses also thrive and tourism is assisted as shows reach large international and domestic audiences. The messaging and positive branding can sometimes be a difficult component to measure but are absolutely valuable assets to a community in our opinion. Why mention this? Well because we know the Landfill will do the opposite for Brighton, its surrounds and Dunedin as a whole. Brighton becomes the once cute seaside town out near the tip, the dump, the landfill. There is nothing positive in this.

AVIATION SAFETY - DUNEDIN AIRPORT - BIRDSTRIKE RISK

We plan to continue bringing new Film and TV projects to Dunedin. This involves flying cast and crew into the region and to this end we along with every traveller need a safe airport.

The proposed Landfill site is approximately 5000 metres* from Dunedin International and Domestic Airport. International Aviation Guidelines prohibit the placement of Landfill within 13 km of an airport. Why would the DCC ignore this important safety guideline given the real and significant risks posed by bird-strike? Even the smallest potential of an aviation catastrophe should be a clear reason to reject this proposed Smooth Hill Landfill site.

If the Landfill proposal is successful how does the DCC guarantee the safety of passengers and crew flying in and out of Dunedin Airport?

*NB: We suspect the site sits even closer (if not within) the controlled airspace around the Airport runway. We witnessed an Air New Zealand Passenger Jet descending directly over the proposed Landfill site. And further note the site will also be some 100M above the level of the Airport.

DOES THE PROPOSAL MEET THE NEW FRESHWATER GUIDELINES?

We feel the revival of a decades old plan for the landfill is a poor vision for the future. Draining a catchment and wetlands at the head of an important creek system would seem archaic in our modern world.

Is it true that the DCC knows that if this plan had been submitted just a few days later it would have failed the new and current Freshwater guidelines? If true, this appears to be extremely cynical

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

That the application be declined.

We respectfully ask the DCC to reject the Brighton site, and begin planning for more suitable options and/or alternatives for a Landfill site. If more time is needed the existing system already using the AB Lime Quarry should be expanded on, exploring carbon offset fees and native tree planting to offset transport emissions.

I/we:

- Wish to be heard in support of our/my submission
- Not wish to be heard in support of our/my submission

If others make a similar submission, I/we will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

- Yes
- No

I, **am not** a trade competitor* of the applicant (for the purposes of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991).

**If trade competitor chosen, please complete the next statement, otherwise leave blank.*

I, **am/am not** (choose one) directly affected by an effect as a result of the proposed activity in the application that:

- a) adversely affects the environment; and
- b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

I, **do/do not** (choose one) wish to be involved in any pre-hearing meeting that may be held for this application.

I **do/do not** request* that the local authority delegates its functions, powers, and duties to hear and decide the application to 1 or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority.

I **have** served a copy of my submission on the applicant.



12 November 2021

Signature/s of submitter/s

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter/s)

(Date)

Notes to the submitter

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.

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.

Privacy: Please note that submissions are public. Your name and submission will be included in papers that are available to the media and the public, including publication on the Council website. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the notified resource consent process

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.

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 may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners.

You may not make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991 in relation to an application for a coastal permit to carry out an activity that a regional coastal plan describes as a restricted coastal activity.

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.

The address for service for the Consent Authority is:

Otago Regional Council, Private Bag 1954, Dunedin, 9054
or by email to submissions@orc.govt.nz