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:
(please print clearly)

Full Name/s:	Lisa Bosshard		
Postal Address:	[redacted]		
		Post Code:	[redacted]
Phone number:	Business:	Private:	
	Mobile: [redacted]		
Email address:	[redacted]		

I wish to submit an opposing submission on (circle one) the application of:

Applicant's Name:	DCC
And/or Organisation:	
Application Number:	R M20.280/ LUC-2020-405
Location:	McLaren Gully Road and Big Stone Road /Smooth Hill
Purpose:	New dump site

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

The whole application

My/Our submission is *(include: whether you support or oppose the application or specific parts of it, whether you are neutral regarding the application or specific parts of it and the reasons for your views*).

I have attached a written submission opposing the landfill at Smooth Hill

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

I ask you to say NO to the landfill at Smooth Hill, to turn the DCC down

I:

☐ 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

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

I **do** 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.

Lisa Bosshard — 25.10.2021

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

Dunedin city council plan for rubbish dump at Smooth Hill.

To whom it may concern, please accept this as my submission in OPPOSITION to the Smooth Hill rubbish dump site. I would like the decision to be made to turn down this application. DCC LUC-2020-405/ RM20.280. I wish to be heard at the hearing.

Lisa Bosshard 270 Otokia Kuri Bush Road East, Kuri Bush RD1 Brighton, 9091. Dunedin

cell 0276535908 email: lisabosshard@xtra.co.nz

Living halfway between Kuri bush and Henley, last year I heard Sandy Graham speaking on RNZ news about the new rubbish dump site at Smooth Hill assuming it was going ahead. I am disgusted by the arrogance of the Dunedin City Council pushing this through knowing the law was about to change which would protect this and other vulnerable sites.

As the Otago Regional Council has the say now, I ask you to consider :

• the new law and the ethics of accepting this proposal and its potential harm to the environment.

• your ratepayers in the area, and other interested parties such as environmental groups and scientists who think that this is an unacceptable proposition.

• the environmental impact of this dump.

• pushing it back to the council to come up with some better options. We are in an era where environmental concerns can no longer be pushed under the carpet, and this must be properly thought through. We are not in the 1990s.

I have lived five minutes down the road from the site on Otokia Kuri Bush Road East for 15 years. I have personal and environmental reasons against this plan. Not least that the council says they have spoken to locals in the area, and none of my neighbours, one of the directly neighbouring farmers or myself have been contacted at any time by the DCC. (ODT report Aug 31 /2020 Boffa Miskells report..." notes consultation began with rural residential and commercial landowners and occupiers in the vicinity of the site in late 2018) This shows an outstanding lack of consideration for the local community, a lack of actually looking at who is in the vicinity and for people that have moved into subdivisions in the area. This is not an acceptable way to treat the community.

I do not believe the Otago Regional Council, now that this area would be protected by the new environmental law can let the dump go ahead at Smooth Hill.

I am against this site personally:

• I live five minutes toward the coast from this site and along with nine neighbouring residential properties will be downwind when a hot and potentially stinking northwester is blowing. People from the council like to tell me that the stench that I often drive through at Green Island is nothing to do with the dump. I beg to differ as a dump is ALWAYS a stinking dirty place and how could it not pollute the local air. Yes there is a waste treatment plant there too, but I know the difference between what rubbish and waste smells like. In recent years I have come across this stench as far south as Westwood.

• One only has to drive over the Waldronville - Kaikorai Estuary bridge to see the amount of rubbish that has blown or somehow got into the water, it's disgusting. I know that if a dump site is put into this forestry

area, people will fly-dump even more than they do at present, and the extreme winds that this area gets will likely see rubbish spread.

• The traffic on the road I use to get to work in Mosgiel will be dangerous on what is at present a single lane dirt road. (Otokia-Kuri Bush Road East and Big Stone Road). I don't want to see this quiet rural area turn into an industrial site other than when the forestry is making their mess. That is bad and dangerous enough.

• There are two houses on McLaren Gully Road whose residents lives will be drastically changed or they will need to move. I know one is accepting of this, but there are residents in Big stone road that are not happy.

• I feel angry that when I am so careful not to buy things wrapped in plastic, to compost, to care for the earth, when I plant hundreds of natives and have a voluntary native revegetation nursery with friends for providing the community with free plants that now I am to be one of the closest houses to the cities waste. That makes me very angry.

• The council should have warned people buying in the area that this was planned. They should never have allowed subdivision if this was their known intention. The public will not know to access this type of information if they don't know the threat even exists.

• I may be considered a NIMBY. Well- I am, because no one else cares what goes on in my backyard, and there is plenty bad stuff there without the dump as well. We have hunters shooting on the road in the middle of the night on a regular basis onto private property including my own, rubbish dumpers, pig hunters poaching, animal remains dumped, fish remains dumped, drinking louts speeding on the road with guns and lighting fires, farm animals poached, my own pets poached. Its not an easy area to live in, which I only discovered when I moved here and by then it was too late. We don't need more negative things going on in this place. But maybe that is why it was chosen. Hidden away in the forest like everything else where nobody from the city will see. Well its a dirty secret and not acceptable.

• I resent that my life will be a very changed world because the DCC is not smart enough to find a better solution.

I am concerned that noise will effect the local environment and residential properties. At night I can hear the train at Henley, so we are likely to hear bird scaring devices/ machinery etc

I note that three significant land owners adjoining or close to the dump area are not listed on those affected. These properties will be as affected as those listed.

Environmental reasons

• I do not want any native forest, wetland,creeks, groundwater, falcons, lizards, birds , insects, frogs, water species to be hurt, killed or disadvantaged by a dump being placed on Smooth Hill.

- If the DCC landfill management are poisoning insects and rodents this WILL affect the wildlife in the environment by secondary poisoning (moreporks/ falcons/hawks). I wonder too how they will discourage pigs in a humane and satisfactory way.

• The dump site may affect Palmer's Creek as well as Otokia Creek. Palmers creek which comes out at the Adams dairy shed on state highway 1 already looks yellow and toxic - possibly from forestry run-off further up the hill where the dump site is planned. This creek is running into the Taieri Plains – what was once a wetland, floods regularly and surely is not the place for a city dump to drain into. Otokia Creek which runs down into Brighton to the sea sounds like it will definitely be affected. People swim here, this is a popular beach with a wetland which has QE2 reserve status. Is this acceptable for potential dump waste to spill into? And make no mistake one day it will.

• This is a borough which has long been forgotten by Dunedin. Historically it has been seen as poor land only fit for forestry and at that time maybe a dump. Many people from the city have no idea the area even exists. Until a couple years ago I would call the DCC to clear fallen trees on the road and they didn't even know this area was in their region. This makes it the ideal place to hide a dump away.

But the world has changed and now things like white bait, eel and waterbird habitat (Henley/ Otokia creek) forest and bird habitat (Kuri Bush remnants and McLaren Gully Road native forest reserve hold environmental value. These are some of the few remaining lowland forest remnants in New Zealand and should not be in the vicinity of a dump. The small degraded wetlands on McLaren Gully Road should be protected not removed as the DCC intends. Until the forest was cleared a few years ago (by the DCC??) these small wetlands were healthy and full of frogs, Carex secta and other native species. I used to love to drive past them, they WERE beautiful.

• **Fire hazard** In the last fire season we had five substantial fires in the local area. Three were thought to be arson including one in the Wenita forest at the top of Dicksons Road. Residents only become aware of the fire hazard in the area once their homes are built and they are settled, and then they realise what they have bought. Added to that the drought over previous summers, the dry winters and the Fire authorities reticence to place a fire ban, plus the extreme weather we have been getting over the past few years, it seems madness to me to place an added fire hazard into this mix.

I am terrified of the Wenita and DCC forestry catching fire. Wenita acknowledges this is a serious danger. I would lose everything to say nothing of the horrific consequences to the wildlife – pest and native and environment as was seen in the Saddle Hill fire. Gas flares burning off LFG is madness in a forestry area just waiting to catch alight during a hot summer. To make it worse this is on the dry side of the range with residential properties that have been permitted by the DCC.

As a resident I am NOT PERMITTED to light an outdoor fire at any time (DCC covenant) because of the fire risk! So why can they have fires going at any time? The fire service makes logging contractors stop work in summer at certain times due to the fire risk, we are told to not use grinders / chainsaws in case a spark starts a fire and burns the whole lot down. Flares are an unacceptable risk to the environment and the local community.

If the forestry goes up in flames my home and my animals who are my pets and family will be destroyed as will my neighbours. The lowland forest remnants on our properties will be lost forever. If this dump goes ahead and there is a fire I will hold both the council and ORC totally responsible. And I wont forget who those in charge are. These people are putting my home at further risk, and I find that distasteful. They would not want that for themselves.

• The Dcc waste manager assured me that the bag/ dam will not leak. That the liquid content of the dump will be taken elsewhere like our sewage treatment station – which then pumps it into the sea. That's not environmentally sound and if the bag does leak – which of course one day it will, what then? Two polluted creeks one running onto the plains the other running into the sea. And what harm will the liquid removed and transported to the waste-water plant in town do when it is pumped into the sea?

In this day and age the councils should be coming up with better ideas than this. I'm a landscape designer studied BAppSc in Landscape management at Massey University. I'm not an engineer or a waste professional or an ecologist but even I can think of other options, better than this.

• compostable items should be taken out of the mix and a community compost scheme should be set up. The DCC man I spoke to agreed, but the council is not forward thinking enough to make it FREE. We are paying for it, it does not have to be charged again. This is what will make people do it. We have all accepted going into lock-down, I think people can accept composting their waste and will be more inclined to do it with no extra cost. If the cost of dumping real rubbish was high then people would compost as much as possible. Christchurch did a free composting scheme so why cant we.

• Our city could do a no plastic in our system campaign – I go to the supermarket and still most people are putting their vegetables into single use plastic bags we haven't gone far enough and the DCC has done nothing about this.

• Building waste is a massive problem - but much of the timber and materials could be used elsewhere or separated and dumped in an environmentally effective manner - untreated timber and particle boards reconstituted or shredded and composted, metal recycled, demolition yards like Halls supported to recycle old house parts, concrete used as fill, green waste composted FREE.

• All these options cost but so does the making and running of a big giant bag of rubbish with the regular removal of liquid and its transport back to Dunedin and the delivery of the waste itself to the dump site.

• Toxic material needs to be dealt with properly anyway. I am concerned the council will be finding some way it can be incorporated into the system.

I hope you will push this back on the Dunedin City Council and make them come up with an environmentally acceptable solution. Waste Futures - the irony is sickening. Our councillors and council workers are voted in and paid to do a good job for the whole of Dunedin not just the central city. We don't want the cities rubbish any more than they do. And just because I don't want this in my backyard, I don't want it to go in anyone else's either. We need to stop producing the rubbish, we need to find real solutions. Clean futures not Waste futures